---

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

or perfect, the soul must be thought of as losing itself in adoration, vision, contemplation, and as thus transcending the time-process which is realized only as we do things that other things may be brought about. Religion, therefore, as being concerned with the end of life rather than with the means and process of living, is necessarily opposite to science in subordinating doing to knowing or seeing; it can make no terms with pragmatism. Such has always been the traditional teaching of the Christian Church. 'God *saw* all that He had made, and, behold, it was very good.' And He created man in His own image so that ultimately, in his tiny measure, man might share the vision. The vision of God and of the world in God has constantly been placed before the Christian soul as the highest and farthest goal of its aspiration. It is a very unfashionable doctrine nowadays to make contemplation the end of action. It is inevitable that this should be so in a scientific age, which is characteristically interested in mechanism and process, and finds the very notion of finality repugnant. But religion, while it confesses that we are pilgrims and sojourners here below, resolutely rejects the veiled scepticism of the doctrine that 'it is better to travel hopefully than to arrive.' All St. Paul's deepest and loftiest prayers are directed to asking that his converts may know fully and understand the love of God in Christ; and St. John speaks of the final heaven as that world in which 'we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.' Here on earth we have faith, not vision, to live by; and faith, being 'the substance of things hoped for,' is necessarily temporal, directing our forward journey towards that which we see not yet. For faith, action comes before knowledge in the immediate order of importance. And yet ultimately even this world can only be changed and recreated in the heavenly image by those who believe that the God of love is the eternal truth of the universe, and that the goal of all endeavour is that He should be fully manifested and expressed in all. It is the longing to see Him as He is, which is the religious, and therefore the most real, motive for abolishing slums. If this be so, we must record our agreement with A. E. Taylor, K. E. Kirk, and the upholders of the Platonic tradition in Christian theology, against brilliant modernist writers, like Macmurray, who, in appearing to reject the distinction between theory and practice, comes perilously near to a pragmatism which destroys the meaning of truth.[1]

There will always inevitably be tension and opposition between the activities of religion and of science. Science will always be throwing fresh light on the mechanisn of the world; and its discoveries will constantly be hard to harmonize with the religious interpretation of the whole. The more science analyses the parts, the more difficult it will be perhaps to fit them altogether again in any intelligible unity. Yet it is by loyally facing and grappling with the difficulties that religion really learns the truth of God, and verifies the faith that all things work together for good for them that love Him.

[1] See his *Freedom in the Modern World* (Faber), and his essay in *Adventure*, ed. by Streeter (Macmillan).

# Missionary Problems of Today.

## II.

## Swaraj in the Mission Field.

By Professor the Reverend J. F. McFadyen, D.D., Nagpur.

In the early days of a Mission the missionary regards it as his chief work to try to win individual converts. At this stage he has one function only, that of a missionary. Soon he will associate some of his converts with himself in his missionary activities. If these are devoting the whole of their time to the work, they will receive a salary. Sometimes there is a secondary reason for engaging them, namely, to provide work for those whose Christian profession has excluded them from the ordinary means of earning a livelihood. Thus the missionary takes on a second function, that of an employer and paymaster. From the beginning the missionary and the converts will worship together;

when there is a reasonable number of Christians they will be formed into a congregation or *ecclesiola*. The missionary now assumes a third function, that of pastor of a congregation. At this stage, whatever form of church government may be adopted, or whatever designation may be given to the missionary, he is, for all practical purposes, a bishop, with or without clergy. The time that may elapse before one or more of the converts may be ordained to the pastorate will vary according to the local circumstances.

In the meantime other missionaries of the same denomination or of other denominations are at work in the same district or the same country; other congregations are being formed and other pastors ordained. Unless the missionary is one who adopts the congregational polity, he will wish to see his congregation or congregations organically related to a larger body of Christians. Historically the plan adopted was to make them part of the foreign church from which the missionary came. It is easy, looking back after the lapse of a long period, to criticise this policy; but at the time, with only tiny bodies of Christians scattered through a large country, with communications exceedingly difficult or non-existent, with denominational feeling running high and national sentiment much less strongly developed than it is now, it must have seemed the obvious policy.

During this stage a fourth development took place, the rise of missionary institutions. It was discovered that, while preaching was one method of conducting missionary propaganda, it was often a very unsatisfactory method; its chief weakness being the lack of a continuous impression and of systematic instruction. Humanitarian motives were also at work, the ignorance of the people calling for schools, and their sufferings and diseases appealing for hospitals and dispensaries. If the children of converts were to receive a Christian education, very often the only means of securing this was that the Mission should undertake the work. Further, it is difficult for a small community, especially if the educational standard is not high, to rise far above the moral and spiritual level of their neighbours. It was important that, besides aiming at the conversion of individuals, the Mission should seek to Christianize the social life of the community, their ideals, their customs, their standards, their whole outlook. For one reason or another, as time went on, hospitals and dispensaries, schools and colleges, hostels and boarding-schools for boys and for girls, institutions for training teachers, for training preachers and ministers, for training industrial workers, orphanages, leper asylums, institutions for social work, and a printing press, became in greater or less degree an essential part of the equipment of Missions (though not all of each Mission). Thus the missionary assumed a fourth function, that of the head of an institution. Not all missionaries, of course, exercised all four functions, though some did.

Thus at the beginning of this century, speaking generally, the position was that Christian propaganda in non-Christian countries was entirely controlled by the foreign missionaries, working with the aid of native Christians whom they appointed and paid from Western funds; and that, while a certain degree of church organisation had been reached on the mission field, the ecclesiastical connexion was with churches in the West.

From the beginning the motto adopted by the Student Volunteer Missionary Union, 'The Evangelization of the World in this Generation' was the subject of criticism; but perhaps the most fundamental objection to which it was liable was that it envisaged the evangelization of the world as the work of foreign missionaries. Even yet, it is by no means generally realized that the work of the foreign mission is to plant a seed, not to develop a full-grown tree. If the seed has life in itself, then it will grow, as it has grown in the countries of Europe. As long ago as 1851 Henry Venn foresaw the time when missionaries would be able to resign their pastoral work into the hands of native pastors, when the *euthanasia* of the mission would take place, and the missionary and his agencies be transferred to the 'regions beyond.'

About the beginning of this century it was recognized as anomalous that large bodies of Christians, especially in the Orient, should be members of churches in countries which they had never seen and were never likely to see. This century has been the period of the foundation of indigenous churches in the Mission field. A generation ago, most of the Presbyterian churches in India united to form one Indian Presbyterian Church; though, not long afterwards, the Southern section left this union to take part in a much larger union which affected South India only, a union on a much broader basis. The scheme for the proposed Union of the South India United Church, the Wesleyan Church, and the Anglican Church has attracted wide attention, and the negotiations are proceeding amicably if slowly. There is also a scheme on foot, probably not to be based, like the South Indian scheme, on the 'historic episcopate,' for a union between the North India United Church

(a union of Presbyterians and Congregationalists), the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Baptists, and possibly the Disciples of Christ, the Friends, and the Anglicans. The 1932 decennial survey of the *International Review of Missions* states that 'the desire for church union found expression in the formation of the Church of Christ in China, in 1927, from some fourteen missions and Churches, chiefly Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist. To-day this Church comprises from one quarter to one-third of the total Protestant Christian community.' In Japan, while something has been accomplished, progress towards church union has been 'disappointingly slow.'

In those cases where the severance of the mission church from the home church involved the stoppage of pecuniary help, it seems to have been a case of putting the cart before the horse. Surely the wise policy would have been to continue for a time to supply funds which would have made possible the appointment of native pastors with some education who might have gradually led their congregations to financial independence, rather than to condemn congregations to the stagnation that arises when the pastor has no capacity for leadership.

One powerful influence at work during the last generation in the churches in mission lands has been the unwillingness of Christian nationals to have imposed upon them systems of theology and forms of church government which their ancestors had no part in framing, and which may not accord with the national genius. Most of these churches have not yet had time or opportunity to develop their own dissensions, and the formation of a national, all-embracing Christian Church seems to many of them easier than it is. Yet we must not assume that the desire for such a Church, at least at this stage, is universal. Thus in 1921 the Christo-Samaj (Christian Union) of India presented a memorandum to Mr. J. H. Oldham in which they expressed their entire disapproval of the proposal 'for the formation of a centralized single ecclesiastical organization comprehending the entire Christian community.' They were afraid it would mean the continuation of close organization and costly institutions, the perpetuation of administrative and financial dependence on foreign missions, and the replacement of the white bureaucracy by a brown bureaucracy.' The 'one church' ideal has many votaries nevertheless.

The missionary, no less than the political, world is increasingly dominated by the nationalist obsession; and this fact has to be kept in mind throughout the entire discussion. One has heard an educated Indian Christian say, in an audience composed chiefly of Hindus, that he hoped the day would come when they would meet, not as Hindus and Muhammadans and Christians, but simply as Indians. The Apostle Paul seems to have been more anxious that his converts in Corinth should be good Christians than that they should be good Greeks; but tremendous emphasis is now placed on nationality, not only by native Christians, but even by missionaries and by Mission Boards. It is regarded as a very serious matter to have a missionary institution that may be described as 'foreign,' or to be accused of 'denationalizing' the natives. One would hope the day will come when the present state of things, curiously reminiscent of the 'foreign devil' psychology, will pass and people of different nationalities will be able to work together simply as Christians. The regime in which we defer to and even encourage nationalist sentiment is at least an advance on the earlier stage in which the European and American, simply on account of their white faces, had almost a monopoly of privilege and power.

Almost from the beginning, then, there were the two institutions, the Mission and the Church; but till the end of the nineteenth century, the relations between them could hardly be said to constitute a problem. The native churches, while never losing sight of the duty of evangelizing the people in their neighbourhood, were regarded, and regarded themselves, as mainly responsible for fostering the spiritual life of their own members. The propaganda work was mainly the concern of the Missions, with their elaborate and often expensive institutions. As the twentieth century advanced, grave dissatisfaction developed with the position that had been established.

On the one hand, the missionaries felt that while the day of their withdrawal from the mission field was hardly anywhere in sight, yet it was part of their business to furnish native Christian leaders with opportunities for acquiring the experience and administrative capacity that would enable the Church ultimately to undertake the work formerly done by the Mission. On the other hand, the members of the new churches realized that it was at once their duty and their privilege to carry the gospel to their own countrymen; and that they could not, without loss of self-respect, continue to allow that duty to be discharged almost entirely by men and women from other lands. More than a quarter century ago, Indian Christians founded the National Missionary Society for the evangelization of their countrymen; and to that and similar

societies in the year 1931 they contributed about £18,000. There were various other ways in which the Indian churches might have taken a large and important part in the evangelization of India, quite apart from the work done by Missions; but what the Christians wanted, at least in the intellectually more advanced countries, was the end of the sharp separation between Mission and Church.

As a matter of fact, there was something to be said for this separation, at least in a country like India in which there was British rule and the white man's prestige was high. The Mission was a temporary and foreign institution; the Church was permanent and indigenous. There was urgent need that the Church, its organizations, and its officials should take a higher place in the respect and affection of the Christians. But so long as membership and office in the Mission Councils with their prestige were open to Indians, there was grave fear that the Indian goal would be position in the Mission Council rather than in the Church. That fear has proved to be by no means unfounded. But all over the East the continued separation of Mission and Church was regarded as a product of race feeling, and in large measure the point has been yielded.

If the wall of partition between Church and Mission had to be broken down, what, then, were to be the relations between them? Where there is a strong indigenous Church, deeply imbued with Christian ideals, and with a fair number of educated and level-headed leaders, perhaps the ideal is that the Mission should, as far as possible, be merged in the Church. This plan seems to have worked well, so far, in Manchuria for example, the missionaries there receiving their locations from the Chinese Church. For a long time past in the American Methodist Episcopal Church Missions, there has been, in theory at least, no vital separation between Church and Mission. But most Missions have not found themselves in a position to take a step so far-reaching; and for the last dozen years attention has, for the most part, been concentrated on schemes of Devolution—the gradual transference of control from the Mission to the indigenous Church, involving incidentally the training of native leaders for the new responsibilities. In 1922, for example, 'the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions passed over all its evangelistic work to a Japanese Church Board, on which were only four missionary representatives.' In January 1930 'the (Egyptian) Church took over from the C.M.S. its literary, social, and evangelistic work.' 'The various Anglican Missions working in India, though rapidly being merged in these Diocesan Councils' (1928), 'co-operate in the work of the Church by placing at the disposal of the Diocesan Councils, which have a predominant Indian membership, their contributions in men and money.' These statements may be taken as typical of the new spirit. India has now, in the Anglican Church, an Indian bishop and an Indian assistant bishop, while there is an Indian bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Christian nationals have also a very large representation on the National Missionary Councils which have been established almost everywhere during the last decade and which are rapidly acquiring prestige and influence.

There has been much discussion of the financial aspect of Devolution Schemes. Church members in the West were willing to allow the missionaries of their own Church to have the disbursal of the money they raised for foreign missions. It was doubted whether they would be equally willing to leave the disposal of these funds in the hands of members of the Church of another country. The question does not seem anywhere to have arisen in an acute form. For one thing, it may be assumed that the Missions have everywhere reserved sufficient representation on the new Boards to be accurately informed of the way in which the money that comes from home is being used. As for the general principle, there is in Western countries a very large number of parishes which could not by themselves have supported a minister, and which feel it no indignity to receive financial support for the purpose from the State, or from stronger churches in other parts of their own land. May we not extend the principle? The Mission churches are asking this financial aid, or at least receiving this financial aid, not for the support of their own pastors, but to help in bringing the gospel to their countrymen.

A matter of great importance is the way in which the grant from the home Church to the native Church is fixed. It would be very easy to give the grant in a way which would not bring home to the nationals their responsibility, and would not stimulate the liberality of the indigenous Church. A plan which has found much favour is the 'block' grant progressively diminishing. Ultimately, however, the sense of responsibility felt by the members of any Church for the welfare of their countrymen, and their willingness to work, to sacrifice and to give that the reign of Christ may spread, will not depend on regulations made by any Board in their own land or in another

land. As was pointed out long ago, swaraj is a thing of the spirit, and the ultimate test of its worth is the contribution it makes to the understanding of the Christ, and to the winning of the world for Him.

The transference of responsibility from the home churches to the indigenous churches has been a comparatively simple matter in connexion with some branches of the work, such as bazaar preaching and primary schools. The chief questions which await solution in that department are financial. What period of time must elapse before the indigenous churches are able and willing to provide the whole of the funds required? If that period seems likely to be lengthy, how long will the churches of the West be willing to finance work which they only in a very minor degree control? These are questions which only the future can answer.

The institutions such as Arts and Science Colleges, Training Colleges, Theological Colleges, High Schools, Hostels, and Hospitals, will present a bigger problem, with regard alike to administration, personnel, and finance. The Lindsay Commission has made proposals for giving Indians a much larger share in the government of the Mission Colleges in India than has been customary hitherto; but at the speed at which things are moving, there seems good reason to hope that, within a measurable time, at least in the more advanced countries, Christian nationals will be able to undertake a very large share both of the work and of the administration. There is already in India (at Alwaye) a College conducted entirely by Indian Christians. Finance may prove a stiffer problem; but, curiously enough, in some of these large institutions, the financial difficulty may turn out to be more easily soluble than would appear on a superficial view. Fees and Government grants bring in so large an income that even now a very expensive college may make no demand on the Home Board except for the salaries of the foreign staff, and for only a portion even of that amount. The same is true of hospital work. If Christian nationals of adequate attainments can be found, as doubtless they can, who will be content with a subsistence allowance, in some cases at least the question of funds need present no insuperable obstacle to the transference of these institutions also. Further, we have to keep in mind the point of view presented by the Indian Christo-Samaj. When the young churches develop a fuller self-consciousness, they may favour quite different methods of spreading the gospel from those used by the Western churches with their passion for organization. Even if they do not disapprove of institutions as a missionary method, they may decide that these have had their day. In so far as Hospitals, Schools, and Colleges exist for the benefit of the Christian communities, there is even now in many cases the option of Government institutions not intended primarily for Christians. It will be for the indigenous churches to say how far these meet their needs.

Speculation on the future development of the new churches, and especially of these churches as agencies for the spread of the gospel, is not at this stage very profitable. The story of the past generation contains much that is reassuring; and with the mutual good-will that is being displayed, and the readiness which missionaries are almost everywhere showing to surrender for the good of the Church power and privileges which they have long held, there is good reason to look forward with hope and confidence to the developments that will take place in the new and most interesting era in the history of Missions on which we have already entered.

# Literature.

## *WHITHER ISLAM?*

ALIKE for political and religious reasons, the movements that are taking place to-day in Islamic countries cannot fail to be of the profoundest interest to any one who bestows any thought on the immediate or the remoter future of the world. To clarify the situation, Professor H. A. R. Gibb, of London, has issued a book with the above title (Gollancz; 15s. net), which consists of four contributions to the problem from writers, all of whom speak with authority, and two masterly essays by Professor Gibb himself. Professor Massignon, of Paris, writes on Africa (excluding Egypt), Professor Kampffmeyer on Egypt and Western Asia, Lieut.-Col. Ferrar on India, and Professor C. C. Berg on Indonesia.

There is a real solidarity of culture and tradition