

THE CHURCHMAN

February, 1914.

The Month.

Islington. WE are profoundly thankful for the Islington of 1914. There are many grounds for our thankfulness. The number present was larger than ever, and numbers count for something. Spirit and atmosphere count for more, and no one could be present without feeling that a new spirit has come upon us—a spirit of devotion and consecration, a spirit of trust and courage, a very presence of the Holy Spirit Himself to bless and to guide. Then, again, we rejoice that in this moment of tension no resolution was passed about Kikuyu. The silence was infinitely impressive—a witness that we will not make this thing a party question, that we will respect the wish of our beloved Archbishop, upon whom the burden of so great responsibility rests. We must pray and think; and when, if ever, the time for action comes, we must act at once and strongly. Bishop Willis stayed away. If he had come, he would have received an ovation of sympathy; but his absence was quite of a piece with the humble self-restraint which has marked his action all along.

Of the papers, we only need to say that never has a higher level been reached, and that high level was maintained all through. The *Record* has printed them all for us in pamphlet

form, and the circulation ought to be immense if the pamphlet is to receive its deserts. To compare or contrast them with each other would be difficult and futile, but the two splendid addresses by the two young dons, one from each of the old Universities, present a ground for splendid hope. Prebendary Burroughs has deserved well of Evangelicalism all these years, and he must have received at least some of his reward when his son rose from his side to win and hold the attention and respect of the vast audience by his brilliant and spiritual address. For his paper—for all the papers—for the whole meeting, we can, we must, thank God and take courage.

Kikuyu. It is highly probable that for the majority of our readers all other topics of public interest have, during the last few weeks, been entirely dwarfed by the controversy in the daily and weekly press on the general subject of Kikuyu. Strictly speaking, and from one point of view, there should be no controversy, because the matter is, legally speaking, *sub judice*. A charge has been made, and the proper authorities will, presumably, investigate the charge. But the charge was made in pamphlet form, as an ordinary publication. As such, it has been the subject of legitimate press comment, and out of this comment the present controversy has arisen. The leading protagonists have expressed themselves, for the most part, in the columns of the *Times*, but the London press generally, and the provincial papers too, have given considerable attention to the matter. The whole topic is now so familiar to our readers that we need not do more than remind them that the debate does not so much concern itself with the proposals that have been put forth for future allied work in the mission field as with the Communion Service, in which an Anglican Bishop, officiating in a Presbyterian Church, welcomed to the Lord's Table the representatives of the various Christian bodies present at the Conference. And the vital question raised is, Did he do right or wrong? May Episcopalians hold communion with Christians of non-Episcopalian bodies?

The question is not wholly academic and theoretical, but has a practical significance, for the issue is being raised whether the English Church is to remain united or is to suffer division. For the raising of this ominous practical consequence the Bishop of Oxford is largely responsible. His own words were these: "To the great mass (*sic*) of Churchmen the open Communion of Kikuyu seems to involve principles so subversive of catholic Orders and doctrine as to be strictly intolerable in the sense that they could not continue in a fellowship which required of them to tolerate the recurrence of such incidents." In other words, either the Church of England must repudiate the action of the Bishops of Uganda and Mombasa, and forbid any repetition of it, or the Bishop of Oxford and those for whom he speaks will withdraw from the communion of the Church of England. This, at any rate, presents a clear issue, and we see where we stand. Over against this utterance we place the words of the Bishop of Durham: "If the Bishops of Uganda and Mombasa are arraigned for heresy for their share of responsibility for a programme which I think to be true to the mind of our Master and full of promise for His work, I for one would willingly, if it may be, take my place beside them." It need hardly be said how cordially we for our part endorse every word of the Bishop of Durham, and should glory in standing by his side in any such position.

With one remark of the Bishop of Oxford we are in cordial agreement. He wishes the Anglican Church to "arrive at some statement of its principles such as will avail to pull it together again in a unity comprehensive, but intelligible, and compatible with the moral principle of sincerity of profession." In other words, let us have a clear statement of what the Church of England stands for and what she does not. Many people, with excellent intentions, are deprecating this. They say that in the interests of peace and the unity of the Church of England it must be averted. We

**A Statement
of Principles.**

**Possible
Disruption.**

think this is a mistaken policy. We think that the good which will result from a clear enunciation of the principles of the Reformed Church of England will more than counterbalance any consequential results which may follow from such statement. We have no doubt whatever that the Bishops of Uganda and Mombasa will be found to have been in the strictest sense exponents of those principles. Once again we repeat the hope in the Bishop of Oxford's words. The issue that has, perhaps all unwittingly, been raised at Kikuyu is a living one, and cannot be stifled or hushed up. One thing has been made abundantly manifest by the press discussion, and that is, where the sympathy of the large majority of Christian Englishmen lies. For so much we are thankful. We have no wish for precipitate or ill-considered action, but the question of principles has been raised, and should now remain insistent till it has received an answer.

We want to take this opportunity to express our

Kikuyu and Party Spirit. intense gratitude for the comparative absence of party spirit in the controversy. It is true there has been some exhibited, but, speaking generally, men of all schools of thought have written and spoken with a sympathetic consideration for the feelings of others, and a simple desire to find the truth and act upon it. The *Times* correspondence, if it be a reflex of the common mind, has lifted the whole controversy out of the sphere of party. And to turn to a much smaller point, it was a real pleasure to us to notice the sympathetic way in which our own notes on the subject last month were referred to in the columns of the *Guardian* and the *Church Times*. We trust we shall remember the sympathy always shown, and the support not infrequently given by large numbers of High Churchmen, who realize their true catholicity.

Another point has its significance : the tremendous interest that the matter has aroused in the columns of the secular press. Leading articles in the *Times* and *Spectator*—and not one only in each—columns of correspondence in our leading journals and

in the halfpenny press, all these things go to show that the interest in religion is not dead, and that the man in the street cares more than we sometimes think. Good will come, good must come, even out of this anxious and trying controversy.

We trust that the letter of Mr. J. P. Baker, **Hymn-Books.** Vicar of Charles, Plymouth, in the *Record* of January 9, will not go unnoticed. Mr. Baker puts a point and asks a question. We doubt whether it is quite so easy to answer as Mr. Baker seems to think, but we are wholly with him in believing that it ought to be faced. Hymns have a tremendous influence on popular theology—popular religion. We have no entirely satisfactory hymn-book, and we ought not to be content that so it should be. We can do no more now than quote Mr. Baker's question and his point :

“The final question remains: Do we Evangelicals care sufficiently about the distinctive truths with which we have been put in trust, to guard them for our own and succeeding generations as carefully in our hymnal as they have been guarded for us in the Book of Common Prayer for the last three hundred years?

“‘Hymns Ancient and Modern’ is not in agreement with the Book of Common Prayer. Do we really see the importance of having a thoroughly good hymnal that is?”

Later on, perhaps, we may return to the subject.

Problems of Education. The year 1914 seems likely to have so many pressing problems on its hands concerning the size of the fleet, the government of Ireland, and the status of the Church in Wales, that others, of an equally important character in the long run, will tend to be crowded out. One such problem is that of the national education. It is there continually, but we become a little more vividly aware of it about this time of the year because of the various conferences in which educationalists gather together. In two that have been held recently interesting side-lights have been thrown on the present condition of things. Mr. M. E. Sadler, the Vice-Chancellor of Leeds University, in an address given at Bradford,

spoke in a vein of cheerful optimism. He admitted that there was just now a "depression" in educational opinion, but he regards this as being only a temporary phase. In the existing mood of harassed uncertainty there will follow a clear perception of a purpose, and this perception will have an exhilarating effect. He holds that at no time have English teachers been so enthusiastic about their work as they are now, and so, even if present conditions are chaotic, it is, at any rate, a "cheerful chaos." So far as there is confusion and turmoil, it is an indication, not of decay, but of growth. The Vice-Chancellor's opinion is a weighty one, and we must do justice to it, as indicating the brighter side of the picture.

Words of
Warning.

A warning note, equally deserving of attention, was sounded by Mr. Bryce in an address given to a conference of educational associations in London. He believes that we have now quite a sufficient quantity of educational machinery, and what we in England want is "intensive cultivation"—more attention to quality. With all our machinery we have not, Mr. Bryce thinks, succeeded in implanting in the English boy a love of learning. In his travels both in South America and the Far East, Mr. Bryce found evidence that the English youth in commercial life compares badly with his competitors from other parts of Europe. Not that he is inferior in talent or capacity, but he will not trouble as the others will to learn a foreign language, to study various local conditions, and other subjects subsidiary to his business. And the question has to be faced, Is there some deeply-seated cause for this? Is the whole system under which he has grown up a defective one? Is devotion to sport pushed to such an extreme, is sport so much a main object of life rather than one of its recreations, that a radically false ideal of life is developed? And apart from the predominance of athletic sports in our national scheme of life, there is the general and increasing passion for amusement. Mr. Bryce does not dogmatize on these points, but he suggests them for consideration, for he

thinks that the results of our educational system leave much to be desired.

Bible Teaching. It is deeply significant that Mr. Bryce's first warning, uttered at the very forefront of his address, was about the teaching of the Bible. "He expressed an earnest hope that religious instruction and the Bible would not be left out of the schools. It was with great regret he saw in these days that the study of the Bible appeared to be declining in all classes of the community, and he was struck with the same thing in the United States. It would be an incalculable loss to the life of the country if a generation of children grew up who did not know their Bible and what the Bible meant." Words like these, coming from a statesman and politician of such ability and eminence, cannot fail to carry the greatest weight. They may well encourage those who hold that in any reconstruction of our national education Christian teaching, based on the Christian Scriptures, must have a fundamental place. Rumours are heard that the present Government is preparing a further set of proposals to lay before the country. It was with probable reference to these that Lord Haldane recently used the following significant words: "Larger and more liberal views would have to be entertained as to the facilities for religious teaching under State supervision if the problem was to be solved in the State schools." This has a hopeful sound, as coming from one who is not likely to undervalue the worth of Biblical Christianity.

