

# *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/robbadshaw>

---

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)

our backs on Hombourg with many pleasant memories, and retaining souvenirs that shall remain fresh and green for ever.

G. W. WELDON.

---

## ART. VI.—MR. CHAMBERLAIN ON FREE EDUCATION.

IN several meetings during the recess, Mr. Chamberlain has handled the question of national education; and no educationist is likely to criticize the right hon. gentleman's utterances as hesitating and ambiguous. Mr. Chamberlain's speeches, as a rule, are marked by singular skill, and his eloquence is of a very pointed and practical cast. About the Established Church, and about national education, his meaning is sufficiently plain. He has addressed himself especially to the working classes, the artizans and labourers of the towns, and the new voters throughout the country; and he has taken pains to let them know that he has the courage of his convictions. A main point in his tempting programme is gratuitous education.

At the eighth annual Conference of the Council of the "National Liberal Federation," held at Bradford, on the 1st, resolutions were carried touching education and the Church. About the Church, of course, little was said. A resolution that "the disestablishment and disendowment of the English and Scotch Churches are urgently needed" was carried unanimously. For an amendment that disestablishment should not be made an issue at the approaching general election a seconder could not be found. With regard to schools Mr. Jesse Collings, M.P., moved the following resolution :

That, in the opinion of this meeting, the public elementary schools of this country should be free, and placed under the management of duly elected representatives of the people, and that any deficiency caused by the abolition of fees in the schools under the control of the ratepayers should be supplied from the national exchequer.

As to the method by which the work was to be done, said Mr. Collings, there were the denominational and other difficulties, which the Act of 1870 made greater than they need have been; but let them first get the principle admitted, and when they came to deal with that still greater question of religious equality they would then eliminate all sectarian ascendancy, whether it be in Church or school or University. Mr. A. Illingworth, M.P., however, in seconding the resolution, declared that schools receiving aid from the rates and taxes

should be under representative control only. He deprecated haste, and said there should first be obtained for the people's representatives absolute control over State-aided and rate-aided schools, and then they might proceed to set up the institution of Free Education. He suggested, therefore, that the words "should be ultimately freed," should be inserted in the resolution after "representatives of the people," and that the words "free and" after "country" should be deleted. Mr. Collings said he was willing to agree to Mr. Illingworth's proposal, but objected to the introduction of the word "ultimately." Mr. Lyulph Stanley, M.P. (member of the London School Board), thought the resolution much better in its amended form, because it now pointed to the importance of the people having the control over their schools, whilst at the same time it recognised the importance of their being free. After debate, the resolution was adopted, with the addition of the words suggested by Mr. Illingworth, and agreed to in the following form :

That, in the opinion of this meeting, the public elementary schools of this country should be placed under the management of duly elected representatives of the people, and that they should be ultimately freed, and that any deficiency should be made good out of the national exchequer.

This action on the part of Mr. Chamberlain's uncompromising friends was possibly—judged by electioneering balances—a mistake; but Mr. Collings and Mr. Illingworth know their own minds, and they appear to think the pear is ripe. The right hon. gentleman, it may be, is of the same opinion; at all events, he showed himself equal to the occasion. Voluntary schools are not consistent with advanced Liberalism; they are "sectarian." The first aim of Radicals, and Liberationists of every shade—according to the Bradford programme—is to bring denominational schools under the control of elected representatives of the people; in other words, we suppose, every elementary school in the country must be a Board School. Secondly, all schools must be "freed."

Mr. Chamberlain replied to objections "on the one hand" and "on the other hand," in the following terms :

On the one hand, it is said that free education will close denominational schools, and will therefore throw upon the rates, already sufficiently burdened, an enormous additional charge in order to supply their place; and, on the other hand, there are many good Liberals who are afraid that free education may give a new vantage-ground to the sectarian system, and may retard the complete assertion of religious equality. In my opinion it will do, or need do, neither one nor the other. It is perfectly possible to imagine an arrangement which would leave the position of the denominational schools exactly where it is to-day, which

should neither diminish nor increase the obligation which is placed upon them of finding a proportion of their expenditure out of voluntary subscriptions.

The "arrangement," we learn, is an increased support from the taxes—not from rates.

Mr. Chamberlain proceeded as follows :

The existence of sectarian schools supported by State grants is no doubt a very serious question in itself, and one which some day or another ought to receive consideration. Whenever the time comes for its discussion, I for one shall not hesitate to express my opinion that contributions of Government money, whether great or small, ought in all cases to be accompanied by some form of representative control. To my mind the spectacle of so-called national schools turned into a private preserve by clerical managers, and used for exclusive purposes of politics or religion, is one which the law ought not to tolerate. But this is a question which can be treated by itself. It is independent of that which I have brought before you, and it seems to me it should not be mixed up or confused with the just claims of the working class to a free education in all the common schools of the country.

This question, namely, the disestablishment of Voluntary Schools, "can be treated by itself," said the right hon. gentleman. First, obtain representative control; then abolish school fees; and an agitation against religious teaching will naturally follow.

Mr. Gladstone, in his *Manifesto*,<sup>1</sup> had spoken of the difficulties in regard to a gratuitous primary education—"difficulties which demand at any rate grave consideration." But Mr. Chamberlain, whose influence over the advanced sections of the Liberal party seems to be increasing every day, presses forward the subject with unabated zeal.

In his speech at Newport, on the 7th, the Prime Minister, remarking that as to Free Education he had the singular and unusual felicity of being very much on the same point of view as Mr. Gladstone, said: "I think that this question cannot

---

<sup>1</sup> The main portion of the Midlothian *Manifesto*, as regards gratuitous education, runs thus: "According to the habits of this country, a contribution towards the cost of the article tends to its being more thoroughly valued by the receiver. It seems necessary to consider with care what will be the effect of the change on primary education, other than that which is supplied by public authority. The rule of our policy is, that nothing should be done by the State which can be better or as well done by voluntary effort; and I am not aware that, either in its moral or even its literary aspects, the work of the State for education has as yet proved its superiority to the work of the religious bodies, or of philanthropic individuals. Even the economical consideration of materially augmented cost does not appear to be wholly trivial. Again, will there not be under the new system an increased jealousy of the introduction into the schools of any subject not strictly rudimentary? There remains the religious difficulty. The nation does not appear to be disposed to confine the public teaching in the primary schools to matter purely secular."

be dealt with in the summary way in which Mr. Chamberlain has dealt with it."

I have no doubt whatever [said his Lordship] that the effect of the compulsory character of education does give to the poorer classes of the community a considerable claim. If they ask for a thing and cannot get it, it is unreasonable to tax the rest of the community to give it to them. But if you say to them, "You shall have this thing whether you like it or not," and then they cannot pay for it without enormous pressure on their resources, I must say there is a considerable claim that they should be assisted. But they are assisted under the present law, though I do not think that the law is liberal enough. I should like to make it more liberal; but I do not see—because I think it reasonable that those who are in very poor circumstances, and to whom a portion of the fee is remitted—that we should therefore make a present of large sums of public money to a great number of people who are perfectly competent to pay for the education of their own children.

The laws may well, said Lord Salisbury, be made more liberal on behalf of those upon whom the present law presses with undue severity. "But I should shrink very much before I gave to every subject of the Queen a right—whether he was rich, well-to-do, moderately well off, or poor—to have his children educated at the public expense. I do not see any reason for adding to such an extent to our public burdens; and I believe it will be some time before the tax-payers of this country will accept it; but I cannot help seeing in this proposal—as, indeed, Mr Morley has clearly indicated—a desire to get rid of that which we cherish as one of our most important privileges—the right of religious education. I am not speaking," added the noble Marquis, "for my own Church alone—what I claim I would extend with equal hand to the Nonconformists of Wales or to the Roman Catholics of Ireland." And accordingly he proceeded, speaking in behalf of "all the denominations of this country": "I commend to you earnestly to defend, as the most cherished possession which we as the citizens of a free country have in this land, the right that our children and the children of those who think with us should be taught the whole truth of Christianity as we believe it, and that no theories about State interference, no secular doctrines, shall be allowed to interfere to diminish or to frustrate the highest privilege that Christianity can possess."

Now, many Liberal Churchmen, we are aware, had pronounced in favour of gratuitous education; but the recent utterances of several members of Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet, pointing strongly the other way, will no doubt be carefully considered and duly weighed. Lord Hartington, Lord Derby,<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lord Derby said: "I cannot admit any right on the part of the individual to have his children taught at the public expense. Schooling

and Mr. Childers have shown that they are not inclined to follow Mr. Chamberlain. Such representative Liberals, too, as Mr. Courtney and Sir T. Brassey, and even Mr. Bright, have virtually condemned the Bradford programme. Mr. Goschen has criticized it severely. Nevertheless, Mr. Chamberlain is a very able, clear-sighted, and vigorous politician ; and he has addressed himself in particular, as we said, to the masses. Disputes between different sections of the Liberal party we have no desire to discuss ; with "party" politics THE CHURCHMAN has no concern. But upon two great questions, the National Church, and Religious Education, we are clearly bound to speak ; and it is necessary to point out that, of those who are agitating for gratuitous education, the leaders advocate the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church, and have given tolerably plain indications of their feeling towards "sectarian," that is voluntary and denominational, schools.

Mr. Childers is not willing to deal a blow at voluntary schools, or in anyway to upset the covenant of 1870. The right hon. gentleman's utterances on such questions, like those of Mr. Forster, we quote with sincere respect. The "covenant" made fifteen years ago, is now, of course, "ancient history." But it may be well to quote Mr. Forster's statement, which we heard him make in the House of Commons, February, 1870. "We must take care," said the right hon. gentleman, "not to destroy in building up—not to destroy the existing system in introducing a new one. In solving this problem there must be, consistently with the attainment of our object, the least possible expenditure of public money, the utmost endeavour not to injure existing and efficient schools, and the most careful absence of all encouragement to parents to neglect their children. . . . Our object is to *complete the present voluntary system, to fill up gaps, sparing the public money, where it can be done without, procuring as much as*

---

for children is not more necessary than food, or clothing, or lodging, which we expect men to find for themselves, and that attendance at school is compulsory seems to be no argument. The wearing of clothes is compulsory, but the State does not undertake to provide clothes. But if the electors in general do not object to heavy increase of rates or taxes, or both, for that purpose, they are the masters. They will only be carrying the load on the one shoulder instead of on the other." Lord Derby, however, understates the case : "the load" to be carried would be a heavier load. Lord George Hamilton, we observe, in a recent speech, said : "It was clear that the object of the advocates of the free system, was to overthrow voluntary schools which educated two-thirds of the children attending elementary schools. The amount payable for the remaining one-third was between two and three millions a year. If, therefore, the other two-thirds were thrown upon School Boards there would be an increase in the rates of not less than seven millions a year."

*we can the assistance of the parents, and welcoming as much as we rightly can the co-operation and aid of those benevolent men who desire to assist their neighbours.*" These are the words of a Christian statesman; and we have pleasure in recalling them. But this wise and liberal policy in national education was supported by the illustrious philanthropist, to whose memory Nonconformists, no less than Churchmen, are at the present moment paying worthy tribute, the Earl of Shaftesbury. At the great meeting in the metropolis, summoned in defence of religious education, Lord Shaftesbury asserted, with eloquence which Lord Salisbury said he had "seldom heard rivalled," the right of the people to religious teaching for their children. In spite of the Birmingham League, the noble Earl called upon the men and women of England to rise with one heart and soul and say: "By all our hopes and all our fears, by the honour of the nation, by the safety of the people, by all that is holy and all that is true, by everything in time and everything in eternity, the children of Great Britain shall be brought into the faith and fear and nurture of the Lord."



#### ART. VII.—THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

*The following Paper was written for the Chichester Diocesan Conference, Brighton, October 29th, 1885.*

THE subject upon which I have been requested to read a paper is—1st. The advantages of the Established Church; and 2nd. The best means of maintaining it.

I am fully aware that the remarks I am about to read are only an imperfect sketch of my own opinions upon a very large and important subject. I will, however, endeavour to state as clearly as I can, in so brief a paper, what these opinions are.

I will then observe, first, that by the words "Established Church" I understand that branch of the Christian Church which is established in England by law.

In support of this view, I have no thought of citing the various statutes by which the connection between the Church and the State has been secured. I have not space for this, and, moreover, the nature of this connection is generally understood by most educated Englishmen. I do not propose to discuss the disadvantages, such as the restraint upon the Church's freedom, and other objections, which are alleged with more or less truth and cogency against our present constitution.