

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Christian Brethren Research Fellowship Journal* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_cbrfj.php

CHRISTIAN BRETHREN
RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP

CONTENTS

The Reason Why 3

Topic of the Issue:—

The Church and Education

Introduction *A. E. Willingale* 5

The Value of a Secular Education *C. G. Martin* 9

Scholars or Saints? *E. G. Ashby* 13

Half Our Future. The Newsom
Report and the Church *P. Cousins* 16

Members' Section

Contribution:—

Dr. Martin Luther King—
An Impression *Phyllis Loosemore* 21

Correspondence (edited by *J. M. Somerville-Meikle*) 23

An Invited Point of View:—
More Precious than Jewels *J. Hills Cotterill* 26

From The Monitors 31

The Bookshelf 32

For Private Circulation only

Copyright © 1965

The Christian Brethren Research Fellowship

THE REASON WHY

Why am I a Christian? The question is not, why did I become a Christian? Why am I *now*, at this moment of time, with all that has gone of opportunity for renunciation, of changing opinion, of fresh thoughts; why am I *now* a Christian? As we discard reason after reason which presents itself to us, we are cast back on the final one: because I have no option. My faith is part of me, of my very nature. It seems to ebb: yet, when the emergency comes, by instinct I pray. Spiritual vigour fades: yet at that very moment, I am suddenly aware of the constant Companion. When we seek to flee Him, He is the more surely with us. We are bone of His bone, flesh of His flesh.

Which, of course, is what some texts of Eph. 5:30 say. As this understanding deepens, so the sheer reality of the thing which has happened grips us. It transcends doctrine: for, essential though sound doctrine may be to the transmission of the faith, doctrine is but the attempt to codify the reality. William Temple saw that this was so (see *Readings in St. John's Gospel*, on Jn. 2:11). It transcends our views of inspiration: for they are but an attempt to explain the colours of the rainbow. The man who has experienced this, need not fear enquiry but can face the world unafraid: for he has truth in the inward parts. It transcends all divisions: for this experience must recognise its brother across all barriers—as Paul saw that he was kin to Abraham, and Luther or Wesley to Paul. Before this knowledge, narrowness and bigotry and fear vanish as the mists before the sun.

For news of the Fellowship, the following notes suffice.

Future Plans. (i). Through the energy of one of our members, the proposed survey is nearer to becoming a reality. Many members will already have received a circular asking them to co-operate in a forthcoming study of *Evangelism in Assemblies*, based on a pilot survey in many different areas.

(ii). Issues of the Journal in preparation include:—

Why I Left the Brethren. This will be based on case studies. Members able to contribute first-hand experience (from themselves or others) are asked to write to the Secretary within two weeks of receipt of this issue of the Journal.

Pentecostalism. An attempt will be made to prepare an objective study of this increasingly important subject, taking into account studies such as Sargent's *Battle for the Mind* on the one hand, and Pentecostal beliefs on the other. Pastoral considerations will be prominent.

Biblical Interpretation.

Liturgy in Worship.

An issue may also be attempted on the problems of alcoholism.

(iii). A new project is planned, involving the issue of occasional papers, in booklet form, forming individual studies of general importance. Two manuscripts are already in hand, the first being Dr. Short's study of *The Ministry* which is at present appearing in serial form in *The Witness*. These booklets will be distributed free of charge to members, but will also be placed on sale to the general public.

Council Members. The Council is particularly concerned about the introduction of fresh blood to its membership. Members are reminded of their responsibilities as to nominations: these can be submitted to the Secretary on any occasion, in writing, signed by the nominee, and supported by at least one other member.

Subscriptions. A considerable number of members apparently overlooked the renewal forms sent out with the fifth issue of the Journal. This matter is of some importance, as arrears will hinder the development of some of the projects under consideration—your subscription goes to launch the new activities referred to above, as well as to meet the costs of the Journal! A word to the wise . . . Banker's order forms are available from the Treasurer.

Annual Meeting. THE 1965 ANNUAL MEETING WILL BE HELD IN LONDON ON SATURDAY, OCTOBER 30th. It is hoped to arrange for the presence of two exceptional speakers.

Back numbers of the Journal. Back numbers of issues 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 of the Journal are available from the secretary at 3/- each, plus postage. No. 4 is now out of print.

As experience grows, so the symptoms of the present state of many churches are seen more plainly. There is the reflex of fear—fearfulness of enquiry, fearfulness of being made to think, fearfulness of ideas which are unfamiliar. There is the building up of walls against others outside the individual's own circle, the readiness to believe the worst and the unreadiness to believe the best, the looking at another only to find fault—to find an excuse not to have to face him honestly. There is the harking back to traditional patterns, because that which we knew as children is always the comfortable and therefore seems inevitably to be right. There is the debilitating suspicion of others, the pathological fear of deep laid plots, the interpreting of the actions of others in the light of imaginary motives attributed to them by our fear or jealousy or rivalry. They are symptoms to be watched for ceaselessly, most of all in ourselves. For the end of these things is death.

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

This issue of the Journal looks at one aspect of education only, that of children in schools.

The 1944 Education Act laid down certain minimum requirements for religious instruction in schools, in order to comply with which the local authorities, in collaboration with the churches, either drew up or adopted, so-called Agreed Syllabuses. These Agreed Syllabuses were a kind of skeleton text book upon which many teaching manuals have been based. Apart from a cursory nod at the outstanding personages in church history and summary treatment of Christian Ethics, the bulk of the curriculum they prescribed was a systematic and progressive study of the contents of the Bible. They are still largely followed by most teachers of divinity, and will probably go on being followed, partly by reason of sheer inertia, but more because a growing number of scripture specialists are committed to their use.

It is not generally realised in Evangelical circles in general or Brethren assemblies in particular that their circles are cornering a fair percentage of the school posts in the subject. One of the reasons is negative and the other positive. The former is the apathy of most other teachers; religious instruction is shunned even more than mathematics, so that the Christian has only to evince the most diffident interest to be press ganged. The positive cause is the output of such institutions as the London Bible College, which enjoys an enviable reputation in examination successes in the London University Diploma in Theology and Bachelor of Divinity, both of which are more than sufficient for specialist appointments.

Nevertheless there is a strong movement afoot to abolish or modify the Agreed Syllabuses in favour of a less academic, doctrinal and Biblical form of religious instruction, and of greater emphasis on the ethical problems that confront the child in his concrete social situation. The contrast is roughly between preaching from a biblical text or from a topical occasion. There is a lot to be said for this change of emphasis. Religious instruction in school is too academic a subject. This is largely the result of a deliberate attempt in the Agreed Syllabuses to reach a residue of factual information which cannot be turned readily to partisan and controversial ends. The outsider can most easily grasp this nature of the exercise by examining the examination papers set for the O level of the General Certificate of Education. They look like the papers for a miniature Bachelor of Divinity. He might be forgiven for supposing the candidates were destined for the priesthood!

The reformers advocate the scrapping of this sort of nonsense. What, they say, are we trying to do? To produce saints or scholars? Clearly, put like this, we hasten to hope the former. But on second thoughts we wonder whether they are aiming at citizens, as opposed to converts. Evangelicals have always been suspected of unscrupulous proselytizing. We must concede that the enthusiastic Scripture teacher must restrain his desire to win his charges for Christ, if it takes on the colour of poaching. On the other hand the proposals of the reformers are suspiciously like an attempt to tame the evangelistic.

Is it the function of the Church to subserve culture or political order? If the reformers have their way the Church and Christian teaching will be diminished to a mere organ of social control, a means of minimizing juvenile delinquency, and the Gospel will be reduced to mere morality and poetry. Sir Richard Ackland's *We Teach Them Wrong* ought perhaps to be set reading for all teachers of Scripture in schools, in order that they may see whither we go. What is called for is not a recoil of holy horror, but a recognition of the pros and cons of the situation. We should embrace every endeavour to wash cold-blooded erudition out of the Scripture lesson, and to pump in warm-hearted spiritual insight. Even the removal of all doctrinal instruction would not be a bad thing, because it would put back into the pulpits the task of interpreting scripture. What, it seems to me, we should stick out for is an unprejudiced teaching of the contents of the Bible: both because, religion apart, our children are entitled to this heritage; and also because we cannot afford to fear free discussion of the basic historical facts of the Faith.

But it may well be that the Church will be unable to insist on so much. The Church has been in the education business a long time now. In the so-called Dark Ages, according to the text books, only the monastery walls baffled the gust of barbarism which was howling round the guttering candle of learning. The Church bore the torch of civilization and culture from the ancient classical world into Europe. In the succeeding Middle Ages she became the sole repository of learning and set her candle on a golden candlestick. Since the Renaissance, however, rival secular institutions have eroded this exclusive hold on the means and manner of learning. The Brethren as a group have never had a professional interest in educational institutions in the same way as, for example, the Church of England has in her schools. For this reason we do not feel the draught so immediately. But we ought to have a mind on the issue of secularisation and perhaps adopt a policy of action; to resist, acquiesce in, or to advocate it. I suggest there might be a lot to gain from positively encouraging secularisation. Just as we have a vested interest in getting scriptural teaching back into the pulpits where it properly belongs, so we have, or should have, a desire to break the hold that some churches have on the infant mind. We do not allow any particular political party to corrupt the thinking of our young; why should we be afraid to say that we do not want them brain-washed into narrow religious channels? Only the Christian who will not admit the full vigour of the Gospel will seek to impose it

on the child through the machinery of schooling. Secularism will not raise itself as a positive force of atheism and anti-religion, unless opposed by obscurantism. If all schools were secular institutions then all churches might be forced to become much more religious ones. Perhaps readers in lands where education is secularised would write of their experience.

Non-conformists are inclined to regard Anglicans as a bit 'toffee', on the side of the Establishment, and generally too well entrenched in the academic world. Brethren tend to view the rest of Non-conformity in the same way, save that they feel on the whole intellectually superior to the Pentecostals and Salvationists who seem to be predominantly working-class. The Brethren movement sprang up historically in aristocratic and upper-middle class circles in the first half of the nineteenth century and only drained down, through petit-bourgeois traders, into the proletariat, toward the end of the century. To-day we have as wide a range of educational levels and social strata as any of the older communions. No doubt the Salvationists and Pentecostals will change too, though probably more slowly, since they are rather working from the base up than from the apex down. I state this situation as what I think is a sociological fact, and not as a judgment of value. My point is that, just as we regard the Anglican and older Non-conformist churches as over-intellectualistic, so we are disdainful and patronizing towards these more 'left-wing' movements, as being theologically scarcely respectable. The Churchman, we imagine, sermonizes modernistically; whilst the ebullient Pentecostalist raves a species of 'only-believism'. The immense value of the Newsom Report is that it enables us to put this matter in perspective. Half our future locked up in the lower streams of our secondary modern schools, is never going to appreciate the over conceptualised Gospel preached from our platforms Sunday by Sunday. In another context I might urge that we do not put enough thought into the preparation and delivery of our evangel. But, against the Newsom back cloth, we are too posh by half. We need to get to the spiritual equivalent of the pop song and dance. The West Indians who have settled in this country have a lot to teach us on this score, on the worship of God through sheer physical ebullience, and we might do worse than pay their churches a visit one Sunday and get the message.

There are a thousand more things to say about education. This issue is mere appetizer. We hope our readers will be provoked to contribute to further discussion by letters and articles. We should like to see something especially on the problems of the proposed turnover to an exclusively comprehensive system. Are those people right who protest that the question is simply an educational one for the minds of professional educationists, or is the contention sound that we must use the educational system as an instrument for social change, to de-class society? Is it the duty of the church to fight a rearguard action to preserve the public, direct grant and maintained grammar schools against the flood? Frank letters would be welcomed from parents on their decisions regarding fee-paying or non-fee-paying schools. How different are we from our pagan neighbour

when it comes to applying superior income or capital to purchasing privilege for our offspring? Are we doing as the Gentiles do when we buy a public school education for our children, even though we can justify our action—by the appeal to the Christian foundations of our best public schools?

Later issues of the Journal may perhaps be devoted to the problems of education on the overseas mission field, the universities, the theological colleges, and, why not, the Sunday Schools. We might consider whether Brethren ought to emulate the Quakers and found and maintain a school in some under-developed land as indeed has been done at Bangalore and elsewhere or copy other churches and found their own theological college as a school of one of our universities. (I have a 'short list' of quite some length for the first principal!). Should we change the times of our Sunday Schools to leave the afternoon free for visiting friends, Christian or otherwise (as some, indeed, have done)?

ALAN WILLINGALE

CHRISTIAN TEAMWORK INSTITUTE

Eighth Introductory Course—London Area

“LEARNING BY EXPERIENCE”

This course is designed to have a special relevance to those involved in the work of the local church and in Christian service in the surrounding community. It is also suitable for others who have a more general concern for the problems of living as a Christian in the world to-day.

CONFERENCE: March 5 - 7, 1965, followed by six Tuesday evening training sessions.

Further information and application form from:—

CHRISTIAN TEAMWORK, 1 WHITEHALL PLACE, LONDON, S.W.1

THE VALUE OF A SECULAR EDUCATION

C. G. Martin

'And Moses was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians; and he was mighty in his words and works'.

ACTS 7:22 (R.V.)

What is the purpose of studies—apart of course from the acquisition of the necessary technical knowledge to equip the student for his life-work? The real purpose is above all to train his mind, so that he may be capable of forming an intelligent and responsible judgment, and of making honest criticisms, both in those matters with which he will have to deal professionally and in his life as a citizen. He must know what words mean, and be able to use them correctly: he must see that words are vehicles of ideas, see that human notions and ideas, including his own, are imperfect and incomplete (he knows by experience how much he has learnt from others): and he must see that there is a truth of things, beyond and above his own ideas and the ideas of others. This is to be an educated man; and our society can be in a healthy state only when it has a sufficiency of such men to lead it. The vice of the spirit of 'the party' is that it deliberately rejects this training up of a sound and responsible judgment, and seeks instead a conformity with the party aims and propaganda. (*see G. Hebert, Fundamentalism and the Church of God.*)

'Secular' is an unhappy word, conjuring up as it does the antithesis between the common round, and the 'religious' exercises of the weekend. For the Christian, of course, as George Herbert reminds us, 'all may of Thee partake', and there is no part of life common or unclean. To make this paper clear, however, we need a word to describe that education whose content does not demand Christian conviction for its appreciation, and whose form does not demand Christian vocabulary or world view. It is, in this country, to a great extent directed and administered by people whose convictions are not necessarily Christian and whose aims therefore do not include the will and purpose of God. Such an education will be labelled 'secular'. Presumably, on this definition, even Christian schools would find a lot of their time devoted to 'secular' education, and would have many pupils who profit from this without being brought to Christian conviction.

What, then, are the merits of a secular education? How much of one's life should be devoted to it? Ought we to stop as soon as we have mastered the 'three R's', so that all our time can be devoted to 'honest trades' and the witness of the gospel? or must we press on to the Ph.D. before we have more than a little spare-time-preaching to offer? To some extent these questions will be answered by our attitude to or assessment of the basic

aims of life. Are we, in Carey's phrase, to 'preach the gospel, and cobble shoes to pay expenses', or are we to spend our time like Kepler 'thinking God's thoughts after Him' in research? May we bear our witness in the world by entering its work and worry, meeting its need and nonsense, and showing the love and power of Christ in all these mundane situations? For the Christian, the basic aim is to please his Lord, Whose will he must find by use of the means of Scripture, prayer, meditation and counsel of others.

The merit of secular education to the individual

Consider first the merits of secular education to the individual. These may again be considered under the heads of the 'getting', and the 'having'. The 'getting' involves a number of years training, endured with varying degrees of patience, boredom, enjoyment and profit according to the attitude he takes. Much education is unfortunately so highly geared to school-leaving examinations that some pupils (often with parental approval) become human tape-recorders able to reproduce correct answers at examination time. Lessons which do not contribute to this aim are regarded as a waste of time. A happy number manage to resist this pressure and find much of their learning of real interest and enjoyment for its own sake. To them it yields the manly joy of achievement, and the thrill of discovery of mental and manual faculties and of new areas upon which to employ them. The acquisition of factual knowledge goes hand in hand with the development of critical capacities. The student becomes aware of his own growing ability to make judgments of value, to stand by his judgments, and thus learn personal responsibility. All this takes place in community, so he learns to realise his individuality, and the many other types of personality with which he is surrounded, and to take his place in the community with good grace, making his own contribution and accepting the contribution of others. In the wider community he learns his own limitations and his own potentialities. He meets those who are better (and worse) equipped in various directions. He learns to communicate with others, to respect divergent views sincerely held while at the same time diverging from them, and to express his own views with clarity and charity. Such an education can be a valuable learning of the virtues of humility, a respect for authority and honest learning, self-discipline and the subordination of present goods to future goods. He may also find wide scope for the practice of personal honesty and integrity, and love and concern towards others. It may be not all readers will recognise their own schooldays in this lyrical description—it could, for all that, be like Turner's sunsets, "what you would like to see".

If the 'getting' is anything like this, what of the 'having'? The 'having' gives both confidence and humility. He knows both the possibilities and the limitations of his own endeavour. With a trained mind he can approach a given situation, analyse it, collect relevant facts and data, and make some judgment upon the contribution of others. With humble respect for truth he will often feel that any attempt at solution is incomplete, but he will at least provide a ground for responsible action in the given situation. His

training in expression will enable him to communicate his ideas with clarity and conviction. He will also be able and accustomed to relate each situation and branch of experience to life as a whole.

To some the last paragraph will sound horribly like Aristotle's 'man of practical wisdom', calculating, aloof, correct. To others it may sound hopelessly academic and removed from the factory floor. It is intended however, to be readable in the context of any walk of life. 'Mental training', 'respect for truth', 'communication' may vary in the cases of plumber talking to his mate, salesman to customer, don to undergraduate, but in every field 'responsible action' is urgently necessary and these three components (no doubt among others) may be discerned. For Christian audience it may hardly be necessary to add that God's full purpose in man will be seen when 'mental training' is matched by 'every thought subject to Christ', the 'truth' to include a world-view in which Christ is pre-eminent, and 'responsibility' to be towards Christ and not only one's neighbour. It may well be necessary to state clearly that the additional factors mentioned are not divinely guaranteed to operate miraculously, alone, where the other factors have been neglected or abused. The indwelling Spirit makes the secular education holy, not obsolete, or unnecessary.

The merit of secular education to society

Action from reason and conviction rather than from hunch and mood is likely to promote stability. Respect for truth and humble openness of mind will promote better conditions for the solution of social problems than superstitious or arrogant tradition. So charms give way to prophylactic medicine in the control of epidemics; ECT treatment supersedes Bedlam for some mental disorders. Where the solution to a given problem is in doubt, progress is most likely to be made where there is mutual respect for sound learning, and free, clear communication of ideas humbly put forward in the common interest. Also by the careful, disciplined, recording of the experiments, hopes, successes, failures of each generation, those who follow may learn, and 'standing on the shoulders of giants' see further. It may well be said that unregenerate man is so vitiated by sin that this picture can be true only with the indwelling Spirit shedding the love of God abroad. It is true that those in whom the Spirit works will have the greater contribution to make, but it is not divinely guaranteed that they will make this contribution without the development of potential that comes through secular education.

The merit of secular education to the Church

The Church's job is to offer spiritual sacrifices to God, and to show forth His praises to the world (1 Pet. 2), to know the abiding presence of Christ while making 'disciples of all nations'. The individual's personal committal to Christ as Saviour and Lord is something he does alone, each in his time for himself. But the knowledge of the Christ to Whom he is committed may be broadened and enriched by the heritage of the past. Writings and liturgy may enshrine the spiritual insights and experiences of generations of worshipping believers, and we in our turn are responsible

to deliver to those who follow that which we also received. A trained mind is no barrier to the humble understanding of divine truth. An ability to convey ideas by accurate words is no bar to the proclamation of the gospel, or the instruction of the faithful. A respect for truth, and the ability to relate the part to the whole, will promote humility and worship in the face of Christ Who is the truth, and the One by Whom and for Whom all things exist. Many would say that the Church to-day could do with more 'responsibility', greater 'respect for truth', a wider relation of the various parts of experience, and certainly a clearer manner of communication. These are tools of the trade that can be gained by secular education. How the tools are used depends on the dedication of the holder to his Master. If the charge "we have filled the pulpits with degrees and emptied the pews by degrees" is true, the fault is not with the degrees but the men that held them. Wesley's Oxford training did not give him what he got at the Aldersgate Street Meeting House, but was very useful to him in employing that experience. Moses' training did not teach him what he learned at the Bush, but was certainly a factor in his becoming the founder under God of the Jewish religion and nation, from whom, as according to the flesh, is the Christ.

THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

THE 1965 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF THE CHRISTIAN BRETHERN RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP WILL BE HELD ON SATURDAY, 30th OCTOBER, 1965, IN LONDON. AS IN 1964, THERE WILL BE A PERIOD OF OPEN DISCUSSION FOR MEMBERS, AND A SESSION OPEN TO THE PUBLIC, AT WHICH EMINENT SPEAKERS ARE EXPECTED TO BE PRESENT.

SCHOLARS OR SAINTS ?

E. G. Ashby

In 1958 the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions, revolting against a 'limited culture dominated by the glory of Greece and the grandeur of Rome' expressed a wish for a curriculum which 'also reflects the importance of science in the mid-twentieth century'. This particular declaration may be accepted as the general tendency of our day and age. Science has come and come to stay, and whether we worship at its shrine or cynically regard it as the Sacred Cow, its influence is felt amongst all, in some more consciously than others.

The importance of this has been emphasized by Paul Tillich in his sermon on 'The shaking of the foundations'. Affirming that in the language of the prophets it is the Lord Who shakes the mountains and melts the rocks, he adds that this is a language modern man cannot understand. But God Who is not bound to any special language or group of men has spoken through the mouths of our greatest scientists and to this effect, that into the hands of scientists themselves has been placed the power to shake the foundations, to create or destroy, and theirs is the choice how they will use this power. In this way the moral problem is restated in new terms. Unless man learns some moral self-restraint and discipline he will destroy himself.

In the light of this it is easy to understand the concern of R. A. Butler concerning the effectiveness of the 1944 Act in respect of religious teaching in schools, and the relevance of the discussion of F. H. Hilliard in the *Daily Telegraph* (7.3.62) concerning 'Restoring Morals to the Curriculum'. Secular humanism is very much on the increase in many places, and Dr. Hilliard points out that such teachers would prefer a moral education divorced from religion. The argument is that this would minimize the danger of adolescents who found little time for religion throwing out the moral baby, so to speak, with the religious bath water. There may be a measure of truth here, but how much is it worth? During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries there were radical changes in belief and outlook but so far morality itself was unchallenged. As Rudolf Eucken stated in his lectures in 1913, to them ethics was the 'pivot of Archimedes which gives stability to the whole of life', but, he added, 'in our days morality has ceased to be a matter of such unquestionable certainty'. Is it anything more than custom? What are its sanctions? The threat of nuclear destruction may enforce it as a matter of expediency, but is that all? Must we be good merely because the alternative is world destruction? Then if we can discard nuclear weapons will there be a fresh relapse into indifference to morality? Without a religious basis moral idealism may be little more than a Utopian myth. In fact is not the present attitude to morality the ultimate and inevitable result of a decline of true religion?

It is here that the Christian teacher comes into his own. As J. S. Haldane expressed it in his 1930 broadcast, 'The only ultimate reality is the spiritual or personal reality which we denote by the existence of God'. But it is here that the present generation are so sadly confused. Jacques Maritain has said, 'I like and respect contemporary youth, and I contemplate them with a strange feeling of anguish . . . they are just at that stage where the acquired structures of moral and religious tradition have been taken away . . . They stand in goodness upon nothing'. While reserving our judgments upon the measure of their goodness, many of us would feel how true it is that they stand 'upon nothing'.

Some enquiries concerning religious teaching in Schools were carried out in 1958 and records of these have been edited by Harold Loukes under the title of *Teenage Religion*. One problem raised was on the subject of belief in creation. The view was expressed that it could be true that God made the world, but 'it's not proved, is it? Nobody stood there and watched Him, so we don't know if He did it or not'. There are a number of confusions here, including the theological one seeing the personality of God as limited by forms of human personality and the logical one failing to differentiate different kinds of proof. Various views were expressed on both sides, but perhaps most important was the fact that the majority missed the realization that this is not merely an academic question but an immediate problem in which all are concerned, for the statement of the creation of the world by God is an affirmation of purpose, intention and meaning. The old problem of Science v. Religion is no longer very much with us, at least in its old form. But Science seems to have a technological value, it effects processes, it does things, it is factual, it counts, whereas Religion is so ineffective that it can be safely disregarded. This is probably a fair statement of how it appears to many.

Such conditions as these posit the need for basic Bible teaching. The Bible does not seek to prove the existence of God—it assumes it, and demonstrates His activity in the lives and experiences of men. It is the only answer which makes sense of the Universe, for it is the fool who says in his heart, 'There is no god'. From the existence of God the creation follows as an act of faith (Heb. 11:3) and this is a meaningful act which affects each of us. From this beginning there is a revelation of the character of God, His holiness, majesty and power being balanced in true perspective by His mercy, grace and love. Through the Old Testament may be traced His activities in human history, His special covenant relationship with a chosen race, and the repercussions of this in their dealings with surrounding nations. The responsibilities of this covenant were enforced by the teaching of the prophets. These forceful challenges are taken up in the New Testament linked with a call to repentance and the acceptance of a new life bestowed by Jesus Christ, God manifest in the flesh. After effecting the work of redemption by His death, His resurrection and ascension made possible the gift of the Holy Spirit. Thus the Acts show the continuation of the work Jesus began, and with the formation of the Christian Church we are already in our world. Though science has

opened many doors and revealed much of the processes of nature, the twentieth century, like the first, has for its supreme aim the making of new men, regenerated by the Holy Spirit, living in fellowship with God. This is the aim of religious teaching, not to make scholars but to create saints, and well informed ones at that. For Christ Himself and the Apostle Paul laid emphasis on the knowledge of God which is spiritual revelation and perception, and man is to love God with heart and *mind* as well as soul and strength. The knowledge of the text of the Bible is a means to an end, to lead to a knowledge of God Himself and the Saviour, and this is the meaning of eternal life. Each of us has his approach to life, however ill-informed the idea, so that we are hardly conscious of it at all. The Marxist, adapting the dialectic of Hegel, views the history of the human race as an economically determined system, the historical positivist thinks of it in terms of evolutionary and scientific principles. The Christian, too, has his *weltanschauung*, his 'world outlook', God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, He is now calling men to Himself to form His Church, and He will ultimately usher in His Kingdom. The aim of religious teaching is to make people aware of this, in the words of Paul, to 'make men see'. Thus far it is instruction, but with a moral and spiritual objective, to promote faith which will lead individuals into this personal relationship so that the Holy Spirit can transform their lives. The aim is, in short, not scholars, but saints.

HALF OUR FUTURE:

The Newsom Report and the Church

Peter Cousins

It is only a minority of British children that receives a grammar school education. About three-quarters attend non-selective (modern or comprehensive) schools. Here a small group take some G.C.E. subjects, another small group struggle to master the rudiments of reading and calculating. It is the education of the remainder—the average boy and girl of 13 to 16—that is discussed in the Newsom Report. Issued in August, 1963 and unfortunately overshadowed by the almost simultaneous appearance of the Robbins Report on higher education, *Half our Future* is worth the attention of all who wish to think seriously about our society. It is compulsory reading for all concerned with work among adolescents. The report deals with the education of the normal citizen. The Church in this country is mainly a middle-class organisation. Its members, themselves largely the products of grammar or private schools, assume that folk who have not passed through a similar educational process are abnormal, even inferior. The facts are otherwise. The very title of this report reminds us that we are failing to reach—let alone convert—the bulk of our fellows, the backbone of the nation, the majority (to put it in political terms) of the electorate.

Christians know that justice is unattainable outside the Kingdom of God. But if they take the Bible seriously they will be concerned to fight injustice. The Newsom Report reveals an appalling state of affairs in our educational system. We are both sinning against our fellows and squandering our national assets, so that God and Mammon may here agree on the need for reform. Consider the facts. About seven per cent of the schools are classified as in slum areas. A chapter is devoted to their problems. Here boys are an inch shorter and four pounds lighter than their fellows elsewhere. The accommodation in seventy-nine per cent is seriously defective. Only a third of the women and half the men have been on the staff for more than three years.

In general, the report shows that much 'backwardness' is not at all the result of inferior 'intelligence', but is associated with disadvantages in social and physical background, and sheer lack of practice in what most of us would regard as normal forms of speech. Said one boy, 'By the time I reached the secondary school it was all Chinese to me'. This indicates not only a need to reconsider our preaching, but to press for a national policy to help those who are thus being prevented from growing up into full human stature.

In an attempt to examine the 'average' in some detail, the report has drawn three portraits of Brown (representing the top quarter in ability), Jones (representing the middle half of the sample) and Robinson (the lowest quarter in ability). There are fascinating tables of their differing backgrounds and attitudes. It becomes plain that we are nowhere near the ideal of equal opportunity for all which (it is sometimes suggested) we have attained. The Browns tend to live in the Home Counties; the Robinsons (even after we have discounted the 'problem areas' involved) tend to come from our neglected North. Still we reap the harvest of national laziness and lack of social love, or simple justice.

Yet the report is not wholly pessimistic. As against the gutter press and Christian people who uncritically echo its findings (sometimes with a religious obbligation) *Half our Future* finds some cause for encouragement in the rising generation. Television is not simply the devil's black box. It extends knowledge of the world and sympathy with others. It provides a wide store of information, such as would not be read in books. Films, plays and ballets are of a higher standard than is available locally. What of behaviour? Less than five per cent in the Fourth Year, say their teachers, present serious problems of discipline. They are kinder, more tolerant, more understanding than their counterparts of fifteen or twenty years ago. Schools of the 'blackboard jungle' type are rare, and would be more so if the staffing situation were better. Some will feel these comments are unrealistic, but they come from men and women who are in daily and close personal contact with the bulk of our young people. Nor are we justified in complaining generally of a deterioration in standards of attainment; between 1948 and 1961 the reading age of the average school-leaver increased by almost two years. The Newsom Report gives little encouragement to those who tell us that the youth of the nation is rotten.

What does the report have to say about our approach to the adolescent? Its findings deserve close attention. They come with the authority of a most distinguished and experienced group of educationalists; they are based on evidence drawn from schools and youth movements all over the country; they look like becoming the standard approach in most schools for the next generation. Secondary education, say these authorities—and their words have importance far beyond the classroom—is concerned, first with self-conscious thought and judgment; secondly with the relation of school and the work done there to the world outside of which the pupils form part and of which they are increasingly aware; and thirdly with the relation of what is done in school to the future of the pupils, that is to the part they see themselves playing, or can be brought to see themselves playing in adult life'. Nothing could be further than this from the tendency that has too long existed in religious circles to encourage young people to accept on the authority of the speaker or the religious group theories or 'doctrines' which remain wholly unrelated to daily life or experience. As against all attempts to construct an ivory tower of belief and experience, the report demands that at school the programme 'ought to be deliberately

outgoing . . . taking the pupils mentally and often physically beyond the school walls'. It is a commonplace of educational thought that such an approach stimulates the will to learn as well as preparing for life. For 'long before they leave the secondary school they have ceased to think of themselves as children, and are beginning to reach out to the life they will lead as adults'. While children may be expected to take something on trust from their teachers, they are right in demanding relevance to life. Plainly we must ensure that our Christian teaching is related (as was that of our Lord) to conditions of daily living, not in any negative way, but as showing how the divine salt may season the whole dish of human existence.

There can be no doubt of the value to adolescents of contact with adults. In many homes there is little or no rational contact between the generations. The report says what many youth leaders will confirm, that young people crave the opportunity for mere adult conversation with folk who accept them as individuals rather than 'teenagers' and that such intercourse may be of great value. And in time of need such an adult may be turned to: 'If it hadn't been for the games mistress I would have left home at one time, but she made me see reason'.

In the light of all this, the churches must rethink their approach to young people. A Christian should be more not less mature than his fellows, and we shall fail utterly unless we can be as realistic, honest and outward looking as the schools. But how many churches, how many groups of elders, really want people of any age—let alone the young—to be characterised by 'self-conscious thought and judgment'? Yet it is lack of these qualities that has repeatedly led to spiritual shipwreck, both among new converts and those from Christian homes.

So far we have purposely ignored the very important section on spiritual and moral development. It might be thought that here above all we have what is relevant to the Church. In particular, there is a temptation to seek in this section for some effective *technique* for putting across the Christian message. It must be realised that as Christians, however, we are concerned with something more than problems of technique. Unless we take seriously all that has been mentioned so far we shall fail in our mission.

Yet there is both help and encouragement to be gained from the chapter. The recommendations based on it are worth quoting in full: (a) Religious instruction has a part to play in helping boys and girls to find a firm basis for sexual morality based on chastity before marriage and fidelity within it, (b) the schools have a duty to give specific religious instruction, which is more than general ethical teaching. The essential conditions for doing this are an improved supply of suitably qualified teachers and an adequate time allowance in the schools. (c) Local education authorities should consider a review of their Agreed Syllabuses to determine whether adequate provision is made for the needs of the older boys and girls of average and below average ability, and whether they leave sufficient scope for the teachers to develop methods which start

with the actual problems which the pupils have to face. (d) We reaffirm the value of the school act of worship as a potent force in the spiritual experience of the pupils.

The factors to be considered, says the report, are (1) that the staff are probably divided in philosophical and religious allegiance, as would be any group of Englishmen. (2) The questioning spirit of adolescence, which must be saved from degenerating into cynical disengagement. (3) The inescapable fact that teachers influence their pupils whether they give formal religious instruction or not. (This is true of other adults besides teachers!) (4) The contrast between the standards inculcated at school and those accepted at work—there is no automatic transfer, and children must be shown the value of these higher standards in all spheres.

In spite of the differences of viewpoint, yet the corporate life of the school can exercise a strong and helpful influence over pupils. (How much more might the corporate life of a Christian community! How often does it do so?) All staff can show their concern for moral issues. (Whereas we too often in the churches seem concerned only about theological ones.)

Guidance is particularly needed about sexual morality, though without any effort to hide the fact that different viewpoints exist. It must be made clear 'that "going off the rails" does not involve for Christians losing the fellowship of the church, still less of forfeiting the love of God'. (The writer remembers cases where a local church has succeeded in giving an impression directly opposed to this.)

What is religious education? It is not simple moral instruction; the R.E. teacher is not primarily an aid to discipline and a 'good tone'. Nor is it simple Bible reading—a sure way to lose the attention of most boys and girls. It is not ancient history. It must provide both objective knowledge and contact with religious experience; no teacher can succeed unless he can offer both together. This means that teachers must be qualified, because one just does not pick up by chance the sort of systematic and detailed knowledge that children have a right to expect of those who teach them. A man who stopped thinking about problems of religion and life twenty years ago may be a perfectly good churchwarden, but he will not be in a position to help adolescents today. *'For this his scholarship must be up to date and he must move on the Christian frontiers of today'*. Yet the teacher must also be able to communicate with his pupils, and talk to them in language they can understand. The report calls for more qualified teachers. (It is plain that these will not be forthcoming unless the churches encourage young people to take up the ministry. Their work would be helped by prayer support—far more useful than the pious moaning about apostasy in the schools that is more often heard in prayer meetings.)

Finally, a recommendation about technique. The report is emphatic that the most promising approach to teaching the Christian faith, once the simple story-telling stage is over (should it ever begin?) is to take a present-day problem of life or thought and to explore it fully and honestly, using whatever light is found in the Bible and Christian experience. Questions

about life after death, suffering, mercy killing etc., arise in the minds of all whatever their social or intellectual level. 'They need to know what answer the Christian faith gives'.

Half our Future makes it plain that in the foreseeable future the education of the average child will be based on the problems and opportunities of real life. It will encourage independent thought and moral judgment. Its objective will be maturity of thought, emotion and conduct. Christians must re-examine the basis of their church life as well as their youth work, to see whether these things are first of all consistent with Christian ideals (which they surely are!) and secondly whether the local church is doing anything to encourage them.

THE CONTRIBUTORS

A. E. WILLINGALE, B.A., B.D., M.Th.
Civil Servant

C. G. MARTIN, B.Sc., B.D.
Mathematics and Scripture specialist,
Worthing High School for Boys
(mostly teaching sixth forms).

E. G. ASHBY, M.A., B.D.
Grammar School Divinity Master.

P. E. COUSINS, M.A., B.D.
Head of Religious Education Department,
Mayfield School, Putney.

MEMBERS' SECTION

Contributions and Correspondence on matters raised in the Journal should reach the Correspondence Editor, 229 Village Way, Beckenham, Kent, within four weeks of the Journal being received.

CONTRIBUTION

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

—An Impression

On his way to Oslo to receive the Nobel Prize for work on racial justice and non-violence, Dr. Martin Luther King visited London and preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on the 6th December, 1964. A large multi-racial congregation of about 4,000 people gathered to hear the Doctor, including hundreds who had to stand for the whole service.

Doctor King began by referring to Rev. 21 : 16 which he used as a text for his address 'he measured the city . . . the length and the breadth and the height of it are equal'. John in exile on Patmos was denied all freedom but the freedom to think. In his thinking he had a vision of the completeness and perfection of the new city. The Doctor saw in this a picture of the Real Life. Life at its best is three dimensional and equally balanced: in length—self interest, breadth—concern for others, and height—upward reach for God.

Length—development of the inward self. Before we can love others we must learn to love ourselves properly. Unless we are at peace with ourselves, we cannot be at peace with others. Our first task must be to find our real aim and ambition, to discover our life's work and to do it well. Be a clerk if you cannot be the boss, be a bush if you cannot be a tree, but above all be the best of whatever you are.

Breadth—concern for others. This is more important than concern for self, and each individual must accept responsibility here. Racial prejudice is present, even in this country, in housing, schooling and employment. If this prejudice is not dealt with in a Christian way the democratic institutions of this country will be endangered. This calls for love, tolerance and understanding on both sides. We need to avoid the danger of substituting one type of injustice for another. The dangers in black supremacy are as real as those of white supremacy.

God is not interested in the freedom of men according to the colour of their skin but in freedom for all mankind. As the struggle for freedom

goes on all over the world we must never use second class methods to gain it. The Good Samaritan had the right idea: he saw a man in need and did what he could. This is what is required of all men; rich nations, too, *must* help the poor or perish with them. One day all men everywhere must recognise they must live together as brothers or perish as fools.

Height—the upward reach to God, without which no man of any race can find fulfilment. Some never get beyond the second dimension, living on the horizontal plane they fail to recognize the vertical reaching up to God. Love yourself in the proper sense of the term, love your neighbour also, but do not forget the greatest commandment: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy mind'. The Christian believes that Jesus Christ is the way to God. But has the Christian Church lost contact? Are the services and the buildings relevant? Is the Church now an echo instead of a voice, a tail-light instead of a head-light? We should see to it that in all the forward movement of freedom for all men our lives are complete in the three dimensions, length, breadth and height.

It was a real privilege to listen to Dr. Martin L. King. Much has been written and said of this outstanding man who has made the cause of the under-privileged his own. Here was a man, in some ways a very ordinary man, filled to the brim with the love of God for his fellow men. He conveyed his deep longings in a quiet but moving way and gave the impression of a man dedicated to the cause with which his name is associated. He spoke frankly and fearlessly and with deep conviction: knowing something of man's inhumanity to man, yet, in a far deeper sense, the prevailing love of God. One was conscious of his deep longing that the Christian Church the world over should give a decisive lead in demonstrating that it is possible for all men to live together in peace and prosperity.

The *Guardian's* paragraph ending on the Doctor's visit was fair comment: 'Many feared he would disappoint—he did not'.

PHYLLIS LOOSEMORE

CORRESPONDENCE

The Biblical Doctrine of Man: Mind—Soul—Spirit

J. W. BAIGENT 6 Windmill Road, London, S.W.18, writes:—

Perhaps the following quotation will be of help to some of your readers concerned with this subject. It comes from C. B. Daly, *Metaphysics and the Limits of Language in Prospect for Metaphysics* (ed. I. Ramsay, Allen & Unwin, 1961), p. 200:—

‘The accounts given by metaphysicians about the soul were not intended as ‘solutions to problems’ as mathematics, formal logic or science understand solutions. Their language was a refusal to put empirical-science limits to man’s self-awareness and self-discovery and self-fulfilment. The terms ‘mind’, ‘soul’, ‘spirit’ are not clear and distinct and closed ideas which end puzzlement; but open ideas of inexhaustible fertility, which arouse wonder and are permanent invitations to the reflection and effort that will translate our assent to them from notional into real, that will convert them from theory into way of life’.

I think the same can be said of the use of these terms in the Bible. They are not *scientific* terms; they do not describe *things*; we should not think in terms of a ‘ghost in the machine’. But they point to the *transcendental* element of man’s nature, the *mystery* of man’s being. These words say that there is more to man than all the third person descriptions that science offers or can offer. They point to man’s self-consciousness, his subjectivity—perhaps the essential meaning of the phrase ‘made in the image of God’: for God ‘breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living person (*nephesh*)’. (Gen. 2.7.)

For those who are interested, there is a novel restatement of the tripartite view of man’s being in *The Recovery of Belief* by C. E. M. Joad (Faber 1952), pp. 201 ff.

Unction

ERNEST LACYOCK 22 Regent Road, Penn, Wolverhampton, writes:

Mr. Brian Davies (CBRFJ v. 26) gives the stock answer, which is so inadequate from the point of experience. He says, ‘“Unction” refers to no more than the gift of the Holy Spirit made to all believers’. Yet if this were true, why is it that so much preaching and ministry lacks this unction? Moreover one must be true to one’s own experience and to that of hundreds of other Christians, who give testimony to crises in their lives when a special ‘unction’ was received.

It is surely just as dangerous to teach that Christians already possess something which they may not possess as it is to urge them to seek something which is already theirs. I cannot understand why we bemoan our lack of power, yet turn away from that very thing which can empower us.

Why is it that we rarely, if ever, hear the expression 'the baptism of the Holy Ghost'? Are we afraid of the subject? John the Baptist said two vital things about the Messiah: one was 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world', and the other was 'He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost'. The first we cherish, the second we ignore! The old answers to these questions are completely inadequate. We all need a new experience of the Holy Ghost, and the wonderful thing is that it is happening! This is what CBRF must investigate! The answers to these questions are not to be found in commentaries or new versions of the Bible. Look into people's lives and see, then go back to the scriptures and verify! Of course, all Christians have the Spirit, otherwise they would not be Christians, but Christ was born of the Holy Ghost (Luke 1.35), yet was also anointed (Acts 10.38) in order that he could go about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the Devil.

God bless you and use the Journal and Fellowship to lift us out of our lethargy.

Should a Woman Pray Audibly in a Church Prayer Meeting?

EDWIN LEWIS, 17 Old Croft Road, Walton on the Hill, Stafford, writes:

May I express my appreciation of Mr. Martin's article (CBRFJ vi, 20 ff.). The arbitrariness of the Divine commands presupposed in the usual interpretation ignores the first principle of all the Divine injunctions—'Instruction in Righteousness'.

Why a woman should be considered righteous for *singing* in Church 'Take my life and let it be Consecrated, Lord, to Thee' (written by a woman—*Ed.*), but morally culpable to the point of causing some 'gracious' brethren to walk out of the meeting if she *speaks* these same words; this has always surpassed my understanding. When the precise *moral* difference between these two actions is determined, then we shall know what part of the Divine Honour is at stake. Personally I am afraid to make the attempt lest I should appear to be turning the Deity Himself into an insipid joke.

CHRISTOPHER SCOTT, 83 Highbury Road, Kings Heath, Birmingham, 14, writes:

Whilst agreeing with B. C. Martin in his main contention that there is nothing to prevent a woman praying audibly in a prayer meeting, I wonder whether he is right in his remarks concerning the subjection of women to men. His first reference is to Adam and Eve, but we need to remember that their relationship was not just that of man to woman, but also that of husband and wife (cf. for instance Gen. 3:17). In the New Testament one important fact (which is concealed in our English versions) is that the Greek word 'GUNE' means both 'woman' and 'wife', and that 'ANER' means both 'man' and 'husband'. Which is the correct translation can be told from the context.

Maybe it is not true to say that the doctrine that every woman is subject to man is an immoral doctrine, but it certainly would be if it were followed to its logical conclusion. I do not believe that scripture teaches that the 'head of a woman is the man' (1 Cor. 11:3). If anyone does think so, then they must be asked *which* man is the head of a woman, for the Greek clearly says '*the* man'? The R.S.V. would appear to have the true sense when it translates 'the head of a woman is her husband'.

One point in 1 Tim. 2 to which your contributor gives no mention, is that there is a change from the plural of verses 1-10 to the singular in verses 11-15. If we believe in the inspiration of scripture surely we must ask why the change was made, and the answer must be that whereas in the early verses Paul is speaking of men and women in general, in verses 11-15 he is speaking of a particular man and woman. Of whom? The only answer can be of a husband and wife, seeing they are not named. The whole of these verses now become clear, including the 'they' of verse 15 which has so puzzled commentators. It can only refer to the previous plural subject, which on this interpretation is the husband and wife.

We would then render as follows: 'Let a wife learn in quietness in all subjection; but I do not permit a wife to teach, nor to exercise the authority of a husband'. Unfortunately the R.S.V. mistranslates here, when it translates the singular 'man' as the plural, and so misses the point.

(Mr. Scott has written a booklet on the subject, *The Ministry of Women in the Present Age*, which may be obtained from his home address above, price 3d.—Ed.)

CLIFFORD WADEY, 29 St. John's Road, Sidcup, Kent, writes:

Mr. Martin refers several times to a church prayer meeting. Why however does he restrict his arguments to this type of meeting? They surely apply with equal force to the Lord's Supper.

There are 'assemblies', one has heard it whispered, where women now voice their prayers in the church prayer meeting; but nowhere, one understands, are their thanksgivings and adorations heard at the Lord's Supper. This situation appears to lack consistency, and possibly so through the understandable desire not to cause any embarrassment to visitors who wish to break bread. Yet, becomingly practised, what better way of commending and spreading the arrangement? For it may be that it is only the anticipated strangeness in practice, rather than traditional doctrine, which is a hindrance to a number.

Mr. Martin's emphatic statement that prayer has nothing whatever to do with usurping authority can scarcely be questioned. Experience indicates that when she prays, they are a woman's meekest moments.

Shall we ever know the enrichment which, by the goodness of our God, the audible prayers of our sisters in Christ could mean? For the present it is difficult to concede that they might as well pray at home. Mr. C. F. Hogg used to say that in the matter of public prayer what counts is not so much the prayers of the few as the exercise of the many.

In view of interest aroused by Mr. Martin's contribution in the last issue, the following invited point of view is published, not to provoke controversy, but to stimulate objective discussion. If any member has contrary views, the statement of them would be welcomed.

AN INVITED POINT OF VIEW

By *Mrs. J. Hills Cotterill*

(*Lecturer in Divinity, Rachel McMillan College*)

'... MORE PRECIOUS THAN JEWELS'

Women have always been a problem, not least to themselves. This is no new discovery for in Scripture one finds parallel lines of teaching about them. Perhaps the apparent confusion may be part of the price we have to pay while here below, in a time-space continuum; perhaps beyond these limitations, in a realm of spiritual perception, the parallels meet. They must, surely, if the will of God for half His creation is to be shown as good, acceptable and perfect.

Israelite culture, like that found among surrounding nations in the fertile crescent, regarded woman as a thing. Or so the wording handed down to us of the final Commandment would lead us to conclude: where woman is listed first but among a man's possessions, his oxen and asses. Sarah was praised for her perfect submission to the will of her husband. Michal was given by her father first to David, whom it seems she loved, but then to Palti when Saul found David a political menace. In a position of tutelage to her father before marriage, of submission to her partner in marriage and of submission to her son if widowed, a woman had to use her wits if she were to call her soul her own. Status appears to have been hers if she could bear sons.

Yet such is not the whole story. Deuteronomic Law gave her a place in cultic rejoicings, as Miriam knew when she led the women with timbrel and dance after the exodus triumph. Deborah, wife of Lapidoth, judged Israel between Ramah and Bethel, summoned Barak to lead the Lord's host into battle and rebuked his unwillingness to do so without her aid. Huldah, wife of Shallum, uttered the Lord's oracle to Josiah in his perplexity when the forgotten Torah was discovered. These women stand out, and may not be regarded as typical of all their sex. But they serve to remind us of the pattern for womanhood given at creation. Genesis 1 and 2 portrays woman made, like man, in the 'image of God' and called, with man, to rule the lesser creation. Genesis 3 shows her exercising free initiative. That its consequences were disastrous is not the point; a man's free choices may also be so described. With no suggestion of 'I must ask

my husband' Eve considered the tempter's invitation to use her power of choice. Nor, when she invited her husband to share her new discovery, did he see any impropriety in the lead she had taken. When rebuked by the Lord God for his act, his immediate response was to point to his wife as responsible. It was her punishment for this event which subordinated her to her husband's authority, clearly a new relationship. Too easily led, Adam must, by a new responsibility, learn the seriousness of all movements of the human will. Too quick to respond to suggestion, Eve must learn to await her husband's decision. The weakness of each was to become the means by which both might mature, in partnership, not in hostility. The inevitable question now arises: what sin has done, can grace undo? Can the gospel restore that proper parity which the sexes were intended to share, though not as identical Powers? Those familiar with the writings of the late Charles Williams will remember the importance he placed on what he called 'co-inherence'. The whole human race is one, 'in Adam'; so man and woman have functions within that unity, complementary functions, each supplying the other's lack. Charles Williams's writings need to be read; a précis of his argument is difficult. But, to attempt it, he likens the diversity-in-unity of the Trinity of the Godhead to the diversity in unity of 'Adam', the entire human race. And as the Son, Incarnate, was subordinate to the Father for the work of redemption, so woman is subordinate to man for a purpose of blessing. The Pauline metaphor in Ephesians 5 of Christ the husband and the Church the wife bears out this interpretation of the relationship between maleness and femaleness. But of that more later.

Our Lord's attitude to women was part of His total revelation of the divine plan for humanity. To a man He spoke of the new birth from above; to a woman at Sychar He unfolded the nature of true worship. Both revelations arose out of the personal search of the individuals concerned. Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman were treated as individuals, not as a man or a woman. German philosophy, at one time, stressed the woman's womanly rôle in the home. What are we to make of the familiar Martha and Mary incident? Martha, for all her womanly concern that the meal should be worthy of the Visitor, was rebuked for anxiety: while her unwomanly sister, content to let the cooking wait while she received 'religious instruction', was commended for her appetite!

Yet, a most important proviso, the woman's gifts are not to be confused with those of the man. The Bible supports no claims for equality, whatever that much misused word means. Jesus chose no woman among the Twelve. If, as other teaching suggests, the apostles represented the leaders of New Israel as the tribal heads did Old Israel, then the choice of men only was natural; anything else would have been unseemly. And the scriptures set much store by all things being done 'decently and in order'. But Jesus, Rabbi of Nazareth, broke new ground with women *disciples*. Their husbands, un-named, may have also been disciples; in which case Herod's steward, Chuza, is un-named and his wife, Suzanna, is! Mark mentions 'many others' as witnesses of the resurrection.

Yet Jesus made no bones about reminding His mother Mary of her place in the scheme of things when, on a few recorded occasions, she stepped out of it. At the Jerusalem passover following His bar-mitzvah, when He has assumed adult responsibilities in the worship of Israel, He bade her remember God's prior claim on His life. When Eastern hospitality had outrun provisions at a Cana wedding and Mary had given Him what one is tempted to regard as a hint Jesus reminded her of the source of His miracle power—frankly no concern of her's. Up to His eyes in public ministry, His teaching was interrupted by a message that, outside the house stood His mother and brothers come all the way from Nazareth to restrain Him. Looking round the circle of His eager hearers He said: 'Here are my mother and my brothers'.

The interpretation given by the early church to His teaching shows this same duality in the position of women. They figured actively in the spread of the gospel and in the life of the local churches. Mary and 'the women' were among the waiting 120 at Pentecost. Mary, mother of John Mark, housed the Jerusalem church during days of persecutions; Lydia of Philippi did the same. In Ephesus Paul met Priscilla, named before her husband Aquila as giving much-needed instruction in the Faith to Apollos. In Caesarea we find four women prophets and to Corinth Paul gave directions concerning the proper exercise of this gift by both men and women. No doubt 1 Corinthians 11: 2-16 is a hard passage to interpret, as the diverse views of commentators show, but clearly two things are being laid down by Paul: that women prophets existed and exercised their gift, but that they must still remember that they are women. Teaching elsewhere confirms this tension in the Christian woman's rôle: 1 Peter 3: 1-7; 1 Timothy 2: 11 to 3: 14; 5: 2-16; Titus 2: 3-5.

Scripture clearly does not set out to solve for the twentieth century the exact application of basic principles. It does, however, state that '... there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus' (Gal. 3: 28). The primeval unity of Mankind, lost at the Fall, is restored in Christ, Second Adam. The complementary functions of sex, the unique part which maleness and femaleness is intended to play in making the human race fulfil the purpose for which it was created: these existed before sin entered. Grace, therefore, does not obliterate divinely designed sex differences; it restores them to their true functioning. The 'all one in Christ' principle must not, then, be used to support strident demands for equality between the sexes. The word 'equality', critically examined, has practically no meaning when applied to the members of the human family. Mathematically the word 'equal' can be shown to have meaning; theologically it is elusive. Anyway, what woman wants equality with man; what man with woman! Life is not, ideally, a battle in which the superior lords it or the inferior clamours for rights. That life is not ideal. That there are women who do demand equality and men who do act as 'lords of creation' is true; but that is not the way life 'by grace' is to be lived.

However, while the grace of God works within faulty human beings in this world, sex differences have to be given due weight, while not for-

getting the principle cited above. Distinction of sex was no accident nor must we limit it to purely biological ends. Any treatment of sex which ignores the total significance of gender on the whole personality is simply not adequate. For that reason such books as:

An exposition of Christian sex ethics by V. A. Demant. Hodder 1963

God, sex and war: a symposium. pub. Fontana 1963

The art of loving. Erich Fromm. Unwin 1962

seem to me more convincing than writings of the 'new morality' type or the pamphlet, 'Towards a Quaker View of Sex'.

To pose the question, finally, as it faces a modern Christian woman, wife and mother, is to see the matter at its most acute. She does not live in a climate of opinion nor in a cultural setting such as Sarah knew, not even such as New Testament women like Priscilla or Phoebe knew. By no choice of her own she has been educated to the top of her inborn academic or practical ability, by the expenditure of public money from rates and taxes. She has been trained to regard herself, to some extent, as a debtor to society, to her country, obligated to make some return. Valuable as is a good home—and she hopes to create that in God's good time—society faces her with competing values. Schools need teachers, hospitals need nurses and doctors, dispensers, radio- and physiotherapists. The list seems endless. And the church overseas is crying out for workers, for women who will dare what men dare, go where men go, go even where men have not yet gone, pioneers as well as mission base staff. Moreover industry now is asking why some women do not use their mathematical training to become engineers, scientists, technicians of all kinds.

The personal salary draws many—an independent income which her husband cannot commandeer, an extra supply of cash to finance better things for her children or to support aged parents whom better medical care has preserved into very old age, beyond the expectation of life known last century.

Furthermore, not all husbands regard the home as the woman's place all day long. Home, of course, must be adequately managed and the family properly cared for, but a wife whose conversation is limited to what the neighbours say or what she saw when out shopping may find herself regarded as dull! Not all husbands see things like this, but enough do to make the problem real. The matter is complicated further if the woman is not only educated but gifted. A former student of mine became a prominent pastor and theologian of his denomination. When a student he loved and married an artist, also a keen Christian. Her forté was painting in oils. Was she to abandon her gift to do odd jobs around the parish, an unpaid curate? Is it a woman's duty to God to allow her talents to atrophy? Yet how does she reconcile the maturing of her gifts with her duties as home-maker? There is little doubt, in most cases, that a marriage runs better where the woman takes a subordinate position to the man, puts his career or vocation before any cultivation of her own, supports him as a 'help meet' for him. But is it necessarily the will of God that the man's

life should be made easy at such a cost? The giving ought not to be one-way.

Clearly, the only solution to such problems is a personal one between the man and woman concerned, as they come together before God for His will to be known. And when the couple do this and believe they have found God's will, it is surely for their fellow Christians to give them credit accordingly. Credit even when what they believe they have discovered seems to run contrary to traditional patterns, in some of our churches if not in all. I recall a couple, devoted to each other and to their Lord: the man had a good head for business but was no talker, the woman was a gifted public speaker. Her Methodist circuit gladly accepted her as a lay preacher; her husband gladly acted as her chauffeur and could be seen, on the front row, praying for her as she preached. The Anglican communion, on the other hand, faced with the undeniable gifts of Maud Royden could find no ministry for her; she found her freedom, regretfully, among the Congregationalists. Recently, indeed, the climate of opinion among Anglicans is altering though much divergence of opinion can be found among the leaders of the church and, logic apart, sentiment clings—in the pews—to a man in the pulpit. The Swedish episcopalian church ordains women and the Anglican Group for the Ordination of Women to the Historic Ministry of the Church finds able sponsors in the Bishop of Birmingham and Canon Geoffrey Lampe. This movement, from within the leadership of the Church of England, stresses the need for more clergy, the fact that gifted women already exercise a ministry, largely unrecognised and badly paid, and that what other denominations can do should not be impossible for the national church.

Yet Canon Lampe's visits to Sweden and the reports received of the movement's progress there do not offer unchallengeable support for the idea, in practice or in theory. An idea put forward once, in conversation, by the Bishop of Bristol seems a possible intermediate step: that of ordaining women to a preaching ministry but not to full 'priesthood'.

It is not easy to see where we stand just now either in doctrine or in practice. Maud Roydens are not numerous; yet few of the *men* who are accepted to the public ministry of the churches are of giant stature. And, a question to be asked even if women as such are given parity of opportunity and status in this way; do *married* women forfeit this ministerial function when they take on the privileges of matrimony?

Suffice it to say in conclusion that the wife whose value is 'more precious than jewels' is not necessarily either silent or shut away from the public eye.

FROM THE MONITORS

Secular Education Month

Children are skilfully defended against advertising and politics at school. Why then are they exposed to an ideology—Christianity—which is just as controversial? This question was asked by Mr. David Tribe at the National Secular Society's first public meeting on religion in the school.

The aims of the meetings to be held during Secular Education Month (November 1964) are that collective worship should be eliminated from morning assembly in county schools, that religious instruction as a special subject promoting the Christian religion and linking it to ethics should be removed from the curriculum, that compulsory chapel should be abolished from public schools, and that denominational schools should be made self-supporting.

Ethics should be taught quite separately from religion, said Mr. Tribe, because from a philosophical point of view they were distinct subjects. It was no secret that religion did not breed morality; Roman Catholic schools had the highest percentage of delinquency in the country.

He blamed a lot of adolescent unrest on the artificial link between religion and ethics. When children reached their teens and discovered that their parents had been paying lip-service to a religion they did not believe, other values were also opened to question.

Christianity tended to breed xenophobia in school children. In a time of nuclear weapons, Mr. Tribe thought world brotherliness infinitely more important than any sectarian allegiance.

Mrs. Martha Bland, another speaker, recommended a plan to diminish prejudice in the schools. Derogatory statements about Jews being guilty of Christ's murder, or infidel Turks, should be removed from text books. Customs and cultures from other parts of the world should be taught.

From the size of the audience—19—religion in the schools did not appear to be the burning issue the speakers insisted it was. However, what the company lacked in size it made up for in unanimity; so much so that one member of the audience suggested that some religious people should be invited to the next meeting to give their point of view.

(From the *Times Educational Supplement*: we are indebted to Mr. C. A. Oxley for bringing it to our attention.)

The Bookshelf

Mr. David Alexander's contributions will be resumed in the next issue. In the meantime, members will be interested to know that *Come Out the Wilderness* by Bruce Kenrick (reviewed in CBRFJ No. 4) is now obtainable in paper-back form (Fontana series, price 3/6). With reference to Mrs. Loosemore's contribution to this issue, Hodder and Stoughton have published a volume of sermons by Dr. Martin Luther King, *Strength to Love* (price 16/-). *Prism* recently published an article by a parson's wife, relevant to themes appearing in this and the previous issue of this Journal.

Members may also wish to acquire a copy of the papers given at the Swanwick Conference of Brethren, 1964. Entitled *Christian Unity*, the papers (by Prof. F. F. Bruce, and Messrs. F. R. Coad, H. L. Ellison, K. G. Hyland, H. H. Rowdon and J. J. Stordy) are closely relevant to this ecumenical age. Obtainable at 5/- post free from E.C.L., 60 Park Street, Bristol, 1.

. . .