

## CURRENT MAGAZINES

---

**Church and State:**—The Bishop of Oxford, in the *Contemporary*.

**The Case for Modernism:**—The Rev. H. D. A. Major, in the *Nineteenth Century*.

**The Campaign in Retrospect:**—Professor W. B. Munro, in the *Yale Review*.

**Before the British Elections:**—Mr. H. N. Brailsford, in *Foreign Affairs*.

**Mr. Bernard Shaw's Theory of Socialism and Capitalism:**—Mr. F. W. Hirst, in the *Contemporary*.

---

THE remarkable spectacle of English bishops just now recommending to their clergy a strategic disregard of the constitution lends special interest to the Bishop of Oxford's article entitled "Church and State". For, though many a precedent may be found in recent procedure by lay politicians, rebellion is still quite a novelty on the episcopal bench. Not indeed wholly unexampled! One thinks of the Seven who went to the Tower because they would not assist James II in what they thought a breach of his word; and of the Seven who were driven from their Sees because they would not swear—as they thought—falsely about the royal title of William III. If these parallels seem rather fantastic, it is because the sight of a rebellious episcopate is so rare that only illustrations somewhat remote are available. This makes it all the more interesting when it comes. Resistance is most striking when it is shown by men habitually complaisant. Does anyone suppose that English bishops will quarrel with the State for a trifle? As old Sir Thomas Browne would have said, in relation to the powers that be, they have seldom shown "heads that are disposed unto schism and complexionally propense to innovation."

The Bishop of Oxford begins with Aristotelian reflection on the nature of man. He points out the need for two kinds of human society, one for religious and spiritual purposes, the other for purposes that are merely physical or—at the utmost—moral. In neither reference is it good, or normal, for man to be alone, and the bishop thinks that "in the more pronounced types of Protestantism" just this fault of isolating the individual has been committed. But membership in these two essential societies, that exist side by side, may plainly lead to conflict. It has been

historically shown that such conflict can be grave. The jurisdictions overlap, and there is no higher court of appeal. In practice, for example, such questions as those relating to marriage and to education may be very differently answered by the two authorities, and to each of them the same person is subject. Which will he obey? Moreover, where the Church is "Established", there is sure to be talk about its "bond with the State". The civil power may argue thus:

You are bound by your contract. You enjoy the use of property—such amount of the Church property of the Middle Ages as has been voluntarily guaranteed to you—and you enjoy other privileges and pre-eminences. In consideration of all these things, you contract on your side to supply spiritual ministrations of the sort we require. It is for us, and not for you, to determine the character of them.

Having thus stated the general issue, the bishop proceeds to translate it into terms of the concrete case about which his reader has certainly been thinking. He tells the story of Prayer-Book revision, substantially as follows.

The Church of England found itself in the twentieth century with liturgical forms that had been untouched since 1662. Alone of English institutions, this one had seen hardly any adjusting of its legal environment for two centuries and a half. Was it conceivable that, amid the changing life of the nation and of the world, no corresponding variety was needed in the usages of devotion? Those who felt this need, and realized the impossibility of meeting it by legal means, were driven to meet it by means technically illegal. According to the constitution, changes in the ritual of the State Church could be made by parliament alone. But what chance had such bills in parliament, amid the increasing congestion of other business? Between 1880 and 1913 more than 200 bills relating to ecclesiastical matters were introduced, and of these no fewer than 183 were dropped! It is thus incidental to its connection with the State that the Church of England has been fettered as no other Church is fettered, and that the one authority which could facilitate its progress is an authority impossible to move.

Yet it was unthinkable that, in a living Church, growth should be stunted indefinitely. What could not be achieved within the law continued to achieve itself outside the law. Hence the riot of ecclesiastical "irregularities", which expressed at least a protest against restraint under the dead hand of an Act of Parliament two and a half centuries old. Yet sheer lawlessness had faults and perils of its own. In an effort to restore order, the Church was invited

by parliament to propose emendations of the liturgy, distinguishing innovations which should be legalised from innovations which should be forbidden. The response was the revised Prayer-Book, and this has been twice rejected by the House of Commons. Now, asks the Bishop of Oxford, who will deny that the Church's most sacred right has been challenged? Parliament has undertaken to say, in contradiction to the bishops, what is a change of doctrine and what is not. Parliament has presumed to dictate rules for "the ministering of the Word and Sacraments". Parliament, in short, would reduce the Church to a branch of the civil service! The right reply is that the bishops should "guide themselves in their administration by the rules of the Book of 1928, behind which there is an immense weight of ecclesiastical authority". In other words, that the vote of the House of Commons recorded last June should be ignored.

There are several ways of telling a story, and in the above statement I have told this one as it shapes itself in the Bishop of Oxford's article. Sir William Joynson-Hicks would tell it differently. But it is at least right to keep apart the distinct issues in this tangled business, and to consider by itself the one point of alleged "lawlessness" on the part of the episcopate. That the bishops are advising a lawless procedure, is as plain as the proverbial pikestaff. They do not gain, but perhaps rather lose, by conveying their advice indirectly—through insinuation or hint, rather than by open signal; for what they mean is beyond doubt. For instance, the Bishop of London (who at all events has been outspoken) desires that 160 priests in his diocese should continue to practise just what parliament has refused to permit. How much force, then, is there in the argument that parliament has nothing to do with it, has travelled outside its field, and hence deserves no homage?

We have surely here a confusion of two problems. The action of parliament is represented as infringing religious liberty. In what respect has it denied liberty of conscience to either individual or Church? Creed and worship are of the things that, emphatically, are not Caesar's. But the representatives of the people are entitled to say what sort of creed or worship shall be officially proclaimed as national, and be supported from the public treasury. Columns of nonsense have appeared in the press, arguing against the validity of the vote in the House of Commons, by a method of which one can most fitly say with Flaubert that "it shames the human mind". Obedience, we are asked to believe, is not due, because parliament had no right to decide an issue like that of the Prayer-Book at all, or—what amounts to the same thing—had the right to decide it

in only one way. Again, that no Scotsman, no Welshman, no Irishman, no English Nonconformist, should have voted on any question of the future of the Church of England, and that the meddling by such intruders deprived the vote of all binding force! That the tax-paying constituents of all these disqualified members would have had reason to complain of such wholesale disfranchisement, is a point left undiscussed. But *what parliament has a right to do* is one thing; *what parliament is right in doing* is another. The Dean of St. Paul's put the point best. It seemed to him, he said, that the House of Commons had decided wrongly; but it was better for it to decide wrongly than to repudiate responsibility for deciding at all.

Granted, then, that the House of Commons decision was to be deplored, by what means could the misfortune best be met? It is here that the Bishop of Oxford seems to have so much sound reasoning on his side. No Church worthy of the name will submit to be directed by a secular authority against its own judgment of what its religious mission requires. What the Bishop of Durham calls "a tame Church in a secularised State" is deserving only of contempt. One remedy would be to ask for Disestablishment as the price of freedom. But paying a high price for anything is a method one need not take until a lower price has been proved unacceptable, and there was precedent in abundance for a less exacting remedy. One must here neglect, for the moment, the question which side was right on the doctrinal issue, and limit one's self to the question what the bishops—believing as they did—were justified in doing after last June. What have other groups in the Church, whose views were "illegal", been doing for generations back? They, too, had the "constitution of this Church and Realm" against them, and it would have been idle for them to ask for constitutional change. What did men like Thirlwall do, and Stanley, and Maurice, and Robertson? What, to be a little more searching, is done to-day by Bishop Barnes and Dean Inge and Dr. H. D. A. Major, and the whole assemblage of the *Modern Churchmen's Union*? These men speak and act just as they judge right, leaving the burden of prosecution upon those who condemn them. They put the initiative on the other side. What one group of innovators can do, another can do. No one is deceived. It is a revolt indeed, but an open revolt—just the method by which the best reforms have in the past been made. The Erasmian procedure, rather than the Lutheran! Is it not indeed the only way in an Established Church? When one holds tenaciously to one's place within the Christian communion in which one was born, leaving it to others—if they choose and can



persuade the supreme legal authority—to cast one out, provided there is no concealment or evading or disguise, who will throw the first stone? Is not this, in truth, the essence of Modernism? Surely those particular pioneers of free thought will sympathise with men whose free impulses direct their thought in a course different from their own? That the first stone should be thrown from the camp of the *Modern Churchmen's Union* would be indeed as ironical an occurrence as the history of persecution has to record.

---

UNFORTUNATELY, however, for this sweetly reasonable way of putting their case, some of these Anglo-Catholics have been casting the largest and heaviest stones they could find at the other group who sit light to Church law. Dr. H. D. A. Major's article, "The Case for Modernism", in the *Nineteenth Century* is a rejoinder to those who denounced Modernists at the recent Church Congress. It will be remembered that Lord Halifax declared the Bishop of Birmingham to be obviously unfit to address any gathering of Christian people! And Dr. Major was included in the general condemnation.

He begins by explaining that Modernists are "religious men", and that they believe certain things quite definitely. One is tempted to a moment of unseemly mirth at the spectacle of a school in the Church finding it necessary to introduce itself thus to readers of a general Review. But the word "Modernist" has been so generally associated with denial, that this preliminary statement is not out of place. Dr. Major dwells upon the anthropological evidence that religion is a universal fact of human nature, that the choice lies not between religion and no-religion, but between different religions, and that what the Modernist desires is to reach the highest form of a way of thinking and feeling whose persistence is to him a token of its essential value. Moreover, he observes that this habit of human nature has had a great rôle in social history, and that the truest way to define a civilisation is in terms of its religion. Among all forms which this spirit has taken in the past, the Christian is to him the noblest; it "marks the highest point in what the student of comparative religion would call the religious evolution of humanity". This it shows, for Dr. Major, by two qualities: (1) its supremely satisfying doctrine of God, and (2) its ethical ideal. In each, it is to the other religions of the world as the goal or climax towards which they were more or less imperfectly striving. And, lastly, the Modernist believes in the mission of the organised Christian Church. He is no "individualist"

in spiritual matters, but a "Catholic Christian", though he is far from content with the ecclesiastical structures which have so far been achieved. Dr. Major quotes with a certain glee the remark by the Archbishop of York: *I believe in one Holy Catholic Church, but regret that it does not exist.* Are not these points, the writer asks, to be regarded as points of a constructive and not a merely destructive school? An unambiguous theism, with clear doctrine of God as a Spirit; a wholehearted acceptance of the Christian ethic as the highest ever preached on earth; a devotion to the organised Church as the instrument by which this Christian message is to be spread abroad; and a general statement, which the writer makes in Scripture language and to which he adds no comment: *We believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.* Appended to this statement is the usual repudiation of the traditional miracles and of the Old Testament cosmology.

One is not surprised that this sort of doctrine shocks Lord Halifax. I am not here concerned to discuss it, but only to point out that the *Nineteenth Century* article does Modernists (including, I think, Dr. Major himself) less than justice. Huxley used to say that Agnosticism was not a creed but a method, and the most skilful Modernists make it plain that they have no uniform system of belief, that their plea is only for a genuine reconciliation of religious with secular knowledge, and that they stand above all for intellectual honesty. To shape a new hard and fast set of dogmas is remote from their purpose, and in truth they often differ widely among themselves in their beliefs—as any set of men will, who are held together by a common method alone.

It is an interesting and pleasing part of his article in which Dr. Major speaks so sympathetically of those who have spoken harshly of him. He has the kindest regard for Lord Halifax, and "those who stand with him, whether Anglo-Catholics or Evangelicals". Though believing that their policy must lead to the secularisation of English life, "and the grievous moral and spiritual loss which must attend that process", he believes that they personally have the highest motives. English Modernists, unlike many of their school in the United States, have this note of sympathy with those who are far removed from them in opinion. They feel a harmony deeper than one of intellect. And the finer spirits of Modernism everywhere have the same mark. "I delight", said Schleiermacher, "to feel myself at one with those who think themselves very far from me." And no one can ever express it better than that fascinating French critic, J. M. Guyau:

When you fill yourself with indignation against some absurd old prejudice, remember it has been the travelling companion of humanity for perhaps ten thousand years; that men have leaned upon it when the roads were bad; that it has been the occasion of many a joy, and has lived, so to speak, on the life of man. Is there not something fraternal for us in every thought of humanity? \_\_\_\_\_

A VERY different subject in current magazines comes next on my list. Now that the tumult and the shouting are over, Professor W. B. Munro writes in *The Yale Review* about the American presidential election as a political scientist sees it.

One campaign, he reflects, is very like another. Except for the far larger scale of their operations, Messrs. Hoover and Smith in 1928 reproduced with amazing exactness the strategy of Messrs. Adams and Jackson just a century ago. As of old, "claims and counter-claims, rumours and roorbacks, slogans and straw votes, tin horns and torchlights, buttons and ballyhoo". What this last word means, Professor Munro does not explain, and no doubt it needs no explanation to an American reader. He is tempted to say, in the words of *Ecclesiastes*, that there is nothing new under the sun. And yet, on looking over the detailed items, this shrewd publicist, whom Canada gave to Harvard, can detect some novelties which are worth attention.

He first points out that this time the two national "platforms" seemed to count for nothing at all. They had to be constructed and displayed, in conformity with American tradition. But once this had been done, everybody forgot about them, and thought rather of what was contained in the "speeches of acceptance". It was no wonder, for in the whole record of political evasiveness those ridiculous documents produced by the party managers on both sides would be hard to beat. They were utterly neglected in the campaign, because they meant nothing. Professor Munro suggests that the party platform should be abolished, like many another American institution which used to serve a purpose, but ceased to do so and was dropped. It is an attempt to secure a consensus of party opinion where no such consensus exists, and the effort is just a piece of transparent shuffling which no longer deceives anybody. Think of the difference, for example, this time about prohibition! One platform included "vigorous" enforcement and the other "honest" enforcement. To the American voter this ceased even to be worth laughing at, and was simply forgotten.

But the speeches of the candidates were not forgotten or neglected. Mr. Hoover and Mr. Smith were more distinctly con-

trusted in personality than any other two candidates for the office in a hundred years, and each addressed himself to the main issues of nation-wide importance—to prohibition, farm relief, the tariff, control of water power, labour relations. Professor Munro thinks their oratory was much improved by the fact that they had to speak with a radio transmitter before them. This did away with much that used to be thought oratorical—and all the better. It compels a new conciseness, because radio time is so expensive. "Governor Smith begged his Boston audience to refrain from applause, because it cost the campaign fund a hundred dollars a minute." Other benefits, too, are to be attributed to the radio, such as the prevention of candidates from giving one speech to the press and delivering a different one to the audience, or slandering the reporter for his "mis-statement" of some unfortunate remark that was actually made. What a gain, also, to be free from the hypnotic effect of "gestures and front", which cannot be put on the air—at least in the present state of television, and from the advantage certain speakers used to possess in leather lungs, for these profit them nothing on short wave lengths. You can shut off the loud speaker, too, at your own fireside when you are tired of him, and this you could not do with the loud speaker at a ward rally. Professor Munro's summary of the blessings of radio in political life is indeed most diverting and suggestive. In his enthusiasm he declares this to be the most important aid that applied science has brought to government since the invention of printing. Perhaps for the first time in the modern world we have in sight the possibility that the whole national audience may be reached by a single speaker's voice. This observer thinks that not one American voter in a hundred thousand missed hearing both candidates at some time in the campaign. What an achievement, with an electorate of forty-five millions!

Another feature of great interest was the participation of women voters. Far more keenly than ever before, the American women took part in a campaign which, they felt, "directly concerned the home". They registered in immensely greater numbers this time, with the Hoover-Smith issue before them, nor did they vote "substantially as the men voted". It was the Republicans who profited enormously by the change, for the Democrats made no effort to capture this section—the most important of all the doubtful groups, as the outcome showed. This was what killed Smith in those southern states which are commonly Democratic. It is now clear, in Professor Munro's view, that "Anti-prohibition is not a winning issue". And it is likewise clear that "the country

is not so tolerant as we have been led to believe". Thus vaguely and suggestively does he touch that religious antagonism which played so unfortunate a part in the struggle.

It is an extremely interesting and vivacious article which is here summarised just in a few of its features, and it may well help the outsider to interpret what was happening in the great republic three months ago. One is a little disappointed at not hearing in more detail about that sharp division of policies, associated with the two clearly-contrasted men, which the article seemed to promise at the beginning, and which seemed so suggestive of the familiar British campaign. But there is a lot to think about in what Professor Munro has given us. And it is satisfactory to find that he is not pessimistic. That "whispering" of which we heard so much, as if it were a shameful novelty in American politics, he reminds us is an old scandal. It must be attracting less notice with the lapse of time, and thus be less effective as it grows old. Here again Professor Munro has a compliment for his favourite invention. "It is the radio that has made roorbucking to-day more difficult than in the past. A last-minute falsehood can be contradicted instanter. And in any event the leaders, if not the rank and file, of both parties have learned during the last fifty years that grossly unfair attacks upon the personal character of a presidential candidate do not pay". Alas, that seems to furnish the only hope that they will be stopped!

---

**I**N *Foreign Affairs*, Mr. H. N. Brailsford considers the outlook for the coming British election. His guess is that May will be the month, because by that time Mr. Winston Churchill will have had a chance to complete the necessary preliminaries. There will be a budget of the sort to dazzle the average middle-class man, while warnings and grumblings from the experts will pass unheeded. The average counts for more than the expert group, on polling day.

Most "candid Englishmen", this critic tells us, are predicting a heavy gain for both Liberalism and Labour. He himself thinks these two parties together will command an absolute majority. Whence, then, the wave of discontent with Mr. Baldwin? If anyone cannot understand it, Mr. Brailsford would suggest a tour of the British industrial areas. Let the enquirer witness "the despair of the mining villages of South Wales, where entire populations are without work or hope". Let him observe "the fall of whole villages in Northumberland or Lanark from relative comfort to the dead level of a bare subsistence". Are these disasters the fault of the present Administration?



At all events, they reached their tragic climax while the present Administration was in power. And is not that reasoning sufficiently rigorous for the hustlings?

It is this tragedy of the unemployed that threatens to turn the Government out. For no one can delude himself longer with the thought that it is but temporary, a "crisis" which will soon be passed. The collapse of British export trade has produced a permanently unemployed population, and there will be no transference of workers from jobs at which they are not needed to jobs elsewhere that need them, except through intervention by the State on a scale which Conservatives refuse to contemplate. Liberalism and Labour are urging "nationalisation" of this and that industry with equal enthusiasm, though in different spheres. Labour, for example, would nationalise mines, at which Liberalism must continue to demur. But Mr. Baldwin continues harking back to a protective tariff as the cure! He has disregarded the report of his own Commission on coal, accepting instead the coal-owners' demand for a lengthened working day—which his Commission decisively rejected. Into the miserable plight of cotton, there has not even been enquiry.

It is plain that one who writes thus has his own mind pretty well made up. Mr. Brailsford, however, while so vigorously anti-Government, does not disclose just how he would himself unite the rather discordant groups of the Opposition—with each of which he sympathises. He seems to expect that Mr. Lloyd George will hold the balance again when the new House meets, and that there will be a "furtive and informal arrangement". The Liberals, he says, are "cursed with a leader so brilliant that no one can ignore him, and so mercurial that no one can trust him". Still, needs must—under certain driving compulsions that we know. It is interesting to observe that Mr. Brailsford expects immense advantage to foreign policy and the stabilising of Europe if Mr. Ramsay MacDonald should again become Foreign Secretary, in place of Sir Austen Chamberlain. In domestic affairs, he remarks, Mr. MacDonald is not inspiring or constructive, but in 1924 he showed brilliant powers in international diplomacy. What a shock a previous generation would have had—at the idea that Labour can surpass Conservatism in the field of foreign affairs! Mr. Brailsford notes, too, that no programme of any party touches the Prayer-Book dispute. Like prohibition, it deters all groups, because nobody knows just what is the popular mind. "If ever Disestablishment comes, it will come by consent, and at the request of the Church".

A BRIGHT and breezy article is that by Mr. F. W. Hirst in the *Contemporary*, about Mr. Bernard Shaw's latest incursion into the economic field. It would be too much to expect that the ex-editor of *The Economist* should let pass that extraordinary volume, *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*. One wonders, by the way, whether Mr. Shaw has correctly calculated the balance of gain and loss in circulation from the choice of such a title. Will more women be attracted or deterred by that word "intelligent"?

On the eve of such a change in the electorate as the addition of some five million women voters must mean, it is well that the novices should have a "Guide" to the chief public issue. Mr. Hirst, however, cannot recommend this one, and can only regret that such literary power should be used to propagate such absurd doctrines. Mr. Shaw, he says, has proclaimed that the whole science of political economy should be turned upside down, and that the one thing to save the social situation is a plan by which everyone in the country—no matter what difference there may be in abilities or performance—should receive precisely the same annual income! "It will be the business of Government to see that he or she never gets more and never gets less, though where it is to come from, and what is the amount of the divisible income of the country, he does not explain". Without a study of the text of Mr. Shaw's book, it would be improper to judge between him and his critic. One must not take the evidence for the accused as stated simply by the prosecuting counsel. But the occasion gave Mr. Hirst a chance to call the roll of economic achievements which his beloved English Liberals (whom Mr. Shaw so dislikes) have to their credit. After profuse acknowledgment of the brilliance with which this unfair attack upon them is conducted, and even after admission that there is an element of value in much of the destructive criticism which Mr. Shaw uses to lead up to his monstrous plan, this valiant Liberal of a bygone day bids us think of the past. Remember the men

who laboured so successfully to reform the franchise, who gave us our system of local government and a first-class Civil Service, who substituted Free Trade for the Corn Laws, who promoted international peace and the reduction of armaments, who instituted a sound and honest system of national finance, and kept the country at peace for forty years, while the wealth and prosperity of all classes were advancing at a rate of progress unprecedented in our history.

## CURRENT MAGAZINES

567

Mr. Shaw, we are told, in his enthusiasm for what he calls "Socialism", has conveniently omitted or obscured or depreciated the work of these heroic individualists. And Mr. Hirst pokes fun at him for his follies. That is what one must admire most in the article. A scientific refutation, on text-book lines, would be commonplace. But what courage must have inspired any man to challenge Mr. Shaw on the plane of humour!

H. L. S.