

THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1916.

The Month.

The
National
Mission.

WE are entering the month of October when, in some dioceses, the National Mission of Repentance and Hope will reach its culminating point. Yet even now, there exists in some quarters only a faint idea of the purpose of the Mission and what it is designed to effect. Its nature and scope have been somewhat obscured by the introduction of a number of bye-issues which might well have been left alone, at any rate until after the main message had been delivered. It is, of course, easy to be wise after the event, but we have a feeling that it would have been better if the Mission could have been divided into two parts, the first part being entirely confined to Bishops and clergy who, by common consent, need the Mission as much as any class of people; the second part, at a later date—say next spring and summer—to be devoted to the people. But the time has gone by for a remodelling of plans, and it is the bounden duty of Church-people to do their utmost to make the Mission a success. And to this end we plead that the Message of the Mission should be made as simple as possible. Its aim, if we understand it rightly, is to recall the nation back to God. It is to seek the “conversion” of the people. We use the old-fashioned word because it best expresses what we mean. Unfortunately the word has fallen into disuse, and with the disappearance of the word the thing signified, which is, of course, the really important thing, has been relegated to the background. We hope it will be recovered during the National Mission, and in this connexion we are particularly pleased with the tone and substance of the addresses of the Bishop of Manchester at the “Solemn Assembly” of his clergy. He insisted upon the primary obligation of the work of evangelization, a work which the clergy have largely neglected or, if they have attended

to it at all in their parishes, they have made it over to the Church Army Captain or other lay worker. Yet it is the recovery of the one lost sheep that matters, more even, perhaps, than the care of the ninety and nine that safely lay in the shelter of the fold. Bishop Knox was most direct and explicit in his meaning. Clergy were apt to judge the success or otherwise of their ministry by the measure of material progress—a new vestry built, a new reredos erected, etc.—and by the strength of parochial statistics. We agree with the Bishop that this is a false standard of values. The true test of the efficiency of a clergyman's ministry is whether or not lost souls are being won ; and this—and nothing less than this—will be the test by which the success or otherwise of the National Mission will be judged. Questions of public morals and of social reform, important as they are in the right connexion, are not the questions that press most heavily just at this moment. The National Mission must be concerned primarily with spiritual things ; it must seek to bring the souls of the people into direct relation with God. The teaching of the Mission must be the teaching of the old Gospel unhindered and untrammelled by any of the modern accretions of man's devising. " We preach Christ crucified," said the Apostle who gloried in the Cross, and we ask that the same note shall be the distinguishing mark of the National Mission. The heart of the Gospel is at Calvary rather than at Bethlehem, and the most successful religious movements in our own day have been those which have proclaimed in all its richness and fulness the fact of the Atonement. How was it that the Salvation Army first won the ear of the masses ? It was because they put the Cross of Calvary in the forefront of their teaching, and even now one has only to listen at the street corner to one of the least instructed of their orators to discover that it is still Salvation through the Precious Blood which is at the heart and the core of their religious teaching. We plead most earnestly then for a sharp return to the old Gospel message during the National Mission. It is the only Gospel which can convert and save ; it is the only Gospel with power.

Labour and the Clergy. What is the secret of the estrangement of Labour from the Church, and the hostility of Labour men to the clergy ? The question is often asked, but it is rarely answered, and we confess that we have no solution of the

problem to offer. The clergy have never worked harder or with greater self-denial or with more whole-hearted devotion among the masses of the people than during the last two years, and yet the Trades Union Congress at its recent sitting gave them a rude slap in the face. There is something wrong somewhere; perhaps in the multitude of discussions which are taking place and are likely to increase in volume, on matters incidental to the war and its influence, some remedy may be found for a state of things which is as disastrous to the Church as it is detrimental to the highest interests of the people. The discussion at the Birmingham meeting of the Congress arose over the exemption of the clergy from military service. Mr. Ben Tillett, the official representative of the Dockers of London, moved the following resolution: "That this Congress regrets the unfair privilege which has been given by the Government to members of the clerical profession by granting them exemption from the operations of the Military Service Act. We view with regret that a large class of able-bodied men who are engaged in unproductive employment should not be used to better purpose during this critical period. We call upon the Parliamentary Committee at once to approach the Government with a view to removing this anomaly." "Unfair privilege"; "unproductive employment"; "this anomaly"—we are amazed that such culpable ignorance of the facts of the case should prevail even in Trades Unionist circles. So far from clergy regarding exemption as a "privilege," hundreds of them look upon it as one of the greatest hardships of their experience that the Bishops should insist on holding them back when they are anxious to take their places side by side with their own men in the fighting line. Then, again, so far from the exercise of their ministry being "unproductive employment," it may be pointed out that the clergy have done more than any other body of men to "keep the home fires burning," and they will continue their efforts "till the boys come home"—aye, and long afterwards. Once more: as to the exemption of the clergy being an "anomaly," the statement is simply untrue, as a little acquaintance with Church history would have shown. We believe we are correct in stating that in no Church in Christendom are the clergy allowed to become combatants. "But what of France?" we may be asked. Since the Separation Act the Roman Catholic clergy are called up like any other citizens,

and the Church cannot interfere, but it is nevertheless against all laws of the Church of Rome that its clergy should serve as combatants. Of course it would have been possible for the English Parliament to have included, instead of having excluded, ministers of religion from the operation of the Military Service Act, but if it had done so it would have created an "anomaly" which, we believe, the better sense of the country would have resented. The speech in which Mr. Ben Tillett proposed the resolution to the Congress was frankly disgraceful, yet he prefaced it with the disclaimer that he did not want to make any attack upon the clergy! Here are his words as reported in the *Times*:—

He protested against the anomaly of their exemption as a profession. There were 20,000 able-bodied parsons and clerics in this country. The majority of them were at the beck and call of the conscriptionists from the beginning of the war. But when conscription came near they went through the back doors of Parliament to get exemption. Two hundred theological students of Bangor thought it would be far better to be a live parson than a dead soldier. They were not playing the game. The lawyers had created a "Devil's Own." It would be far more to the credit of the clerical profession if they would create a "God's Own." Why should these men who were so fond of talking about Heaven be so afraid to go through its gates? He protested against the action of these "cowardly creatures sneaking out of their obligations."

The resolution was seconded by a Mr. Law, in a speech which was somewhat enigmatical. He said that he was a lay preacher in a section of the Church which had a paid ministry and was not exempted, but lay preachers—working men like himself—in another section of the Church which had no paid ministry were exempted. This, he added, was an intolerable injustice. But this speech was not quite to the mind of the Congress, and a Mr. Ammon protested that it was not the business of the Congress to help one amateur sky-pilot who had not got exemption to vent his feelings against professional brethren who had. Mr. Tillett represented the Dockers of London. The Dockers of Liverpool had two representatives who stuck up for the clergy—a tribute, we may hope, to the excellent service that is being rendered by the clergy of that well-worked diocese. One of these representatives, Mr. J. Sexton, protested against Mr. Tillett's speech. There was not, he said, a university or training college which had not contributed generously of its men to the Army. Why single out the clergy for attack? There were some others exempted, he added, who were doing a good deal more mischief. The other representative, Mr. G. Milligan, spoke

still more forcibly. He said Mr. Tillett must have some private motive in raising this question. "It would create bitterness all over the country. To introduce his anti-clerical ideas into the Congress was a shameful thing, while his seconder was merely a blackleg minister. The resolution said the clergy were engaged in unproductive employment. Well, what did the dockers produce? The production of morals was surely a far nobler employment." Nevertheless the resolution was carried by 1,379,000 votes to 1,200,000—a small majority, but still a majority. Again we ask, What is the secret of the animosity of Labour towards the Church? It should be the business of the leaders of the Church to discover the reason, and, if possible, find a remedy.

When Bishop Browne, late of Bristol, was Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral, he was called upon, as a member of the Chapter, to take his share in the election of a new Bishop of London, and in writing to the *Times*, describing the proceedings, he said, in his own incisive way, that he had just taken part in what was described by some people as "a blasphemous farce." How very far removed from such a description the actual proceedings really were, Bishop Browne showed most clearly, and he also vindicated in the most convincing way the absolute independence of the Cathedral Chapter in the matter of episcopal elections. Yet the old fallacy still lingers, and in some quarters, where the procedure involved in the making of a bishop is only imperfectly understood, the idea is still prevalent that the Dean and Chapter have no real voice in the matter at all. What are the facts? The *Peterborough Diocesan Magazine* has rendered a distinct service to the Church in printing *in extenso* the documents relating to the appointment and election of the new Bishop of that See, who was consecrated on September 21, and from these the true relationship of the nomination by the Crown and the election by the Dean and Chapter is clearly seen. The Crown nominates, and leaves it to the Dean and Chapter to elect, the new Bishop, and thus the rights of Church and State are preserved. The new Bishop enters upon his work with this double authority behind him. He feels that, on the one hand, he possesses the confidence of the Sovereign, and, on the other, that he is the chosen and elect of the Dean and Chapter of the diocese over which he is called to preside. Of the documents in question there is, first, the text of

the Order in Council declaring the See vacant by resignation ; then the Petition of the Dean and Chapter that His Majesty will be favourably pleased to give his leave and license " to elect and choose another Bishop " ; and next the *Congé d'élire* addressed to the Dean and Chapter and the Letter Recommendatory. The full text of these two documents must be quoted in full :—

CONGÉ D'ÉLIRE.

GEORGE THE FIFTH by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King, Defender of the Faith.

To our trusty and well beloved The Dean and Chapter of our Cathedral Church of Peterborough Greeting : Supplication having been humbly made to Us on your part that Whereas the aforesaid Church is now void and destitute of the solace of a Pastor by the resignation of the Right Reverend the Honourable Edward Carr Glyn, Doctor of Divinity, late Bishop thereof, and declared vacant by Our Order in Council of the twelfth day of July, One thousand nine hundred and sixteen. We would be graciously pleased to grant you Our fundatorial leave and license to elect another Bishop and Pastor of the said See. We being favourably inclined to your Prayers in this behalf have thought fit by virtue of these Presents to grant you such leave and license requiring and commanding you by the Faith and Allegiance by which you stand bound to Us that you elect such a person for your Bishop and Pastor as may be devoted to God and useful and faithful to Us and Our Kingdom. In Witness whereof we have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent. Witness Ourself at Westminster the twentieth day of July in the seventh year of Our Reign.

By Warrant under the King's Sign Manual.

Crown Seal.

SCHUSTER.

LETTER RECOMMENDATORY.

GEORGE R.I.

Trusty and Well-beloved.

We greet you well !

WHEREAS the Bishopric of Peterborough is at the present void by the resignation of the Right Reverend Father in God, Doctor Edward Carr Glyn (the Honourable Edward Carr Glyn) late Bishop thereof :

We let you weet that for certain considerations Us at this present moving We, of Our Princely Disposition and Zeal being desirous to prefer unto the same See a person meet thereunto, and considering the virtue, learning, wisdom, gravity, and other good gifts wherewith Our Trusty and Well-beloved Frank Theodore Woods, Master of Arts, Vicar of Bradford in the county of

York is endued, We have been pleased to name and recommend him SEAL. unto you to be elected and chosen into the said Bishopric of Peterborough. Wherefore we require you upon receipt hereof to proceed to your election according to the Laws and Statutes of this Our Realm and Our *Congé d'élire* herewith sent you and the same election so made to certify unto Us under your common seal.

Given at Our Court at Saint James's the twentieth day of July, 1916, in the seventh year of Our Reign.

By His Majesty's Command.

A. BONAR LAW.

To Our Trusty and Well-beloved

The Dean and Chapter of Our Cathedral Church at Peterborough.

In the light of these documents it is clearly a gross misrepresentation to speak of the election of a Bishop by the Dean and Chapter as a "farce," a "formality" or a "sham." The Dean of Peterborough who, like Bishop Browne, took occasion after the election to explain the circumstances, showed that election is a power held in reserve in the last resort, so that if by any unhappy fatality a wrong appointment should ever be made such as could not be assented to by Churchmen and by Christian men; there was the opportunity—a difficult opportunity, he granted, but still always the opportunity—to dissent and to oppose. Before parting with this subject we should like to express our whole-hearted satisfaction at the appointment to the Bishopric of Peterborough. Bishop F. T. Woods, during his ministry as Vicar of Bradford, showed discernment of the signs of the times, and his policy was always practical, always progressive. We do not doubt that in the difficult days that are to come he will take a large share in the much-needed work of commending the English Church to the English people.

A section of the British nation at one time believed that German methods were superior to our own in almost every department of life. Those who thought thus have probably now seen reason to modify their views. But there is one aspect in regard to which the delusion still lingers. There are still some foolish people who affect to believe that in the matter of education Germany has the more excellent way. We are sincerely glad, therefore, to find that the Rev. W. Temple in his address to the British Association took pains to combat that view, and he did so most successfully. The abstract of his paper as given in the *Times* is good reading:—

**Education
Problems.**

The present interest of Englishmen in education is partly due to the fact that they are impressed by German thoroughness. Now let there be no mistake. The war has shown the effectiveness of German education in certain departments of life, but it has shown not only its ineffectiveness, but its grotesque absurdity in regard to other departments of life, and those the departments which are, even in a political sense, the most important. In the organization of material resources Germany has won well-merited admiration, in regard to moral conduct, and in regard to all that art of dealing with other men and other nations which is closely allied to moral conduct, she has won for herself the horror of the civilized world. If you take the whole result and ask whether we prefer German or English education, I at any rate should not hesitate in my reply. With all its faults, English education is a thing generically superior to the German.

From this point Mr. Temple went on to speak of general education problems.

He insisted that a general education must include, if it was to be truly general, the training of all the faculties, and this plainly covered manual work as well as mental work. Technical instruction might be of commercial value, but it had nothing to do with education, and they, as interested in education, had nothing to do with it, except that they protested against such early specialization as might develop the wealth-producing capacities at the cost of dwarfing the human nature as a whole. Education was very vitally concerned to see that the physical conditions were such as might be the basis for the intellectual and moral life. For the spiritual development of the rising generation they urgently needed that corporate life in schools which the so-called public schools possessed in so large a measure.

The school leaving age selected was unfortunate in the last degree. It released children from the discipline of school just at the moment when discipline began to be most essential. The child was taught to read, and was then sent away from school at a time when it was too early to have begun the training of his taste and judgment. A system which depended upon a kind of educational ladder, by which men and women might climb from one section of society to another, was in a fair way to train a nation of self-seekers. Their demand, and here he knew that he was speaking for the whole community of Labour, must be for the educational highway. The aim of education was primarily spiritual, and there were three, and only three, primary aims of the spiritual life. These were Goodness, Truth, and Beauty.

There is much sound sense in these remarks, and we are especially pleased to note the emphasis Mr. Temple laid upon the spiritual character of education. The British Association was, perhaps, hardly the place in which to discuss the problem of religious education, yet it is the greatest problem of all—great, not because of any inherent difficulty, but because of the cantankerousness of Christian people in dealing with it. It is little short of a scandal that the Christian Churches cannot find some *modus vivendi* by which their own distinctive principles (if need be) can be safeguarded, and definite Christian instruction secured for the children. The reform of our education system will assuredly be taken in hand by the Government immediately after the war—already Committees are at work—and unless the question of religious teaching is settled by mutual agreement, the secularist party will secure an easy triumph. The Education Settlement Committee of a few years ago came so near to an agreement that it is much to be hoped that, if that body is still in existence, further attempts will be made to reach a satisfactory decision. It is not too soon for the leaders of the various Christian bodies to be putting their heads together to see what can be done to remove the deadlock. The policy which has gained the largest measure of support—certainly among Church-

people—of equal facilities for all, with the right of access into all schools—has much to recommend it and might at least be taken as a basis of discussion. But the point upon which we desire to insist with all the earnestness we can command is that the question of religious education should receive attention at once, so that when the time comes the Christian Churches may be ready with their scheme. It ought no longer to be a question of the Church *versus* Dissent, or Dissent *versus* the Church, for such an issue on such a question is a disgrace to our common Christianity; the real issue ought to be Christian Teaching *versus* Secular Teaching, and, thus presented, we have no doubt on which side the verdict of the country would be given.

Two years have elapsed since the passing of the Welsh Church Act and we see no immediate prospect of its cruel provisions being reconsidered. When an attempt made to readjust the Home Rule Act (which is not yet in operation, whereas the Welsh Church Act is in force in several important respects save only as to the date of disestablishment) failed, notwithstanding the eagerness of leading politicians on both sides to come to an agreement, it can hardly be expected that Parliament will find time just now to reconsider the Welsh Church Act. But reconsidered it must be, for the Act was literally forced on to the Statute Book, and it has never yet been submitted to the people. Churchmen are not likely to forget the circumstances in which it was passed, nor the strong grounds which exist for demanding its repeal; and they have now to do what is possible, having regard to national interests, to show the country that the case for reconsideration is strong and clear. The current number of the *National Church*, the admirable monthly organ of the Central Church Committee for Defence and Instruction, devotes its leading article to this question, in connexion with the second anniversary of the passing of the Act on September 18, 1914.

What, it asks, has happened in Wales since the passing of the Act? On the Church side, Bishops and clergy have been indefatigable in promoting national interests. They gave their dearest and their best to the cause of King and country; they assisted in the work of recruiting for the new armies to such good purpose that it is estimated that about 70 per cent. of the recruits are Churchmen; many of them went as Chaplains to the Forces; and most of the leading laymen, whose counsel and help in a Church crisis would have been invaluable, have given themselves wholly to war work. But none of

these things moved the Government. They appointed highly paid Commissioners under the Act with power to harass the Welsh clergy with interminable inquiries as to the nature and extent of Church property in each parish, and generally to create a spirit of unrest. These inquiries often involved long and anxious research, and imposed upon the clergy—already overtaxed with work through the depletion of clerical and lay staff—a burden which has proved wellnigh intolerable. These inquiries have involved the expenditure of a very large sum of money. The official return issued some months ago showed that upwards of £5,000 had been expended in this way, and it may be presumed that every week the costs are mounting up. It is monstrous that the Church in Wales should be mulcted in this way and under such circumstances. And for what purpose are these inquiries being made? Simply that when the war ends everything may be in readiness to strike the final blow which shall rob the Church in Wales of about £157,000 per annum. The Church is admittedly—even on the testimony of some of its bitterest opponents—doing a great work; it is a strong force working for righteousness, and yet its work is to be crippled by the confiscation of its ancient endowments. Yet at the conclusion of the war, when the country should be rejoicing at the restoration of peace, the Church in Wales is to witness the transfer to secular purposes of funds which for centuries have been used in the service of Almighty God. The passing of the Welsh Church Act inflicted an intolerable wrong upon the Church, and it remains for the country to determine that the consummation of this base deed shall not be realized.

These are strong words, but, when all the circumstances are considered, they are not too strong, and it may be hoped they will be successful in calling marked attention to the injustice from which the Church in Wales is suffering. We agree with our contemporary in thinking that the future is not without hope, and that even Mr. Lloyd George, in his new mood, may look not unfavourably upon proposals for reconsideration. In his Eisteddfod speeches he spoke of the dangers of materialism and of the necessity of maintaining “every institution that will exalt the vision of the people.” If there is one institution in Wales which is doing more than any other to “exalt the vision of the people” it is the Church, and so astute a man as the War Minister cannot fail to see the force of the application of his words to the case of the Church in Wales. But, however that may be, the duty of Churchmen is clear and unmistakable. They cannot, they will not, do anything that would promote dissension and difficulty while the country is at war; but there rests upon them the paramount obligation to use the interval to spread information as widely as possible concerning the history, position, and work of the Church in Wales.