

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

gate of the Christian bodies. It is a great Church, with special privileges, and we may humbly hope that its work in the world is not altogether unworthy of it. But it is further important through the middle place in which it stands. If an unfriendly critic might taunt the Church of England with being neither one thing nor the other, neither loyally Catholic nor frankly Protestant, we shall prefer to believe that it is both. And it may be for the advantage of Christendom that we should not throw in our lot either with those to whom succession and order are everything, or with those to whom a Church is a collection of persons who happen to agree in the deductions they draw from the New Testament.

5. Lastly, if the perfect Church of Christ is represented on the earth by these many inadequate and fragmentary and transitory bodies which profess loyalty to the one Lord and Saviour, and if each of the bodies has life and truth in proportion to its real loyalty to Christ the Head, then the royal road to unity must be through each drawing closer to Christ as a member to the Head. To be open to the light of Christ and so to drop errors, to study what the Son of man will approve in policy and conduct, to weigh interests and values in the scales of God, to understand that the aim of all Christians and of all Christian societies must be to grow into perfect fellowship with Christ—these are the ways of progress for the bettering of each Church in itself and for the unity of Church to Church.

J. LLEWELYN DAVIES.



ART. IV.—HOW TO SAVE VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS.

“It behoves every ratepayer, who wishes to keep down his rate-bill . . . to bestir himself in time to prevent his fleece from being cut utterly short.”—LORD SALISBURY, Nov. 19.

THAT the average cost of elementary education “has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished,” is the cry of the groaning ratepayer over probably the whole area of England and Wales. It may be worth while to sketch the modest beginnings, and contrast them with the enormous progress of that career of costliness of which the end is not yet in sight. In 1870 Voluntary Schools alone existed, and were educating at 25s. 6d. per head. In 1872 that charge had risen to 27s. odd. Why? Because School Boards had in the meanwhile got to their work with a will, and were already spending 28s. per head, thus forcing up the scale of expense for the others. In 1894 Board School charges reached over 48s. 9d. per head, and had forced up the voluntarists to spend nearly

33s. 2d. But of this cost a fraction *over* 18s. 4½d. represented the ratepayers' share, while a trifle *less than* 6s. 6½d. was that of the subscriber. We need not for present purposes pursue the analysis of income into further detail. The important point to notice is that rate-supported schools cost the ratepayer *over* 18s. 4d., whereas subscription-supported schools cost the subscriber 6s. 6½d. or less; that is to say, the proportion is little short of 3 to 1, or £1 subscribed goes nearly as far as £3 of rates in maintaining a school.

The cost for erection of buildings, including sites, and also—as a note (p. 19) of the last Report of the Education Department (from which the above figures are taken) informs us—including “the cost of laboratories, workshops, laundries, cookery-kitchens, School Board offices, etc.,” is for Board Schools £13 6s. 9d. per head; while for Voluntary Schools (which often get their sites free) it is £7 per head. What the “etc.” covers in the above enumeration must be conjectured. Probably swimming-baths, gymnastic exercise apparatus, and the like, may go in under it. Of the relevancy of these to elementary education, the reader may form his own estimate. To meet the rapidly expanding outlay, a total of loans, amounting to little short of £29,500,000, had up to April last been contracted, with the express sanction of the Education Department, on the security of the rates, of which only a little over £4,500,000 is spoken of as “repaid.” This mass of indebtedness has lately been increasing with overwhelming strides. In 1889-90 the year's loans were *under* £820,000; in 1894-95 the Boards plunged in a single twelvemonth into *over* £2,500,000. We should be only too glad to think that rateable values had risen by even one-third of the amount of this enormous pile of debts incurred on their security. There needs no other proof that the Boards, as a whole, are not only “outrunning the constable,” but distancing him out of sight.

Thus the net result is, that Voluntary Schools, after all the inflation of educational expenses by the spendthrift rivalry of the Boards, remain about 28 per cent. cheaper to maintain than Board Schools; that they build and accommodate for nearly 50 per cent. cheaper; and that the subscribers' share, as compared with the ratepayers', is nearly 200 per cent. less, all the while avoiding the local *incubus* of indebtedness.

But from the tantalizing advantage of this superior economy the ratepayer is debarred, because (1) in every Board area, after subscribing to a Voluntary School, he is compelled to pay his rate in full; (2) whenever there is a call for further school accommodation, the Department claims a statutory power of forcing a School Board on a reluctant locality, and mostly exercises that power to thwart or exclude voluntary provision.

It is well known that Mr. W. E. Forster in 1870 fixed a rate of 3d. in the £ as the probable maximum. We learn from the Report (p. 38) that interest and repayment (although, as we have seen, tardy) of loans are now together absorbing precisely that figure. The cost of elementary education, it should be observed, need no more rise than the cost of other education. The human mind is much as it was, in respect of capacity, twenty-five years ago; the rudiments necessary to it are no other than then. What can be the reason why the school bill should rise nearly 90 per cent. in the course of a quarter of a century? It is not so at Eton or Winchester. Why must it be so on the Victoria Embankment of the Thames? We can only sketch an answer in brief outline: (1) The policy of the Education Department has been to secure to the School Board a practical monopoly of fresh supply. (2) Under the influence of the Department, and that of a free hand in the public purse, every School Board, however popular its electoral basis, tends to become an oligarchy; and (3) experience shows that oligarchies and monopolies, especially when coupled, result in extravagance; while, (4) given once an initial movement in favour of costliness, it follows a law of evolution, and every fresh expense entails a further one. Just as the weird sisters laid on Macbeth the ban,

He shall, he will, he must spill much more blood,
And become worse to make his title good,

so the average School Board "shall, will, must" spend much more cash, "and become worse"—*i.e.*, for the ratepayer—but *without* bettering its own "title." It remains oligarchic still.

To the above-stated elements of greater cost incurred must be added the enormously increased burden for the ratepayer in each of the items if Voluntary Schools become extinct. The estimate of cost for replacing fabrics and sites in that case was put some six years ago by Mr. Chamberlain at between £28,000,000 and £40,000,000. This is the avalanche likely to descend on the ratepayer's back. This is why the appeal now lies to *him*. Let him demand on the ground of bare justice, as I will presently show, his absolute right in the matter, and answer the appeal which the Prime Minister has lately made to him by so doing.

It seems reasonable to presume that rateable values rise slowly, while population rises more quickly. If so, *that* should, with every sound economist, be a cogent reason for studious thrift. The opposite has been the course of School Board precepts, as translated into pence or shillings in the

pound. They should have taken nature's warning in finance. They have, in fact, ignored it.

On the special merit of the Voluntary system—its personal share in the child—I do not now enlarge. The humblest school in obscure hamlet or squalid suburb which speaks thus to the child's whole nature warmly, becomes in its degree an *alma mater*, claiming, and often finding, love and veneration. Towards a Board School such feelings would seem almost grotesquely misplaced; as in the child whom Sydney Smith found stroking a tortoise on the back of its shell. A cold and neutral respect for the ladder of learning, serviceable to mount by, is all one can expect there. But I am dwelling now on the purely economic aspect, important to civil liberty and local self-government, the rightful heritage of the sorely-taxed Englishman.

My point of view is that of the citizen ratepayer, from which standpoint the following considerations were not long since respectfully submitted by a life-member of the National Society to the committee understood to be advising his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury as regards Voluntary Schools. They were politely returned by the secretary of that committee to the writer without note or comment:

“ Let the two rival systems of Voluntary and Board Schools once be set before the ratepayer with perfect freedom of choice, and the superior economy of the Voluntary will command his preference. At present he has no effective choice, because as soon as he has subscribed to A, he is mulcted, by compulsion of law requiring payment of rate, in full to B.

“ When in 1870 an amendment was proposed in Parliament that subscriptions should be counted against rates, it was negatived, and its supporters solaced with a special extra grant, up to 50 per cent., conceded to Voluntary Schools—a relief which very soon became nugatory, through onerous conditions annexed to it by the Education Department, and by a rising scale of expensiveness all along the educational line of advance. This is the standing risk to which all such relief is liable. It is always in the power of the Government, either indirectly, through the Educational Department, or directly, if the relief comes direct from the Exchequer, to make it nugatory. The same is true of relief direct from the rates. Conditions, giving the ratepayers powers of management, can always be subsequently obtruded. There is no finality and no security in any of them; but *once give the ratepayer a strong and direct interest in the maintenance of Voluntary Schools by counting subscriptions against rates*, and his vivid sense of their value in relieving his burdens will make him their lasting friend.

The absence of this condition is why the general public take so languid an interest in the controversy about saving Voluntary Schools. But given this condition, they cannot then be extinguished, because the interest in maintaining will always be greater than that in surrendering.

“The present system is indeed one of gross injustice. Every shilling subscribed is a public subsidy from the individual, maintaining a public elementary school in efficiency. Every such shilling is entered in a public balance-sheet, duly audited, as law requires, and submitted to the inspector, and is treated as an asset for the purposes of public education, to every intent except that of *pro tanto* relieving the subscriber. The subscriber is told, in effect, that the public is to take full benefit from his subscription, but is to give him no credit for it. He is treated as a dangerous person, and promptly mulcted, rather than as a useful citizen, zealous for the public good. By conniving at, and submitting without indignant protest to that injustice, Voluntarists make themselves accessories to the wrong, and share in a measure its moral culpability. The position is analogous, only with *a fortiori* cogency, to that urged by Dissenters against Church rates in 1868-69. They said: ‘We subscribe voluntarily for the support of our own sectarian places of worship and their services, and it is not fair that we should be taxed over again for the public needs of the parish church.’ But in this case it is a *public* elementary school, open to all, and existing for the benefit of all, to which the subscriber pays, and his subscription vastly relieves the common public burden of all; and yet he is taxed over again, as though he had done nothing. This is, therefore, *a fortiori* a case demanding redress. It is so clearly a just demand, that, if once made and sustained, no Government can refuse it; and for the same reason no Government will venture to rescind it. It becomes an absolutely impregnable position.

“It will, moreover, not impede, but prepare the way for any further educational reforms, in the matter of finance, which may be equitable and safe. Thus, if a ratepayer liable to 30s. rating subscribes 20s., and pays to the rate the balance of 10s., his school’s right to any share in the distribution of that balance is no whit the worse. But probably, if coupled with a large measure of federation, with the abolition of rates on school-buildings, and with that of the income limit above 17s. 6d., it would supply all that was necessary.

“It is obvious that the above proposal will give the Voluntary System a new root in wide, popular sympathies, instead of its depending on the precarious favours of Government, which of themselves tend to provoke the attack of any

hostile Government which may succeed. It is also the only plan which will impose a salutary check on the ever-growing costliness of the School Boards, the effect of which is to starve subscriptions at present. Once obtain the right, which justice demands, of *counting subscriptions against rates*, and that costliness will have the opposite effect, of increasing subscriptions; since the greater that costliness, the greater will be the attraction of the more economical, *i.e.*, the Voluntary System. At present the School Boards hold the longer arm of the lever, the Voluntarists the shorter. This concession will equate those arms, and there is nothing else that will. The double-action of the screw, which now forces subscriptions down exactly in proportion as it forces rates up, will be by this exactly reversed.

"It should never be forgotten that in 1870 the probable maximum of rate was put at 3d. in the £, and that by this understanding much opposition was conciliated and economic fears allayed.

"The history of School Boards since 1870 shows a somewhat ostentatiously scandalous contempt for that understanding. They have directly made the power of the purse, confided to them 'to supplement' only, the means of 'supplanting' the Voluntary system. The same power has been worked without scruple by the Education Department to give Boards a pre-emption, which often amounts to a practical monopoly.

"The Voluntary system represents that spring of individual energy from which all the greatness of our country, imperial and commercial, has been evolved. School Boards represent that opposite system of State interference which, where needless, should ever be avoided, and which, wherever admitted, should be jealously watched. Their working has been to maximize that influence which should be minimized; and their result monopoly, coupled with extravagance, as monopoly mostly is.

"The present proposal takes as its basis the ratepayer's rights pure and simple, and among them his right to free choice between two existing systems, from which choice he is now barred. It makes that right a point of civil liberty. It would in effect arm him with a 'local veto' against the excesses of Boards and Department alike, and thus crown the edifice of local self-government in respect to his public burden of education.

"It thus wholly avoids all religious difficulty, being open to Church and sects alike. Baptists, or Wesleyans, or Secularists, could, if they pleased, avail themselves of its broad charter of perfect freedom equally. It also disturbs neither management nor teaching, and requires—what seems to escape the

notice of the propounders of several schemes—no interference with the trust-deeds of schools. It is difficult to see how these last can be reconciled with some conditions contemplated in such schemes. But, in fact, any scheme which depends on relief from without opens the door to future, if not present, tampering with trusts, because it gives the power of the purse, imperial or local, indefinite opportunity of asserting itself.

“The defenders of Voluntary Schools, so far, seem busying themselves with the problem—how to preserve conditions of independence under a status of dependence. The two are irreconcilable and the problem insoluble.

“School Boards would, of course, be limited and circumscribed by the present proposal. They would have, in homely phrase, to ‘cut their coat by their cloth,’ which is just what Voluntarists have now to do. It is only by their abuse of the power of the purse that they have been able to dispense with that obligation, and that is the just and sufficient answer to any inconvenience which they may sustain.

“The present memorialist thinks that the outcome of his proposal, if adopted, would probably settle down, after a few years, into Boards building school premises, and Voluntarists maintaining and working the schools built. But that these would be built on a less sumptuous scale, to the great relief of the ratepayer, and the checking of the vast local debts which are now being piled up. In short, the ratepayers’ rights and interest are the key to the system proposed.”

It is not easy to exhaust the far-reaching consequences which would at once or soon follow from this absolutely just concession. “*Magnam vectigal parsimonia*” is a venerable proverb. I would read at present “*justitia*” for “*parsimonia*.” “Voluntarists will find in simple justice their amplest endowment.” “*Parsimonia*” they have always shown. Let the two be now united, and their schools are saved; and the ratepayer, in saving them, saves himself. But the principal among those many-sided benefits, some positive, some negative, may be tabulated as follows:

This proposal, then—

1. Promises *not* an increase, but a reduction, in the ever-growing and largely-superfluous cost of elementary education;
2. Makes no demand on the Exchequer; and thus
3. Encounters no “lion in the path”;
4. Absolutely avoids all religious difficulty, and does not, by seeking public money for denominational schools, challenge the opposition of political Dissenters.
5. Gives the ratepayer an effective “local veto” on (i.) the heavy hand of the School Boards, (ii.) the high hand of the Department.

6. Opens the widest field of choice to the parent, by the "multiplication of denominational schools" (as urged by Lord Salisbury to the Dissenters' deputation).

7. Saves Voluntary Schools existing, and, if coupled with adequate federation, saves them *all*.

8. Replants the Voluntary System wide and deep in an enlarged area of popular sympathies.

9. Thus ensures the ratepayer against the vast increase of his burdens threatened by that system's extinction.

10. Runs no risk as regards management, teaching, or teachers;

11. Therefore needs no securities;

12. Is automatic in its action;

13. Does not clog the further course of remedies, if necessary, and if any can be found equitable, safe, and expedient;

14. Effects that control directly by the ratepayer over the rates, which some desire to attach to County Councils, etc.;

15. Is founded on ABSOLUTE JUSTICE and CIVIL RIGHT. The original sin of the Act of 1870 was that it shut out this obviously just condition. By the neglect of this over 1,300 Voluntary Schools have been lost in twenty-five years, or fifty-two on the average yearly.

Had this condition been observed, they might all have been saved. Their transfer to Boards has probably cost the ratepayers some £100,000 annually for maintenance merely; and this wasteful havoc is still going on. The Board Schools, created "to fill up gaps," as Mr. Forster expressly said, have been busy in making them; and in this mischievous policy the Education Department has mostly given them a free hand—most certainly has done nothing effective to stop them.

The recent case of King's College, London, may be cited to those who call for Treasury grants. Because it received aid from Lord Salisbury's late Government, *therefore* it became the *bête-noire* of the next. So it will be with the policy of subsidies from the Exchequer, even under a special Act, to denominational schools as such. It might be judged even by a hostile Government impolitic and invidious summarily to rescind a vote affecting the salaries of many thousand teachers, although, with due notice according to the custom of the profession, even this would be within a Government's, like any other employer's, rights. But to couple the continuance with conditions destructive to the *raison d'être* of Voluntary Schools would be easy and safe. Nay, from the Harcourt-Asquith standpoint, it would be the one method of policy encountering least resistance. Deterred by recent lessons from direct attacks upon Church interests, they would let that "sleeping dog lie," for they have felt his teeth. All the more eager would they be to undermine the Church through her schools. Lulled by

Treasury grants (assuming the policy lately urged by high ecclesiastical authority adopted), Churchmen would meanwhile have let their subscriptions drop down to the bare rate of current demand. To improvise these suddenly to meet such a hostile policy as the above would be impossible. The Voluntarists would then be exactly as Æsop's frogs if they had taken the leap down the well and then found it drying up. The bargain, indeed, which the Church leaders are urging is a Mephistophelic compact—not, of course, with the enemy in person, but with that friend into whose shoes the enemy is sure sooner or later to step. For the only constant factor in British politics is now their inconstancy. Every General Election since 1868 has reversed the majority of its predecessor, with, I believe, the one exception of 1885, due to the overwhelming popularity, then at its zenith, of one political personage. What men call "the jump of the cat," and gods "the swing of the pendulum," is sure to take place. Then back comes Mephistopheles. He is, in effect, away on furlough only. And as sure as he returns and finds Voluntary Schools virtually in pawn to the secular power, he will *exact the bond*, by enforcing secularist conditions. Will any one of the hundred or so of men who, most of them eminent and many of them brilliant, formed the Archbishop's deputation on November 20 show any weak link in the above chain of probable reasoning?

I say the counter-proposal made above combines simple justice with freedom, economy, efficiency, elasticity, neutrality for a Church and sect, and automatic action. Of course, it will probably ruffle the rose-leaves on which School Boards repose, and introduce the thorn of thrift into their well-stuffed pillows. It may even dislocate the wheels of the triumphal car of the Department, and cause it to "drive heavily." But Boards and Department need the lesson that they exist to square their machinery with justice and freedom, not to warp these last to suit it. I say, then, to voluntarists, "Make to yourselves friends of that mammon of unrighteousness," the ratepayer's interest in what tends to keep down his rates. Voluntarism will then strike its tap-root deep in the native soil of civil right and civil freedom. It will entwine itself with those traditions which lie deepest in the heart of our race, and which will only perish with the race itself. Is not this better than sitting on the door-steps of Downing Street, and crying for a slice of the moon—"because the man in the moon is our friend now, don't you know"? And *après*—how about the *new* moon, and the man in *that*?

CANON HAYMAN, D.D.

P.S.—Since the above was written the writer has received, direct from Canada, through an unimpeachable channel, infor-

mation showing that the principle advocated above is the basis of school administration in the important province of Quebec. The statement is that "any persons sending their children to such separate schools, or supporting the same by subscribing thereto annually an amount equal to the sum at which, if such separate school did not exist, they must have been rated, in order to obtain the annual school grant, are exempt from the payment of all rates imposed for the support of the public schools." Thus in Quebec the "separate" schools correspond to our "voluntary," the "public schools" to our Board Schools; and whoso subscribes to the former is exempt from being rated to the latter. The proposal made above is to exempt him either *in toto* or *pro tanto*. But that is a question of detail, the principle being clearly identical with that practised in Quebec. This forms a sufficient answer to all objections of impossibility or practical difficulty, such as the official mind is prone to urge against any change of system, however founded in justice.



ART. V.—THE INTERMEDIATE STATE OF THE BLESSED DEAD.

THE subject I am about to deal with is, without gainsaying, interesting, but also somewhat speculative. The materials out of which we have to construct a theory are scanty. The purpose of Divine revelation is, not so much to satisfy our intellectual curiosity with regard to the next stage of our life, as to attract our attention and concentrate our love upon the Lord Jesus, so that for all the future that lies before us, visible and invisible, we are in a way impelled to go on trusting in Him exclusively for guidance, direction, and spiritual satisfaction at our journey's end. The veil which hides the invisible world is drawn aside only partially, and for this practical purpose; and it is only indirectly and, as it were, casually, while in the pursuit of this purpose, that a stray gleam of light falls upon the enveloping darkness and dimly illuminates it.

Gathering up, then, such hints as Scripture thus affords us, and adopting the only possible method of argument open to us—the analogy of our present spiritual life and experiences—I propose to consider, as briefly as is consistent with lucidity, what opinions in harmony with the tenor of Christian revelation we may reasonably entertain (1) with regard to the mode of existence of, and (2) the modifying causes which will probably be operative upon, the blessed dead in the intermediate stage of their existence.