

# 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 Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

How would the released and adoring Apostle, standing free at length from self, at the feet of Jesus, exhort us, if we could hear him, to listen every day to this Divine assurance of the blessedness of believing, and, for that purpose, to use every day the precious written record; for (ver. 31) *these things have been written that we may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that, believing, we may have life in His name.*

I would go from pole to pole  
 To behold my risen Lord;  
 But content thyself, my soul,  
 Listen to thy Saviour's word:  
 They who Me by faith receive,  
 Without seeing who believe,  
 Trust My word and therein rest,  
 They abundantly are blest.

*Moravian Hymn-book.*

H. C. G. MOULE.

---

#### ART. V.—THE CHURCH AND THE GENERAL ELECTION.

I MAY conveniently initiate the remarks which I am now desirous of making by proposing the following question: "What concern has the Church of England in the pending General Election?" The answer must be, "Much every way," and it is extremely important that this fact should be brought clearly home to Church people, the more so as there is for a particular reason much risk of the fact being lost sight of. Not many weeks before the General Election of 1885 the intentions of the Radical party with respect to the Established Church were blurted forth in a now celebrated book with an ostentatious frankness which, though praiseworthy, had a most mischievous effect on the fortunes of many Radical candidates. Churchmen of all shades of opinion were suddenly and thoroughly roused, with the result that the Disestablishment party were completely routed and their cause put back several years, to say the least of it. Since then they have learnt wisdom. The Dissenting section of the Liberation party has been much less demonstrative, whilst the Atheistical section, of whom Mr. John Morley is as good a type as any, has been professedly occupied more with social and general questions, and has been rather taciturn in regard to ecclesiastical matters. Herein resides the danger to which I alluded above, the danger being that the Disestablishment question as a plank in the Radical platform will be forgotten by us and concealed by our opponents amid the pressure of more

obtrusive topics; yet ready to be forced into the fullest prominence by the Radical party so soon as they have obtained place and power on grounds of a more general and mundane character.

It must be quite evident to all who have thoughtfully and attentively watched the course of events, especially during the last three years, that the line of argument taken above is sound. Laborious attempts have been made to separate the case of the Church in Wales, and, indeed, the case of the Church in Scotland, from the greater question of English Disestablishment, and, until the Rhyl Church Congress, with some measure of success. Thanks, however, to that Congress, and in no small degree to the Archbishop of Canterbury personally, both then and previously, the minds both of the public in general, and of Churchmen in particular, are now in a much better condition for appreciating all the ultimate issues involved in the controversy. I ought not to ignore, however, in this connection the great work done by the Church Defence Institution in enlightening public opinion by its hundreds of lectures in all parts of England and Wales.

It is not the purpose of the present article to discuss the Disestablishment controversy either as a whole or even in part. I only want to look at it in its immediate bearings on the question of a General Election, and for that purpose the following words uttered many years ago by Lord Beaconsfield seem to put the whole matter in a most concise and convenient form:—"So long as there is in this country the connection, through the medium of a Protestant Sovereign, between the State and the National Church, religious liberty is secure. . . . The ultimate triumph, were our Church to fall, would be to that power which would substitute for the authority of our sovereign the supremacy of a foreign prince, to that power with whose traditions, learning, discipline, and organization our Church alone has hitherto been able to cope, and that, too, only when supported by a determined and devoted people."—*Times*, October 3, 1868. He had some months previously defined with equal plainness, though in other words, the character of the issue:—"As I hold that the dissolution between Church and State will cause permanently a greater revolution in this country than foreign conquest, I shall use my utmost energies to defeat these fatal machinations."—*Times*, April 14, 1868.

With these words of warning sounding in his ears, let no well-wisher to the Church of England approach, or worse still, abstain from approaching, his allotted polling booth under the impression that however much as a Churchman he may have especial interest in some future General Election, it is not a

matter of much importance what he does do or does not do this month in the way of voting.

Up to this point I have called attention to a few generalities connected, as it may be said, with only one of many important pending political problems. Supposing we could know that the Disestablishment question, whether in England, Wales, or Scotland, were absolutely shelved till the year 1912, it would not in the least follow that Churchmen had no duties or responsibilities this July. There are an unusual, indeed, an infinite, number of home and foreign problems awaiting solution, many of which, though not absolutely religious on their face, yet may or might have, in the long-run, a material bearing on the position and growth of Christianity in England and out of it. Moreover, there are questions pending which, though political and not religious in one sense, yet very much concern all of us as Englishmen and citizens. Were we to regard them as the Plymouth Brethren do, we should stand convicted of obvious and flagrant abnegation of duties which we owe (as is plainly set forth in Holy Scripture) to our Queen, our Country, and Society. First and foremost amongst these is the terribly threadbare subject of Irish Home Rule. Many of us probably are heartily sick of it. Nevertheless, beyond a doubt it is our duty as Englishmen, both for the sake of England and still more for the sake of Ireland, to go on with the struggle. It is difficult to understand how any man who has seriously and attentively read up the English history of the last thousand years can have any doubt both as to what is his duty and as to what is expedient herein. Not to touch a single secular point involved in the matter, look only at Irish Home Rule in the interests of the Irish Protestants, and is it not absolutely clear that if we were to grant the Parnellite (or Anti-Parnellite) demands we should be doing one, or perhaps both, of two things—handing over a million of our Protestant fellow-subjects to the unceasing tyranny of the Romish priesthood, or (and equally likely) be inviting both parties to start a civil war?

The idea involved in speaking of the tyranny likely to be exercised by the Irish Romanists over the Protestants is no mere figure of speech. It is the fashion nowadays in certain quarters to talk about the persecuting spirit of Popery being extinct. But this is not so. *Semper eadem* is still truly Rome's motto, and if the present generation has not seen so much of it as former generations, the fact is due, not to a change of principle, but merely to a change of tactics of a temporary character. Archbishop Manning truly said in 1859, speaking of the work of his co-religionists:—

We have to subjugate and subdue, to conquer and to rule, an imperial

race ; we have to do with a will which reigns throughout the world as the will of Old Rome reigned once ; we have to bend or break that will which nations and kingdoms have found invincible . . . were heresy [that is, Protestantism] conquered in England, it would be conquered throughout the world. (*Tablet*, August 6, 1859.)

A few weeks previously in the same newspaper another very able 'vert, Mr. Oakley, had said "the Catholic Church [by which he meant the Roman Catholic Church] is getting to feel its true dignity and right position in this country. What we of course aim at, in God's good time and way, is to be as we have once been, the dominant Church of England." This last statement is, of course, historically untrue, because even in the worst days of her mediæval corruption, the Church of England was never a Roman Catholic Church. I quote the sentiment, however, as being, what it truly is, a fair indication of the current hopes and expectations prevalent at this moment in Roman Catholic circles in England. Some confirmation of it came under my own notice only a very short time ago in Derbyshire. I had been announced to speak at some Church Defence meetings, and in the case of one place I went to, Ilkeston, I was told that the Roman Catholic priest had been preaching on the Disestablishment question, and in one of his sermons had said that he confidently looked forward to the time when he or a minister of his Church would occupy the parish Church of Ilkeston in the capacity of vicar. I may here add, by the way, that more than one instance has come under my notice of a Romish priest in England styling himself "Rector," and his place of residence the "Rectory"—a gross impertinence, to say the least of it. No wonder that Sir W. Harcourt in his (politically) more sober moments should have said, as he did at Oxford in 1876, that "he is a purblind politician who does not perceive that the residuary legatee of Disestablishment will infallibly be the Church of Rome." It is much to be regretted that under the pressure of trade competition in politics Sir William, like so many other partners in his firm, should since 1874 have turned his back upon the more matured ideas of his earlier years.

To return from a somewhat long but not inopportune digression, let me remind my readers that in considering their duty as electors with especial reference to the Irish question, they must not disregard such warnings as the following, which I cite from Roman Catholic authorities of repute :—"It is an act of kindness to obstinate heretics to take them out of this life ; for the longer they live the more errors they invent, the more men do they pervert, and the greater damnation do they acquire unto themselves." (Bellarmine, iii. c. 21.) Or again :—"Heretics when strong are to be committed to God ; when weak to the executioner." *Devoti*, a celebrated Roman

Canonist, thus writes respecting the "forbidden toleration of the enemies of religion," as he calls it: "Finally, there are apostates, heretics and schismatics. *That these should remain among Catholics is not to be borne.*" Again, the same writer says:—"Among our Catholics it is *certain and fixed that men are not to be tolerated* who are aliens from Catholic verity, *and that they are also to be coerced* by merited punishment."

Perhaps it will be worth while to individualize and localize sentiments of this character close at home, and this I will do by submitting an extract from an influential Roman Catholic magazine:—

You ask, if the Roman Catholic were lord in the land, and you were in a minority, if not in numbers yet in power, what would he do to you? That, we say, would entirely depend upon circumstances. If it would benefit the cause of Catholicism he would tolerate you; if expedient he would imprison you, banish you, fine you; possibly he might even hang you. But be assured of one thing, he would never tolerate you for the sake of the "glorious principles of civil and religious liberty." Shall I hold out hopes to the Protestant that I will not meddle with his creed if he will not meddle with mine? Shall I lead him to think that religion is a matter for private opinion, and tempt him to think that he has no more right to his religious views than he has to my purse, or my house, or my life-blood? No! [Roman] Catholicism is the most intolerant of creeds.

As recently as 1886 the Romish Archbishop of Philadelphia, U.S., in an official pronouncement, said:—"The Church tolerates heretics where she is obliged to do so, but she hates them with a deadly hatred, and uses all her powers to annihilate them." And the present Pope is equally explicit. In a letter addressed to the Cardinal Vicar of Rome in March, 1879, he announced that:—"If he possessed the liberty he claims, he would employ it to close all Protestant schools and places of worship in Rome." (*Times*, April 11, 1879.)

Authoritative extracts such as the foregoing—and they could be readily multiplied—demand the most serious attention of Christian electors in deciding the question as to what they ought to do with their votes at the forthcoming General Election.

Turn we now to some of the many other matters that are within our reach and deserving of consideration. Many of these may be most conveniently got at by giving a little attention to that very notorious and objectionable body the London County Council. Having regard to the population which it governs, the money which goes through its hands, and the number of the members of which it consists, it may be regarded as, after the House of Commons, the most important elective body in England. Now, we know also that at this moment, thanks to the strange apathy of the respectable

inhabitants of the Metropolis, the London County Council is the most purely radical, democratic, or republican body in the United Kingdom, perhaps within the confines of the British Empire. It is, I suppose, the nearest approach which an English-speaking population has ever seen to the French national assemblies of the Robespierre epoch.

No sooner did the London Council become the body to manage the Metropolitan parks and open spaces (other than those under Royal control) than it set up in many of them that greatest of curses to a neighbourhood, an open-air Sunday band. I will not stay at this moment to discuss this question as a whole, but will only remark that when these bands were first established, and for long afterwards, they were defended with the plea that they only played sacred music. This plea has for some time past ceased—but I do not know for how long—to be based on fact; for as far back as four years ago I remember seeing a Battersea Park programme in which the sacred element had been reduced to small proportions, general secular music having taken its place. Apparently it had done so with results only too pronounced, for on May 31, 1892, a member moved at a Council meeting that it be an instruction to the Parks Committee to prohibit the playing of dance music in the parks on Sundays. The motion was seconded by the Rev. F. Williams, who very truly said that “the inevitable effect of allowing dance music would be to surround the bands with dancing groups of young people. He did object to their taking the one day of the week, when a large number of the people of London would be shocked and outraged by such a spectacle, and utilizing it for this purpose.” The motion was opposed by Mr. Boulnois, M.P., a so-called “Conservative,” and also by Mr. John Burns, the Socialist. The most significant part of the whole business was the voting; on the show of hands, 45 voted for the motion and 45 against. On a division, however, the motion prohibiting the performance of dance music was carried by the narrow majority of 53 to 49. Let us imagine a new House of Commons composed with a substantial preponderance of Radical faddists of the type which for the present, at least, has got the upper hand at the London County Council, and I make bold to say that there are no extremes of insult to Christianity, to the Church of England, and to sound principles of morality and good government to which a numerous and noisy section would not proceed.

I will not pursue this branch of the matter farther, because I wish to limit myself as closely as possible to Parliamentary considerations. It is not a little significant of the altered tendencies of the times in regard to mere party politics in connection with the House of Commons that so prominent a states-

man as Sir Henry James should have recently announced a determination on his part to dedicate his time and talents more especially to social topics. Ill-natured Gladstonians might suggest that he was going to do this because no other career was open to him as a Liberal-Unionist out of work; but, be this as it may, the fact remains as a tribute to the importance of social problems. Looked at from such a standpoint, I think it may well be said that the present Government have established very strong claims upon the sympathies of Churchmen. I say of Churchmen in particular, because the Church in general, and the clergy especially, have always been foremost in all schemes calculated to promote the home and personal welfare of the artisan classes in regard to public health, allotments, agricultural holdings, and matters of that character, the details of which are more or less familiar to most of my readers, and need not be reproduced here. The candidates who propose to support the present Government have, on these grounds, strong claims on all those numerous electors who, independent for the most part of political parties, yet are interested in philanthropic and social matters.

If the question be asked, "What has the present Government done more especially for the good of the Church?" possibly the answer must be of a somewhat negative character. The Bills passed directly in the interests of the Church<sup>1</sup> during the past five years have, perhaps, been neither numerous nor important, although the settlement of the Tithes question must not be forgotten; and be it remembered also that Lord Salisbury's Government collectively, and many of his followers individually, have rendered good service by blocking and otherwise obstructing scores of wild and revolutionary measures calculated to inflict not only great injury on the Church of England, but on religion at large.

There still remains one matter which I ought not to pass over, but which is obviously a delicate subject to deal with, and that is, What criticism should be passed on Lord Salisbury's ecclesiastical appointments during his tenure of office as Prime Minister? I fear I cannot answer this question, either to my own satisfaction or to that of the bulk of my present readers. If I could say that half had been satisfactory and half unsatisfactory, I should feel in some measure content; but I believe I am giving expression to the sentiments of a vast number of people of thoughtful and prudent judgment when I say that far too many dignitaries have been chosen from the extreme

---

<sup>1</sup> In the recent discussions in the House of Commons on the Clergy Discipline (Immorality) Bill, the official leaders of the Opposition, including even Mr. Gladstone himself, were for a time powerless to stem the fanatical bigotry of some of the Welsh members.



High Church party. Of Lord Salisbury's appointments during the last twelve months, it may be admitted that they have done something in recognition of the fact that there are other parties in the Church besides the High Church party, but a good many of the same type will have to be made before the balance can be deemed to be adequately redressed, and "High," "Low" and "Broad" represented amongst the higher clergy in anything approaching the proportions in which they are represented amongst the inferior clergy, and still more amongst the laity.

The foregoing observations, though perhaps they may be regarded as somewhat discursive, as in point of fact they necessarily are, do not by any means exhaust all that might be said upon the question; but they will serve, I think, to bring into tolerable relief what, after all, was the main purpose with which I sat down to write this article, namely, to submit to the consideration of the readers of *THE CHURCHMAN* that, one and all, they have duties to discharge and responsibilities to bear in connection with a General Election which they cannot or ought not to ignore, much less shirk. In other words, that so long as the precept of Holy Scripture "that righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people," is operative, so long is it the duty of Christian electors to assist, to the utmost of their power, in securing the return to the House of Commons of men who will uphold the rights and liberties and purity and freedom of the Church and people of England.

GEORGE F. CHAMBERS.

---

ART. VI.—GOODMAN'S LIFE OF BISHOP PERRY.<sup>1</sup>

THIS comely volume records the successful establishment of the Anglican Church in one of the foremost of the British colonies, under one of the best and ablest prelates of the century. We demur to the opening statement of the introduction—the product, it would seem, of another pen than the author's—that the book "does not purport to be a history of the Church in Victoria." Such a history, down to 1876, is what, in fact, it furnishes, in terms of a biography of the man whose life-work consisted in his commanding share in that history. "It was a happy thought of Eusebius," says Dean Stanley, "that he would trace the history of the various

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Church in Victoria during the Episcopate of the Right Reverend Charles Perry, First Bishop of Melbourne.* By GEORGE GOODMAN, M.A. Cantab., Canon of Melbourne. Melbourne: Melville, Mullen and Co. London: Seeley and Co. 1892.