
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

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

subject, to whose decrees their commands must yield, to whose majesty their sceptres must bow. . . . We are subject to the men who rule over us, but subject only in the Lord. If they command anything against Him let us not pay the least regard to it ".[1] Scripture supplies us with the noble examples of Daniel, and Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. To such a perverted authority we should reply with the Apostles : " Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. . . . We ought to obey God rather than men " (Acts iv. 19 ; v. 29). Yet let us remember that these words were spoken, not to the State, but to the *ecclesiastical* authorities! The Church, no less than the State, which seeks to enforce requirements that are contrary to the Word and Law of God has become a Church of man or of Satan and can no longer hold our allegiance.

Too often to-day the Church speaks as though the responsibility for present conditions were all on the side of the State, as though it is the State which has obligations to the Church, and not *vice versa.* Surely it is needful in these perilous times for Church and State to see and acknowledge that they have a *mutual responsibility* to each other. Surely it is high time for us Church-people to shoulder *our* responsibility to the State, namely, to remind it of its position of dependence under God, and to educate it by every means possible concerning its essentially God-given standing and function. We must, indeed, recapture the vision of Church and State as, under God, complementary institutions, both deriving their authority from the same Lord, and both designed for the benefit of fallen human society, the one as an instrument of special, the other of common, grace. Let us, with the utmost sincerity, proclaim to the State the solemn scriptural admonition : " *Take heed what ye do ; for ye judge not for man, but for the Lord, who is with you in the judgment. Wherefore now let the fear of the Lord be upon you ; take heed and do it : for there is no iniquity with the Lord our God, nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts* " (2 *Chron.* xix. 6 f.). No words could be more appropriate than these. To-day we desperately need to recapture the *theocratic* world view.

[1] *Institutes*, IV. xx. 32.

Contemporary Commentary

A Quarterly Review of Church Affairs and Theological Trends

By The Rev. F. J. Taylor, M.A.

CONVERSION BY RADIO

IT is said that in Ecuador an American broadcasting station exists for the purpose of securing direct religious conversions by radio, but elsewhere the impersonality of the microphone has been generally regarded as inimical to the achievement of direct evangelistic results. Nevertheless Listener Research has revealed the fact that very large numbers of non-churchgoers, perhaps even of non-believers, listen

regularly to religious broadcasts, so that a radio preacher has the opportunity of addressing a far greater congregation than even the most popular preachers before the twentieth century could ever have visualized. The importance of this fact, indeed its prominence in the available evidence on the results of religious broadcasting, led the Scottish Religious Department of the B.B.C. to conceive the idea of a " full blooded radio mission ". To some degree every service broadcast is a radio mission in miniature, but the Radio Mission in Scotland in the autumn of 1950 was designed to make a concentrated assault on the modern ' outsider ', through this distinctively modern medium.[1]

The plan had a twofold reference. Five weeks of religious broadcasting time at a strategic period of the year (October was ultimately chosen because of the Glasgow Churches' Campaign already arranged in that month) was used to present some sixty programmes of various types with one overriding evangelistic theme—' This is the Way '. The most experienced radio preachers were invited to serve as missioners and all possible assistance was given to them for the proclamation of the message, from the great technical experience of the B.B.C. staff. But this was only one part of the project. The second and much more difficult task to organize was the part to be played by the churches in such a unique mission.

The aims of the mission were essentially the same as those embodied in any more traditional evangelistic activity: to strengthen the faithful, to reclaim the lapsed and to challenge the careless. What demanded from the missioners hard work, thought and prayer to a unique degree was the method by which these aims were to be achieved. The faithful find it almost impossible to realize that a message which speaks to their condition, because it uses language and symbols familiar to them from a lifetime of church membership, fails to register on the consciousness of the outsider. Every analysis of religious conditions in Great Britain in the last two decades has laid emphasis on this gap in ideas and understanding between the insider and the outsider. Religious broadcasting has achieved some success in bridging this gap, for multitudes of non-churchgoers have been kept in touch with the life and worship of the Church over the years. But the listener, unlike the occupant of the pew, is able to answer back by switching off the radio if his attention is not caught at once and held. It is the unusual approach which will normally achieve most with this type of listener, for those unfamiliar with ordinary preaching will still listen to the proclamation of the Gospel in ways to which they are accustomed—i.e. radio and screen methods of presentation.

Like any other evangelist, the radio evangelist must, as the first condition of achieving anything worth while, have something vital to say. But it matters enormously how he says it. He must acquire the ability to establish a link with his listener, to communicate himself in such a way as " almost to sit beside the listener and make sense of life ". Without a willingness to learn the technique of the microphone, he will never commend his message to the " man or woman who bridles at the sound parsons make ".

[1] R. H. W. Falconer, *Success and Failure of a Radio Mission* (S.C.M. Press, pp. 79, 3/6).

The radio mission was not intended to convert listeners to more ardent listening but to " prise the non-churchgoing listener out of his armchair into a pew in his local church ". This meant that the mission was not something planned and carried through within the walls of Broadcasting House, but an endeavour to be what religious broadcasting has always claimed to be, " the handmaid of the Church ", this time in relation to a particular evangelistic objective. Through the Religious Advisory Committee, the liaison officers appointed in a majority of presbyteries in Scotland and various church groups, the whole idea was expounded in relation to the witness of the congregation in its own locality. Ministers were asked to explain the scheme to their congregations and congregations were urged to make the scheme of broadcasts into ' talking points ' amongst their neighbours and work mates. Like most experiments, there was both success and failure to report. New ideas take time to penetrate ecclesiastical fastnesses and much of the failure was due to inadequate local publicity or failure to appreciate the fact that unfamiliar methods must be pioneered in a new medium if any impression is to be made on the unchurched masses of our time. Nevertheless, as a result of these weeks of radio evangelism, many congregations reported an increase of attendance at public worship from among their nominal members. A significant minority of churches used the mission in such a way as to revitalize their fellowship and to grow in membership ; but this happened only where ministerial leadership had brought together the nucleus of a lay apostolate of Christian witness and action. Lay action did not take place without ministerial leadership, a sign not only of the true function of the ministry in the Church, but also that clerical ineffectiveness is hardly likely to be offset by lay initiative and action. There is in fact an enormous missionary task still to be done within the membership of the Church.

This report of a new venture suggests that there is a harvest to be reaped by the churches from the seed constantly being sown through religious broadcasting, a harvest which only awakened congregations can reap. There is need for a much closer integration between the work done by the B.B.C. in religious broadcasting and the programmes which the local churches make for their work and witness. Meanwhile the lessons derived from the experiment of 1950 are being applied in the plans for a new Scottish Radio mission in the Lent of 1952, a mission whose progress and results will be watched with keen and sympathetic interest.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY PASTOR

IT has frequently been remarked that the parish and the parish church are the sphere where the real life of the Church can best be displayed. The parish priest, as he bears the burden and heat of the day in front line work, is, if not invariably yet very frequently, the unsung hero of the Church. But parochial conditions change like everything else in the contemporary scene and many of the older manuals of pastoral theology speak out of a different context, and a much less bewildering one, from that in which the average ordinand finds himself set to carry out his task to-day. The Bishop of

Peterborough has described his essay[1] on the place which the church of St. Mary occupies in the dockland community of Southampton, "as a study in social economics and pastoral theology". It is a shrewd and wise interpretation of the function of the parish priest in a modern secular community, but against the background of many centuries of pastoral tradition. Such a priest must know how his people live and be able to exercise "a sanctified common sense reinforced by centuries of Christian thought and experience" in dealing with them and their problems.

Three things of great importance, by no means peculiar to St. Mary's, Southampton, emerge from this account. In the first place, Dr. Spencer Leeson emphasizes the proprietary feeling about the Church which so many outside the ranks of the regular churchgoers yet possess. This goodwill towards the Church, which includes a sincere belief in its value and importance, brings its own problems as well as the unique opportunities of the occasional offices. At these great moments of personal experience there is some chance of awakening many for whom regular worship is quite outside their habits to an awareness of the eternal dimension of life. "These services bite when Matins and Evensong have no appeal." Secondly, the part which the parish clergy can play in the Welfare State is admirably expounded. It is still far too common to find amongst the clergy a half cynical, half humorous, delight in criticizing the shortcomings of the Welfare State (perhaps reflecting the lingering Toryism of so many congregations) and far too little appreciation of the very great advantages it has brought to great sections of society and their determination not to lose these benefits so tardily gained. "The parish priest is deeply interested in the working of the Welfare State. He believes it has come to stay; what is his own function in relation to it?" Dr. Leeson shows how in co-operation with the new class of officers and welfare workers exercising a semi-pastoral function, the Church can make its own distinctive contribution to the total welfare of a parish, winning the confidence both of the officials and of the people. Want, Squalor, Idleness, Ignorance, Disease and Error are foemen worthy of the steel of the pastor as well as of the welfare worker. Indeed, if the Welfare State is not to do as much harm as good, Christians must help administrators to deal with people and not with numbers or categories. Pastors must show themselves concerned with people and with all the people in their parishes—not as potential church fodder but as people whom God values so highly that Christ died for them. So the reader is reminded that if the word goes round that the clergy are out to make friends with people, doors will swing back of their own accord. Much parochial visiting can be done in the street and the right kind of publican can be made into a wise friend to the clergy, for he knows the wants and difficulties of his customers.

Thirdly, the book ventures a statement of Christian priorities for the present age. "If I were asked which are the focal points to-day in the Christian battle line, I would reply, the Sunday School, the upper

[1] Spencer Leeson, *The Parish Priest in Dockland* (Longmans Green, p. 87, 3/-).

forms of the grammar schools, and adult education." It is particularly in these areas of pastoral activity that the impact of the secular interpretation of human life and duty is to be faced and overcome. If there is failure here the pastoral future may be black indeed.

DECISION ON CHURCH RELATIONS

WHEN the work of the Joint Conference of Anglicans and Free Churchmen, called to discuss the implications of the Cambridge Sermon of the Archbishop of Canterbury, was nearing completion last autumn, the Archbishop in addressing his Convocation in full synod expressed the hope that the theological principles upon which the proposals of the Report were based would receive careful discussion by the membership of the Church at large before the Convocations were asked to give their judgment. The Church Union has responded to the invitation of the Archbishop and in a recent pamphlet presented the results of its critical examination of the Report.[1] It is an interesting document, though few considering churchmen could have supposed that the Church Union would find itself in the position of being able to welcome *Church Relations in England*. The opinion is expressed that any attempt to put into practice the procedure summarized in the final section of the Report would gravely compromise the catholicity of the Church of England and gloss over fundamental theological issues. The familiar language about opposition to proposals of this sort not being synonymous with lack of concern about unity is accompanied by a welcome insistence on the need to respect Free Church scruples. The vital importance of avoiding in any proposals such ambiguity of language as may lead to the hasty acceptance of institutions or doctrines which, in fact, one or more of the participating communions still felt bound in conscience to reject, is very properly emphasized. The reader is warned that the heart must not in any circumstances be allowed to run away with the head. He is also reminded that Anglicans must keep in mind the whole of Christendom and not pursue any projects of reunion which may prejudice that ultimate reunion of Christendom which must include the Romans and the Orthodox. These are all principles which loyal churchmen will applaud, but they cannot feel too happy about their application in present circumstances. Any one of them can be used in a delaying action calculated to impede the implementation of any conceivable set of proposals.

Most of the criticism here offered appears to ignore the fact that the original suggestion of the Cambridge sermon was designed to make possible some measure of intercommunion, where at present—apart from individual action—there is no intercommunion at all. The archbishop explicitly disavowed schemes of formal reunion in this country, though of course it is impossible to foresee what the consequences would be of a period of complete intercommunion to which the "giving and receiving of episcopacy" would ultimately lead. But for a long period at least the Church of England and one or more of the Free Churches would continue as independent communions (compare

[1] *The Church of England and the Free Churches* (The Church Union, p. 31, 1/3).

the Anglican relation with the Old Catholics) and the Church of England would enjoy with this Free Church a limited but growing measure of intercommunion. In fact, the position in this respect would be analogous with the relationship of limited intercommunion with the Church of South India which already has the full approval of the English Convocations.

A second criticism is directed against the language employed about episcopacy. It may well be admitted that this language could have been more carefully chosen, but it is hard to deny that it expresses a reality which cannot be ignored in contemporary church life. The language of the formularies of the Church of England is as important for what it does not say as well as for what it asserts. The clear assertion that the Church is resolved to maintain the historic threefold order of ministry, because it believes that ministry to be agreeable to the Word of God, is accompanied by a deliberate refusal to assert that episcopacy is so constitutive of the nature of the Church that without it no Christian body can be truly accounted a church. The classical tradition of Anglican theology and the majority of Anglicans of this generation have endorsed this position. It is true that the formularies do not exclude a more rigid view of episcopacy, but neither do they require it. In any reunited church the language of an ordinal or of any statement on the ministry must be so drawn as to allow room for this interpretation as well as the prevailing Anglican view. But in all honesty no more can be required of non-Anglicans in respect of a doctrine of episcopacy than is at present required of Anglicans.

The Church Union does quite right to insist that it will not do to demand the acceptance of episcopacy as a condition of intercommunion or reunion without some agreement about the meaning of such a ministry. Agreement on the fact does, however, involve a measure of agreement in doctrine. But this is only another way of saying that there is a distinction between what the Church of England regards as essential in its understanding of episcopacy and what is allowable but not so essential as to require assent before there can be any communion in holy things. It is to be noted that the Church Union uses not the Ordinal but the *Responsio* given by the Archbishops in 1897 to the papal condemnation of Anglican orders, as a means of explaining its views on episcopacy. Even so it does not set out a full and coherent account of the significance of episcopacy, such as justice requires to be placed before the Free Churches. Moreover, the statement which is criticized for saying that no particular doctrine of apostolical succession is to be required of the Free Church contemplating the " taking of episcopacy into its system ", must not be read in isolation from what is asserted positively in the main body of the Report about the functions of a bishop in the Church of God.

A third criticism is devoted to a close examination of the reference in the Report to eucharistic sacrifice in an attempt to show that such language as " offering up Christ in the eucharist " has a firm place in Anglican tradition. A disproportionate amount of space is devoted to this topic, but the pamphlet might well have considered the extent to which Wesley permitted himself to speak in this language. It is doubtful, however, whether these references do not darken counsel

rather than illuminate a difficult question. The context and meaning of such references and the differences between Anglican and Tridentine teaching are of supreme importance. In general, Anglicans will welcome the critical comments of this pamphlet and the charitable spirit in which they are set forth. But what they will want to know, and what this pamphlet does not reveal, is whether Anglo-Catholics think that there is no way by which Anglicans and Dissenters can be brought at least into a measure of sacramental unity other than by the conversion of the Dissenters into Anglicans. If, as they assert, they are deeply concerned about Christian disunity, what proposals would they make to Dissenters which would not involve the latter in the repudiation of their own spiritual past? On what terms would they be prepared to see episcopacy offered to a non-episcopal church? What set of proposals would be free from the kind of objections which seem to weigh so heavily with the members of the Church Union? Anglicans and Dissenters alike have a right to know the answers to these questions.

THE AFRICAN MINISTER IN THE PICTURE

FEW topics require greater attention on the part both of church leaders and of the rank and file of church members than the serious questions involved in the recruitment, training and maintenance of the ministry. Several considerations have united to make this issue one of the most important in current ecclesiastical discussions. The recovery of the biblical insight of the Church as the Body of Christ has directed attention to the true function of the ministry within the Body. The acute shortage of ordained men in the ministries of the older churches in the West, caused partly through the dislocations of a world war and partly by the perplexities of a rapidly changing situation, has underlined the central importance of the ministry in the life and service of the Church, whatever doctrine of ministry may be accepted in the official standards of a denomination. This lack of a sufficient number of ordained men is a comparatively new phenomenon in the West and is the more serious in face of the growth in population and the increased opportunities offered by new developments in education and society. But the experience of the younger churches overseas is of a much graver shortage of ordained men, whether native or European, than the older churches have yet known. In Uganda, for example, there is on average only one ordained minister for over 5,000 baptized Christians. Moreover Africa and Asia are being subjected, in the space not of a hundred years but of a single generation, to the tremendous changes which are involved in the political and technical aspects of modern western civilization, so that a ministry which is not trained to deal with this revolutionary situation may fail the young churches at the most critical hour of their history.

The danger in Africa and Asia is not so much of hostility or even persecution but that the challenge of the Gospel may be by-passed by a generation to whom the Church and its ministry seems to belong to an epoch which historical development has left behind. In the words of Bishop Stephen Neill, " Young Africa is asking questions and will not stay long for an answer. If the pastor cannot give the answer,

the communist, the secularist, the political agitator are ready with very seductive and appealing answers. The African minister must know." The quality of the ministry is at least as important as an adequate supply of numbers. Both in China and in India much careful thought has been given to these problems and notable books produced within the last decade.[1] In 1950 the International Missionary Council sent Bishop Neill to make a survey of theological education in East and West Africa " with special reference to the training of the ordained ministry ". His report[2] merits the careful attention of all who are aware of the crucial importance of the subject and of the need for the African Church itself to perceive its own great responsibilities for training the ministers who will lead the Church of tomorrow.

The report emphasizes the astonishing progress made by the Church in tropical Africa in little over a century. After four centuries of missionary activity in India only just over two per cent of the population is Christian whereas in tropical Africa the proportion is at least ten per cent. The social status of many of these Christians is not less remarkable than their number, and Bishop Neill thinks that by the end of this century " tropical Africa might well be in the main a Christian country, taking perhaps the place of a paganised Europe as the main centre of Christian life in the world ". Thousands of people are still pressing into the Church in a way that surpasses the more publicized mass movements in India, but it is doubtful whether the churches are at present able to do much more than " to bring converts into a superficial level of Christian emancipation ". To lead them forward into Christian thinking and living at the deepest level is a much more difficult task to accomplish, but it is this responsibility which now rests upon the African minister. He is at the centre of what Bishop Neill from his wide knowledge of the Church in the world deliberately affirms to be an unexampled opportunity in tropical Africa.

There is no doubt about the faithfulness and pastoral zeal of the great majority of the African clergy, despite the serious handicaps of intense loneliness, lack of equipment and poverty under which most of them have to work. In the modern situation such faithfulness and zeal are not enough. Those who are called to lead the flock of Christ must have received such training in the understanding and expression of their faith as will enable them to speak to the condition of their people, caught up in this bewildering and frightening epoch of history.

The problems of ministerial training discussed in this report, though presented in the context of African church life, are not remote from the English scene. There is, for example, the insistent demand for a sufficient supply of African clergy who will prove themselves intellectually and in other ways the equals of the future leaders of the social and political life of the people. The formation of the four university colleges, one in East Africa and three in West Africa, demonstrates the urgency of this need. When Bishop Neill was in Africa last year about 800 students had been enrolled in the four

[1] C. Stanley Smith, *The Development of Protestant Theological Education in China* (1941). C. W. Ranson, *The Christian Minister in India* (1945).
[2] S. C. Neill, *Survey of the Training of the Ministry in Africa* (I.M.C., 1950).

colleges, and of these at least 600 were non-Roman Christians. The number of those who were not Christian was infinitesimal. These figures provide a striking testimony to the value of the education offered to Africa by the Church in the recent past and present a unique opportunity to train a whole generation of Christian leadership. Yet only a very few of these students are likely to become ordinands, partly because of the very low standard of living among African clergy, compared with all other avocations open to university graduates. In Africa as in England the maintenance of the ministry the Church already possesses is at least as great a need as its further recruitment. Attention must be given to this problem if there is to be any effective recruitment for the ministry from secondary schools and university colleges.

Other problems present themselves comparable to the difficulties which confront the churches in this country. Improved academic standards, in themselves so necessary for the health of the Church, may yet disqualify a new generation of ministers from the task of meeting the needs of the ordinary village African in the concrete circumstances of his life. Indeed, this issue is closely related to the whole question of recruiting for the ministry. The local pastor who has experienced deeply his Christian faith and from a clear understanding of its meaning can express it convincingly is likely to be the greatest power in the Church for calling out new vocations. Here is a reminder that two things which cannot be separated, an adequate theological education and training for the ministry, are nevertheless distinct and must never be confused either in Africa or in England.

Book Reviews

SOME TENDENCIES IN BRITISH THEOLOGY. FROM THE PUBLICATION OF "LUX MUNDI" TO THE PRESENT DAY.
By John Kenneth Mozley. *S.P.C.K.* 10/6.

The author had planned a larger and more comprehensive book. But what is here given to us is, nevertheless, a whole: a clear and invaluable interpretation of the theological scene as that is covered by the years 1899 to the outbreak of the second World War. It is important, however, that the reader should be prepared for disappointment if he should be expecting 'the present day' to deal with the theological tendencies of 1951 or even of the 'forties'. The book stops short before that.

Biblical Theology, for instance, is treated here only in its significance as a reaction against a purely philosophic approach to the Christian religion. But as Principal Cobham remarked in his broadcast in March entitled "Here the Church of England Stands", we are confronted with the embarrassing fact that "the Bible has become the exclusive province of the trained theologian, and in consequence an almost closed book to the devout layman". That observation, which is so largely true, is of course not a condemnation of Biblica