

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

and justification by faith in Christ, because he hoped by peaceful means, by literature and cultivation, to accomplish his object, that he failed hopelessly in his scheme for the regeneration of European society. Of what use is the mere knowledge of literature and science, independently of religious truth, in taming the passions, in quenching pride, in moderating ambition, in stifling envy and all the malignant passions of the natural heart? How, too, can it preserve a man from those crimes and excesses which degrade human nature, and place him on a level with the beasts that perish? But union to Christ by faith necessitates the renunciation of every known sin; attraction to God by Christ prevents the deliberate omission of any acknowledged duty. Having laid the foundation in faith, then, enjoins the Apostle, "giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue." The mere knowledge of science and literature, unconnected with the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, cannot "bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." It may shed a gleam of light over "the cloudy and dark" day of adversity, and minister consolation during the weary moments of languor and disease; but it cannot cleanse us from that moral pollution with which our nature is infected; it cannot deprive death of its sting, and the grave of its victory; it cannot speak peace to the man who is troubled with a sense of his sinfulness; it cannot give us the assurance of pardon and reconciliation with our Maker; it cannot ensure us approval on the day of judgment; it cannot "minister unto us an entrance abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Then only can we be instrumental in saving the souls of others around us, and in promoting the peace and good order of human society, when we constantly exhibit Christ as the sole atonement for known and forsaken sin, and as the best example of virtuous and holy living; Christian morals as founded upon Christian doctrine, and Christian principles as leading to Christian practice; to "the holiness without which no man shall see the Lord."

ARTHUR R. PENNINGTON.



ART. VI.—THE AGITATION FOR DISESTABLISHMENT.

THE preparations for a new Parliament on an extended franchise have brought the question of Church and State into sudden and excessive prominence. Whilst professing to

decline to make Disestablishment a test question for candidates at the forthcoming election, the so-called Liberationists—a designation which is still retained by those who, by their leaders, plainly declare that they are wholly indifferent to the liberation of religion, but are very deeply interested in ecclesiastical endowments, and their possible appropriation—have done their utmost to elicit a distinct enunciation of the views and intentions of candidates in this matter; and where a public cross-examination seemed inexpedient, they have, we are told, essayed to procure secret pledges.

As a result, we have a very large number of candidates practically pledged to Disestablishment and Disendowment, either unconditionally or “in the event of its being taken up by the Government of the day.” This is a position of undoubted gravity, though not quite so alarming as some people have imagined. Many of these pledges have been, we are well aware, given with the greatest reluctance, and those who gave them will make not the slightest effort to promote the policy for which, on a division, they have promised to vote. At the same time, the fact that the party which will in the future, as in the past, do all in its power to impede, harass, and humiliate the Church in her great work, have secured even so many nominal adherents among the possible members of the next Parliament, is one which is far from being satisfactory to any thoughtful Englishman who recognises the many hindrances which the Church may be confronted with in the prosecution of her sacred mission.

Those who have been for any time engaged in Church Defence work can hardly be surprised at this partial success of the assailants of the Church. The enemy has long been sowing tares while men slept. The watchman on the walls has again and again tried to rouse the slumberers, but few, comparatively, have heeded the warning, appreciated the mischief which was being done, and set to work to eradicate the bad seed. Consequently, the seed has been sown broadcast, and now is bearing fruit. The franchise has been enlarged, and it will be exercised by men who, through the culpable neglect of Churchmen, have learnt to believe many strange things: that, for instance, all rectors are wealthy and fat; that the Church, as a whole, is enormously rich; and that the labour of the poor man is grievously taxed to support it. These are but samples of the delusions, diligently fostered, which are prevalent in all parts of the country to-day. The Bishop of Durham presides over a diocese whose inhabitants are not deficient in intelligence or common-sense, but he has publicly stated that it is a common belief in the Diocese of Durham that the clergy receive not less than £700 a year

each, and that their incomes and the revenues of the Church generally are derived from the taxes. On the publication of the Bishop's remarks, the anti-Church papers affected to ridicule this statement as an exaggeration or an isolated experience. I could adduce numberless examples to prove, and few of the readers of *THE CHURCHMAN* but could corroborate me, that the misconception is most common, and I question much whether, under other circumstances, the Liberation Society's representatives would so promptly ridicule it. Certainly it has been no unimportant factor in producing an acquiescence in the Society's schemes; a state of things which otherwise would be unintelligible, seeing that the working class is that which derives the greatest benefits from an Established Church, and would be the first and most serious sufferer by disruption.

At length, however, the slumberers are waking up. The heads of the Church have spoken out in trumpet-tones, and, whether they will or no, men must hear, and learn their duty. Four years ago the late Primate, having had his attention drawn to the designs of the Liberationists, issued a pastoral letter both to clergy and laity, which at the time was universally read and discussed, and for a while produced the best results. But as the impotence of the most radical Parliament of Queen Victoria seriously to injure the Established Church was realized, a false sense of security began once more to prevail, and it needed an apprehension of the unknown possibilities which resided in the newly enfranchised millions to disturb again the repose of the sleepers. Accordingly, the address of Bishop of Durham at the Annual Meeting of the Church Defence Institution in June, the few but well-considered words in which the Primate touched on the subject in speaking to his own Conference in July, and the letter which the Bishop of Rochester has forwarded to the laity of his diocese, have fallen on ears which were no longer wholly closed. The words of these prelates have received the consideration due to the high position held by them, and to their own intrinsic importance and suggestiveness. While the Archbishop speaks with dignity of the serious consequences to the State of forcing the Church to assume a resolute and united attitude against the common foe (not of attaching herself *en masse* to the Conservative party, as he was untruly charged with saying), the Bishops of Durham and Rochester deal more especially with the necessary consequences of Disestablishment, and with the measureless wrong which would be thereby inflicted on the State, the poor, the sick, the children, as well as on the daughter communions, the American and Colonial Churches. Both these documents should be read with care. They will

show to many who have, indeed, hitherto not been insensible of the magnitude of the calamity involved in Disestablishment, how far-reaching, how well-nigh universal would be its consequences, that not only would the cause of religion suffer owing to the means of its support being suddenly withdrawn, but that it would suffer just where it was most needed, and would be least likely to be supplied, in quarters where Dissent had found it impossible to live; that it would suffer not only in England, but in every continent of the globe; that the evil would not stop with purely religious work, but that all philanthropic efforts would be injuriously affected—schools, hospitals, temperance work, and much besides—and that, in fact, for the country to commit itself to such a scheme of Disestablishment and Disendowment as has been propounded by the Liberation Society would be nothing less than an act of national infatuation. If the truth and force of these arguments required confirmation, it has been supplied by the eager unanimity with which anti-Church papers have sought to minimize and explain them away. Their importance is, however, only too obvious to impartial judges; and it being conceded, as anyone who reads these documents must concede, that Disestablishment would prove an unspeakable calamity, the question remains, what is our immediate duty?

It is primarily the duty of trustees. We hold this trust of our National Christianity, nationally endowed, which has been the distinguishing characteristic of our empire for more than a thousand years, and under which God has so richly blessed our country, for those who are yet unborn, for those who are not old enough to speak and act for themselves, and for those who unassisted cannot know or appreciate adequately the heritage which is theirs. If we are unfaithful to our duty as trustees, the day may come when these may let that pass out of their hands, which, as I believe, no power can put back in its place, and which, once lost, will be regretted to all future time. There is no lack of material whereby any one may inform himself and become qualified to inform others. Books and pamphlets abound, dealing with every conceivable point of the controversy. Not to refer to older and larger works, I may mention the various volumes (S.P.C.K. and Walter Smith) prepared by Mr. Moore of Maidstone, one surely of the most indefatigable writers and workers on this subject; to Mr. Freeman's "Essays on Disestablishment and Disendowment" (Macmillan), which maintain so clearly and unanswerably the continuity of the Church and her right to pre-Reformation Endowments; and to the "Handy Volume of the Church Defence Institution," which is, as the press has pointed out, a very storehouse of facts and opinions. Of leaflets, the supply

is almost endless. Not to refer to some which have been prepared for local use, I may instance Bishop Ryle's (W. Hunt and Co.), not so well known as they deserve; the *Banner* leaflets which have had a very large circulation, and which, though unfortunately not altogether free from political bias, are, so far as they go, very pithy and pointed; and, lastly, to those of the "Church Defence Institution," which offer a choice of between seventy and eighty different publications. At the time when I write more than a million of these have been issued during the present year, and the demand for them appears to grow daily.

The faithful trustee having been shown what Disestablishment would involve, will therefore have no difficulty in doing his duty to avert it. From these various sources of information he will first instruct himself more perfectly in the history and position of his own Church, and he will next do his utmost to inform others who have not his opportunities or capacity. But do not let him be content with merely buying leaflets to distribute, or obtaining grants of them. Let him spare no pains by word of mouth to state facts, to remove misconceptions, and to correct misstatements. There is a readiness to learn and be put right on the part of those who have hitherto been in favour of Disestablishment, simply because they knew no better, as the lecturers of the "Church Defence Institution" can testify, from experience, in all parts of England and Wales; and it will be our reproach if the involuntarily ignorant are not taught. We can thus work, and we can give. For the next few weeks there will be special pressure. The staff of the Institution's lecturers will be considerably increased to meet increased demands, and good men deserve to be well paid. The occasion is a very serious one, and surely no one who realizes this will refuse to do his utmost. The occasion is very serious, because of the great prominence which has been already given to Disestablishment in the present electioneering campaign; but I must not be supposed to express an opinion that the struggle for Disestablishment is imminent. Even those who would most like to think so are convinced of this. "It is true," says the *Liberator*, the organ of the Liberation Society, "that the approaching General Election will not be a decisive one as regards Disestablishment; but," it adds, "it will be decisive as to the position which it will subsequently occupy in the programme of the Liberal party." I do not think my own belief could be better expressed than in the foregoing words. Our duty, then, and especially the duty of Liberal Churchmen, is to show the Liberal leaders that Disestablishment must not have a place now or hereafter in the programme of the Liberal party. Mr. Chamberlain no doubt

desires it, and some weeks ago seemed disposed, as far as he could, to insist upon it; but Lord Hartington gives no encouragement to him; and Mr. Herbert Gladstone, who may be assumed to know his father's mind, both in England and Scotland, has distinctly deprecated it. Well, indeed, he might. Never to be forgotten are his father's words in reply to the late Mr. Watkin Williams in 1871, and they may be commended to the earnest attention of some of Mr. Gladstone's lieutenants to-day:

I do not envy my hon. and learned friend, or my hon. friend the Member for Merthyr Tydvil, or any other man who ventures to take in hand the business of Disestablishing the Church of England. Even if it were as fit to be done as I think it unfit, there is a difficulty in the case before which the boldest man would recoil. It is all very well so long as we deal with abstract declarations put upon the Notice Paper of this House, of what might be done or ought to be done; but only go up to the walls and gates and look at the way in which stone is built upon stone, on the way in which the foundations have been dug, and the way they go down into the earth, and consider by what tools, what artillery you can bring that fabric to the ground. I know the difficulties, and I am not prepared in any shape or form to encourage—by dealing with my hon. and learned friend's motion in any way except the simple mode of negative—the creation of expectations which it would be most guilty, most unworthy, most dishonourable on our part to entertain, lest we should convey a virtual pledge.^c

Long may such sentiments be the sentiments of the Liberal leaders; and, meanwhile, of this let Churchmen be assured, that if by the force of honest persuasion and pure conviction they ward off the present attack, they will do far more than leave the Church where they found her: they will leave her much stronger, because far better understood, because any number of cobwebs will have been for ever swept away, and the people, having seen through the fallacies by which interested parties have sought to delude them, will realize that the Church is their own Church, that those who attack her strike at them, and that they would not only be false to their trust but utterly blind to their own best interests if with open eyes they consented to part with their religious inheritance, the admiration of Continental Christians, the pride and stay of Anglican Churchmen in all lands.

H. GRANVILLE DICKSON.

^c Since this paper was written, Mr. Gladstone's manifesto to the electors of Midlothian has been published; and it must be confessed that it does not leave the Church question precisely where it was before. Mr. Gladstone undoubtedly now regards Disestablishment as a possibility, though in the dim and distant future; but he insists "that so vast a question cannot become practical until it shall have grown familiar to the public mind by thorough discussion." Certainly we should have liked to have seen higher ground taken, but Churchmen will only have themselves to blame if they do not accept the warning which is offered them, and labour strenuously to inform "the public mind" on this all-important question ere it becomes "practical."

H. G. D.