

THE CHURCHMAN

July, 1910.

The Month.

The World Missionary Conference. THE great gathering in Edinburgh last month seems to have fully realized, if not more than realized, the hopes and expectations of its promoters, for it called attention to the great work of world-wide evangelization in a way that probably has never been done before. The space devoted to the deliberations of the Conference in the leading daily papers was most encouraging, and the influence of this testimony is sure to be fraught with far-reaching issues at home and abroad. We hope in due course to have an account of the Conference itself from one of the delegates. Meanwhile we desire to call special attention to that point which, as the leader in the *Times* rightly said, "constitutes its chief interest to some, and to others its most unpardonable offence." We refer to the hope expressed by the King that the deliberations of the Conference "may be a means of promoting unity among Christians." We rejoice with unfeigned satisfaction in the presence of the Archbishop of Canterbury at the opening meeting, and in his addressing non-Episcopalian Christians as "fellow-workers in the Church Militant, the Society of Christ on earth." This rings true to the essential character of the Church of England as expressed in our Reformed Prayer-Book, and as illustrated by our history in

the sixteenth century. As the *Times* went on to remark, German missionaries from the Sudan, as well as workers from Korea, China, and India, pointed to the clamant need of many more missionaries to cope with the gigantic task of world-wide evangelization. In opposition to those who have so strenuously objected to this Conference because it did not happen to fall in with their own ecclesiastical narrowness, the *Times* has this significant and important word :

“Neither the Church of Rome, with its endless resources and its unflinching courage, nor the Orthodox Church of the East, nor the revived missionary ardour of the Church of England, are sufficient for these things, or even a tithe of them. Meanwhile, if we are to wait till the one ecclesiastical system which we believe to reflect the exact mind of Christ has gathered enough strength to evangelize the world, we are losing what the World Missionary Conference can do and has done so much to supply—a knowledge of the contribution which the converts of every nation are making to the sum of Christian experience and to the interpretation of the Christian message.”

This is the true spirit in which to face the problems which now confront Christianity all over the world, and it is all the more imperative to do so because there never has been, and there never will be, or can be, “one ecclesiastical system to reflect the exact mind of Christ.” God fulfils Himself in more ways than one, and the Conference at Edinburgh has already shown that Evangelical Christians of the various Churches at home and in other countries are all essentially united in the one great work of extending the knowledge and the authority of our Lord and Saviour. And so we rise from the contemplation of the World Missionary Conference with the renewed hope and prayer of the Apostle, “Grace be with all those that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.”

It will be remembered that the Educational Settlement Committee was formed in consequence of an attempt made to find a way out of the difficulties consequent on the rejection of Mr. Runciman's Bill. The Committee has now published its Report, and we desire to call special attention to the proposals as embodied in the

**Educational
Peace.**

pamphlet, "Towards Educational Peace" (Longmans and Co. ; 1s. net). The object of the scheme is to "retain religious teaching as an integral part of our national education, while permitting the largest freedom to all forms of conscientious belief." It proposes on the one hand to enlarge and strengthen the existing system of Council Schools so as to place accommodation in a publicly-managed school within reach of every child, and on the other hand to allow alternative schools within the national system in areas where choice of schools is possible, while permitting in Council Schools generally the withdrawal of children to receive religious or moral instruction outside the school buildings where parents desire it. We have studied with some care the opinions of those representative organs of public opinion which were, on the whole, opposed to Mr. Runciman's Bill, as well as, politically, to the present Government, and we would call attention to three utterances which seem to us worthy of special notice. Thus, the *Times*, in an article headed "A Way of Peace," says :

"This careful and, as we firmly believe, hopeful scheme is not only well balanced in its administrative provisions, but it rests upon a belief which its framers have proved to be sound—that it is possible for Churchmen and Nonconformists, denominationalists and anti-denominationalists, to sit round the same table and bring each their several contribution towards the peaceful ending of a long-standing struggle."

The *Morning Post* concluded its article thus :

"It is only when one comes to study the plan closely, and to realize that points have been fought hard on both sides and given away with the greatest reluctance, that it begins to dawn on one that, after all, there may really be in this scheme some prospect of a settlement. The plan of course needs the most careful consideration. On many points objections will be raised, and, it may be, sustained. But here, perhaps, is the germ at least of the long-sought peace. Not until it has been looked at and discussed from all sides and points of view shall we be justified in rejecting it."

And the *Pall Mall Gazette* spoke as follows :

"We welcome it, therefore, as the first practical basis of compromise that has been arrived at, and we hope that it may be the means of uniting educationalists in the serious work, too long neglected, of co-ordinating our elementary schools on a system that will combine the best elements of moral and rational instruction."

These are striking testimonies, and go far to support and confirm the hope that educational peace is possible. The extremists on both sides, as represented by Lord Halifax and Dr. Clifford, have already expressed their disapproval of the scheme, though this tends, in our judgment, to make it all the more worthy of consideration. The Educational Settlement Committee consisted of a number of very representative people, and its findings deserve the most minute and sympathetic consideration. We do not at this juncture plead for the acceptance of the proposals, but we do urge upon all Churchmen the importance of giving the Report every possible attention. Many Churchmen were convinced at the time, and are more convinced than ever now, that the failure to arrive at a compromise in 1908 was a deplorable mistake, and it is well known that our late far-seeing King did his utmost to obtain the passing of the Bill of 1906. In view of all our national educational needs, to say nothing of our religious, moral, and spiritual progress, we ought to be prepared to make sacrifices all round in order to bring about educational peace.

The papers have been full of the discussion of the proposed alteration in the King's Declaration against Roman Catholicism, and it is announced that the Government intend at an early date to bring in a Bill to effect some change. The two articles in the *Times* have created a very deep impression, and have shown many people the difficulties that surround the problem. The question is whether it is possible to obtain an amended Declaration which will at once avoid language painful to Roman Catholics, and also insure, without any possible doubt, the Protestantism of the King. Bishop Welldon's letter to the *Times* seems to us to sum up the matter in the best and, indeed, the only possible way :

“The example of King James II. has not been lost upon Englishmen. It showed how grave a political danger may lie in the accession of a strong Roman Catholic Sovereign to the Throne. Nobody regrets more deeply

than I that the Church of Rome should not accept those principles upon which modern society rests—viz., the right of private judgment, liberty of conscience, religious equality, and the independent authority of the State. But she is entitled to her own opinions—and to the consequences of them. The Declaration of the Sovereign, in its substance as distinguished from its language, is the first line of defence against the possibility of the religious tyranny which England threw off once for ever at the Revolution. Whether the language of the Declaration can be so far modified as to be tolerable to Roman Catholics is a question for the Church of Rome. Lord Llandaff has frankly avowed that their ultimate object is to abolish the Declaration itself. If so, I am afraid the answer will be that, as long as the Church of Rome rejects and condemns those principles which are the axioms of modern society, so long the Declaration must stand.”

In spite of everything that we have read during the last month, we are still of the opinion that it ought to be possible to alter the language in such a way as to provide for the two conditions mentioned above, and we will not abandon hope of a change until the matter has once again run the gauntlet of discussion in Parliament. Meanwhile we have no hesitation in saying that a Declaration against Rome, as Bishop Welldon points out, must undoubtedly stand as long as Rome is what she is.

It is a curious coincidence that, just at the time that the Church of Rome is clamouring for an alteration in the King's Declaration, she is showing her true colours elsewhere. In Germany the Pope's recent Encyclical has given rise to an immense amount of indignation and anger. In praising the work of Cardinal Borromeo, the Encyclical stigmatized the adherents of the Reformation in almost vulgar terms, and we are not surprised that Germany should have risen indignantly in protest against the slight thus put upon some of her noblest men and her proudest national traditions. Denunciation of the Reformation and of the personal character of the Reformers comes with a very bad grace from the descendants of some of the worst Popes that have ever occupied the throne of the Vatican. At the very same time, too, the effort made in Spain to grant a little more religious freedom has been met with a strong protest from the Vatican. The Spanish Royal Decree only authorized some liberty

Religious
Liberty.

in regard to publicity about the places of worship of those who are not Roman Catholic, and yet Rome at once entered a protest against any such permission. The *Guardian* very ably points the moral of this fact :

“ The latest pronouncement on the part of His Holiness confirms the view of plain men outside its communion, that that Church abhors the idea of religious liberty. Its advocates in this country strenuously labour to show that it desires nothing better than a fair field for all religious denominations, and they point with legitimate pride to the achievements of their Church, both here and in the United States, as evidence that the air of freedom suits it perfectly well. Pius X., however, knows better, and we cannot help thinking he is the more trustworthy exponent of Roman opinion.”

We do not wonder that a very great deal of Protestant opinion is averse to any change in the wording of the Royal Declaration, in view of these outbursts of Roman intolerance. We should have thought that policy alone would have dictated silence just at present ; but, as we said last month, Rome is relentless, and will brook no interference with her designs. But all these protests will do eventual good to the cause of civil and religious liberty, and we know that in those countries where Rome still has the upper hand, as in Belgium, Spain, and South America, the absence of liberty has led to the most deplorable results in individual and national life. The lesson to our own country in regard to Rome is only too patent : “ The price of freedom is eternal vigilance.”

Mr. Roosevelt. The visit of Mr. Roosevelt to this country, which was received and welcomed with such heartiness, brought into our midst one of the most striking personalities of modern days. From the moment that he became President of the United States his words and actions have been followed with the greatest interest by friend and foe. No man in high political life ever had more bitter enemies in his own country, and yet no President has approached his popularity with the American people. There is something of the Hebrew prophet about him, and whether he lectured in Cairo, or Paris, or Berlin, or London, or Oxford, he was listened to with respect

and with a good deal of approval, because of his emphasis on the simple virtues of righteousness, truth, and kindness. His Guildhall speech, when he warned the British nation against sentimentality in Egypt, was of course received with mixed feelings, some thinking that it was a timely and useful message, others that it was an unwarrantable interference with our affairs. Certainly, the hypersensitiveness of the people of America would never have allowed one of our leading statesmen to speak against United States policy in the Philippines or elsewhere in the way that Mr. Roosevelt lectured us! But we cannot help thinking that, on the whole, the *Spectator* expressed the feeling of most of us in referring to the speech as follows :

“It is surely the height of tactfulness to recognize that the British people are sane enough and sincere enough to like being told the truth. His speech is one of the greatest compliments ever paid to a people by a statesman of another country. He could not have made such a speech to a touchy, vain-glorious, or self-conscious race. He knew the people to whom he spoke.”

What Mr. Roosevelt says is just the expression of what he is, a strong personality, and there is nothing in this world so interesting and so important as the power of personality in the cause of righteousness and truth. Mr. Roosevelt is well known to be a member of the Dutch Reformed Church of America, and he has never concealed his convictions in regard to Christianity. Nothing could have been finer than his testimony at the Guildhall to Christianity in Uganda. His aims are high, his motives are sincere, and even those who cannot endorse all his ideas and methods are among the readiest to acknowledge the genuineness of the man. For our part, we are thankful that one who is in so high a position in the eyes of the whole world should be numbered among those who believe in the reality of the Christian religion.

“The
Principal
Service.”

The Worcester Diocesan Conference on June 14 received two Reports referring to the Service of Holy Communion. A Committee was appointed at the instance of the Bishop of Worcester two years ago to con-

sider "how best the Holy Communion can be made the principal service of the Lord's Day." The Majority Report brought in a number of very remarkable recommendations, urging quite definitely the propriety of non-communicating attendance, and advising that the Holy Communion should be "the service of obligation" on the Lord's Day. The teaching of the Report on the Eucharistic Sacrifice is also very extreme, and as far removed from the Bible and Prayer-Book teaching as truth is from error. The Minority Report was a very different document, and urged with striking force the impossibilities and dangers of the counsel recommended by the majority. We are profoundly thankful to Canon G. S. Streatfeild for his strong note of warning in deprecating the idea that there was any special blessing attached to presence at Communion apart from reception. "It was false to Holy Scripture and the liturgy of the Church to make Holy Communion the be-all and end-all of Christian work." It was evident from the debate that the Majority Report had gone too far, for on the suggestion of the Bishop a resolution was adopted which was confined to a recommendation that the service of Holy Communion should find a place in the principal service of the Lord's Day. The fact is that the Majority Report is, as a clergyman in the Worcester Diocese has rightly said, "a bold and clever advocacy of a return of the Church of England to practices and doctrines rejected at the Reformation." The *Record* considers the Report "a most serious sign of the times," and so far as we know this is the first endeavour to secure official recognition of the un-Scriptural and un-Anglican practice of non-communicating attendance. The one great value of the two Reports is that they serve once again to show the utter impossibility of reconciling the two positions in the Church. If one is right the other is wrong, and no good can accrue from any endeavour to shut our eyes to this patent fact. It behoves all true Churchmen to call attention to this fundamental difference on every available occasion.

In the Bristol Diocesan Magazine for June the Bishop of Bristol is reported to have pointed out that the phrase "The Church of England as by law established" had its origin in a mere blunder, and that the true phrase was "The liturgy of the Church of England as by law established," the phrase "by law established" referring to the liturgy. On this the Bishop's reported contention was that the Church of England is not by law established, for no one has ever found the law. This must have seemed a remarkable statement to many, in view of the Bishop's well-known historical knowledge; but very soon a leading representative of the Liberation Society pointed out that the phrase "established by law," referring to the Church of England, is found in the Third Canon of 1603. And he also quoted a recent letter of Dr. James Gairdner in support of this position. We were glad to read later that the Bishop of Bristol said that the explanation of the phrase in his letter as quoted above was "given in error," but we are none the less sorry that such a handle should have been given in this way to the opponents of our Church. According to Dr. Gairdner, the establishment of the Church of England by law dates from the Reformation which brought the Church under subjection to the Sovereign and his laws. Whether this be true or not, the particular phrase in question is quite clear and unequivocal. The Church of England is an Established Church, and it would seem to be impossible to conceive of it as established except "by law."

