

The Fraternal

JANUARY, 1944

No. 53

Officers:

President — SYDNEY G. MORRIS.

Chairman — E. CORNS DAVIES.

Treasurer — W. H. PRATT, 17, Rickmansworth Road, Watford.

Secretaries —

B. GREY GRIFFITH, B.D., 11, Herondale Ave., Wandsworth Common, S.W.18
SYDNEY G. MORRIS, 253, Creighton Avenue, London, N.2

Librarian — H. M. ANGUS, B.A., B.D., 19, Furnival Street, E.C.4

Temporary Editorial Board — J. R. EDWARDS,
W. CHAS. JOHNSON, SYDNEY G. MORRIS.

STAND FAST, BAPTISTS!

SO Dr. Whale transfers from Cheshunt to Mill Hill, and the Schoolmaster takes the place of the College Principal. Some years ago the Head of Taunton became President at Bristol; thus travelling in the opposite direction. Is this an indication of the comparative value of these posts in the estimation of the holders? If so, it would be interesting to hear what Whitaker would say to Whale.

A further query is, whether Dr. Whale's acceptance betrays doubt in his mind concerning the future of the Congregational Church and Ministry, a reflection which derives some substance from his expressed hope that Archbishop Temple may, ere his reign closes, lead us all into a United Church of England—a hope that will doubtless find frequent expression.

Now, the irreducible minimum claimed by Anglicans as the price of union, is the acceptance of the Creeds, the two Sacraments and Episcopal Ordination, depending in its turn on the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. This may present no difficulty to Dr. Whale, but it is not easily welcomed by Baptists. Creeds always create an uncomfortable theological atmosphere and Baptists ever hesitate to require solemn subscription to statements of faith often expressed in terms which can be used, only with reservation. Apostolic Succession they regard as a figment of the imagination or, if this be too strong, they are perplexed when Convocation looks askance at their irregular ministry only in turn to be outchurched by the Roman, in whose eyes the Archbishop himself is simply—Mr. William Temple.

The chief difficulty, however, with Baptists lies in the Anglican insistence on Sacraments. It is not only that by this act Christian bodies, Quakers and Salvation Army, for instance, are left out in the cold, but that Baptism, as taught by Anglicans, is fundamentally different from the Believer's Baptism of the New Testament. Infant Baptism is emphasised by Dr. Whale as in some mysterious manner conveying grace to an infant, the while Dr. Micklem, looking over his shoulder, smilingly nods assent. Baptists regard such a ceremony as devoid of Scriptural authority, and

the teaching of Anglicans and Romans concerning it as savouring more of paganism than of Christianity.

The appeal, therefore, is, that while Baptists should welcome every opportunity of uniting with other Christians (although the R.Cs. will not consent even to pray with us) the time has come for Baptists to stand fast in the Truth by which they have been made free.

Merely to stand fast, however, is insufficient. We have neither to sit, nor stand, but to go forward. If Believer's Baptism is the citadel of Evangelical truth, conserving the very essence of the Gospel, it is for Baptists to proclaim that Gospel with increasing conviction and fervency. Man's need is to know the Grace of God which enters the human heart, independent of priest or ceremony; and it is the need of our churches to realise that spiritual life, which is the heritage of those who have been redeemed by Christ, and who have confessed Him in His own appointed way.

Let Baptists be up and doing. It may then well be that those evangelical principles which Baptists cherish, shall prove to be the supreme instrument by which God, through Christ, shall lead mankind back to Himself.

THE GOSPEL AND THE APPLICATION.

PROFESSOR C. H. Dodd in his book *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* succeeded in giving a new vitalizing idea to students of the New Testament. He distinguished between what he calls the *kerugma* or proclamation from the *didache* or teaching in the early Christian mission. The proclamation was the good news preached to the heathen whereby they were stimulated to believe and to leave the kingdom of darkness for the realm of light. The teaching, on the other hand, was instruction in the Christian way aimed at producing good Christian living. Thus the *kerugma* had faith in view and the teaching obedience; the *kerugma* aimed at conversion while the teaching sought to instruct those who were converted. It almost corresponds to our distinction between preaching to sinners and to saints.

Not quite however, because the saints want to hear the good news as well as the sinners, and what is more, they need to. Does Dodd's distinction help us in our present situation?

Every preacher knows the difficulty of balancing the gospel and its application. To-day the application seems all important. There are so many wrongs to be righted, so many manifest needs in the world calling for the challenge of the Christian teaching. Indeed, how this word "challenge" has become prominent of late years. Further, are not most of the people we address on Sundays already converted people who need most of all to be stimulated to put their Christianity into practice?

Yet the observer cannot fail to notice that too much application—preaching is resented by many of our people; further, that it does not seem quite to build up the church as one might expect. Maybe we have overdone the prophets, but it is a fact that an announcement of a course of sermons on the prophets of Israel creates depression rather than enthusiasm. "Our minister seems to be carried off with every kind of ism rather than with the gospel." This kind of thing is being said by members of our churches who are far removed from the old cry "Give us the good old gospel." I have heard it so many times in different places that I am obliged to think there is something wrong somewhere, or at least, shall I say, something for us to think about and investigate. When enquiry is made the ism is frequently some quite worthy cause, some fundamentally Christian idea or bit of service, usually service on the world scale.

Now it is quite easy to say that this kind of talk is due to the fact that our people are lethargic and just want to sit back and be at ease

in Zion, for which the remedy is still more stimulus toward application of the Gospel. It is true that none of us would say that Christian devotion is anything like what we would fain see, nor is the impact of the church on the world in its desperate need anything as good as an ardent spirit who has measured the significance of Christ would desire. The minister, by reason of his position, is in these days, bound to be greatly concerned, and in a sense, to bear the world on his heart, and this, more so than can be expected of the average member, busy with the ordinary affairs of common days. But does this difference of intensity of spirit between minister and people account entirely for the restiveness and impatience of the congregation under application-preaching? I believe there is something more to it.

I have before now been told that it is a long time since I myself was in the pastorate and that things are very different now from what they were twenty years ago. That I fully admit. In the present sphere I have more opportunity of hearing what the pew says, and perhaps forming a judgment concerning it. I am far from wishing to instruct my brethren as to how to preach, but Dodd's idea has given me some insight, I think, into the situation that we together face. I am convinced that it is largely a question of atmosphere created by the two kinds of preaching. The one gives a sense of the irresistible power of God, and has in it the note of triumph since it celebrates something done. The other rather depresses by sketching the magnitude of the need, when so often it seems as though there *is little* we can do about it. There is perhaps, nothing more depressing for a sensitive soul than to be shown a great human need, and at the same time be made to feel that he cannot at once strike into it and relieve it. Does not much of our application-preaching to-day merely reveal and emphasize our futility? Is this why, to some extent, it is resented?

The early Christian mission, I believe, has help for us at this point. The *kerugma* was something more than a mere call to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and repent. It was actually a preaching of Christ in his historic setting. Always it began with the assertion of the activity of God in history from the beginning. Thus the preachers, as witnessed in the *Acts of the Apostles*, always begin with the Old Testament. There God is seen on the human plane, revealing himself to men, guiding history and redeeming the race. This pre-Christian activity of God culminates in Christ. Christ is God's outstanding gift in this providential guidance of the race. As men accept Him in this setting they find the powers of the reign of God in their own hearts. They thus know that they are safe and the world is safe and eternity is sure. Hence they can lift up their hearts.

The whole message is indeed heartening; it stirs the soul at the signs of the goodness of God and gives a sense of assurance and confidence even in the darkest hour. "When the sky is overcast with dense clouds" wrote Calvin, "and a violent tempest arises, the darkness which is presented to our eye, and the thunder which strikes our ears and stupifies all our senses with terror, make us imagine that everything is thrown into confusion, though in the firmament itself all continues quiet and serene. In the same way when the tumultuous aspect of human affairs unfits us for judging, we should still hold that God, in the pure light of His justice and wisdom, keeps all these commotions in due subordination and conducts them to their proper end." No one will deny that this is the kind of faith which ought to strengthen the Christian heart in a time such as that through which we are passing. But is it not a fact that such a faith can only be sustained on the basis of our salvation in Christ? What God has done through Christ to us personally, and to the world through the years that, and that alone, can be the soul's true rest.

Then, how necessary it is for even converted people to hear about it again and again in such a pass. I believe this is the reason why Christian people ask for the gospel as apparently they always do in war-time; it is a testimony to what Christ, the fact of Christ means to the bewildered soul. And if we can present him as did the first apostles in the historical setting as the culmination and proof of God's firm hold of the world, the one in whom all the promises are yea and Amen, then we shall at least minister to Christian confidence, and maybe create the atmosphere in which obedience can blossom and triumph. Certain it is that there can be no effective application save where the gospel itself is highly appreciated. The *kerugma* is the basis of the teaching.

All this however, is not written to excuse us from the application type of preaching. We all know the temptation—and it is a temptation—to leave that to the other fellow. We all know that gospel-preaching is more acceptable especially just now. That fact in itself makes us beware. There has to be the teaching, as well as the *kerugma*, and in the present situation there has to be much of it. The only point I raise is the proportion. How much space shall we give to each? The Christian message contains consolations as well as challenges. All consolation and no challenge leads to anæmia, and that speedily. On the other hand all challenge and no consolation depresses to the point of inertia. The scribe who is wise in the kingdom of God brings forth out of his treasure, things new and old.

A. DAKIN.

CAN ROME UNITE WITH US?

ONE of the outstanding features of the religious life of our time is the apparent change in attitude on the part of the Roman Church towards Protestantism in this country, as evidenced by Roman participation in many "Religion and Life Weeks" held in our cities. In some places Roman participation in united meetings has been qualified by the strict observance of Cardinal Vaughan's frank declaration "We will not pray with you, and you shall not pray with us," a qualification, so it seems to me, of the gravest implications: in other places Rome's tender conscience on this point has been appeased in some way or other. The fact remains that prayer or no prayer a willingness to appear on a united platform constitutes a remarkable change of front, and calls for serious consideration.

Indeed, in view of the warm welcome it has received by many Protestants, who read into the apparent change of front a genuine change of heart, it may not be inopportune to remind ourselves of the Rock from which we are hewn, and in particular to reacquaint ourselves with the historical circumstances in which the Protestant Reformation was wrought, and the principles for which it stood, and in the light of these facts to consider what may be our reaction to the new fact of our time.

What, then, were the circumstances in which the Reformation was wrought? On the eve of the Reformation, the long rivalry between the Papacy and the Empire had ended in a victory for the Papacy, the claim of the Pope to both spiritual and temporal power had been declared in the Gloss of Innocent IV on the Decretals. It is true that the claim to temporal power was resisted by the Emperor of Bavaria, who relied on the arguments of Marcellia of Padua, and also by the Princes at the Councils of Basle and Constance; but the Popes won the day, and as a result they came to be treated almost as gods. A contemporary epigram coined about Alexander VI is significant: "Cæsar was a great one, now Rome is greater; Sextus reigned as a man, Alexander reigns as a god!"

This autocratic power led to two far-reaching results—the secularisation of the ecclesiastic and the subjection of the believer. Dr. Kidd,* who will

* B. Kidd, "The Continental Reformation."

not be accounted a friend of the Reformation, provides the following facts among many others. The first Borgia Pope gave his nephew 70,000 ducats per annum from benefices. Cardinal John was given his first bishopric when he was three years old. Two clerics killed a brother of Lorenzo the Magnificent at Mass, and Sixtus IV put Florence under an interdict for putting the assassins to death. The utterances of the Popes themselves are revealing. Said Alexander: "God willeth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should pay and live!" Said Julius: "God has given us the Papacy; let us enjoy it!" That the immoral lives of the Popes were well known is shown by the following verse chalked up on the walls of the Vatican: "Innocent has eight sons, and as many daughters; well does Rome do to call him 'Father'!"

As to the position of the humble believer, I cannot do better than quote Professor Beard†: "The devout believer found himself in the presence of a vast organised Christianity which imposed itself upon the believer in the majesty of an unquestioned authority. It demanded his obedience under penalties, both temporal and eternal, of a tremendous kind. For all good he was the supplicant of the Church. Without her there was no access to God, no spiritual life now, no salvation hereafter." An autocratic power leading to the secularisation of the ecclesiastic from Pope to village priest, and to the complete subjection of the individual believer, such was the state of things on the eve of the Reformation. This was Rome when her life was unassailed by heretics, and her historical claims as yet undisputed.

And now, what was the nature of the Reformers' challenge? First, from out of a redeeming experience they put forth the Bible in place of the Church as the word of God to men. Luther's experience is classic. In torment for many years through believing that God demands penance for sin—for who can know if he has ever done enough penance?—the Greek New Testament came into his hand; he found that the penitencia of the Latin was the metanoia of the Greek, and that, therefore, what God requires of man is not penance but repentance. At once his life was changed. Penance had left the issue in the balance, but repentance he could give! He found the peace that comes from believing. What, then, could he say of the Book which had brought him this discovery? Must it not be the true rule for faith and life? From out of that redeeming experience he went out to put forth the Bible and not the Church as the word of God to men.

Second, and following from it, Luther in particular preached the doctrine of Justification by Faith, in place of an ultimate salvation attained by external acts. The fourth article of the Confession of Augsburg sets forth his case: "We teach that men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, merit, or works, but that they are freely justified because of Christ, by faith, when they believe that they are received into grace, and that their sins are remitted because of Christ, who by His own death has given satisfaction for our sins. This faith God reckons righteousness before Him." In a world where men were taught to believe that an ultimate salvation might be secured through a faithful observance of a long list of ritual acts, this was a fundamental challenge indeed. It made religion what it had not been, intimately personal. As Beard says: "This promise of the Gospel was made known everywhere, and once it was accepted what more was necessary? The need of a priesthood, of a visible church, even of sacraments, fell away. The whole fabric of the Roman Catholic Church tumbled to pieces under the operation of this powerful solvent. Christianity was once more a personal thing, a power within the soul, placing it in direct relation to God."

† Charles Beard, "The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century."

Third, and closely connected with his other claims, Luther advanced, in common with Hus, Wycliffe, and the Waldenses, the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, against the prevailing sacerdotalism. What is a priest? And how is a priest made? Luther answered these fundamental questions in his typical forthright way: "All Christians," he says, † "are truly of the clergy, and among them there is no difference save of office only." It is baptism which makes a man a priest. As Baptists we cannot but discern an inconsistency in this latter claim. If, as Luther asserted, salvation is the gift of God in response to repentance towards God and faith in Jesus Christ, what is the function of infant baptism? What can it do? Luther, as the evidence shows, actually felt a considerable difficulty on this score, and was hard put to in his attempt to uphold Justification by Faith and Infant Baptism. But when that has been said, his claim that it is baptism which makes the priest can be understood to express the New Testament position—that all Christians are priests. Here we touch the fundamental divergence between Luther and the Roman Catholic Church. His whole system was built upon the principle of a special caste, possessing special powers, whose ministrations were absolutely essential to their people. When Luther struck at sacerdotalism, he struck at the very heart of the Roman Catholic Church. Here no compromise was possible. It was a fundamental divergence. The battle could not but be joined. Such, in brief outline, were some of the principles of the Protestant Reformation.

What, then, of this apparent change of front? Is it a genuine change of heart? Have we really ceased to be heretics in the eyes of Rome? The recent burning of Bibles in Spain does not suggest a change of heart upon that issue, while the hesitations and qualifications with which united prayer are surrounded do not indicate any fundamental change there either. And on our side, have we anything to yield over the authority of the Bible, Justification by Faith, and the Priesthood of all Believers? Are we really aiming at the same things? And can two walk together except they be agreed? As inheritors of the Protestant Reformation, for which we do not apologise, and for whose great blessings we thank God, such questions are at least worthy of consideration alongside of our desire "that they all may be one."

K. TUCKER.

† "Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation," 1520.

FIVE FUNDAMENTALS FOR REVIVAL.

LOOSE thinking often leads large sections of the Christian Church to imagine that nothing can be done in order to produce a true religious revival except to pray for it. I have never been able to accept that point of view.

We know that God *may* use the most unlikely instruments in the most unpromising times to bring about the progress of His Kingdom; but I hold that if we wish to be justified in *expecting* such progress, and to be of service in speeding its advance, there are several things to which we must attend, and to which we should attend at once.

I.

The first is that we and our people must understand the folk we are endeavouring to convert. We must appreciate their outlook and realise their difficulties if we are to address ourselves efficiently to the task of changing their outlook and removing their problems. To most of us who are ministers this attempt to form a just estimate of the non-Christian's attitude will probably come naturally; but it may not be so easy to all who work with us. Hence we must give thought to the matter. Otherwise

we shall often find efforts that had promising beginnings ruined by addresses full of technical terms which the "outsiders" do not now understand—"salvation," "justification," "propitiation," and so on; or by others which put things in the wrong order—offering people deliverance from sin before they are aware of being sinners; or by yet others which build their argument purely on Scriptural texts, while the hearers have not yet taken the initial step of believing in the inspiration of the Bible in any sense at all. Such wasting of well-meant energy is regrettable, and should not occur. All the Christians should take the trouble to understand their task. They should realise that they are dealing with people who are mostly fairly satisfied with themselves and entirely unconvinced that they are in any serious sense worthy of condemnation by God or man. They are dealing with people who are not convinced that either the Christian religion or its authoritative books are true. And because of these two points these people are not likely to have any interest in the first instance in what we say about other worlds than this.

II.

If we have grasped all this, we shall readily accept the second point of my thesis, which is that a Church which is to be justified in expecting Revival must not only *understand* those it seeks to convert, but *must be capable of arousing a sense of sin in them*. And this is by no means an easy task. Most of those with whom we have to do are not people who have drifted from the high standards of godly homes, but are rather the all-too-faithful followers of the low standards of homes that never were Christian. Hence they have little sense of guilt. They do, however, realise that "there is something wrong with the world"; and it seems to me that our task is to open their eyes to their share of responsibility for the hideous "corporate sins" that torture our afflicted race. They realise, for example, the heinousness of the horrors of war and the cruel frustrations forced upon many lives through unemployment; let us show them that these are not due merely to the exceptional wickedness of a small group of politicians or financiers, but to the constant indifference of men in general to the wrongs of people of other races, or other classes, than their own. Again, they realise, or they can soon be brought to realise, the horror of the needlessly widespread ravages of preventable disease; of the dreadfully high mortality of infants in our slums; of the prevalence of evil customs in many lands, such as child marriage in India; of the blasting of all hopes of true romance and of satisfying home life for many thousands, through sexual laxity; and of the wrecking of all too many households by strong drink. Cannot we show them that all these things are the result of humanity's criminal negligence. The world is like a house on fire; and yet authors, journalists, playwrights, and our hearers themselves have often fanned the flames instead of putting them out. Jesus offers the means of extinguishing the conflagration, and they have neglected him.

It seems to me that the Church must speak to-day on such social, corporate sins, in order to produce individual repentance. By some means or other the sense of guilt must be aroused.

III.

It must be remembered, however, that the sense of guilt, when aroused, will not find its proper means of remedy unless we are able to convince men of the truth of our beliefs. This generation is not likely to be convinced by anything less than direct factual evidence. Mere exhortations, appeals to the emotions, or emphasis on the beauty of Christian teaching are not likely to go far with those who have been trained almost to idolise the methods of modern science. To deserve Revival, therefore, let us proclaim the facts we have to give. In our Bible

classes, at least, time should be given to setting forth, for example, the easily-grasped proof of the authenticity of the great Pauline Epistles. The extent to which the progress of the Western world has been an outcome of Christianity can scarcely be too often stressed. Moreover, Christianity is essentially a belief that the Supernatural has impinged upon the affairs of our world. Let us therefore give, unhesitatingly and clearly, good evidence of modern miracles, such as the power of the Spirit of God to change the hearts of men. The evidence can be given; and an ounce of witness will be worth a ton of exhortation. To repeat the triumphs of "Acts," the Church must give men facts.

IV.

Another point must be emphasised. Christians who are to win those really outside the Church must *live out* their gospel. For we have to gain the attention of the people around us; and they are not greatly interested at first in our theories about the next world. They want to know if Christ's teaching will affect this world, to-day; and they test us by our deeds as much as by our words. The tragedy is that there is a popular impression abroad that there is not much difference, either in outlook or character, between the Christian and the "good-living" man who is not Christian. Yet how easily this mistaken view could be dispelled! There are a whole range of virtues in which the Christian is unique; and it is our business to display them. The importance of the present time of war is in part the golden opportunity it gives for this—for showing that the acceptance or rejection of Christian teaching is going to make all the difference in solving the problems of our own time. For example, a Christian is one who loves his enemies—who, unlike Lord Vansittart, endeavours to understand their point of view, even while he opposes them. He remembers that even in our modern Ninevehs there are "more than six score thousand persons who know not their right hand from their left," and when all others are silent, he is the man to raise his voice against the needless brutality of destroying whole cities by bombing, or starving whole nations by unduly rigorous blockade. He has been taught, too, not to "lay up treasure on earth" either for himself, his family, or his class. He is that amazing spectacle—a being who lives to serve. Let him, like a Francis or a Wesley, consistently live out these principles, and he will not have to complain long of having failed to attract attention.

We shall never win respect, much less attention, unless we are consistent to our Master's teachings. Let us live them, and let us draw attention to their importance and relevance for our time, by shouting from the housetops those parts of them which differentiate His followers from other good men.

V.

One point more. When the flame of Revival has begun to flicker into existence, it is not likely to make good its hold if we are unduly and foolishly afraid of the emotional manifestations which will doubtless accompany it. Indeed, I believe that Revival may be delayed if we are not frank and wise about this matter. No one, I hope, to-day believes in playing upon emotion, or seeking through it alone to secure an unreasoning decision for Christ; for emotion should not be our great instrument. But to expect a true decision for Christ with a complete absence of emotion is to expect the impossible; and to endeavour to tone down the natural overwhelming joy and penitence that should be present is to do a most unwise thing. Subconsciously, most young people judge their experiences by the quality of emotion they produce. If films and dances make them feel "on top of the world," while Christianity makes them feel only "good," in due course they will prefer those things to Christianity. But if conversion is accepted for what it really is, its effect upon the emotions will be greater

and gladder than that of any other earthly experience. Let us, then, welcome this, and give it means of expression. Let us revel in the look of utter joy and confidence, the speaking handshake, the exulting eyes, which the new convert displays. Let us rejoice in the hymns and tunes that offer them means of expression, and abandon our stilted reserve as we sing with them:

"Floods of joy o'er my soul
Like the sea-billows roll,
Since Jesus came into my heart."

There are no doubt more points that should be raised; but let us start with these. Let our churches take these things to heart, and at least we shall have removed some of the main hindrances that retard Revival's dawn.

A. C. DAVIES.

A RUGBY EXPERIMENT.

IN the chapel of Rugby School is a plain square stone which bears the name "Thomas Arnold." My first visit to it made me read again a book which I managed to enjoy in boyhood days by skipping the pages of morallings; the book is, of course, entitled *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. The book is some evidence of Arnold's greatness, for here is a boy's hero-worship standing the test of manhood's judgment. Not only among the boys of the school, however, did Arnold's character make a vivid impression, the more intimate circle was equally aware of the force of his personality. Fifteen years after his death his famous son, Matthew, in thinking of the father, speaks of the light of his "radiant vigour," describes him as a "mighty oak," beneath whose boughs was rest and shade, and feels the power of the "strong soul."

Thomas Arnold lived in days very much like our own, for they were days of much change and many experiments. The call was for leadership, and, perhaps, no one gave a more influential answer to that call than Arnold. In his book entitled, *The Price of Leadership*, Middleton Murry suggests that "Arnold's reform of the public schools reformed the old and created a new ruling class, superior in moral quality and sense of social responsibility to the old one"; and he asserts that from Arnold's educational convictions "derived (I believe) most of the fine achievements of the English ruling class of the nineteenth century." To-day we are facing educational problems of a radical character, one of the chief of which is the meeting of the need for strong leadership; so we might do well to spend a few moments in thinking of Arnold's experiment at Rugby.

This educational experiment at Rugby was an attempt to answer the question with which that excellent book of the Christian News Letter series entitled *What is Christian Education?* begins, "What is the purpose of education?" That is still the fundamental question—which we are not facing! Arnold desired to make Rugby a place of Christian education. His purpose is expressed in a remark which occurs during a speech made after the expulsion of some boys. "It is not necessary that this should be a school of 300 or 100 or of 50 boys, but it is necessary that it should be a school of Christian gentlemen." Now it is easy to ridicule that phrase "Christian gentlemen" and many have indulged in the pleasure. It has been given a political or social label, and dismissed contemptuously. Before we do dismiss it, however, we might try to discover what Arnold meant by it.

In the first place he means that education should develop a right moral judgment. Education is religious in itself, and should not be merely based on religion. The teaching of the ancient classics or of modern history is calculated to develop character as much as is the teaching of

Scripture itself, for, as Arnold said in a sermon: "It becomes impossible to read and think much about human actions and human character without referring both to God's standard." The classics were studied then, not for "elegant scholarship" as one biographer puts it, but as "a perennial source of light and guidance for the modern world"; while another biographer, A. P. Stanley, gives us this picture of him in the classroom: "No more forcible contrast could have been drawn between the value of Christianity and of heathenism than the manner with which, for example, after reading in the earlier part of the lesson one of the Scripture descriptions of the Gentile world, "Now," he said as he opened the Satires of Horace, "we shall see what it was." At the centre of all Arnold's conviction was his belief in the value and the influence of right moral judgment. He saw life as a conflict. He felt responsible for his boys. He was eager to equip them with the power of making right decisions—and right decisions for him meant Christian decisions. It is significant that he should have made himself the school chaplain and should have sought, as he undoubtedly did, to make his sermons intelligible to the boys and directed to the moral and spiritual issues of which the boys themselves were aware in their own school life. This whole emphasis on moral conflict is well expressed by his son as he meditates upon the life of his father:

Still thou upraisest with zeal
The humble good from the ground,
Sternly represseth the bad.
Still, like a trumpet, dost rouse
Those who with half-open eyes
Tread the border land dim
'Twixt vice and virtue; reviv'st,
Succourest,—this was thy work,
This was thy life upon earth.

In the second place Christian education means the formation of habits of intellectual industry. Consider a sentence from Arnold's daily prayer with the Sixth Form, "O, Lord, strengthen the faculties of our minds and dispose us to exert them." It has been said that "this conception of mental cultivation as a religious duty is just as important a part of Arnold's teaching as is the idea of moral earnestness." Laziness is a moral fault. At the same time Arnold could appreciate the dull boy who makes every effort to succeed. He accepted the rebuke of a small boy whom he had somewhat hastily reprimanded: "Indeed, sir, I am doing my best."

In the third place education must lead to the acceptance of social responsibility. The qualities of moral judgment and intellectual industry which Arnold sought to develop were not for the enrichment of personal life only; he was acutely conscious of being a member of society, and he believed that true life is found only as social responsibilities are accepted. A large part of the Rugby experiment was directed by this conviction, so that he endeavoured to make the school a real society, in which each boy should be aware of his proper place, and should accept his responsibility. It was an axiom with Arnold that he should treat everyone with courtesy. The junior masters, who in those days occupied a very inferior, and often despised position, were made to feel that they were "partners in a thrilling enterprise," and shared in a council of masters. He chose them always with care: "What I want," he said, "is a man who is a Christian and a gentleman—an active man and one who has common sense and who understands boys." But in addition to the real co-operation between masters he sought the co-operation of the boys. The Sixth Form boys became *praeceptors* and were given considerable

responsibility in the government of the school society. The position is well described thus: "He turned the Sixth Form into a corps of young commissioned officers for a campaign against offences in the school." Perhaps the large measure of responsibility which Arnold gave to the Sixth Form led to priggishness, perhaps sometimes it was abused, but his desire to develop a community of boys in which the capacity for self-government should grow is not to be despised. Boys left the school with a sense of social responsibility, ready to serve in the society of the nation as they had served in the society of the school.

There is nothing new in these conceptions, though they were revolutionary in Arnold's day. All are familiar to us—yet they are still fundamental. Middleton Murry puts it like this: "By a Christian education Dr. Arnold meant an education based on the conviction that the national society was a Christian society, whose purpose was to strive to realize the Kingdom of God on earth . . . He was no facile optimist . . . but he believed that Christ offered the means for overcoming the natural evils of society. He was convinced that it could not be overcome by secular means . . . Either men must set themselves consciously and deliberately, under the leadership and inspiration of Christ, to realize the Kingdom of God on earth, or they would achieve the devil's kingdom instead. Neutrality in education was fatal: "He who is not with me is against me." That is the issue! It was so in Arnold's day; it is so in our day. What made Arnold's Rugby experiment so successful was the fact that he himself was an ardent Christian. There is never any doubt about his personal discipleship, and there is never any doubt that that took the first place in his life and thinking. He set out not merely to develop educational theories. He was the Christian soldier fighting his battle against evil. He illustrates the abiding truth that the soul of Christian education is the Christian teacher.

L. G. CHAMPION.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AFTER THE WAR

THE Government White Paper on Educational Reconstruction declares that "there has been a very general wish, not confined to representatives of the Churches, that religious education should be given a more defined place in the life and work of the schools, springing from the desire to revive the spiritual and personal values in our society and in our national tradition." To the indignation and, we may hope, the confusion of the now out-of-date materialists who still believe that scientific knowledge is man's most efficient weapon in the struggle of life, we are swinging back to the saner standpoint that the boy or girl who knows a great deal about science and very little else is unlikely to achieve the balance and harmony which is the true end of education. The Norwood Report is emphatic on this point. "We believe that education cannot stop short of recognising the ideals of truth and beauty and goodness as final and binding for all times and in all places as ultimate values; we do not believe that these ideals are of temporary convenience only, as devices for holding together society till they can be dispensed with as knowledge grows and organisation becomes more scientific. Further, we hold that the recognition of such values implies, for most people at least, a religious interpretation of life which for us must mean the Christian interpretation of life. We have no sympathy, therefore, with a theory of education which pre-supposes that its aim can be dictated by the provisional findings of special sciences, whether biological, psychological, or sociological, that the function of education is to fit pupils to determine their outlook and conduct according to the changing needs and the changing standards of the day." (p. viii.) The framers of the White Paper and the Norwood Committee are evidently aware, as well they might be in such a world, that a generation with a

scientific training but no clear ideas about the ultimate purpose of life, is likely to be in as perilous a situation as a child who finds a stick of dynamite and thinks it is marzipan. Religion in the educational world is achieving a renaissance, but with the decline of the Sunday School and modern youth's deep suspicion of the traditional methods of the churches, religious education is likely to centre more and more in the day schools.

2.

Religious instruction in schools will certainly fail to achieve the high aims set forth in the Norwood Report unless a strong emphasis is placed upon the teaching of sound doctrine. Especially in the senior forms of secondary schools, for pupils of 16-18, simple Scripture teaching is not enough. To insist upon this is not to advocate sectarian instruction in the tenets of one denomination of the Church. Sound doctrine is the only way to make the Bible intelligible to the growing mind. No master can take his sixth form through St. John's gospel and come to the phrase "I and my Father are one" without discussing the doctrine of the Incarnation. Nor can they read "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world" without being brought face to face with the doctrine of Atonement and the question of sacraments. The gospels raise as living issues all the problems of theology, as sixth form pupils are well aware, and their questions must be answered. The protest against sectarian teaching, however justified it may have been, has indirectly resulted in an attenuated Christian teaching in schools, which has emptied the Bible of much of its significance.

There is a further reason why sound doctrine is an important part of senior religious education. The sixth form of an imaginatively organised school is largely an introduction to university life. T. R. Glover, in "Cambridge Retrospect," protesting against Cambridge colleges being staffed by "denatured groups of specialists from a score of alien universities," says that "education is really the play of soul on soul, the touch of spirit, something not communicable so readily as people think by lectures and laboratories." Now the function of a sixth form, like that of a university, is to give its members three privileges—leisure to think, the stimulus of teachers who have thought and are continuing to think, and the stuff to think about. Education at this stage is not "packing the memory with dead information and then emptying it over an examination paper" (T. R. Glover again!), but is carried on largely by discussion on all manner of subjects, and no power on earth will keep theology out of the debate. If it is not discussed in the class-room it certainly will be in the prefect's room and on the way home. "If you don't blame God for disasters, can you thank Him for safety?" "If God was divine, why did He need to be born a man?" "Should a Christian condemn Communism because it is anti-religious?" These are living questions for many sixth form boys and girls, and the answers are just as vital to them as are the latest theories of physics.

3.

It is obvious that this doctrinal teaching must be largely in the hands of the teachers who are responsible for religious instruction in the schools, but who are themselves often aware of the inadequacy of their qualifications for the task. The Board of Education arranges frequent "refresher courses," often with the help of the Institute of Religious Education, whose terminal magazine, "Religion in Education" (S.C.M. Press, 4s. 9d. per annum), is a valuable publication. But "refresher courses" by themselves are not enough. Specialists, thoroughly grounded both in the Scriptures and in their theological interpretation, are needed in schools as much as specialists in botany or chemistry. It is to be hoped that the training colleges will give facilities for students to train as Divinity masters and

mistresses, and that Local Education Authorities and Governors of Schools will employ them.

The Student Christian Movement has just set up a new department wholly concerned with the religious education of senior boys and girls in secondary and public schools. Its method is to hold a three or four-day conference, either during the holidays or over a week-end, for a school or group of schools, at which an attempt is made to state the Christian Faith clearly, to approach the problems of religion with the same intellectual honesty, seriousness, and thoroughness as is demanded in any other study; to encourage free discussion and to relate intellectual conclusions to the problem of personal conduct and social life. These conferences are followed up by S.C.M. study groups meeting regularly, where the boys and girls, led by a master, a mistress, or a minister of religion, work away at their problems and, incidentally, discover something of what fellowship means in the life of the Christian.

In these and other ways some attempt is being made to meet the new challenge and opportunity which the changing outlook on the purpose of education is offering to the whole Christian Church. R. C. WALTON.

INDIVIDUALISM AND THE MODERN TREND.

I. *Salvation: Individual or Social?*

A PADRE who had been preaching to his battalion for a year, stressing the need of personal salvation, was concerned at the lack of response to this type of preaching. His batman explained the situation thus: "Look here, sir, I'm one of a large family in Greenock. I was brought up in a one-apartment house. Do you know, sir, there are 147,000 families in Scotland living under similar conditions? You speak to me of personal salvation. I'm not worrying about the *salvation of my soul*. What I want to see is *Scotland saved* from single ends."¹

This is typical of the modern attitude. But are the salvation of the individual soul and that of society to be set in such antithesis? True as it may be that a revival of personal religion would build the foundation for a new social order we do not feel justified in ignoring the latter until the former is a *fait accompli*. Still less can we delude ourselves that our primary task is to promote social reform, as the batman suggested. Have we then, a *dual* task? Is the Christian religion as Ritsche contended, an elipse with *two foci*—the Kingdom of God (of liberal theology) and justification by faith? Or can we penetrate deeper and discover a common theological *centre* from which we visualize sin and salvation as both corporate and individual? Our theology has tended to be too individualistic in its interpretation of sin and therefore it has seemed unreal in face of collective sins such as war and mass unemployment. As individuals we do not feel these are our sins and the evangelical appeal has seemed irrelevant here.

Our supreme need to-day is to restore to our theological outlook the lost sense of corporate sin, which alone can be the basis of an appeal to repentance that does justice to the facts of our collective civilisation. We have not so much over-stressed individualism as divorced it from its proper setting of corporate responsibility.

II. *The Biblical background.*

The prophets of Israel, conscious of the social evils of their day made them the basis of an appeal for repentance. They could do this because Israel had an idea of corporate sin, based on a sense of social solidarity. The sin of the group was the sin of the individual and vice-versa. With Jeremiah and Ezekiel, individualism emerges—but fundamental as this is, we must see it on the background of the older ideas

of the social solidarity of the group, which doubtless they had no intention of completely repudiating. Theirs was a protest against excessive collectivism—but the pendulum they set in motion has swung to the opposite extreme. As Dr. Wheeler Robinson expresses it: "The growth of the idea of individual responsibility which may be seen in Jeremiah and Ezekiel ultimately led to the rejection of the old idea of the group; yet the group idea expressed, however imperfectly, that sense of social solidarity which our modern individualism has had to re-discover for itself."²

We must beware of reading an excessive individualism into the New Testament. The social solidarity of the O.T. is doubtless so much a part of the Hebrew mental outlook that it is implicit even where the stress appears to be on individualism. We err if we divorce the N.T. from the social conceptions of the Hebrew prophets which themselves go back to the social life of the nomadic clans.³ Anderson Scott says, "The salvation experience of the individual was secured to him as part of the experience of the whole. This feature which is specifically characteristic of St. Paul's conception marks it off very definitely from the Hellenistic (individualistic) conception of salvation and shows its affiliation with the Jewish (corporate) conception of the Kingdom of God."⁴

We shall miss the key to the modern situation if we dismiss St. Paul's conception of Adam and humanity's sin (in Romans V) as abstruse Rabbinical doctrine. Dodd's note on this passage is strikingly relevant. "Behind it is the ancient conception of solidarity. The moral unit was the community rather than the individual. Thus . . . Adam's sin was the sin of the race. With the growing appreciation of the ethical significance of the individual the old idea of solidarity weakened. But it corresponded to real facts. . . Adam is the name which stands to Paul for the corporate personality of mankind and a new corporate personality is created in Christ."⁵

III. *Individualism and the Reformation.*

As Protestants, and especially as Baptists, we are jealous to safeguard our individualism which we rightly regard as a heritage bought by our spiritual forebears at a great price. The pendulum in their day was swinging from the collectivism of mediæval feudal society to the economic individualism of capitalism. Max Weber, Troeltsch and others, contend that Calvinism, and especially English Puritanism, played a part of preponderant importance in creating moral and political conditions favourable to the growth of Capitalist enterprise. Certainly Calvin's theology enabled men to find their spiritual bearings in the new conditions of society; it also helped to preserve a sense of social responsibility which might have been quickly lost in the surging tide of individualism.

Unfortunately this influence was not maintained. Religious individualism, and economic and political individualism drifted apart. This was at any rate partly due to the divorce of religious individualism from the social solidarity which was at least implicit in the outlook of those who lived nearer to mediæval society. The pendulum set in motion by the Reformers went too far. Tawney observes, "The moral self-sufficiency of the Puritan nerved his will but it corroded his sense of social solidarity. . . A spiritual aristocrat who sacrificed fraternity to liberty, he drew from his idealization of personal responsibility a theory of individual rights which, secularized and generalized, was to be among the most potent explosives the world has known."⁶

"Individualism in religion led insensibly, if not quite logically, to an individualistic morality, and an individualist morality to a disparagement of the significance of the social fabric as compared with personal character."⁷

IV. *The Issue to-day.*

To-day the economic and political pendulum is swinging back to collectivism. "The attitude produced by competitive action between antagonistic individuals is transformed into a new attitude of group solidarity."⁸ What is going to be the impact on religious individualism? Our task is to preserve the essentials of our individualism by setting it in its proper perspective and restoring the Biblical background of social solidarity. The primitive collectivist outlook has its dangers which may serve to warn us, but it had its elements of truth that may contribute to a realistic approach to our modern dilemma. We certainly dare not ignore the implications of the growing collectivist mentality, especially such as produced by Fascism. It has a vital bearing on evangelism as is illustrated by the remark made by a German to Dr. Dunning. "Our paganism, as might be expected, is collective; we put the State before God. Yours is individualistic; you in your 'new paganism' put the individual's passion before the restraints of morality."⁹ But collective paganism is not alien even to Britain—we have our sins of society.

Our missionaries have been confronted with the difficulties of relating the evangelical appeal to the primitive collective mentality. Levy Bruhl observes: "There is too great a gulf between the primitive mind and the missionary's aim. How could the native imagine his personal destiny as dependent alone on his faith and his actions, to say nothing of Divine grace, when he has never even contemplated such individual independence in the community to which he belongs."¹⁰

If, as Protestants, we fail to get to grips with this issue, we may find that the religious pendulum will swing back to the collectivism of Catholicism as the economic and political pendulum swings to the collectivism of a planned society. Mannheim focuses this point in his *Diagnosis of our time*: "Catholicism has the advantage of having in many respects maintained the pre-Capitalist and pre-individualist interpretation of Christianity. In many ways it may be easier for this tradition to understand the needs of a social order beyond individualism. Protestantism in its genuine forms is handicapped in that it itself helped to produce the modern individualistic mind, and to develop those psychological attitudes which keep the system of Capitalist competition and free enterprise going."¹¹

He later observes, "The genuine contribution of Protestantism is bound to come from its emphasis on voluntary co-operation, self-help and mutual aid. These will always be the great antitheses to the coming forms of authoritarian centralization and organisation from above."

Our contribution to the times must, however, be more than a negative protest against the incoming tide of collectivism. Individualism must be expressed in its proper context of social solidarity. We must appeal to the collectivist mentality with a call to repentance that can make our evangelical message potentially relevant to the sins of society no less than to those of the individual.

On the positive side we must endeavour to foster a true sense of spiritual solidarity, to create that quality of *esprit de corps* which can become the adequate spiritual basis for the emerging secular order. We must give to men a sense of individual value *within* the community such as can safeguard them from the perils of a deadly bureaucracy which threatens to submerge the individual in the interests of political and economic efficiency.

Our Baptist forefathers gave the ideals of democracy to the political world in the age when individual economic enterprise was emerging. Can we make an equivalent contribution to the new conditions of to-day?

In shaping our ecclesiastical polity we seek to attain the degree of efficient administration that the urgency of the situation demands, without surrendering our essential principles to a soulless bureaucracy. It involves building up a true sense of spiritual solidarity which will not only preserve, but deepen the values of democracy. If we succeed, then Westminster and Geneva may well look to 4, Southampton Row for guidance, as did Roger Williams to John Murton.

N. S. MOON.

REFERENCES.

- ¹ Expository Times. Volume LIV, p. 300. August, 1943.
- ² H. Wheeler Robinson. "Redemption and Revelation." p. 26.
- ³ c.f. *ibid.* p. 36.
- ⁴ C. Anderson Scott. "Christianity according to St. Paul" p. 22.
- ⁵ C. H. Dodd. Moffat commentary on "Romans" p. 79/80.
- ⁶ R. H. Tawney. Religion and the Rise of Capitalism p. 179.
- ⁷ *ibid.* p. 198.
- ⁸ Karl Mannheim. "Man and Society" p. 70.
- ⁹ T. G. Dunning. "Settlement with Germany" p. 43.
- ¹⁰ Levy Bruhl. "Primitive Mentality." p. 400.
- ¹¹ Karl Mannheim. Diagnosis of our time p. 106.
- ¹² *ibid.* p. 108.

BRISTOL COLLEGE AND MISSIONS.

AMONG the influences leading to the widespread missionary movement in our denomination 150 years ago we have become familiar with the following: the evangelical revival led by the Methodists, the prayer movement originating in Scotland and returning to this country through Jonathan Edwards and America (see E. A. Payne's *Prayer Call of 1784*), the example of the Moravians, Brainerd, and other missionaries, and what Fuller described as "the workings of our Brother Carey's mind." Further, it is commonly supposed that the home missionary movement came *after*, and as a direct result of, the founding of the B.M.S. There are good reasons for thinking, however, that the missionary movement at home was simultaneous in its start with the foreign mission, and that in both ventures Bristol College played a larger part than has generally been reckoned.

We know, of course, that of the thirteen ministers who met at Kettering on October 2nd, 1792, five of them were trained at Bristol—John Ryland (afterwards President of Bristol), John Sutcliffe, who led the prayer movement, Samuel Pearce, Thomas Blundell, and the student William Staughton. Of the early missionaries, Joshua Marshman was the first of a long line of Bristol men who went abroad. (Actually the first Bristol man to go as a missionary was a student named Grigg, who went to Africa in 1795.) Fuller records that he found Ryland and Sutcliffe "faithful brethren who, partly by reflection, and partly by reading the writings of Edwards, Bellamy, Brainerd, etc. had begun to doubt of the system of false Calvinism to which they had been inclined when they first entered the ministry." It would seem, then, that the most we can say of them is that they left Bristol still holding to the system of false Calvinism, but that they were susceptible to new influences and ideas.

Samuel Pearce brings us nearer to a possible clue. He was at Bristol from 1786-89, under the Presidency of Dr. Caleb Evans, a man "who abhorred a narrow and sordid spirit . . . he devised liberal things." In 1790 Pearce began a ministry at Cannon Street, Birmingham, that was widely cast. He brought a new evangelical fervour to the West Midland Association. He and Edward Edmonds "disturbed the sedateness of the Association. They pleaded for a new aggressiveness and set its pattern by sending forth their most gifted workers every Sabbath to the villages and

growing towns. . . . They pleaded with every minister and church to evangelise a thirty-mile circuit round their homes." (*Samuel Pearce*, by S. Pearce Carey.) Of Pearce's part in the founding of the B.M.S. and his desire to go to India everyone knows.

Pearce had among his fellow-students at Bristol Joseph Hughes, James Hinton, who went to Oxford, and William Steadman, who became President of the Northern Baptist Academy. Hughes is remembered as a co-founder of the R.T.S. in 1799 and the founder of the Bible Society in 1804. Hinton settled at New Road, Oxford, and Steadman settled at Broughton, in Hants. But here is a significant thing. While Pearce was evangelising the West Midland area, Hinton was beginning home mission work around Oxford, and Steadman was making similar efforts in Hampshire, Wiltshire, and the West Country. Hinton settled at Oxford in 1788, and under his leadership the church at New Road, which had been re-constituted as recently as 1780, began a programme of widespread evangelism in the villages around. Village preaching, Sunday Schools, day schools, and the training of teachers and preachers were among the outstanding developments of Hinton's ministry till his death in 1825. E. A. Payne has ascertained that soon after the formation of the B.M.S. a grant was made to the church at Oxford for missionary work in "evangelising the heathen villages of Oxford." Hinton met with a good deal of opposition and suffered beatings, especially when he first preached at Woodstock in 1794. Against his critics, some of them his own church members, he put forth a pamphlet entitled *A Defence of Village Preaching*. In it he affirmed that "we cannot, consistently with our duty to God and to mankind, omit any opportunity within our reach of communicating the knowledge of the blessed Gospel that brings life and salvation to dying men." That, surely, is the word of a true missionary. It is not surprising that the B.M.S. found in him a strong supporter and, for a brief period, one of its joint secretaries.

William Steadman confesses that it was through reading the works of Brainerd that he determined finally to make practical attempts at evangelism around Broughton and to found a new church nearby at Stockbridge. But it is clear that he had had it in his mind for some long time to do something for the villages in Hampshire. Once he began he became the leader of home mission work in that and the neighbouring counties. He was one of the first supporters of the B.M.S., and in 1796 he went as a missionary of the Society on an evangelistic tour in Cornwall. He accompanied Fuller on his last tour in Scotland to raise funds for the Society. The records of his journeys and preachings, especially in the villages and growing towns of the North of England, read like extracts from Wesley's *Journal*. Home and foreign missions found a champion in Steadman, whose labours in building up the Northern Academy were inspired by true evangelistic zeal.

How came it then that these sons of Bristol College possessed such a strong evangelistic strain and proved themselves ready supporters of home and foreign missions? Is it too much to say that they gained their first enthusiasm at Bristol, and that behind their lives there was the influence of another, probably Dr. Caleb Evans? Caleb Evans, as tutor of the College, had shared with his father, Dr. Hugh Evans, in re-constituting the Bristol Education Society in 1770, establishing it "upon the most liberal principles" and opening its doors to students of other Dissenting bodies. "One of the avowed aims of the Society was to help towards the evangelisation of parts of England, and from early days particular attention was given to Cornwall. . . . Grants were made in aid of other churches, notably Oxford. . . . Help was given also to the cause in Anglesea, and, during this period (i.e., during Caleb Evans's Presidency), much interest was taken in Wales." (Quoted from *Bristol College—250 Years, 1679-1929*,

by Dr. A. Dakin.) The students were encouraged to go on preaching tours, and the Society sent a minister annually on a mission to Cornwall. Readers of Pearce's life will remember his visit to Coleford, where he preached two Sundays, staying the week between because he was so moved by the condition of the miners whose homes he visited, "preaching, praying, and weeping with them." Steadman also, long after he had left Bristol, remembered the evangelistic needs of Coleford and the Forest of Dean.

It seems clear, then, that even before the B.M.S. was formed, Bristol College had started some organised home mission work, and that Caleb Evans was training his men in evangelism. We ought, perhaps, to think of the beginnings of the home and foreign missions, not as separate ventures, but as one movement, a general awakening among Baptists to the obligation of Christian men everywhere to preach the Gospel. Neither work was the getter of the other. They ran together. Each gave impetus to the other, as they will in every age that rightly understands the nature of the Gospel. Both sides of the movement owed much to Bristol College, whose men became pioneers in the B.M.S. and the home mission. It may well be also that we have not sufficiently recognised the work and influence of Caleb Evans, whose liberal mind that "devised liberal things" was broader than the prevailing false Calvinism of his day. To him credit is due for giving to his students that spirit of evangelism that made them eager supporters of missionary work at home and abroad, and for sending out from Bristol men who had a concern, as Hinton put it, "to communicate the knowledge of the blessed Gospel . . . to dying men."

WALTER W. BOTTOMS.

BAPTIST POLITY REPORT.

The following statement, in reply to B. G. Collins, was unanimously agreed upon:—

We are reluctant to enter into controversy with such a brother as B. G. Collins, whom we hold in the highest esteem and affection. Nevertheless, he has expressed what seems to us serious misconceptions in regard to the criticism from the Leicester Fraternal.

We fail to see that there is any rebellion against the fundamental principles of our Baptist faith involved in a criticism of Congregational government. In fact, the "spiritual autonomy" of the local Church has been modified by the regulations of the Sustentation Fund, but it appears wrong to us that such modification should rest on a purely economic basis. We do claim spiritual autonomy for the Church as a whole, but suggest that local churches should be directed, at least in some matters, by the complete body.

Regarding the "call to the ministry," are we not right in believing that it comes through "a mystic and individual persuasion on the part of the man himself?" Our article made no suggestion, however, that the gathered church has nothing to do but humbly accept. What we said, or implied, was that the "call" must be confirmed by the whole Baptist Church, acting through its representatives, not merely by a local church, and that the minister should, primarily, be a minister of the Church as a whole. This opinion in nowise indicates any loss of faith in the Baptist people. The local communities of Methodism and Presbyterianism are not vested with the absolute autonomy of Congregationalism, yet those denominations would reject with indignation any suggestion that their orders implied an absolute lack of faith in their peoples.

We are sorry to think that any of our brethren should entertain the thought that others are trying to make the pulpit a "Coward's Castle." We do not regard "insecurity" in itself as a virtue, but we are quite willing to accept it, if it be necessary for the pursuance or maintenance of some noble cause. If it hampers rather than helps our witness, we see no

reason for clinging to insecurity for its own sake. The Sustentation and Superannuation Funds were initiated to eliminate certain unnecessary insecurity. Why, if we wish to eliminate still more, should we be censured for the fact? The question of security versus insecurity, however, is not the real point at issue. It is rather the question of effectiveness versus futility. The prophets lived in different times from our own. Whatever opposition their words created, they could not be silenced except by imprisonment or martyrdom. Such persecution only bore more eloquent witness to the truth they proclaimed. A minister who speaks with prophetic voice in our denomination as at present constituted can be silenced in a very different manner, so that his witness is hopelessly quenched. That is the state we deplore:

W. H. WESTON, Chairman,
R. J. WALKER, Secretary.
Leicester Baptist Ministers' Fraternal.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Four of our members have produced interesting brochures:

P. Franklin Chambers, of Ryde, under title *Love Among the Ruins*, tells a moving story of bravery on the home front amidst the dangers and death of war illustrative of His sacrifice Who laid down His life for us all while we were yet sinners.

J. R. Edwards has published a further volume of his poems—*Padre's Pie*. He certainly has a distinct flair as one of the minor poets, and his verses on the Stop-Gap are themselves worth the price at which the volume is published.

"Love Among the Ruins" can be obtained from the Drummond Tract Depot, Stirling, price 9d.; and "Padre's Pie," can be obtained from the author at 57, Sudbourne Road, Brixton Hill, S.W.2, price 7½d., post free.

What Dr. Williamson does not know about China—its land and its people—is not worth knowing. Much of what he does know is told in an absorbingly interesting manner in his book "China Among the Nations," published by the S.C.M. at 6s. A book well worth reading, especially at a time when China looms large as the leading Empire of the East.

* * * * *

ANNALS OF HOWRAH BAPTIST CHURCH.

Herbert Anderson has compiled, from the church chronicles, an interesting account of the Baptist Church at Howrah, of which he was at one time minister in charge. It is a fascinating story of early missionary enterprise, and especially of the work of Thomas Morgan, who was pastor of the church for 43 years, and who at the same time rendered signal service as a missionary to the district.

The faith and zeal of this early Christian community offer an example to all labourers for Christ, whether at home or in heathen lands.

* * * * *

INTERPRETERS OF MAN

By GWILYM O. GRIFFITH (Lutterworth Press, 15/-).

The author of this book has given us a series of biographical and interpretative studies of well-known thinkers, from Hegel to Karl Barth. The underlying unity of theme is to be found in their reaction to, and from the idea of man associated with the European Renaissance. This latter assumed the competency of man, including religious man, to develop the latent resources of his own nature and overcome the contradictions of human existence, including evil, by action, thought and religion, the latter understood not in the Christian sense but as the cultivation of religious

sensibilities and powers already possessed by man. The author maintains that this doctrine of man has brought us to an impasse, and has shown itself quite incapable of solving the problems of human life and destiny. These studies show also the complete chaos in European thought in regard to man and his destiny, since the Christian faith ceased to be the integrating force in modern society. Neither Schweitzer's reverence for life in an indifferent universe, nor Barth's unbridgeable gap between the Word of God and human culture can give modern theology a satisfactory resting-place. On the other hand, there can be no return to the humanism of the Renaissance. The author has earned our gratitude by making very clear the great issue dividing the modern world, which is not primarily that of democracy and totalitarianism or any economic cleavage, but between a faith where man stands in proud self-sufficiency at the centre and one in which the Word became flesh for us men and our salvation.

R. FOSTER ALDWINCKLE.
