

any true relationship which will bind the nations in one? The League of Nations, at whose meetings no prayer was ever offered and the name of God rarely mentioned, has been proved ineffective. Can it be that the world-wide Church will prove herself to be the world-community for which the hearts of men yearn? Surely this will never be, while barriers stand between denominations and sections of the Church. It is from India that a great step forward has come, as we shall be hearing later, and yet how much opposition has still to be overcome from Bishops and others. And how much progress will still have to be made even after the South India Scheme is accepted and in operation. It will not affect England at once. The Baptists are in no way included as yet. While the Church, the Body of Christ, wrangles on still divided, it would seem as if the world's opportunity will all too quickly slip by her.

Who is sufficient for these things? Surely God only. The fire of His Spirit alone can burn up the dross in denominationalism until we are fused into one body of purpose and love for our common Lord, though details of practice may continue to differ. He, alone, can bring purity and true fellowship into homes and relationships of men and women. It is Christ, by His Spirit within, Who alone can enable a man to live utterly selflessly for others, so that the Golden Rule becomes a practical proposition. It is Christ alone Who can so tune our lives that we shall love God with all our heart and soul and mind and strength. The Church, with the fire of the Holy Spirit energising her, will alone demonstrate to the world, *that* community for which it is yearning, in which every individual will have his or her true place. The Spirit-filled life is the truly ordered life in which faith and works find their right balance. How necessary then in these critical days when we face the Challenge of Social Righteousness that we take upon our hearts the prayer of the Chinese Church after the Jerusalem Conference: "Lord, revive Thy Church, and begin in me." May God grant it.

The Challenge in Respect to Education.

BY THE REV. H. J. BURGESS, B.A.

WHEN I was invited to give this paper, there was every indication that the new Education Bill expected early this year would be before the House by now. In its absence it is very much more difficult to gauge what scope the national system of education will offer to us in the matter of religion. We may be safe in assuming that in one way or another, the Bill will incorporate the substance of the Archbishops' Five Points, but beyond that assumption it is not safe to go.

I purpose to divide this paper into two main sections:

1. *The General Challenge of Education.* I shall conclude this section by asking the pertinent question—Are we interested?

2. *The Challenge of the Schools.* I had also hoped to add a third section dealing with the Challenge of the Service of Youth and also of Adult Education. But I found that the other two sections would claim so much of the Conference's time that an exposition of the Service of Youth and Adult Education was out of the question. I hope, however, that these subjects may be included in the discussion subsequent to the paper, and will do my best with any questions put to me about them.

I. THE CHALLENGE EXAMINED.

Sir Robert Martin, in his address to the Church Assembly in November, 1942, said :

" There is a very widespread volume of thought about what kind of a country this is going to be when we have disposed of Hitler. . . . Among the subjects for discussion none holds the field to anything like the same degree as education. Never before in the history of this country has there been such a volume of thought and consideration, and of print, about the future of education, what it should mean and what it should not, what it should contain and what it should not, as we are being favoured with at the present time."

Sir Robert then went on to prove his thesis by pointing to the Board of Education's two important Commissions on the training of teachers and on the future of the public schools, and to published statements on educational policy of such diverse bodies as the Association of Directors and Secretaries of Education, the National Union of Teachers, the three political parties, the associations of local government bodies, the Trades Union Council, the Co-operative Movement and the Workers' Educational Association. From which Sir Robert concluded : " Never before has there been such a mass of literature, of speculation and of prophecy on this subject."

In his brilliant book " Education for a World Adrift " Sir Richard Livingstone has pointed out that we are living in an age when more and more a new class, which we compendiously call " the masses " is taking the centre of the political and economic scene, and he shows that it is education which has brought this about, and that only a good education can ensure that the *new* democracy will be a *good* democracy. When the Roman Empire reached the point where the masses dominated the scene, Juvenal wrote, " the once sovereign people has thrown its cares to the winds, limits its ambitions, and only asks anxiously for two things, bread and the games of the Circus." I am not at all sure that we are not in similar danger, for " free trade " to-day means economic satisfaction and " the games of the Circus " the satisfaction of the pleasure craze. If we are to be saved from such an inglorious future we shall have to rely a great deal upon a true system of education. We shall need an educational system which is not finally interested in conveying knowledge but in creating ideals.

Education has consisted too much in teaching *subjects*. There has been (except in the public schools) no integrating factor—no sense of real direction.

Plato knew more than many modern educationists when he wrote, " It is not the life of knowledge, not even if it included all the sciences, that creates happiness and well-being, but a single branch of knowledge—the science of good and evil. . . ." " Without the knowledge of

good and evil, the use and excellence of these sciences will be found to have failed us." Place alongside of Plato, the dictum of Professor Whitehead: "Moral education is impossible without the habitual vision of greatness," and you begin to see the place which true philosophy makes for the Christian religion in education. The "knowledge of good and evil" has its source in the knowledge of God. The "habitual vision of greatness" is given to all those who have seen "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

The Christian religion is then not one of the subjects competing for a place on the time-table of our schools. It is *the* integrating factor which alone can give direction and meaning to our whole educational apparatus. When once that fact is realized, two things become obvious: In the first place it becomes clear how difficult is the problem of establishing a truly Christian educational system. In the second place it becomes clear that we shall be very unwise in drawing any dividing line between education and evangelism. A little while back I was present at a meeting of the Sixth Form Societies of the Public and Secondary Schools now in Devon. The boys and girls had met to discuss the future of education and the second session took the form of a Brains Trust. In answer to a question "What is the aim of education?" Professor Fletcher, who is head of the Education Department at Bristol University, made a number of points, and then summarized his answer in these words. "The aim of all education is to equip human beings for the worship of God." Remember that this was at a purely secular meeting! Remember also what the Scottish catechism says about the true end of man, and you will see that there is no hard and fast dividing line between evangelism and education. Those who reformed our church in the sixteenth century—the men who were the spiritual ancestors of Anglican Evangelicals—were never in danger of drawing any such distinction. "True religion and sound learning" stand as the foundation principles of many of our great schools which date from that period.

The Evangelicals of the eighteenth century certainly knew the value of education as a partner to evangelism. John Wesley's foundation at Kingswood and the subsequent foundation of Dean Close and other evangelical schools demonstrate the attitude of our evangelical forefathers. I question very much whether there is the same practical realization of the value and importance of education among Evangelicals to-day. Was it a mere coincidence that the first public school to close its doors as a result of this war was Weymouth College—one of our few evangelical schools? If it was a coincidence, it is nevertheless an interesting light on evangelical apathy that its passing caused no stir among us, no general move to make secure the schools we still possess. If *we* are blind to our own short-comings, churchmen who are not evangelicals recognize them without difficulty. Canon Woodard writing about the small evangelical membership of the National Society recently, said, "It may be that readers of *The Record* and their friends regard personal and individual conversion as of more importance than education, considered technically, for service of the living Master." I submit that we ought to put equal emphasis on evangelism and education and to regard their co-ordinated use as the best service

we can render to Our Lord.

I turn now to the more specific and practical part of the paper.

II. THE CHALLENGE OF THE SCHOOLS.

Let us begin with the primary or elementary schools, of which there are about 20,000 in the country.

(a) *Church Schools.* There are about 10,000 elementary schools in this country called "non-provided" because the Local Education Authority did not provide them out of public funds. Of those 10,000, 8,500 are Church of England Schools, so that the Church still holds 8,500 out of the 20,000 elementary schools in the country. Our church schools are, in the main, smaller schools—because the church was in the field before the local authorities; so that out of 4,325,000 elementary school children, 1,100,000 attend church schools. The Church of England is thus responsible for nearly half the elementary schools in the country and for over a quarter of the elementary school children. Wherever there is a church school in an Evangelical parish, that school constitutes a challenge in two ways. In the first place, it is a challenge to the incumbent to see that the tone of the school is good, that the Opening and Closing Prayers are productive of real worship, that the Scripture hour is wisely and efficiently used—and not least, that he himself or his curate, does some teaching there. It is a real disgrace that an evangelical vicar should not make his school an institution that counts in the spiritual lives of the children. In the second place, there is the challenge to hold what we have. We have reason to believe that the new Education Act will not abolish the Dual System. But even so, it is not going to be easy to keep our schools. After the war the Local Education Authorities are bound to demand that the standard of our school buildings be raised to meet their ever-rising requirements. But if the National Society's proposals are accepted, it will still remain possible to retain complete control of our church schools if half the cost of improvements can be raised by the church. That will be a real test of our zeal and of our interest.

(b) *Provided Schools.* We do not know how the new Education Act will affect the position but under existing law the Local Education Authority's elementary and senior schools provide us with more limited opportunities of service. If an incumbent is known to be interested in education, he ought to be able to become a manager of the local Senior School, especially if he happens to have a church Junior School contributing children to the Senior School. The Anson Bye-law also offers the opportunity to teach Church children attending the Local Authority's School. In Cornwall we have been able to arrange that the "withdrawn" children can be taught *inside* the school, so I am in the somewhat interesting position of a Senior School Manager teaching a class inside the school!

In secondary education, the incumbent's influence is more limited still, though he can become a governor if he is known to be interested. I was appointed a governor of Bude County School some time after my appointment as manager of the local Senior School. A recent conference of Secondary and Public schools held at Newquay (where the Holt School is stationed for the duration) shewed great sympathy with the suggestion that local clergymen who have the necessary gifts

should be asked to help the teachers in their presentation of the Christian religion to their scholars.

I turn now from the challenge in the parish or locality to the challenge in the diocese. The diocesan body dealing with schools has up to now been called the "Day Schools Committee." In view of the Church Assembly's "Diocesan Education Committee Measure" of March of 1943, it seems likely that the functions of the Day Schools Committee will be taken over by a new Diocesan Education Committee which will also undertake the work of the Diocesan Youth Council. It is very much to be hoped that Evangelicals will see the wisdom of obtaining adequate representation on these Education Committees.

Furthermore, it is apparently the policy of the National Society to urge upon the bishops a speedy appointment of a full-time Director of Education for each diocese. At the moment only 14 dioceses have full time Directors. In the case of Exeter and Truro, the Director holds a residentiary canonry. The opportunities offered by these directorships will be very considerable. In Exeter the Director has a full-time, and a part-time, staff of inspectors working under him, and has been able to co-ordinate the work in the Day Schools and the Sunday Schools with the Diocesan Youth work. In Devon the county requires that Religious Instruction shall be inspected annually in its Council Schools by approved inspectors, invited by the Managers. As a result of the Exeter Diocese having an experienced staff, which has won the confidence of the teachers, the diocesan inspectors visit not only all the Church Schools but also 90% of the Devon Council Schools.

To watch the Exeter Director at work on inspection is to realize how much education can be the handmaid of evangelism. It is very much to be desired that some of the new directorships will be secured by Evangelicals. The qualifications required are not purely scholastic. Ability to handle a class, power to instruct the children in a way which gives the teacher new ideas, ability to secure the teacher's goodwill are all essential to an inspector. The Diocesan Director must be a good inspector. But he must be more. It is his task to establish good relations with the County Secretary for Education and with His Majesty's Inspector—the Board's representative. He must also have considerable administrative powers. The creation of these new posts is a challenge to Evangelicals if they are to exert any influence in the educational structure of the future.

There is one other sphere of which it behoves Evangelicals to take account. I refer to the Teacher Training Colleges. Before the war there were 70 such colleges with a student complement of 9,000. Of the 70 Colleges, 2 were Methodist, 8 Roman Catholic, 29 Church of England, and 31 provided by the Local Authority. Of the 9,000 students 3,000 were in Church of England Colleges. The Board of Education's Commission on the Training of Teachers will doubtless result in a number of desirable changes.

The present overcrowded 2 year course which leads to elementary teaching will almost certainly be extended to 3 years. The present social distinction between secondary school teachers (who stay 4 years and take a degree and diploma) and elementary teachers (who stay only 2 years and take a certificate) will almost certainly disappear.

The raising of the school-leaving age, together with the demand for

paid youth leaders, will mean that 70,000 new teachers will be needed after the war. At this point, I would like to emphasise the wisdom of encouraging keen young Christians in our parishes to consider the opportunities of Christian influence in the teaching profession. We shall be strategically unwise if we think *only* in terms of the ministry of the Church for our keen young men. Teaching can be a vocation from Christ just as much as the ministry or the mission field. The opportunities of the Christian teacher in the realm of religious education will be greatly increased if—as we expect—the Archbishops' Five Points are accepted.

To go back to the Training Colleges : it ought to be clear from what I have already said that when the war is over the Church will be faced with a great opportunity in the training of teachers. Almost certainly she will be called upon to enlarge her existing colleges and to build new ones. The challenge to Evangelicals is clearly what proportion of the Church Colleges are to be under evangelical influence—how many men we shall have qualified to be principals and tutors in these colleges.

If we recognise the tremendous influence which the teacher has on the lives of his scholars, if we realize the almost certain integration of the teaching profession which will remove the present gulf between elementary and secondary teachers, then we dare not neglect the opportunities offered by the church training colleges to give, to those whose life work will be spent among the children, the evangelical faith which can provide a dynamic direction to their life work, and transform "earning a living" into a call from Christ to feed His lambs.

In conclusion I should like to make a practical suggestion. Ought there not to be an Evangelical Schools Committee, representing all shades of evangelical opinion, which would concern itself with organising interest in the maintenance of all evangelical schools—whether public schools or parish schools? Had such a Committee existed, a general appeal might have been launched to save Weymouth College, which was educationally sound and was gradually improving its finances when an unexpected blow occurred. An Evangelical Education Committee could also keep before our parishes the need for Christian teachers, and for men qualified to undertake work as Diocesan Directors, or as members of the Training College staffs. Could it not also work for the foundation of another Evangelical Training College for Teachers? Quite apart from all other considerations, if the proposal to send ordinands in the course of their training for a term to a teacher training college is acted upon, an Evangelical training college would be invaluable to our theological colleges in providing the necessary training. The Committee would also undertake a campaign to persuade Evangelicals to join the National Society, now the formally constituted Council of the Church of England for Religious Education. Despite its great responsibilities and wide powers as the ecclesiastical opposite of the Board of Education the National Society has less than 3,000 members. I understand that the number of Evangelicals among them is extremely small. That is a symptom of our lack of interest in education and of our lack of strategic wisdom. Too often Evangelicals stay outside the church's machinery to criticise, instead of entering it to correct what for us is its mistaken bias. We

are members of the Church of England with Prayer Book and Articles which are loyal to our Reformed faith. Let us not fail—through lack of vision about education—to serve those whom we want to grow up as loyal members of our Protestant and Reformed Church.

The Challenge in Regard to Europe after the War.

BY THE REV. J. PAUL S. R. GIBSON, M.A., F.I.A.

IN this paper we deal with the largely problematical. It may, however, be possible to find some solid ground both as regards Europe as a whole and also as concerns its constituent parts in all their variety of background and immediate political, economic and religious circumstances. Speaking first of Europe as a whole it is well to remember one of the main causes of the present conflict. When aristocratic feudalism gave way to middle class capitalism and industrialism, the pendulum in Europe swung mightily. In England, restrained by various religious forces, it only oscillated. The importance of the Methodist Movement, of the Oxford Movement, of the Christian Socialists, is tremendous. These and other forces together have prevented the full play of *laissez-faire* individualism and have helped to keep the masses, through the parish clergy and ministers, in at least some contact with religion for far longer than across the water. Socialism in England arose from Christian sources and has never become divorced from religion. The gulf between capital and labour, great though it is, has never been impassable, and even to this day labour wishes to work for reform by constitutional means.

In Europe generally the position has been very different. Individualism has run riot and become licence. I shall never forget the utter bewilderment of a Frenchman as we stood by some Cambridge traffic lights and saw the cars all stop when the road was obviously clear. "But why do the cars stop," he said, "There is no policeman." To him self-disciplined obedience for the common good was incomprehensible. He could not appreciate the effect of our public school system for the upper classes, nor the influence in moulding character and inculcating the right use of responsibility, of our various Friendly Societies, for the middle classes, nor the emphasis on personal religion permeating all classes. The gulf between rich and poor is far greater in certain continental countries. Before the war there were 8 suicides a night in Vienna alone, I am told. Religion, though the peoples of Europe are better churchgoers than we are, has tended to be otherworldly. It has not felt the call to social expression of Christianity as we have. This almost became a divisive issue at the Jerusalem World Conference in 1928. Hitler's call to the German Church to keep to its own business and prepare people for heaven was a demand less preposterous to many in that country than it would be to us.