

THE CHURCHMAN

September, 1915.

The Month.

The Second
Year. It is no part of our business to discuss in these pages the military aspects of the War, but we may be permitted to say that, in spite of the doleful jeremiads and canting criticisms of a section of the Press, we are persuaded that the country has entered upon the second year of the War with stronger faith, larger hope, and deeper resolve, than have marked any previous period of the conflict. The immediate outlook may appear to be less favourable than we should desire, but we are learning to take long views, and those who believe in the ultimate triumph of Right over Might feel that they can survey the position "in quietness and in confidence"; and knowing the strength which comes to those who "watch" and are "steadfast in the faith," they are prepared to "quit" themselves "like men." It affords ground for solid satisfaction that the country has awakened to the needs of the time. The "iron sacrifice" which is demanded of us is being slowly, and perhaps somewhat imperfectly, realized; but the sacrificial principle, in one form or another, is taking possession of large numbers of people who previously were eaten up with their own selfish conceit, and surrender of personal interests is becoming more common than it has ever been. We do not say that there is not yet much more to be learnt before we shall have attained the true ideal, but we do say emphatically that the country is moving in the right direction; and there is good ground for

believing that, as a people, we shall in due time be prepared joyfully to bear whatever burden may be imposed upon us in the sacred conflict in which we are engaged. And what of the Church? In our last issue we indicated pretty plainly that, in our view, the Church—using the phrase in its largest aspect—was behind the nation in its realization of what is demanded of it. There is nothing that we then wrote that we desire to withdraw or apologize for. We stand by every word; but we are thankful to be able to record our conviction that the last few weeks have witnessed a marked improvement in the attitude of the Church towards the War. The solemn service at St. Paul's Cathedral on August 4, when the King and his Counsellors and distinguished representatives of the nation and the Empire gathered for a service of humble prayer to God, inaugurated, we believe, a new departure, which, if adequately followed up, as we hope and believe it will be, is calculated to have a decidedly uplifting effect upon the religious life of the country. And that, before all, is the need of the time. Until the nation has turned to God in penitence, faith, and prayer, it seems difficult to realize that we can expect the fulness of His blessing.

The Archbishop of Canterbury's magnificent
 "Quit You
 Like Men." sermon at the service at St. Paul's on August 4 sounded, if we may respectfully say so, quite the right note, and the great congregation which heard it must have gone forth from the Cathedral heartened, strengthened, ennobled. His message was based upon the immortal phrases of St. Paul: "Watch ye. Stand fast in the faith. Quit you like men. Be strong." The earlier passages of the sermon furnished an unanswerable vindication of the justice of our cause. "Every month," said His Grace, "adds proof that we said and judged aright when on this exact day a year ago, after exhausting every effort which could be honourably made to avert the conflict, we deliberately faced the tremendous issue, and unsheathed the sword in a cause which we can, with clear conscience, commend

to God—the cause of fealty to plighted word and of resistance to the ruthless dominance of force, and force alone.” This being so, “the duty is absolute” that “we put into the furtherance of the right every ounce of strength, and, what is harder, of perseverance, which we can muster and sustain.” The exhortation is to “watch,” for “the well-being of the world in centuries unborn may turn upon our right use everywhere and in all ways of this momentous, this decisive, hour.” The clue to the position is to be found in the command, “Stand fast in the faith”—“the faith in a Father’s care, Who knows and loves and guides, to Whom we can in humble confidence commit the issues, if so be that, with loins girt and with lights burning, we are doing what in us lies to maintain unflinchingly that for which our faith stands, whatsoever things are honourable and just and pure and of good report.” And then “Quit you like men.” The Archbishop spoke with enthusiasm of the gallantry of those who offered their lives with simplicity and even gladness for their country and its cause, but the burden of his message was to those at home :

“Plaudit and reverent admiration go only a little way unless we are showing in ourselves at home what it means in the nation’s hour of need to ‘quit you like men.’ Brothers, it is for that daily opportunity, and for the power to every one of us to use it fruitfully, that we humbly, eagerly, bend our knees under this great dome to-day, and in resolute self-surrender—not through others, but ourselves—make answer to the Empire’s resonant call.

“A year has gone by since we set our hands to this fearful task. We have learned much, we have given our very best and bravest, and, before God, we believe it is worth while. And now, as the second year of our high emprise begins, we realize, far better than we did last August, our country’s claim upon us all. Please God, no man or woman here is going to leave it unanswered, unfulfilled. That offering can be a very sacred thing if it be given in the Name of Him in whom we citizens of a Christian land believe. He surely calls us as a people, His people, to penitence and prayer—penitence for forgetfulness and waywardness, for lust and sloth, for selfishness and lack of discipline. And to-day, as we gird ourselves anew, we think upon what we, His children, might have been, and are not. But He is here, and we can speak to Him to-day. We do. Lord, we believe; help Thou our unbelief. Long centuries ago, upon a rocky islet, almost within hearing of the great guns which thunder across peninsula and sea to-day, there came to the sacred seer a vision of His Presence and His abiding

might. The world was in throes of conflict and unrest when He spake in the Apostle's ear the steady word: 'Fear not, I am the first and the last. I am He that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, and have the keys of hell and of death.' Over these changes and chances, that is, Christ lives, Christ abides, and among all the horror and desolation which death brings to human homes, and in all the carnage and the noise of battle sounding like the very gates of hell, He holds the keys. 'Behold, I am alive for evermore, and have the keys of hell and of death.' Therefore, brothers and sisters, therefore to-day, as then, we can stay ourselves on Him who was, and is, and is to come, and even while we strive with might and main we can look upward and onward, and gain new strength and courage from the abiding vision. Look for it. Count on it, and then! Forward without fear. 'Watch ye. Stand fast in the faith. Quit you like men. Be strong.'"

We are deeply moved by the nobility of these words. They set before the nation and the Church the greatest of all ideals, and we are persuaded that if Bishops and clergy generally would take real pains to impart something of the same spirit to the people who look to them for guidance and help, the effect would be impressive beyond all calculation. Central services and central pronouncements have a value of their own, but it is only as and when their influence radiates to the circumference that they accomplish their full purpose. The Bishop in the diocese and the clergyman in the parish must busy themselves in their respective spheres if the nation as a whole is to be lifted to the position to which the Archbishop so solemnly called us. And, as we have so often said before, it is in the parish that the greatest work needs to be done.

What is happening in regard to the Archbishop
The Kikuyu
Statement. of Canterbury's Kikuyu Statement? If we may
 judge from the columns of the Church newspapers,
 it is being assailed with considerable vigour, but we look in
 vain for any declaration in its support from those whom we
 should naturally expect would be ready to strengthen the
 position which the Archbishop with so much courage and
 wisdom took up. The Statement was one for which the whole
 Church ought to be thankful. It did not go as far or yield as
 much as we ourselves could have wished, but its main pro-

nouncements opened the way towards a closer union in service between Churchmen and Nonconformists in the mission-field, and was of the utmost importance. The questions which are involved in the Kikuyu business are questions which must be faced, and faced bravely. They are vital to the future welfare of the Church, and to attempt to burke them now or to leave the discussion of them only to the retrograde party in the Church is to court disaster. It is urged on the part of those who are maintaining this most regrettable silence that the War forbids all controversy. We sympathize with this view up to a certain point ; but if there is to be a truce, it must be a truce on both sides, otherwise the side which loyally abides by it is placed at a great disadvantage. That is what is happening in connection with Kikuyu. Those to whom the Archbishop's Statement is distasteful do not hesitate to say so. Even Bishops, who ought to know better, are seeming to discredit it ; and it is not too much to say that many of the rank and file of the extreme Anglican party are planning and scheming so as to prevent the great principles for which the Archbishop's Statement stands from ever becoming effective. And yet, in the face of all this, Evangelical Bishops and Evangelical leaders are doing practically nothing, so far at least as it is permitted to the general body of Churchmen to know. Even the Church Missionary Society, which one would suppose to be vitally concerned in Kikuyu and all that Kikuyu stands for, is silent, so far as its official utterances are concerned, on the wholly mistaken idea, we suppose, that Kikuyu is not their business. This was the attitude taken up by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. "We have never uttered a word officially," said the Secretary, "about Kikuyu. Why? Because it is not our business. We are not in charge of any diocese." But this attitude did not prevent the same Secretary on the same occasion launching against the principles for which Kikuyu stands the heaviest fire they have yet experienced. If Churchmen want to know the real attitude of the S.P.G. towards Kikuyu, let them read Bishop Montgomery's lecture,

“Principles and Ideals,” which has since been published by the Society.

The Bishop was a member of the Edinburgh Conference, yet this is how he describes his present state of mind towards such joint meetings :

Bishop
Montgomery's
“Alarm.”

“The pendulum has swung of late years towards the extreme left, if I may so call it. The breadth of sympathy existing in the Anglican Church urged some of its members to join such a Conference of Christians as that held at Edinburgh. It was purely a Conference at which no resolutions were passed. Since then that Conference has been the cause—in a sense, the unconscious cause—of Councils or Federations in many lands, such as in India, China, and Japan. These local Federations have taken different forms. In some lands they have been purely for mutual report and conference. In other lands they have become perilously near to being close Federations, with growing executive force as one body in full communion. I think I foresaw this tendency after Edinburgh, and I was myself reluctant to join anything like a Continuation Committee. Of course, Churchmen have taken alarm at these developments abroad. Some Bishops have refused to join them. The S.P.G. has never had any connection with any of them. I think the Church, indeed, as a whole has been frightened, and rightly so, I think, and will certainly draw back. Remember, it is our breadth of sympathy which makes that pendulum swing ; and we want very strong Churchmen in the S.P.G. to sound the alarm, but not to leave the Society. Speaking for myself, I confess that though breadth of sympathy took me to Edinburgh, I am to-day among those who are alarmed. I could not go to an Edinburgh Conference to-day because it would be impossible to prevent misunderstanding. The consequence of the extreme swing of a pendulum is to produce a reaction, a pull back, and it is right it should be so.”

To allay his own “alarm” and that of his friends, Bishop Montgomery proposes there should be “another Pan-Anglican Congress” which is to be the “answer to Kikuyu”—a Congress, we presume, which is to fasten upon the Church principles which would be absolutely subversive of the Evangelical position. But this is not all.

Bishop Montgomery, disclaiming any intention to “dictate” to Bishops abroad, nevertheless says some very plain things to them :

A “Confident
Prophecy.”

“I do think we have every right to appeal to them to be statesmen, to survey the situation, and to refuse to

split the Church at home by acts which may be legal, but which they now know do vex, trouble, and destroy unity in the Church at home. If at home we try to hold a central position, then the leaders of the Church abroad also have a responsibility to do the same thing—to be central, and not to approach the margin in either direction. But, indeed, I believe with my whole heart that this is just going to happen. In the course of a few months I believe it will be discovered that no one abroad, no Bishop, will think of permitting what is now known to be disturbing the unity of the Church at home. It is no longer a case of mere legality, but of acting as what they are—as gentlemen, with a sense of chivalry towards the brethren at home, albeit with views differing from their own. So far as I can see, the point that hurts many Churchmen at home most, and threatens to hurt the S.P.G. in particular, but through no fault of our own, is the possibility that some Bishops abroad may permit members of other communions, but not in communion with us, to preach in our churches. It surely is sufficient now to know that this offends many at home. I believe it is illegal in England to give such permission; it will certainly lead to trouble if it is permitted abroad. That is sufficient. I prophesy that no Bishop will now permit it; that at least is my confident prophecy, for Bishops know how to play the game. Personally, I am wholly with those who protest. It offends my own sense of discipline. I cannot see that it is right to ask those who do not belong to us to teach us in our churches. But I should go farther. I am confident that the noble men not of our communion, ministers in their own communions, and chivalrous gentlemen, would take the same view. They would say unhesitatingly: ‘We have no desire and no intention to accept any such invitation, since we know that the proposal causes disunion within your own Church.’”

We confess we have read these words with a feeling akin to indignation. The Consultative Committee saw “no essential difficulty” in, and the Archbishop of Canterbury said that no principle of Church order was contravened by, the proposal to invite men “not of our communion to address our people,” yet we have the Secretary of the S.P.G. making a “confident

prophecy" that "no Bishop will now permit it." Why? Because of the fuss the extreme men are making. If Bishop Montgomery should prove a true prophet, it will only be because the Bishops abroad misunderstand the real position here at home. And then who shall blame them? The blame will rest with those who, while cordially agreeing with the Kikuyu proposals, and preparing to stand by the Archbishop's Statement, have seen fit to keep silence while those who feel "hurt" have made their protests loudly known.

The Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity—September 19—is "National Church Sunday," and we hope that clergy will observe it by bringing before their people the sacredness of the cause of Church Defence. To facilitate their arrangements we reprint from the *National Church* (the monthly magazine of the Central Church Committee) the following suggested Notes for a Church Defence Sermon, based on Psalm lxi. 9:

"I. Many illustrations used in the Bible for the Christian life—warfare—wrestling—race—pilgrimage—school—search—training. All these involve zeal, effort, endeavour. These supremely necessary in these strenuous days if we would attain success. The same with the Christian life. God's grace must be responded to by man's endeavour. Christ teaches the necessity of zeal: (1) Those not with Him scatter. (2) Simon the Zealot chosen as an Apostle. (3) He purged the Temple of the traders. (4) He rebuked the Church of Laodicea for lukewarmness.

"II. This same zeal necessary for the defence of the Church. The attack on the Church in Wales; the Church in England threatened. Much zeal has been shown—protests—literature—petitions—demonstrations. Many still apathetic—strong indignation required against the wrong being done to the Church, and determination yet to avert it. Our special duty is to arouse these. 'O ye that love the Lord, see that ye hate the thing that is evil.'

"III. The work is worthy of special effort and self-sacrifice. (a) The Church has done much for the nation: given it unity—educated it—gained freedom for it (Magna Charta, 1215). (b) The State would put asunder those whom it never joined; would repudiate the Christian basis of our national life. (c) The work of religion generally would be crippled by disendowment at a time when the blessings of religion specially needed.

"IV. The zeal taught by Christ must be shown by every Christian. Ways of doing this are by: (1) Oneself learning the history of the Church, its work for the nation, and the facts relating to its position and revenues. (2) Imparting this information to others. (3) Praying, working, giving for the defence of the Church."