


THE DISCIPLES DIVINITY HOUSE
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



HERBERT LOCKWOOD WILLETT
LIBRARY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
CARLI: Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois







"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

The Editor's Notes:

The Reality of Discord—The Method of Conference—Division a Denial of Christian Idealism—Seriously Facing Divisions—The Passing of Robert H. Gardiner

Denominational Education	WILLIAM WESTLEY GUTH
The Unanswered Prayer of Our Lord	FREDERICK D. KERSHNER
Christian Unity — A Survey	W. ROBINSON
Religion and the Christian Church	FREDERICK F. KRAMER
Christian Unity	W. I. T. HOOVER
The Hope of Christian Unity	L. W. McCREARY
George Calixtus	MATTHEW SPINKA

What People and Papers are Saying About Unity

Is Reordination the Only Obstacle to Reunion?—An Irish Bishop on Anglican Reunion—The Roman Catholic Church on Unity—Unity Along Spiritual Lines—A World Association of Churches—Church Union in Canada—The Will to Fellowship—The Way of Hope—The Discussion of Doctrinal Differences—What Kind of Union?—The Reasons for Broken Unity Exist no Longer

Letters to the Editor

The Present Status of Unity in the East — Fellowship for Christian Unity

Book Reviews

Catholic and Protestant Elements in Christianity, etc.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

504 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York

Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

Olliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4; 190, Princes Street, Edinburgh

CONTENTS

JULY, 1924

VOL. XIV

No. 1

<i>THE EDITOR'S NOTES</i>	5
<i>DENOMINATIONAL EDUCA- TION</i> WILLIAM WESTLEY GUTH	12
<i>THE UNANSWERED PRAYER OF OUR LORD</i>FREDERICK D. KERSHNER	26
<i>CHRISTIAN UNITY—A SURVEY</i>W. ROBINSON	35
<i>RELIGION AND THE CHRIS- TIAN CHURCH</i>FREDERICK F. KRAMER	41
<i>CHRISTIAN UNITY</i>W. I. T. HOOVER	52
<i>THE HOPE OF CHRISTIAN UNITY</i> ..L. W. McCREARY	58
<i>GEORGE CALIXTUS</i>MATTHEW SPINKA	67
<i>WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY</i>	80
<i>LETTERS TO THE EDITOR</i>	101
<i>BOOK REVIEWS</i>	106

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is seventy-five cents a single copy, or two dollars and fifty cents a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion contributing annually \$5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive two copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copy to some designated person or institution.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md.

BL
1

IT MAY BE THAT SOME DAY THE
CHURCH WILL BE SUDDENLY CAUGHT
OF SOME PASSIONATE, BURNING EN-
THUSIASM FOR CHRIST AND HIS
KINGDOM AND SUDDENLY FIND IT-
SELF ONE WHERE IN VAIN IT HAD
TRIED TO MAKE ITSELF ONE.

—FREDERICK LYNCH.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

JULY, 1924

THE EDITOR'S NOTES

The Reality of Discord

DISCORD in the Church of God is a reality which must be faced, not merely by a few leaders here and there, but by the membership of the whole Church. A few cannot solve this problem. It must be done by the many—not simply by majorities, but by a voice from all. Not until the reality of discord has a place in the thought of all Christendom can discord be removed. It is not merely a theological question. If it were, it would be hopeless. Canon Streeter well says:—

Theology must always be for the few, and even for those few it can only represent one aspect of the soul's life. This has always been recognized by Christians; but in the present age it is especially necessary to emphasize more strongly than ever that the center of gravity of Christianity does not lie in theology. For, whether we may regret it or not, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the traditional Christian theology has lost the prestige, which it enjoyed in earlier ages through its acceptance, practically without question, by the leaders of human thought. This no longer holds good; and although individual thinkers may for their own part give their adherence either to the traditional theology or to some particular restatement, adaptation, or modification of it, it is impossible for them to close their eyes to the fact that others, equally qualified to hold and express an opinion, think very differently. It may well be that the present situation is transitional, and that in the course of time, perhaps in a generation or two, perhaps after many generations, a theology commanding general acceptance will be again evolved. But so long as there is no greater agreement than at present obtains among historical critics or philosophical theologians, it would seem that any one who builds his faith primarily on their conclusions, cannot be without apprehensions that he is building his house upon the sand.*

* *Restatement and Reunion.* By Burnett Hillman Streeter. Macmillan & Co., London.

But in facing the reality of discord in the Church of Christ, we are at once face to face with a religious problem. Our approaches and conclusions lie in the field of religion. Its basis is the fact of Jesus Christ, whose expressions are in those great terms—fellowship, brotherhood, love! Modern Christianity has failed in its ability to interpret these terms to an unbelieving world. This is the fact we are facing. It cannot be dodged nor treated lightly. There is enough freedom to-day in the Church through which the Holy Spirit may function, if that freedom will give itself, without reservation, to the one task of the removal of discord. There are many Christian unity organizations. If these would be willing to combine their interests in sending forth groups of evangelists with the one purpose of removing discord, it would do more than any other one thing. Is there no possibility of this being done in this generation?

The Method of Conference

Religious controversy has played havoc with the Church, especially with the Protestant section, where almost every theological opinion has culminated into a separate denomination. Thomas Campbell of the Seceder Presbyterian Church was a prophet of the new order of adjusting differences by conference rather than by controversy. In his *Declaration and Address* he pleaded for the method of conference and prayer. This was the method of Jesus and is now and eternally the method for unity. It was unfortunate that this movement broke with the Presbyterian Church, in which it was so deeply rooted. It became a separate body, taking the name "Disciples of Christ." They had the right start, but they got on the wrong road. They abandoned the method of conference and adopted the method of controversy in public debate and in the press. While they grew rapidly and are now the largest Christian communion in America that had its origin here, numbering a million and a half, nevertheless, had they held to their original policy of conference and prayer, they would have numbered five to ten times what they do now and would have been a real factor in the unity of American Christianity.

Controversy, however, not only isolated them from other communions, but reacted disastrously among themselves. Later they divided over missionary methods and instrumental music in their churches, those dissenting churches now numbering more than 300,000 members and taking the name "Church of Christ." Information now comes that another division is on the way, some churches dissenting from the spelling of "Disciple" with a capital "D" and some secondary matters of missionary methods. These are taking the name "Free Church of Christ." As ridiculous and scandalous as all this is, it is not without its value as an illustration of how unity cannot be attained, and students of church history are observing it from this angle.

It must be said though that, for several decades, the Disciples have been gradually getting back to the original method upon which they started, namely, that of conference. Dr. J. H. Garrison was one of the leading voices for this better interpretation, and there are now multitudes of Disciples who have no confidence whatever in the controversial method. Out of this atmosphere for a return to the method of conference and prayer the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity had its beginning in 1910, being a revival of Thomas Campbell's Christian Association of 1804. It has functioned modestly in this field as opportunity has offered.

But the World Conference on Faith and Order has the place of leadership in the method of conference. It had its origin in the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1910. It has been gradually going forward, gaining confidence year by year, until to-day it holds the co-operation of all Christendom, except the Roman Catholic Church. The co-operation later of this ancient church is a possibility. Conferences have been held in America, in Europe, and in Australia. A most outstanding conference was held at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1920, and now a still larger conference is looked forward to in 1927, perhaps in Jerusalem. Mr. Robert H. Gardiner has been the secretary of this movement from its start. His fidelity, patience, wisdom, and faith have been great factors in bringing the World Conference to where

it is. Bishop Charles H. Brent, whose voice, out of the experiences of the Edinburgh Missionary Conference, was a large factor in bringing the World Conference into being, is the chairman. His vision, passion, and freedom have been felt in its guidance. Aside from the benefits of the conferences that have been held, the very fact that the World Conference on Faith and Order exists is both a reminder and a challenge to Christendom. The Church of Christ is divided; the method for the healing of its division is by conference and prayer. When the Church has united upon this method, there is no power in the world that can keep back the unity of Christendom.

The Christian Unity Foundation of New York is another American movement that had its origin in the Protestant Episcopal Church. It emphasizes conference and research and its work has been of exceptionally fine character. It is now interdenominational and for several years it has conducted an annual Christian unity lectureship. The conference method has also a place in Christian unity movements in other countries. It has a permanent place in the thought of all Christian unity approaches.

Division a Denial of Christian Idealism.

The ideal of Christ was oneness among his followers. The very fact of a divided Church is a denial of this ideal. Paul maintained that dividing the followers of Christ into party groups under the names of Paul, Apollos, Cephas, and Christ was a worldly and unspiritual condition. The divided Church not only denies Paul's ideal, but proudly does the very thing that the Apostle said should not be done. Here are the names—Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Protestant Episcopal, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, Congregational, Christian, Disciple of Christ, etc., each with its party organization, party schools, and party journals, and each condemned by the Apostle in language that cannot possibly be misunderstood. If the followers of Christ had sought to duplicate the condition at Corinth, they could not have done it more accurately than has been done by the present day parties.

But a distinguished minister writes that it is entirely wrong to take such a position and that Paul was wrong and should not have said what he did, because division is a most healthy condition for the Church. Doubtless there are some things in which Paul was wrong, but he could not have been wrong on the point at issue, because it is not only in conformity with the ideal of Jesus, but also with every principle of reason and science. Imagine, if you can, the following excerpt from the lost letter of Paul to the Corinthians—III Corinthians 1:1-8:—

Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God unto the churches of God which are in Corinth. Grace and peace from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ, who rejoices in your fidelity to denominational loyalties and party rivalries, which are the motives of service; and I beseech you to be true to the different interpretations as expressed in the terms now so popularly used among you, such as "Paul," "Apollos," "Cephas," and "Christ," and may it please God our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ that other parties may appear, taking the names of "Thomas," "Matthew," "Timothy," and all the apostles and evangelists.

I thank my God always for you who have taken my name because you have the true interpretation, even though those who have taken the name of "Apollos" and "Cephas" and "Christ" have some truth among them, but no one of those parties has the whole truth as you have, to which I beseech you to hold fast till I come, and do not enter into any compromise with those who have taken the names of Apollos and Cephas and Christ. They are really sectarians and should be referred to as the sects. Do not receive them at the Lord's Table or into your membership. Keep yourselves pure by holding the traditions that I delivered unto you and wear my name in the remembrance of what I have done for you.

There are three things about this exhumed excerpt that involve its invalidity. First, if Paul had been its author, he could not have been the author of any other epistle in the New Testament; secondly, if the group of church Fathers who formed the New Testament canon had admitted it into the canonical Scriptures, it would have indicated not only their incompetency, but insanity; and, thirdly, if the principles laid down in this excerpt had been the principles of Christianity of the first century, it would have perished with the religion of Diana and

Jupiter, even though its interpretation had to do with a crucified and risen Christ.

Seriously Facing Divisions

Our difficulty is in not seriously facing a divided Christendom. Do Christians want unity? Is denominationalism satisfactory to the modern mind? Are Christians more absorbed in their denominational programmes than in unifying the denominations for the winning of the world to Christ? Can a divided Church win the world to Christ? Is unity or division the law of God? Does division lower spirituality? Is the Holy Spirit free in its work in a divided Church? Was it in the dream of Jesus that a divided Church represented his mind? Is division in the Church of Christ a sin? Are Christians more proud of their parties than penitent for their divisions? These and many other questions crowd the mind as one looks out upon a divided Church in its incompetency in ministering to a heart-sick world.

The Church has piety, education, money, but it has not power. It will not get power by all in the Methodist family getting together, or all in the Baptist family getting together, or all in the Presbyterian family getting together, or all in the Episcopal family getting together, or all in the Disciple family getting together. These unifications will help. But there must be a unity of the life of the whole Church of God based upon the fact of Jesus Christ and the reality of a spiritual experience of brotherhood, whose influence upon the world will convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. The only possibility of Jesus' method of living lies in a united Christendom.

There are many plans for unity, but the need of these times is a spirit for unity. Until there is some sense of penitence there will hardly be a spirit. Is it out of place to talk about the Man of Sorrows? Can the world ever be lifted up to the Saviour without the sorrow of Jesus finding lodgment in the hearts of his disciples? Is not this the approach—the only approach of Christian discipleship—for a redeemed world?

The Passing of Robert H. Gardiner

As this journal goes to press a telegram comes from Boston announcing the peaceful passing from us of Mr. Robert H. Gardiner on the morning of June 15th. This announcement will bring real sorrow to many in the various Christian communions in all parts of the world. A lawyer by profession, he held important positions of trust in directorates and trusteeships in financial and educational affairs, besides responsibilities in the general work of the Protestant Episcopal Church, especially since 1904; but his greatest contribution was as secretary of the World Conference on Faith and Order, in which he showed a remarkably fine statesmanship. By his gentleness, patience, and devotion he made friends for himself and the cause of a united Christendom wherever his name has gone. A real prophet has passed from us.

His passion for unity and his faith in its achievement heartened many who were looking for guidance. He gave freely of his time and his money for this cause. Once, in a group of friends, he remarked: "I have advanced nearly \$10,000, but it will come back, for the Church is bound to wake up to the necessity of a united Christendom." Because of his unstinted fidelity, he carried forward the idea of the World Conference on Faith and Order beyond that of any other spokesman. He was a man of real life and carried constantly upon his heart the burden of the necessity of a united Church.

Sometimes amid discouraging results and inexcusable apathy, his wonderfully tender heart revealed itself in its confidence and trust that God would lead us out of our sectarian entanglements. As it appears now, his passing is as great a loss as could possibly come to the World Conference and the ideals for which it stands. He will ever be remembered as one of the Lord's noblemen, and we must now look for another to carry forward the work that has been so nobly begun. Men come and go, but the great work of healing a divided Church must go on until the dream of Jesus is realized in the souls of all who adore Him as Lord and Saviour.

PETER AINSLIE.

DENOMINATIONAL EDUCATION

BY WILLIAM WESTLEY GUTH, PH. D., LL. D.

President of Goucher College, Baltimore, Maryland

A SHARP distinction should be made between denominational education and Christian education. It is assumed by many that the two terms are synonymous; that a Christian education can be secured only in a church school. And many assume, also, that the education offered in the State or privately endowed institution is non-Christian, if not anti-Christian. If this is so, which I do not believe, then the first duty of the Church is to see that the condition is changed. The State and privately endowed institutions belong as much to the Church as they do to the State. They are as much a part of the endeavour and effort to Christianize as any other field in American or world civilization. If the State and privately endowed universities are not doing their part to make religion a dominant factor in our national life, are the churches entirely blameless? And if the assumption is warranted that these institutions offer only a "secular" education, is it the part of wisdom to let them go their way unmolested, and to seek to stem the tide by the organization and maintenance of a vast number of so-called "church schools," the total force of which, either in plant, endowment, or efficiency, could never weaken that of the State or privately endowed institutions, nor their resources rival those of the State, or of individuals interested in non-sectarian education?

The argument of the advocates of the denominational school always turns, in one way or another, upon the fact that in the beginning education in our country was aimed at religion, in a word, was directed toward the raising up of Christian ministers. This argument takes rise in the well-known statement *From First Fruits of New England*, which runs as follows:-

After God had carried us safe to New England and we had builded our houses, provided necessaries for our livelihood, reared convenient places for God's worship, and settled the Civil Government, one of the next things we longed for and looked after was to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity, dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to the churches when our present ministers shall be in the dust.

The one purpose of the Puritans in fleeing to this country was to find a place where they could worship God in their peculiar way, unhampered by State or by other church restrictions. They came to found a Church, not a State. And it was natural that their educational endeavours should be set for the perpetuation of the Church and religion, than that they be fitted into the wider needs of the State.

After our national Independence had been secured and our Government was well on its way, Congress delivered itself of an opinion that gives us a wider and more reasonable ground for our educational efforts than the statement of the Puritan fathers. In the preamble of the famous Act of 1787, providing for the government of the Northwest Territory, appears this sentence: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and means of education shall be forever encouraged." And for this purpose the Government set aside certain portions of the public domain. If religion and morality in our country are not being secured in connection with knowledge, whose fault is it? And to correct the evil, if such exists, shall we hark back to 1620, or hold to the foundation principle in matters of education as set forth in the Act of 1787?

In addition to the assumptions already mentioned, there is another that unconsciously finds its way into the argument for the church school, namely, that religious education is a department of education in general. "Too frequently religious education has been regarded as a thing apart. Rather is it the natural and logical conclusion of all education, just as religion is the natural and complete expression of man's being" (Horne). "Religion, instead of being a department of education, is an implicit motive thereof. It is the end that presides over the beginning and gives unity to all stages of the process" (Coe). The

term "religious education" is a misnomer. As well might one speak of "scientific science," or "mathematical mathematics."

If the churches would bend their efforts, in a broadminded and catholic spirit, to see to it that education in our country be not a partial but a complete endeavour, rightly rooted and grounded in religion and morality, instead of establishing and vainly seeking to maintain a vast number of nondescript colleges and "universities," education, no doubt, would be a more vital factor in the churches. The State universities and the large privately endowed institutions, to which the students flock, will gladly accept aid from the churches to better the religious conditions at these places of learning.

Woodrow Wilson said: "Scholarship has usually been more fruitful when associated with religion, and scholarship has never, so far as I can recall, been associated with any religion except the religion of Jesus Christ." But the religion so general as the religion of Jesus Christ—the universal religion—cannot be confined in the realm of education to any one particular sect or denomination. "Let the college be as Christian as it may please, but let its fate be determined by itself and not by any religious body, which of necessity looks upon the educational problem with different eyes" (Ross). In spite of all that denominationalists say about their educational efforts being general in scope and not confined to their particular sect, evidence to the contrary abounds. Not all are as frank as the president of a church school who said that "the purpose of the colleges of Methodism" is to see that students in Methodist schools "have full opportunity for such equipment of mind, body, and soul, as will fit them to do their full part, not only as citizens, but as Christian men and women, *and especially as Methodists* [italics mine], in the programme of Christ's Kingdom." But all denominationalists, however they veil their phrases, let their meaning show through. And the "especially as Methodists" finds its echo in the *especially* as Baptists, or as Lutherans, or as Presbyterians. I had abundant opportunity for testing the truth of this statement as a member, for a number of years, of the Commissions for the accrediting of

higher institutions of learning in two of the regional associations of schools and colleges in our country.

The denominational ostrich attempts to conceal his body by hiding his head in the sand under the phrase "denominational, but not sectarian." In educational usage these two words have the same meaning. I once listened to a long argument by an ecclesiast, who attempted by a display of oratory to show that "denominational" and "sectarian" had widely different meanings. But he succeeded only in expressing the wish that is father to the thought. For five years I was president of a denominational institution that printed this phrase, "denominational, but not sectarian," in its catalogue. The statement was not true. I remonstrated to the use of the phrase without effect. The institution was rigidly controlled by the church, and the particular policies and precepts of the denomination were an essential part of its life. The term "non-sectarian" was used simply as a bait to secure non-Methodist students. And this is the case with other denominational schools. They are sectarian simply because they are denominational, and as long as they remain the one, they will be the other. It is customary in our country to list institutions of higher learning under two headings only: "sectarian" and "non-sectarian." The sectarian institutions are those under the control of or in close affiliation with a religious body—Protestant, Jewish, or Catholic; the non-sectarian—the State or privately endowed institutions. A religious body that undertakes to put its schools and colleges under its control cannot escape the charge that it thereby sectarianizes them.

The word "denomination" was first used to designate "one of the bodies separated from the church. The sects: applied to the various bodies of dissenters by Roman Catholics to all forms of Protestantism". (Murray). Murray also defines "sectarian" as "confined to a particular sect. In recent use often a synonym of denominationalist, especially with reference to education." Arnold in his *Stanley, Life and Correspondence* (Vol. II p. 23), written in 1836, says: "All our edu-

cation must be Christian, and not sectarian." This is the distinction that ought to be made. The denominations that are interested in educational institutions of their own would come far closer to modern educational demands and fairness if they dropped the characterization "denominational, but not sectarian," and substituted therefor "Christian, but not denominational." They would then put their institutions under governing boards and faculties free from any semblance of denominational control, and trust them to assume the responsibility of keeping the colleges Christian. And the trust would not be violated. To be "Christian" would not necessarily imply either sectarian or denominational. That church bodies refuse to do this, indicates their intention to emphasize the particular beliefs and practices of their sects, in a word, to keep their institutions of learning "sectarian."

A writer in a recent issue of *The Christian Century* entitles an article "The Slow Retreat of Sectarianism." If there is a "retreat," it surely has not yet been ordered to apply to the educational ventures of the various denominations. President Henry S. Pritchett made an address in 1908 before the Conference on Education of the Methodist Church, South, on "The Relation of Christian Denominations to Colleges." The paper was not only scholarly and exceedingly interesting; it was eminently fair to all the interests concerned, a clear and conclusive exposition of the whole question. It left no room for refutation by an unprejudiced mind. Yet the denomination to which the arguments were addressed has gone on maintaining educational institutions that have no reason for existence, except for denominational pride or purpose, but has established new ones. This is true of all the denominations. The newspapers recently carried the heading: "Southern Baptists Bid for University. But Trustees of George Washington Institution Reject Offer of \$2,000,000." "The trustees of the university stated that the offer was rejected because of a desire to continue the institution as an undenominational university." But the church "committee recommended that the rejection be not considered as final and that efforts be continued

with renewed vigour to have the university returned to Baptist *control*" [italics mine]. Under date of the sixth of June, 1924, the Board of Education of a religious body broadcasted the following information. The enrollment of Oklahoma City College has increased 100 per cent. this past year. "In the Liberal Arts Department 600 students were enrolled; 100 in the Fine Arts; 600 in the extension of the University (*sic*); and 300 in the Summer School." Six hundred in the Liberal Arts Department, such as it is; 900 in Fine Arts, Extension work and a Summer School. "In view of this increase, the trustees have decided to change the name from Oklahoma City College to Oklahoma City University and are taking proper legal steps to that end." And the legal authorities of that Commonwealth will undoubtedly grant the request. No! The sectarian retreat in matters educational has not yet begun. A better figure is that used by the Pullman porter, who, when asked if a fast train stopped at a particular station, replied: "No sah, she don't even hesitate."

"Many a Western or Southern state," says President Pritchett, "has more colleges than Massachusetts, and Ohio has more colleges than all of the New England states combined." "One of the most common objections urged against the abandonment of legal denominational control of colleges is fear lest they fall into the hands of competing denominations. One college president writes that his trustees would be glad to drop formal and legal denominational relations, already practically obsolete, but fear another enterprising church may 'steal' the college. Another brother, speaking in the breezy language of the Southwest, says, 'When a college down here gets loose, some denomination ropes it and puts its brand on. We don't have any educational mavericks in this part of the world.' "

A writer in *The Educational Review** gives six reasons commonly advanced in favour of the existence of denominational colleges:-

1. The overcrowded condition of the State universities.
2. The advantages that accrue to a student in a small college.

* A. Wakefield Slaten, February, 1923.

3. The paternal care a denominational college is able to throw about its students.

4. Such a college as a denominational possession requiring financial support stimulates educational interest in the denomination.

5. The denominational college is regarded as the conservator of the young people of the church.

6. The denominational college is useful as an agency for denominational propaganda. Candidates for the ministry of the church may take their foundation training there. Pride in the denomination and devotion to its activities and aims can be inculcated, along with loyal support of its traditions and doctrines. The students' minds may be guarded against ideas at variance with the accepted beliefs of the denomination.

In regard to reasons one and two, if the small church college is to take the overflow of the State universities, the church college would no longer be "small." And the college authorities do not intend that it remain small. The competition among church colleges for students is keen, and when the enrollment increases, the joy of the college president is great. Witness the gleeful announcements: "The Freshman class larger than ever"; "We have the largest graduating class in the history of the college"; and so on with increasing enthusiasm. Dean Briggs, years ago, said the claims advanced for the small college is always a bid for more students. This statement was, is, and always will be true. The only possible exceptions, of which I know, is in the case of small colleges not under denominational control.

Concerning point three, *The Christian Century* remarked lately that "some exception has been taken to the suggestion made by us that in the development of religious robustness, colleges under denominational control can hardly be said to be achieving greater success than other institutions." The basis of these suggestions was a sober fact that cannot be controverted. Church officials and overzealous college authorities deceive themselves sadly in this regard. During the past year the greatest scandals, in which students were the actors, took place in two educational institutions under denominational control. The "paternalism" of the denominational college is by no means an unmixed good. Human nature is human nature whether in a

church school or in a State university. And where rules are made for the regulation of the details of conduct, an invitation is given the student to rebel and free himself from restraint. And it sometimes happens that parents who have lost all control over their children vainly hope that this control can be regained by the authorities of a college who "throw parental care about their students." A student was put under strict probation because of a serious offence, and then dismissed on the repetition of the offence. The mother, in pleading for restatement, wrote the President: "I do not want him to go to any other college; I want him to be looked after more than in the average college." An educational institution that must resort to reform school methods in the care of its students cannot help but weaken its educational efficiency.

Concerning point four, the churches have not yet discovered that an educational institution requires financial support, and a very great deal of it. They want to get into the educational show without paying the price of admission. And this in spite of the "drives" for money recently made in the interests of denominational education. A president of a denominational college writes a "creed" which he entitles "An Educational Creed for the Methodist Church." His first paragraph is as follows:—

The Church is facing open doors and opportunities as never before in its history. One of its greatest needs is consecrated, educated leadership. Such leadership will be provided if the schools and colleges *are adequately supported and made fully efficient. Unfortunately the schools have not been so supported. They have always been regarded as a local and secondary interest of Methodism* [italics mine], and have not continuously been included in churchwide efforts to secure the interest and support of every member.

The denomination to which this president belongs boasts of its educational institutions. Yet, in another place, he goes on to show how far short of an *efficient standard* his church falls. The productive and unproductive endowment of the forty-four listed Methodist colleges is "a little over \$26,000,000, the total plant and equipment something over \$25,000,000"—a

total of \$51,000,000. He estimates that, in order to make these colleges efficient and up to standard, almost again as much will have to be supplied by the church, namely \$100,000,000,—\$70,000,000 for endowment, and \$30,000,000 for plant and equipment. His estimate is very low, inasmuch as many of these forty-four colleges are so far below standard that millions would be required where he probably estimates only hundreds of thousands.

Another president of a denominational institution wrote under the heading "Our First Duty to our own Colleges." He prefaced his appeal to the church for help by saying:—

We have not one endowed college between the two great oceans, nor have we one that is half endowed, nor a quarter endowed. We have not one that is not crying aloud for equipment to meet the new educational demands of our young people. Is it unimportant that we have colleges and universities as strong and thoroughly equipped as any in our country? If we should have them, and we do not have them, is it because our people are not able to have them?

We would answer, No! His people are able financially to support educational institutions. But, as a whole, they are not particularly interested in them. They do not want their children to go to a school where a denominational label is placed on them, and the advantages are not what they have a right to expect. Far more significant, the children do not want to go to such a school.

Speaking of point six above mentioned, the writer says:---

This last consideration, though it is only one of the reasons generally advanced, and certainly was not the chief one in the minds of those who planted the denominational colleges for educational purposes, is coming at present to receive in many instances the major emphasis. Adherence to the religious convictions of "the fathers," who founded and endowed the colleges, is now loudly insisted upon, to the disregard of the interests of the sons and daughters for whom the colleges exist. Their convictions are now being restated in the form of creeds impossible of acceptance by a man who has had his university training within the last ten years. These creeds, assumed to represent the essential elements or "fundamentals" of the Christian religion, are now being made the standard by which one's fitness to teach in a denominational college is judged. In some cases, whole

faculties are being called upon to affix their signatures to drastic statements of belief, designed with the specific intent of discovering and dislodging any professor who may hold to evolution, or other "abominable heresies."

While the danger is not so great as the writer fears, it is sufficiently great to cause apprehension. Some of those who have zeal without knowledge look upon the denominational school as nothing more than an opportunity to propagate particular beliefs. What the Church naturally fails to do with its young people, namely, to induce them to take their religion ready made, these men would wish upon the school. And they would do this by forcing the faculties to subscribe to fixed tenets and beliefs rather than follow the truth where it may lead them. The following pronouncements exhibit the mind of man not only closed, but hermetically sealed:—

Resolved that we do hereby record our vigorous protest against retaining upon the faculty of any of our denominational schools any person or persons who are manifestly at variance with our essential faith.

The schools, seminaries, churches, and mission stations must, one and all, be purged of every suspicion of un-Christian and rationalistic teaching [Who is to determine what is un-Christian and rationalistic?]. Eliminate, discharge, get rid of, all such unfaithful and disloyal employees without a moment's hesitation, and without a moment's delay.

We believe that God created man in his own image [physically or spiritually?], that man voluntarily fell into sin involving its consequences, we believe in the Deity of Christ, his Virgin birth, his vicarious atonement, and his personal return.

Resolved, that the trustees of the institutions of learning controlled and fostered by the Baptist General Convention of Texas are hereby instructed not to employ any one who holds to the Darwinian theory of evolution, or any other theory of evolution that contravenes the teaching of the Word of God, to any official position or to teach in any of the schools controlled and fostered by the Baptist General Convention.

If our states and colleges will pass this declaration adopted by the Baptist General Convention of Texas, we will carry the war to the public schools and high schools, and there will be a terrible battle for five years, and we will win. If we don't win, we are doomed.

And yet, one of the fundamental teachings of Holy Writ is found in the words: "Not by might, nor by power, but my

spirit, saith the Lord"; and "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

Of course, the foregoing quotations exhibit a very extreme attitude on the part of some of those interested in denominational education. But is it not a logical consequence of the attempt to control education and drive it to the defense of any kind of religious belief? A church official remarked to me, in connection with a teacher in an undenominational school, who was charged with teaching evolution in his Bible classes, that such a situation could never arise in another institution, which he named, and which is under denominational control, simply because the teachers in that institution take programme from the authorities or soft pedal any question that might arise out of scientific investigation which seems to contravene traditional belief. How can untrammelled research and freedom of teaching find a place in such an institution? And what, under such circumstances, does the "growing revelation" mean? The student is bound to have his faith "shaken," if he is sincere, when he first comes to the study of science and philosophy, or even history and biography. But it need not be *shattered*. And it will not be shattered where the winds of freedom blow, and where he is pointed to the open door of research and development which no man, least of all an ecclesiastic, can shut.

That the concensus of opinion among educators, entitled to the name, is against the school under church control cannot be denied. A poll of the faculties, even of denominational institutions, I am sure, would overwhelmingly prove this assertion. The teacher covets the freedom of research and teaching; it is the essence of his life and his inalienable right. Where this is denied, there cannot help but be restlessness and fear and chafing under restraint. If this does not follow, then the teacher is merely a tool operated by other hands. President Eliot, the prince of educators in our country, stated the case once and for all: "Of course, I believe that every endowed institution of higher learning in our country should be by charter and practice free from denominational control, just as the tax supported colleges and universities are so free; and that

they should be supported financially by members of all denominations." President Neilson voices this conviction in another way: "The day is past when an official relation to a particular church can be anything but a handicap to a college which aims at giving a liberal education; and I do not believe that it is through such affiliation that the colleges can best serve the churches."

Another educator of outstanding rank says: "It goes without saying that every one, who is really interested in the advancement of higher education in the United States must be thoroughly in accord with any efforts to free a college from church control. To any one who knows the history of universities, it is a familiar fact that the Church—Catholic in Europe and Protestant in the United States—was chiefly responsible for the inception of higher education, and that, with the gradual development of culture, the theological bonds were severed and the church influence relegated to the background until complete freedom from anything that savoured of denominational control became a necessary earmark of the really advanced institution." Another leading educator says: "In every instance to my knowledge, control of any form exercised over any college by any church acts like a blight, and hinders all the development of mind which one associates with such institutions." Another says: "The growth of all the great colleges and universities of our country has run parallel with their success in building up organizations free from church control, whatever may have been the history of their foundations or their early development. One need only inform himself of the history of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton to appreciate this fact. We have no great educational institutions denominational in character."

One might add: Where would Oberlin or Amherst or Williams or Vassar or Wellesley or Smith rank to-day had they been under church control? Professor Albert Bushnell Hart writes of Harvard: "I have heard President Eliot say that when he entered this college in 1849 it was 'nothing but a small Unitarian school.' It certainly has not been either small or

Unitarian in the last fifty years, and its growth and influence are directly connected with its freedom from ecclesiastical control."

A father, whose son spent two years in a denominational school and then transferred to one not under church control said to me: "He is getting some religion now. He did not seem to do very well in that regard at the other place." Are Oberlin and Princeton and Yale and Harvard and Amherst and Williams and Vassar and Wellesley and Smith less religious than the colleges under church control? I say decidedly: No! I verily believe that these institutions make for a saner and sounder and more vital type of religion than the schools where the students are put under the pressure of conversion to a certain type of religious experience and belief. Read the tribute of General Dawes to his son which he wrote to be read at his son's funeral, and ask whether one could wish for a finer type of religion than was developed by this young man at Princeton.

Of course, the more advanced thinkers in the various denominations will disclaim any desire to have the colleges and universities of their churches under direct denominational control. They favour only a strong affiliation of the colleges with the churches which gave them birth. This is right and as it should be. But the difficulty with the colleges whose trustees must be elected or confirmed by a religious body is that the overzealous in the denomination are carried away with denominational pride, and insist upon the institutions as a denominational possession, with all which that term implies. They want to bring them under the legislation and implied direction of the Board of Education of the respective church and, in other ways, perhaps not intentionally, restrict their freedom. And so what is nominally "affiliation with the church" becomes "control by the church."

The General Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church lists two types of "Presbyterian" colleges. First, "The institutions listed below are organically connected with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America or have

by charter requirement at least two-thirds of their Boards of Control members of said church." In this list there are forty-one institutions. Second, "The following institutions are not connected with the Presbyterian Church by any legal ties, nor are they subject to ecclesiastical control. Their history, however, and their associations with the life and work of the church, are such as to justify our earnest co-operation with them." This list contains fifteen colleges.

If all the denominations could be broadminded enough to free their colleges from organic connection or ecclesiastical control and regard them as proper for listing in some such category as the second one above, education in our country would surely receive a great impetus for good and a real blessing. There would then be no rivalry among denominations to establish and maintain institutions of learning; funds could be honestly solicited for real and worthy educational efforts; many colleges would achieve their well earned and much desired retirement, but others would be infused with new life; plants, equipment, and endowments would increase to keep pace with justified demands; freedom of research and teaching would be assured; teachers would be more adequately remunerated for their services and better men and women would be attracted to the teaching profession; the student would get what he is entitled to—an education without sham or pretence; and religion and morality, as decreed by the framers of the Act of 1787, would go hand in hand with knowledge, to the end that good government and the happiness of mankind would not be an ideal only.

WILLIAM WESTLEY GUTH.

THE UNANSWERED PRAYER OF OUR LORD

BY FREDERICK D. KERSHNER, LL.D.

Professor of Christian Doctrine, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa

THERE are two unanswered prayers in the life of Jesus Christ. The first He prayed to his Father in the garden of Gethsemane: "O, my Father, if it be possible let this cup pass from Me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt." The second was his prayer for the unity of his followers as recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John: "That they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one is Us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me."

There are striking points of contrast between these two remarkable petitions of the Son of God. The first was obviously unanswered because the cup could not pass and the mission of Jesus be fulfilled for the salvation of the world. Paradoxical as the statement may seem, the second apparently remains unanswered because if it were answered the world would be saved. The failure to answer the first sprang from the dictates of boundless love; the failure to answer the second makes that love in large measure unavailing. The one situation, therefore, checkmates and neutralizes the other. So long as the Intercessory Prayer remains unheeded, the agony in the garden was endured in vain. Jesus drank the cup and the purpose for which He drank it is still unrealized.

Both the unanswered prayers are addressed to the Father. But it is clear that the second prayer is really a petition to Christ's followers. This prayer the Father cannot answer. Had he been able to have done so, the purpose of the prayer would long since have been achieved. Only the disciples of Jesus can answer it. The Father cannot compel them to love one another

or to work together in harmonious and brotherly devotion. This they must do for themselves.

Is it not a strange paradox that the very purpose of the Incarnation and of the Atonement should be defeated by those for whom Christ came into the world and for whom He died on the Cross? He gave his life for his followers and of their own will they defeat the purpose of his gift. A disunited Church means a defeated Christ. Jesus so taught and history has borne out his words. Jesus could die for the world, but He could not compel his followers to love each other and to be true to the principles of brotherhood. He can only plead with them to be one and then leave upon their consciences the answer to his prayer.

I

Jesus' enemies nailed Him to the Cross outside the walls of Jerusalem 2,000 years ago, but his friends and disciples are crucifying Him daily by their schisms and by their martyrdom of the spirit of love. For his body He cared little, but He pronounced solemn judgment upon those who sinned against his spirit. And what is that spirit but the spirit of love and good-will and brotherhood against which all factions of the divided Church are sinning to-day? He forgave the men who drove the nails into his hands and feet, saying, "They know not what they do," but his professed followers who sin against his spirit and, by their strife and jealousy and bitterness, bring his work and his Kingdom to naught, must surely incur a more serious penalty. When we think of what is involved here, there is a certain vivid realism about those words—"Many will say to Me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? And in thy name have cast out devils? And in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from Me, ye that work iniquity." There is no greater iniquity from the standpoint of the extension of the Kingdom of God than the cultivation of the sectarian spirit. Surely to all of us those words of William Walsham How apply:

O, Jesus! Thou art pleading in accents meek and low,
I died for you, my children, and will ye treat Me so?

Surely, too, however partisan and uncharitable we have been in the past, standing between the Cross and the Judgment, we should be able to re-echo the answer of the poet to his own question.

O Lord, with shame and sorrow
We open wide the door.
Dear Saviour, enter, enter,
And leave us nevermore.

II

Why is it that the Intercessory Prayer remains unanswered after so many centuries? It is easy to furnish an explanation by analyzing the history of the past and by studying the psychology of individuals and of social groups. But, after all, these scientific explanations do not touch the main point. The Gospel of Jesus was intended to meet the problems of historical development and to conquer the selfish and turbulent impulses of the soul. To say that history and psychology have sufficiently explained the schisms of the Church, and that we are, therefore, bound by a sort of natural compulsion to go on with our divisions, may help to salve our consciences but will scarcely absolve us at the Judgment. We shall hardly escape so easily from our obligation to our Master and to the world. Christian union is not scientifically impossible. The Master never asked impossibilities of his followers. If the Intercessory Prayer remains unanswered, it is because some of us, and to a certain extent doubtless all of us, are not doing our duty toward answering it.

III

There are three outstanding reasons why divisions persist in the Body of Christ. If these reasons could be eliminated, schism would cease. All of them, moreover, are capable of being banished from the Church. If we do not banish them, the fault is ours and the stigma and the sin which result are ours also.

The first and, perhaps, the most pervasive reason for schism is a lack of realization of what it is and how bad it is on the part of the professed followers of Christ. The average Christian of to-day accepts the sectarian order in which he lives as sacrosanct and incapable of change. He accepts it just as he accepts the international anarchy of the present world order in which he lives or the iniquities of our modern selfish industrialism. He is born in a certain church, stamped as it were with a certain sectarian label, and his instinct of religious patriotism keeps him loyal to his clan. He does not know that there are one hundred sixty-nine Protestant denominations in the United States alone, each one of them with its own organized propaganda and all of them in a state of more or less hostile neutrality, if not at times of open antagonism. He does not stop to consider what enormous financial waste is involved in this state of affairs, nor does he concern himself about the spiritual losses which are bound up with it. While the Christian union sentiment has grown rapidly during the past few decades, there are still many excellent and saintly figures, like the late Phillips Brooks, who can see no particular need for union.

Moreover, there is much misunderstanding about what Christian union means. Some regard the term as synonymous with a great ecclesiastical hierarchy, a politico-religious organization, a sort of Protestant Catholicism which shall include all churches and individuals in its enfolding arms. It must be obvious that Jesus had not such a union in mind when He spoke of the bonds which drew Him to his Father and which He desired to bind his followers together. Surely, the unity of Christ and his Father is the unity of love and not the unity of compulsion. Christ's Church cannot be made a despotism. Christian unity does, indeed, mean one Church, one Fold, one Shepherd, but it does not mean ecclesiastical over-lordship or tyranny.

IV

A second outstanding reason for the schisms in the Church is what may be styled a lack of religious perspective. The term "perspective" may seem a little technical, but it precisely fits

the case. An artist knows that if his painting is to be worth anything it must possess a correct perspective: that is, it must show every object painted as possessing approximately the size and proportion which it would possess if seen in actual experience. So he puts some things in the foreground of his painting and some farther away in the background. He gets his important figures where they will show up best and the less important where they will not attract too much attention. Now, perspective is not only essential to art, but it is also essential to life. There are some people who never seem to be able to get things in the right proportion. In the picture of life which they paint, they put the little things where the big things ought to be and the big things where there ought to be only little things. As a result, an ant becomes an elephant in their eyes or an elephant shrinks to the proportions of an ant. They have, it would seem, no sense of comparative values.

This lack of perspective is one of the chief causes of religious schism. Somebody gets things out of proportion and proceeds at once to start a new denomination or sect. And since any man earnest enough and bold enough to originate such a movement can always gain followers, the denomination is soon launched upon the world. Once started, it speedily digs in, as they used to say during the war, and after a few generations it has achieved permanence. This is the history of practically all denominations. Now, the stressing of some particular point, which the Church had previously understressed, may be a good and even a necessary thing to do, but there can be no doubt, also, that such emphasis often leads in the end to schism and to a false view of Christianity as a whole.

Let us take a few examples from ecclesiastic history. New sects have arisen because of a difference in the way in which the communion vessels were handled; because of disagreement as to the shade of meaning of a technical theological term; because of differences of opinion as to ecclesiastical costumes and garb; because of divergent views of intricate points of church ritual, because of the way in which missionary and benevolent funds should be handled, and because of the use of

a certain kind of musical instrument in the worship. In all of these cases, conscientious and sincere Christians were willing to destroy the unity of the Church for the sake of something infinitely less important in the scale of religious values. What is wrong here is obviously the lack of a correct sense of perspective. These advocates of schism see big things as little things and little things as big things. If they could be brought to understand the paramount value of unity, they would not destroy it in order to emphasize the smaller items which they wish to secure.

V

A third reason for the schisms in the Church is a lack of understanding of the fundamental message of Christ. Christianity is complex and many-sided in certain respects and yet in its ultimate essence and meaning it is very simple. It represents simply the incarnation of love in every department of life and in every activity of experience. The Master left only one commandment to his followers, the simple statement that they should love one another. He had only one criterion of their discipleship: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples if ye have love one to another." Moreover, they were to love their enemies, to do good unto those who did them harm, and to pray for those who persecuted and despitefully used them. Paul, interpreting the spirit of his Master, tells us that love is the fulfilling of the law and that it is the supreme and paramount virtue of the Christian life. Nobody stressed faith more than Paul, but he believed that love was greater, and surely no one has emphasized the resurrection hope more than the author of the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians. But greater still than either hope or faith is love.

Now, if we agree with Jesus and Paul that love is the first thing in the Christian message, how can we endure the sin of schism? Schism obviously destroys love and negates the Gospel. No Christian can live perfectly the Sermon on the Mount or the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians so long as there is a divided Church. The hope of humanity to-day is a united

world, but we shall never achieve world unity until Christ's followers become one in the spirit of love. If the Church turns to the world with a programme for disarmament or for universal peace, will not the world hurl back the answer "Physician, heal thyself"? Christians have become engrossed with such a multitude of subsidiary things that they have forgotten the main thing. Christ came to make love real in the world and in Christ's name we are shutting love out of the world. I know that we can all justify our schisms on the very best of grounds. Each one of us is sure that he is right upon the points which produce and perpetuate schism, but rarely do we stop to reflect that we purchase our logical correctness at the expense of love. Maybe the Master would think more of us if we were not so correct and still retained the heart of his message.

"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples if ye have love one for another." But, if we have not love for each other, how can men know that we are his disciples? Does not the heathen world to-day accuse us of insincerity because of our lack of love? If all Christians were to exhibit this mark of discipleship, the walls of heathendom would crumble tomorrow. There is no withstanding the power of love. In India, Mahatma Gandhi preaches a borrowed gospel of love and rallies millions to his standard. If Christendom would but incarnate the principle of love, who doubts that Gandhi's followers would surrender to the Cross? There is something tragic about that statement of Dr. Arthur Daniel Berry in his chapter on "The Youth of Japan" in which he says: "I have had Japanese young men at dinner, at my table, when I, a Christian missionary, have been the only one at the table who would argue that war was ever right." So long as the Church gives its blessing to war and violates the spirit of love by its schisms and divisions, it will be impossible to convert the heathen world. "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me." But we cannot lift Him up so long as we do not make love so real that no man can dispute its presence in our lives. When Christians unite with each other in an unbroken

brotherhood, the heathen world will be irresistibly drawn to the Christ. "In this sign shalt thou conquer," and in no other sign. Judas betrayed his Master for thirty pieces of silver, but we betray Him and do not even receive the price of the potter's field for our burial.

VI

In the concluding pages of Andreas Latzko's epic production *Men in War*, a book which no boy or girl should ever pass through the high school age without reading, there is the picture of the home coming of John Bogdan from the late war to his native Hungarian village. He had been a hero in the conflict, had killed a number of Russians himself and had paid the price. What that price was, let Latzko tell:

With a furious curse, he tore off his hat and threw it on the seat Was that the face of a human being? Was it permitted to do such a thing to a man? His nose looked like a patchwork of small dice of different colors. His mouth was awry, and the whole left cheek was like a piece of bloated raw meat, red and criss-crossed with deep scars Instead of a cheekbone, he had a long hollow deep enough to hold a man's finger.

And then when he got home, the girl to whom he was betrothed did not recognize him. He was so hideous in appearance that he scarcely recognized himself. I need not tell the tragic outcome of the story; horrible as it was, it represents only one faint feature of the ghastly horrors of war. But I thought as I read the pages how much responsibility for the John Bogdans of this world rests upon those who claim to be followers of Christ. Only a united Church can rid the world of the demon of war. Little children and women by myriads will rise up against us in the judgment and condemn us because we plunged them into perdition in the very name of Christ who died that they might be saved.

VII

In the Intercessory Prayer, Christ prays to us. In the other great petition from his lips, which we usually call the

Lord's Prayer, He makes God's forgiveness of our trespasses conditioned upon our forgiving the trespasses of others. To-day we pray for many things: for the salvation of the world; for universal peace; for the triumph of the Cross in distant lands; for the conquest of evil; and for the extension of the Kingdom of God. Perhaps the answer to our prayers is conditioned upon our answering Christ's prayer to us. Men's trespasses cannot be forgiven by the spirit of love until that spirit is welcomed in the inner chambers of the soul by the act of forgiveness. The world cannot be redeemed in any other way save through the spirit of love. And the Church which is divided and schismatic has already denied that spirit. Our prayers do not rise above our lips because we make it impossible for them to rise. We have destroyed the power of prayer by the same act which has made impossible the salvation of the world.

It is said that Monsieur Clemenceau, during the sittings of the Peace Conference, apologized to some of his countrymen for his occasional concessions and indecision by saying, "What can a man do when he is sitting between Jesus Christ and Napoleon Bonaparte?" The words were intended as sarcasm, the reference being to President Wilson and Marshal Foch, who occupied seats on the right and the left respectively of the presiding officer of the Conference. But after all, Clemenceau was wiser than he knew. Humanity stood at the Peace Conference between Jesus Christ and Napoleon, and Napoleon won. Will Irwin says that the real choice of the world to-day is between Christ and Mars, and apparently the world is choosing Mars. Ultimately, that choice can mean only the doom of civilization. A united Church can stem the tide and save the world. Which shall it be—union and salvation or division and destruction? To-day this is the challenge, to you and to me, of the unanswered prayer of our Lord.

FREDERICK D. KERSHNER.

CHRISTIAN UNITY—A SURVEY

BY W. ROBINSON, M.A., B. Sc.

Principal of Overdale College, Birmingham, England

AMONGST those who are seeking earnestly and conscientiously to achieve the unity of the Church, there is a considerable number who sincerely believe that unity will be brought nearer by the practice of federation and open membership. As between some of the separated churches, federation is quite a simple matter and quite workable; for there are no serious doctrines or practices which separate them. In the case of others, however, such as the Episcopal Church, on the one hand, and the Baptist and Disciple Churches, on the other, there are real difficulties in the way of federation and open membership; and these difficulties are felt to be serious by many within these churches. No good can come from evading them. We must be *real* and face the situation as we find it.

There can be no doubt, at all, that those who plead for open membership are most anxious to achieve the unity of the Church; it is to this end they work: in fact, they have a supreme passion for unity.

Amongst Disciples in America no one has pleaded for this position more ably than Professor E. S. Ames of Chicago University. Two years ago he delivered a stirring address at the National Convention in Winona, in which he claimed open membership as the only logical position for Disciples in America. This the *Christian Standard*, the conservative organ of the Disciples, denied; but surely Professor Ames was right. Speaking of the reformation of the Campbells he said:—

In a larger sense, the attitude of our churches to members of other communions was an original and essential problem of this movement, for it was from the first a movement for the union of Christian people of all denominations and faiths. More specifically this matter was involved in the original determination of our administration of the ordinances. Different attitudes were expressed in the administration of

Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Alexander Campbell and his co-labourers took *an exclusive position in the practice of Baptism*, but allowed Christians of any denomination *to decide for themselves concerning their observance of the Communion*. This fact arrested my attention when a young man just out of college. During a conversation in a railway coach on a train in Iowa, before I went to Yale University, and before the University of Chicago was founded, I asked B. W. Johnson, then the editor of the *Christian-Evangelist*, about this difference. I asked him if we were consistent in the practice of *open Communion* and *close Baptism*. At once, as if it were not a new matter to his thoughtful mind, he replied, "That is a question which the Disciples will have to face in the future." Within that decade one of the churches in Cleveland, and another in New York City, began the practice of receiving the unimmersed into their fellowship; but neither one continued it beyond the pastorate in which it originated. The question, however, was emphasized by their experiments. Some years afterwards, in 1903, the Hyde Park Church adopted the plan of associate membership. I have a letter from B. B. Tyler, then with the South Broadway Church of Denver, congratulating us upon this action, and exulting over the fact that his own church had adopted it the previous year. After one year we modified our designation of this relationship, and for sixteen years received unimmersed persons as *members of the congregation*. Two years ago the church adopted a resolution recognizing these persons as *full members of the church*, and it continues to receive such persons as full members.

With Professor Ames the practice of open Communion, or inter-Communion, to use the wider term, can only lead to open membership; and how far it has led is seen by his own frank statement, that in the Hyde Park Church one-third of the membership are unbaptized by immersion, and that amongst this number are Methodists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Roman Catholics, *Jews* and *Mormons*. Professor Ames has carried his policy to the extreme, and has not only abolished sacrament and order, but creed also. He believes in an *ethical* Gospel, and, according to his sermon, regards Peter—not Paul—as the arch offender against the Christian faith.

This is only another form of the cry which has become articulate amongst some thinkers in all religious bodies—the cry "back to Jesus." Some, like Professor Ames, have seen in the Church of the first century an institution which wholly

misinterpreted the message of Jesus, and under the guidance of Peter became intensely legalistic. Such have seen in Paul the defender of liberty for all time, and the true interpreter of the mind of Christ—the destroyer of all religious tests, whether of order, sacrament, or belief.¹ This interpretation of Paul has not been consistently held without the rejection of the Pastoral Epistles, together with Ephesians, as genuine Pauline works; but even apart from these Epistles it has been found impossible to hold such an interpretation of the Pauline teaching. This appears on the reading of a single early Epistle like I Corinthians. Any really historical examination of this Epistle reveals a very different Paul from one who summed up Christianity as mere *ethical living* or even, as was formerly thought, simply *justification by faith*. Referring to this, Professor Kirsopp Lake has said: “It is impossible to pretend to ignore the fact that much controversy between Catholic and Protestant theologians has found its centre in the Eucharist; and the latter have appealed to Primitive Christianity to support their views. From their point of view, the appeal fails: the Catholic doctrine is much more nearly primitive than the Protestant.”² Thus another school has blamed Paul for giving Christianity a wrong turn, and has sought to get beyond him to the mind of Christ, regarding Paul’s writings as “secondary expressions.”³ But, after all, are we not entirely dependent upon “secondary expressions” for our knowledge of Jesus? Speaking of this tendency to undervalue “secondary expressions,” Dr. Mellone has said: “It is only a glorified piece of impressionism The meaning of the moral impulse given by Jesus is shown in its results and its first results are found in these ‘secondary expressions.’”⁴

And, when we come to examine the teaching of Jesus in the Gospels, do we find a Teacher entirely concerned with morality apart from belief and sacrament? Do we not rather

1. For such an interpretation see: *The Meaning of Paul for To-day*, by C. H. Dodd M. A.; and *Paul the Interpreter of Christ*, by A. T. Robertson, LL. D.

2. *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 215.

3. See the literature for and against this view: (a) *Jesus or Paul*, by Arnold Meyer; *What is Christianity?* by Harnack. (b) *Paul and Jesus*, by Johannes Weiss; *The Gospel and the Church*, by Loisy.

4. *The New Testament and Modern Life*, p. 16.

find a Teacher who taught disobedience to commands which were conceived as purely legal? Let us look only at the ordinance of the Sabbath. He was accused more than once of Sabbath breaking, but did He, in reply, assume a superiority over, or an impatience with, a legal injunction, and so justify Himself? No! As with much of the moral code of Judaism, He showed that the Jews had entirely misinterpreted the mind of God in these matters. They had regarded the Sabbath as a legal institution—a mere arbitrary command on the part of God, made so that man might obey it, or failing to do so, die. "The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath," put a new interpretation on the keeping of it. It was designed by God to meet man's needs, to fit his nature, and thus in a sense was a sacrament—a channel through which grace could flow to man.

Jesus was anti-legalistic, and so was Paul, and to those who regard Baptism and the Lord's Supper as mere legal commands to be obeyed, there is little wonder that some of the messages both of our Lord and of Paul mean for them to-day freedom from these *bonds* and *shackles*, and a sole dependence on right conduct. But Jesus gave both Baptism and the Lord's Supper to the Church, and they were never from the first regarded as mere legal commands to be obeyed, but as meeting supreme needs of the human soul in its religious and social aspirations, and as being channels of God's grace—as operations in time and space of the spiritual energy of God. Together with *belief* they cannot be separated from *morals*, and, however tired of our divisions we may be, we shall not hasten the day of the undivided Church by ignoring them, or seeking to avoid them by a return to the ethical teaching of Jesus: Every ethic must have its belief: a man's conduct is influenced by his belief, and in the Christian religion belief is bound up with communion with God, which communion, our very nature demands, must be partly conditioned by certain manifestations in time and space.⁵

It is from such thinking as we have outlined that the ten-

5. See further my book: *Essays on Christian Unity*.

dency to give little or no place to matters of belief, and more especially church orders and sacraments, arises amongst many who sincerely seek for a larger unity. Thus, interchange of pulpits and inter-Communion are advocated as the chief methods of bringing about this unity. Describing this tendency, Dr. Headlam has said: "There is a common body of opinion at the present time which suggests that all such questions (creed, sacrament, and order) can be ignored; that any one who takes an interest in them or thinks them important or lays stress on any particular point in order may be treated with contempt, and that all we have to do is to ignore such differences. Such an attitude is exactly the sort which will do more than anything else to keep people apart";⁶ and Dr. Garvie has emphasized the same truth: "Because distinctive principles have often been held in a spirit of exclusiveness, these distinctive principles are being ignored in a spirit of indifference. Young people are not being taught, and, if they were, would probably not learn, the principles of their own denomination, because denominationalism has in the past degenerated into sectarianism. Hence, their apprehension of church unity is now vague and less definite than it would have been Each denomination serves the cause of unity best, not by ignoring what its past has given to it of distinctive conviction, but by preserving that in a spirit of charity."⁷ These are sound words from sane teachers. Those who hold that the sacrament of Baptism stands at the entrance to the Christian Church, however much their sympathies would lead them to act otherwise, must be true to their belief. While still believing they cannot act as though they had ceased to believe, neither should any of us demand it of them. Those who further believe that the intention of our Lord was that Baptism should be administered by immersion, and that at the conscious period of life; and those who demand Confirmation as necessary to full Christian fellowship, if wrong, must relinquish their belief; but whilst they still believe, there can be no gain to the organic unity of God's people by compromise either on

6. *The Christian Union Quarterly*, April, 1921, p. 252.

7. *Ibid*, July, 1921, p. 45.

Communion or membership. For as Dr. Headlam has said: "The Church cannot live on a basis of emotion and good-will, without any embodiment of its principles, any more than human life would be possible without a framework and a rigid skeleton . . . Christianity is an *historical* religion, and it must be true to its history. We cannot cut ourselves off from our past: it would be as fatal to our life as to uproot a tree." ⁸

We must contend earnestly for the faith, or give it up. This need not mean any lack of charity—we can respect another man's convictions and hold our own until we all come to the unity of the Faith for which our Lord prayed. This we shall surely reach by sinking our own prejudices and entering fully into study, conference, and prayer.

⁸. *The Doctrine of the Church and Reunion*, p. 281. See also *Impasse or Opportunity*, by Malcolm Spencer, M.A.

W. ROBINSON.

O TEACH ME HOW TO PRAY

When in life's darkest hour I turned
 For solace, Lord, to Thee,
 Thy mighty presence I felt near,—
 And Thou supported me.
 O Holy Spirit ever close
 In life beside me stay!
 And that my words may reach Thee, Lord,
 Oh, teach me how to pray.

—*Blanche Taylor Cooney.*

RELIGION AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

BY FREDERICK F. KRAMER, PH. D., D. D.

Warden of Seabury Divinity School, Faribault, Minn.

THE world to-day is sadly in need of practical religion. By this I mean a religion that can furnish a spiritual impulse to human action. "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he" is eminently true, and a proper ethical and moral standard can only be attained through religion. For religion is subjective, it is belief in God and means the conscious relation between man and God, and the expression of that relation in human conduct.

Christianity is the ultimate expression of religion, for there is only one religion, but there have been many expositions and expressions of it. Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, and the ancient Assyrian, Greek, and Roman religious cults were only attempts, prompted by human desire and fostered by fear, to come into a conscious relation with superhuman powers, to gain their favours. A monotheistic conception of God they never reached; this came through the revelations to the ancient Hebrews and finds its completion and perfection in the teachings of Jesus. The Christian Church, founded upon the teachings and life of Jesus, accepts Him as God and receives his revelations of God as the only, and full expression of religion. The Christian religion—I now use the phrase in the commonly accepted sense of the term—was given to man by the revelations of Jesus Christ. It is not founded or established upon the miracles of the Gospels nor upon ecclesiastical marvels. Its truth and value rest upon the fact that it was *lived* by Jesus. The consequences of his life and the merits of his sacrifice have become the heritage of mankind through faith. Christianity, therefore, is the means by which the highest good may be attained by man.

But, after nineteen hundred years, the Christian Church is to-day struggling for a place in the life of the world and true religion is moribund. When we remember that within a short space of three hundred years the early Church supplanted the religion of Rome and was chosen by Constantine the Great as the one instrument that could harmonize and stabilize his restless empire, when we recall and enumerate all that Christianity has done for civilization, when we bear in mind the great inspiration given to art, literature, and music, the amelioration of human existence, the establishment of hospitals and the abolition of slavery, the lifting up of womanhood, the dissemination of the spirit of human brotherhood, the glorification of the family, hope for the living and comfort to the dying, when we remember all these things and many others and note the present apathy toward the Christian Church, we must ask the question, What is wrong with the Church? To answer this question is the purpose of this article.

1. When Constantine the Great made Christianity a *religio licita*, that is, permitted the Christians to practice their religion in the Roman Empire, and then arrogated to himself a leadership in the Church, which by his successors was magnified until the Church became a State Church under control of the emperors, the Church lost her spiritual autonomy. We need only recall the dictations of the emperors Zeno, Justinian I, and Heraclius in theological matters to see how the Church was dominated by the secular powers and how she was made a tool of political intrigues. With the fall of the Eastern Empire, the situation was reversed. St. Augustine (d. 430), in his *City of God*, laid the foundations of the medieval theory of the Church as a visible, hierarchical kingdom on earth, that should govern the world with Rome at the head. With the crowning of Charlemagne as emperor of the West in 800 by Pope Leo III, the Holy Roman Empire was established and the Papacy began its struggle to control the temporal powers of the world and place them under the domination of the Church. The results of this great struggle were disastrous to religion. The Church in the pursuit of her temporal

ideals permitted these ideals to adumbrate her Divine mission. The Church became worldly and her leaders politicians. Through the Papacy she became imperialistic. Under Innocent III she reached the highest point of her growth and after him, decadence set in. In an excursus on Innocent III, found in the French version of Hefele's *History of the Councils*, the writer points out that, if this Pope had led the Church out of the sphere of politics into which she had been plunged by Pope Gregory VII and restricted her work to the purely spiritual, disaster would not have followed.

2. With the Great Schism, a Pope in Rome and one in Avignon from 1305-1377, the decadence began and slowly gained momentum until it culminated in the cataclysm of the Protestant Reformation. Upon the Papacy the blame of shattering Christendom must rest. True, there were reforming councils—Pisa, 1409; Constance, 1414; Basel, 1431; and Ferrara-Florence, 1438; but these councils did nothing to avert the impending disaster. Pisa ended with three Popes; Constance burned the reformers—Huss and Jerome of Prague—and started a religious war in Bohemia; Ferrara-Florence failed to bring about a union with the Greek Church. Corruption within the Church, however, was not the chief cause of the Reformation. This great movement was a revolt against the coercion of the thought and consciences of men by the Church. Humanism and the Renaissance sowed the seed of the Reformation. Completely obsessed by “other-worldliness conception” of the Church, the Papacy failed entirely to grasp the meaning of the Renaissance. The Renaissance was the expression of a yearning for the beautiful in this life. It was in reality more spiritual than the ecclesiastical tyranny of the Church. The Church offered only two alternatives, heaven or hell, and since she conceived herself to be the custodian of the souls of men, she claimed the right to state how the one must be attained and the other escaped. Had she rightly appraised the underlying principles of the Renaissance and met the situation in a spirit of co-operation, not only would the revolt have died out, but the Church herself would have been greatly strengthened.

3. The splitting up of the Church into hundreds of fragments after the Reformation is the greatest calamity that has ever happened to the human race. After the soil of Europe had been drenched by the blood of hundreds of thousands in the long series of religious wars; after millions had suffered mental spiritual, and physical anguish for conscience sake, what was the result? Christendom divided into three main hostile camps—three Catholic Churches. One claiming supreme authority and jurisdiction over the living and the dead, custodian of the keys of heaven and hell; the second claiming a more intellectual and more reasonable exposition of Christianity; and the third claiming precedence over the other two by reason of a perfect orthodoxy. Then we have the rest of Christendom—Protestantism, cut up into hundreds of greater or less divisions, carrying on a spiritual guerrilla warfare among themselves, with a constant malevolence against the Catholics. This is not religion but simply ecclesiasticism. This condition of the Christian Church produces these awful results:

1. It kills true religion and dissipates the spiritual powers which Jesus gave to the world.

2. It causes a colossal economic waste and sends the Christ out into the world as a mendicant and has brought about the perversion of religion as revealed by Christ.

In the days of St. Paul, as we gather from his writings, his converts gladly suffered the loss both of life and of goods. Naturally, they asked "What is the good of it all?" The Apostle replied: "Through much tribulation we must enter the Kingdom of God," and "Maranatha, the Lord is at hand." He believed that the coming of the Kingdom was imminent. After St. Paul's time and in the Post-Apostolic age, when Christian theology developed, chiefly through the leadership of St. Augustine in the West, whose earlier Manichæan training somewhat tintured his Christian teaching, this world was looked upon as the abode of evil from which men could only escape through the gate of death into heaven. The theology of the Middle Ages and the philosophy of the Schoolmen emphasized this theory and the Medieval Church founded upon it the dogmas of

purgatory, the treasury of merits and indulgences, all used as instruments of the spiritual imperialism on earth to hold sway over its subjects. Protestantism also fosters the conception of a totally depraved and lost world for which there is no hope, and the escape from which is into another, a purely spiritual life.

But what has Christ said on the subject? What do we read in the Gospels? I have space for only two or three quotations. John 9:5—Jesus said: "I am the light of the world." John 12:47—"I came not to judge the world, but to save the world." John 1:4—"In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." Jesus elucidated his teachings when they concerned the things of this life by example, and we can see by the many ways in which He alleviated human suffering, that He was deeply concerned about the physical welfare of men. Furthermore, if God created the world as a place of habitation for the object of his love—man—it is highly probable that in this world man would realize a large measure of the Divine blessings in a society in which the Holy Spirit of God, working in and with the spirits of men, will give them a taste of Divine love. This does not signify to me a world going down into moral ruin and physical destruction because of men's sins, but the perfection of human society as a foretaste of a still higher and more perfect life in a future, spiritual existence.

I, therefore, maintain that the Christian Church owes a duty to society. The social fabric of the world must be purified and strengthened, in other words, there must be a Christian ethic or standard of the highest good to be striven for. Christianity has a life to live. All Christian people must live for one another. To Christianize the *summum bonum*, that is, the highest good, is the human task of the religion of Jesus. But it must be borne in mind that ethics and religion are not the same thing. Religion furnishes the power which puts ethical principles into operation. Thus, the Christian virtues—righteousness, holiness, benevolence, and sympathy—brought into various combinations and vitalized by love will create duties that will rectify the moral defects in our social fabric and

emphasize the truth of the brotherhood of man in Christ. Martensen, the great Danish theologian and authority on ethics, says in a letter to Dorner, the eminent German theologian: "The Kingdom of God as the highest good finds its centralization in the imitation of Christ." The Kingdom of God cannot, therefore, be an abstraction or a mere state of spiritual peace. On earth it is found in every sphere of human activity in which the laws of the Kingdom, that is the laws of God, are operative.

Since I do not accept the Dantean conception of hell as given in the *Divina Commedia* of the Italian poet, salvation means to me something different from the usually accepted meaning of the term. God is not eager to smite men, but is anxious that they reach the highest possible point of development in this life, spiritually, in order that they may reach the highest possible point of human development. Salvation is escape from failure to please God and, of course, has also a future reward. But "since no man liveth unto himself," to quote St. Paul, every one must be a coworker with God in the world to establish a brotherhood of man. The failure to realize this great truth is one of the weaknesses of the Christian Church.

5. Religion and theology are not the same. Religion is subjective, a thing to be lived; theology is the theory or science of God, the motivating force in religion. Every living religion has a theology, but no theology, however complete or elaborate, makes a religion. Christianity must have a theology, for even in the sphere of pure religion man must be permitted to think; but Christian theology may not expand the limits of human reason by means of philosophical speculation. The dogmatic teaching of the Medieval Church concerning the sacraments has, at least in one case, done this. A sacramental theology, that is, a system of belief centered around a sacramental system, is the comfortable and easiest system to follow, but pushed to an extreme it becomes a menace to real spiritual growth. If one accepts the theory that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, e. g., contains and conveys the grace which is proper to it, coming to the Communion may easily become a purely

mechanical act without any spiritual reaction. The Lord's Supper is the great sacrament in all branches of the Christian Church. The celebration of this sacrament is the greatest act of Christian worship. One of the Catholic branches of the Church teaches its members that it is a sin for any one to absent himself deliberately from a celebration. All other Christian bodies, whether Catholic or Protestant, urge its necessity either as a means to the forgiveness of sins or as a mark of Christian fellowship and communion. Overvaluing the sacraments on the part of Catholic Christendom, and underestimating them on the part of Protestant Christendom is weakening the cause of true religion in the world to-day. These two things foster the unhappy divisions within the Christian Church.

Let me now sum up this indictment of the Christian Church, before I propose a "Peace Plan"; for, surely, if the world needs one the Church, whose head is the Prince of Peace, must have peace within her borders.

The failure of the Christian Church is due :

1. Because in the year 800 she entered politics when Pope Leo III crowned Charlemagne emperor, and thus established the Holy Roman Empire, through which the Church sought to dominate the temporal powers of Europe.

2. The Great Schism 1305-1377, arising out of the failure of the Church to correct internal weaknesses.

3. The Protestant Reformation.

4. A divided Christendom.

5. Theological controversy—each denomination more intent upon proving that it is the true Church of God than it is upon fostering true religion, by means of which the world can be saved and the work of Christ completed.

In proposing a Peace Plan for the Christian Church, the first three causes, which have led to the dissipation of Christian religious leadership, need not be considered. The problem is, How can the damage be repaired? The task will be difficult, but is not, I think, insuperable. It will demand devotion and sacrifice. Many cherished beliefs will have to be given up; many personal preconceptions of religion will have to be cast aside,

but nothing that is essential in the religion of Jesus need be discarded. The Christ who now appears only divinely through the fog of theological controversy, must be led in triumph into a world hungering for righteousness and peace. I am no prophet, but I confidently predict that unless this be done, the Christian Church will decay. Many will scoff at this prediction and quote our Lord's words: "Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world." But I retort by pointing out the true meaning of these words by adding the phrase "through my Holy Spirit." This exegesis is sound in the light of what Jesus says in another passage: "He [the Holy Spirit] shall take of the things of mine and shall show them unto you." If the rendering of the Body of Christ—the Church, by which I mean all persons baptized in the name of the Trinity—be the fruit of the Spirit of God, I know nothing about God.

A RELIGIOUS PEACE PLAN

I propose the following plan for the consideration of earnest and thoughtful Christians:

I. Emphasize Religion over Theology. For nearly 1900 years theology has dominated the Christian Church with the result that the life-blood of the Church has been sapped and her strength reduced to weakness. The fundamental truths of Christianity were revealed by Jesus Christ. In his revelation He tells us that "God is a spirit and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." But nevertheless, theology for centuries has tried to make this statement harmonize with reason. Jesus declared his deity again and again, and yet innumerable volumes have been written to prove his statements. Faith, not metaphysics, is the prime factor in religion. By this statement I do not imply that freedom of thought and liberty of conscience have no place in Christianity. Far from it. But freedom of thought must be permitted in theology, and liberty of conscience allowed in the practice of religion. The Church must have a theology, but when this is made an occasion of strife and cause of divisions, believers must take pause. The early creeds of the Church were simply symbols

of Christian fellowship, and not theological expositions. I would, therefore, suggest as a sufficient statement of the Christian faith, the creed found in the Apostolic Constitutions, (Ethiopic MS) which the Catechumens declared at the time of their Baptism :

“I believe in the only true God, the Father, the Almighty,
“And in his only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord
and Saviour,

“And in the Holy Ghost, the Life-giver.”

II. Emphasize the world-saving task of the Church. Truth, justice, love, righteousness, and benevolence injected into every stratum of human society by the spirit of religion will save civilization. Nothing else can do it. The brotherhood of man must become a reality. The concept that the world is irredeemably evil is not the concept of Jesus. It is conceived in fear and perpetuated by a theology that strives to coerce men into being religious. “There is no fear in love ; but perfect love casteth out fear,” wrote the Apostle St. John. Love is the greatest thing in the world, for God is love.

III. A modification of the theory of sacraments as held by the three Catholic branches of the Christian Church—the Greek, the Roman, and the Anglican. The sacraments are the *crux* in the theological differences within the Christian Church. The Schoolmen of the Middle Ages developed the theory that the sacraments not only contain but also convey the grace which is proper to them. This is the *opus operatum* theory. This theory was made *de fide* by the Council of Trent (1545-1562) at its seventh session in Canon six—“If any one shall say that the sacraments of the new law do not contain the grace which they signify, or do not confer grace on those who do not place a bar (*non ponentibus obicem*) let him be anathema.” In the eighth canon the last clause is nullified by the statement that the “sacraments confer grace, *ex opere operato*,” that is, by their performance. Thus, e. g., mere presence at a celebration of the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper without mental, spiritual participation or communion ensures the grace of the sacrament to the believer. This makes it a purely mechanical thing.

Spiritual strength is gained in spiritual combat. Every individual Christian must deliver his own soul by mental and spiritual travail. In this struggle the sacraments of the Church are helpful, but they are not workers of magic. They form a mystical union between man and God, whereby man is aided in his fight against evil and sin. There is nothing mechanical in their transmission from Jesus to us.

IV. Here the question of Holy Orders obtrudes—the great question that keeps Christendom dismembered. Rome denies priesthood and sacraments to all other Christian bodies except the Greek. The Greek and the Anglican Churches deny both to all Protestant bodies. Is there no way by which these breaches can be healed?

I believe firmly in a historical ministry, joining the Church of to-day with that of Apostolic times. This continuity of Orders was broken by the Reformation. That the Anglican Church has retained valid Orders I also believe. The Roman Church believes itself to be the true Church of Christ by Divine right, and the Greek Church advances the same claim by ecclesiastical right. Anglican Orders cannot be vitiated by anything that Rome may say or do. The Episcopal Church in the United States, as a branch of the Anglican Church, also has valid Orders. The commission on the World Conference on Faith and Order of this Church has had a number of conferences with a large number of other Christian bodies since 1910 and a world conference will be held, perhaps, in Jerusalem in 1927. I have great hope of this conference. If the spirit of pure religion and not ecclesiasticism dominates it, the Christian Church will make a great advance toward new life and power.

The present theological strife in this country which has touched many denominations well indicates the disintegration of the Christian Church as a power for good. To the man in the street it must appear as if the various denominations either did not believe in themselves, or else believed in themselves to such a degree as to esteem all others to be false. Meanwhile, Jesus, the Saviour and lover of men, has become a dim figure in the background. As I stated before, the task of the Christian

Church as the expositor of true religion is first to save the world, and in saving the world it will also save souls. To emphasize the other-worldly aim of religion at the expense of its this-worldly task, to my mind, places limitations on God's power and love.

This world needs peace. War casts the shadow of shame upon the banner of the Prince of Peace. This world needs the spirit of brotherhood and of love. Theological disputes and ecclesiastical quarrels among the churches and within them make mock of religion and sow the seeds of malice and hatred. This life is swelling with latent beauty and power waiting to burst into being under the warmth of human fellowship; but fear chills the heart of it and there is no flowering. Religion which alone can give it warmth and power to blossom and bear fruit, is wantonly wasted and dissipated in vain disputes.

The psychological effect of a united Christendom would be immense and irresistible. The knowledge that all Christians were striving after the same end, say a peaceful world and a happy and equitably adjusted social state, would bring out and co-ordinate all the subconscious powers of every individual. This is what happened during the late war and we were all amazed at the marvelous display of the nation's strength, which really lies in the fixed purpose of the loyal individual citizen.

Theological differences and disputes are not brought about by the laity, but are fomented by the clergy. Happily, the laity of the Christian Church believe in God and accept his Son, Jesus Christ, as their Saviour. In this thought I find hope for religion as a power in the world.

FREDERICK F. KRAMER.

CHRISTIAN UNITY

BY W. I. T. HOOVER, PH. D., LL. D.

Dean and Professor of Philosophy, La Verne College, La Verne, Calif.

It is presumed in this article that the unity or oneness that Jesus prayed for, as recorded in the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel by St. John, has not yet been realized. And, if we ask why this is so, we are likely to receive various answers to our question. But it is evident that all professed Christians worship the same God, adore the same Christ, and entreat the same Holy Spirit; they use the same sacred Scriptures; seek the same eternal home; and live on the same plane and under the same general conditions. Then in what consists their differences that this unity has not yet been realized? It is plainly one of interpretation of the sacred Scriptures. Hence, theology or dogmatics has been made the center of their thought and devotion. But can the oneness which Jesus prayed for ever be realized on this basis? If not, shall his prayer be in vain? And yet, it seems to the writer that the many Christian denominations are much nearer this unity than the majority of Christians believe.

We propose that the center must be shifted from dogmatics, upon which people have never agreed, to the personality of Jesus Christ. Once "orthodoxy" of belief was made the *sine qua non* of church membership and, consequently, of "salvation," but Jesus said to the inquiring youth: "Come, follow Me." And, upon various occasions, He declared: "I am the Way; I am the Truth; I am the Life; I am the Door; I am the Living Water"; etc. Hence, we shift the center from creed to personality; and from abstract belief to concrete life.

John the Baptist, by his preaching, aroused all classes among the Jews who came to him in great multitudes asking for Baptism. One day out from the multitude on the banks of

the Jordan came Jesus of Nazareth as an applicant for Baptism. But John demurred. Why? Did not Jesus fit into his plan? Did not Jesus fit into John's baptismal formula? Did not both John and Jesus have to stretch their theological beliefs in order to accommodate Jesus? Whatever dogmatic kinks appeared Jesus shifted the point of view and acted upon it, and John had the good judgment to accept Jesus' statement—"for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness"—and he acted upon this, baptizing Jesus in the Jordan, though as to the baptismal formula used we are in the dark.

There are many people to-day who find theological formulas too rigid, and formal; or else over-emphasized or under-emphasized rather than erroneous. And so long as human creeds are made the center for Christian unity or even church unity we shall remain divided and continue to keep up barriers which invite argument rather than brotherly feeling.

Many people are legalists, that is, the Scriptures to them are a body of laws, the primary thing being obedience to its letter. Perhaps, no one ever had a harder time than Jesus did on this very thing because the Jews were legalists in the extreme. Among the many incidents illustrative of this position, we refer to the teaching as given in Matthew 5:21-26, where Jesus passes by all legalisms and dogmatic differences and insists that the worshiper first be reconciled to his brother who had "aught" against him. Hence, "orthodoxy" of belief was to Jesus insignificant compared to the personal and feeling relation existing between them. The Jews somehow looked at the end rather than the beginning of the transgression; they punished under the law the act of murder. But Jesus showed that murder has its beginning in anger and so condemned it. It is apparent that an immense gulf separates the morality of the Law from the morality of the Gospel.

Note how Jesus personalized the Law. Once a lawyer asked him what he had to do to inherit eternal life, and Jesus asked him what the Law said on the matter. He correctly replied that it commanded love to God with one's whole heart, mind, soul, and strength, and one's neighbour as well. Jesus commended

his answer and told him to so do. But he did not like the answer and so he asked Jesus who one's neighbour is. Whereupon, Jesus replied with the parable of the so-called Good Samaritan, who was a racial and religious enemy of the Jew. This incident then shows most plainly how Jesus would personalize the Law. The Jew could quote the Scripture correctly, but it had no dynamic in it for him as the parable above mentioned shows. Love is not impersonal but an intense personal passion, the limits of which are the limits of personality. Jesus exhibited this in its superlative degree and declares it to be the essence of true religion. Jesus Himself is the concrete human embodiment of Love to both God and man.

To a certain rich young man, who had inquired what good thing he needed to do to inherit eternal life, Jesus said: "Keep the commandments." These, the youth replied he had done; whereupon, Jesus said that if he would be perfect, he should sell his property, give it to the poor, and come and follow Him. This following Jesus has a deeper meaning than merely walking the highways with Him. On another occasion He extorted the weary and heavy laden toiler to come to Him for rest. If correct theological belief is the one essential, why did not Jesus so say? But instead, He offers Himself.

A unique incident illustrative of the fact that Christian unity can come alone through the dynamic personality of Jesus Christ is that of Philip and the Eunuch. The Scripture specifically states that Philip "preached unto him Jesus." And, in return, the Eunuch replied: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God"; whereupon, Philip baptized him. Now, if Philip had entered into giving the Eunuch instruction as to the mode and formula of Baptism, and all that belongs to a church covenant, as is done to-day by the many denominations, would there not be some indications of it in the account as given in the *Book of Acts*, chapter VIII?

There has always been much difference in the theological beliefs of men and it bids fair to so continue, but the attitude of one to the other is undergoing rapid changes, for which we should all be thankful. Once men quarreled, persecuted, and

fought over their theological beliefs. There still remains much of the old spirit of contention and argument for the correctness of the creedal statements, but the spirit in which the arguments are carried on has greatly changed. There will probably remain much difference of opinion on Baptism—its purpose, mode, and formula; the eucharistic formula; the correct position of the body in prayer; the nature and purpose of the Atonement; the day of the week for rest and worship; the time of Jesus' return and the conditions preceding it; etc., etc. But the spirit is changed from that of the debator to that of the investigator, whose aim is truth. The debator's aim is to defeat his opponent; hence, he seeks argument to sustain his position.

Jesus, somehow, refused to be entangled in speculative niceties, logical formalities, religious verbalisms, and theological disputations. He chose higher ground and grasped the essentialness of religion as rooted in human personality. He was supremely interested in people and not in their theological speculations. He pronounced a woe upon the scribes and Pharisees for their traditional formalism. He denounced them as "blind guides, which strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel," both being unclean according to Leviticus XI. That is, He censured them not only for the stress they laid on ceremonial trifles, such as tithing "mint and anise and cummin," but also for neglecting the weightier matters of "judgment and mercy and faith." In other words, He censured them for their scrupulous avoidance of insignificant breaches of the ceremonial law, but yet gulped down such monstrous iniquity as injustice. Jesus not only personalized all Law, but insists that we do likewise. The time is rapidly passing when men can be saints by profession on Sunday and anything else during the week in their business, or home, or in society.

Jesus Christ would have us link up human life with such universal principles as honesty, integrity, sincerity, truthfulness, justice, faith, prayer, and love. These have a universal value, but our speculative theological beliefs do not have such. He would have us choose that which has a human value and not a mere intellectualism as a guide for daily life.

But some one may ask, Does not the Roman Catholic Church possess the unity which Jesus prayed might prevail? Roman Catholics so claim, but history shows that theirs is not such a spiritual unity as Jesus meant; it is mechanical, hierarchical, and formal; it lies rather, perhaps, in ecclesiastical organization than in creedal acceptance. John 17:21-23 shows plainly that it is a spiritual oneness that Jesus prayed might prevail among his people on earth. The natural result of this oneness will be "that the world may believe that Thou didst send Me."

The desire for eternal life has, perhaps, been the chief motive of the Christian in all centuries and the essential condition for it has been either correctness of theological belief, or "works," or both. But (John 17:3) "This is life eternal, that they should know Thee the only true God, and Him whom Thou didst send, even Jesus Christ." St. Paul's statement (II Tim. 1:12), "I know whom I have believed," shows that he had progressed from the plane of intellectual assent onto the plane of knowledge which is a high type of the personalization of the truth.

Theologically stated, Jesus came "to seek and to save the lost"; philosophically stated, He came to show us, rather than merely to teach us, how to live. He says: "I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly." Laws are often valuable as guides, but they do not possess a living dynamic which can be found alone in personality. Laws are made under certain conditions to meet certain ends, but when these conditions change the laws are no longer adequate to meet the ends sought. In addition to the "Law and the Prophets," the ancient Jew heaped to himself hundreds of precepts as guides in his legalistic life, so much so, indeed, that Jesus could take nothing for granted in his religious teaching. The outcome of such legalistic literalism was a formal, mechanical kind of life. And so long as the Christian world continues to lay the stress it has upon dogmatics, the highest type of spiritual life will not prevail, viz., the kind of unity and oneness that Jesus prayed for.

The Jew placed the Law first; but Jesus placed a child in

the midst of the disputants and said: "Of such is the Kingdom." The Old Testament taught the Jew how to become liturgically clean through a ceremonial institution; but the New Testament does not begin with a sacerdotal order, but with a Moral Person; its ideal is a manhood and not an institution.

John 5:39, 40 shows that Jesus accused the Jews of searching the Scriptures because they believed that in them was to be found eternal life, while these same Scriptures revealed Him as that life. I John 5:11, 12 says: "And the witness is this, that God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life." Hence, whatever our theological notions may be, we shall perish if we do not make the Personal Christ the supreme object of our devotion.

We conclude that, so long as people make some theological interpretation or creedal belief the central factor in their religious life, the unity that Jesus prayed for will not be realized. This unity or oneness can be realized only in and through the Personal Christ. Again and again, Jesus declares: "I am the Way"; "I am the Truth"; "I am the Life"; "I am the Good Shepherd"; "I am the Living Water"; "I am the Living Bread"; "I am the Resurrection"; etc. Hence, Jesus Christ is Christianity, and our theological doctrines should be carefully evaluated and not over- nor under-stressed. The point of view we take and the emphasis we give to it are of supreme importance not only in philosophy, but in theology as well.

W. I. T. HOOVER.

THE HOPE OF CHRISTIAN UNITY

BY REV. L. W. McCREARY

Executive Secretary of the Baltimore Federation of Churches,
Baltimore, Md.

CONSTRUCTIVE leaders of to-day are almost unanimously agreed that the immediate outlook for the Church is alarming. It was thought that denominationalism would profit by the experiences of the war and thereafter a closer unity and cooperation would characterize all religious endeavour. Instead, it may be seriously doubted if there has been a time within the last twenty-five years when denominationalism has been more assertive. Its movements are more subtle to-day because they lurk behind an apparent brotherliness. Doubtless this condition is the direct result of readjustments within the denominations themselves. While the battle for ascendancy wages between the liberalist and fundamentalist as to which shall formulate the categories of truth, those who are responsible for extension work are compelled to press, with unrivaled vigour, the claims of their denomination to maintain the present status. Indeed, most of the communions are just now laying their plans for retrenchment in all lines of missionary endeavour. So far from the Church rising to meet the emergencies of the hour and assuming her prophetic mission, the present day can only be characterized in things religious as one of confusion. The fruit of the Spirit is not conspicuous in this hour. The works of the flesh predominate. Under such conditions Christ is left without effective witnesses. Instead of the Church being irresistible, she becomes pitiable, and we cannot wonder that thoughtful men are turning away in derision. The great mass of men outside the Church care nothing for our denominational differences, and the coming generations will more and more ignore them. If, somehow, we could get the denominations to look outward rather than inward, the challenge of a needy

world might be sufficient to turn the scale of endeavour. So long as church representatives are intent upon saving the denomination to the world, just so long will the Church stand impotent in the presence of appalling need.

Alarming as this picture seems, there is yet a graver truth to be considered,—namely, that, with the denominations confused and self-seeking as they are, there is no other machinery existent with which to cope with the world situation. You quickly remark, Have we not the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the International Sunday School Council, and kindred organizations of an interdenominational character? Yes, but theirs is only a delegated authority. They have no power except as derived from the denominations themselves. I am not pleading that it should be otherwise. That is not my purpose in this discussion. I am simply trying to analyze and evaluate the situation in which we now find ourselves. The fact that denominationalism to-day seems destined to fail in winning the world may constitute our chief hope for to-morrow. Physicians tell us that, when certain diseases have laid hold upon the body, little can be done but to allow them to run their course. The patient must get sicker in order to recover. In the opinion of many, denominationalism, as it now exists, has about run its course. It is persistent because it is fighting its last battle. If this be true, the throes of our present crisis in church life may be but the travail of a new birth which will compel the Church to lose her life in order to save it to the Master's programme. Our Lord's prayer for the union of all believers, reinforced by his life of lowly service, is the blazed trail along which the Church must move to the redemption of the world.

One of the most fascinating mental excursions one can take is to be found in a study of denominational polity. Here we open the door of a vast enclosure which offers ample room to journey back and forth across the centuries from the very beginning of the Christian era. There is scarcely a religious communion that does not trace its particular sanctions to a God-given and Christ-inspired form of church government. The

Reformation was not so much a protest against authority in church polity as in church doctrines and practices. To-day we are witnessing a revolt against authority that seems quite as willing to reject constituted church governments as orthodox beliefs. One cannot mingle with the various ministerial groups of this or any other city without quickly sensing this unrest. You may characterize it as a growing desire for greater democracy or call it an attempt to organize for more efficiency. I care not how you denominate it. The essential thing to note is that this age will not be bound by an appeal to authority, however ancient or sacred. The modern man refuses longer to think of religion as history. He is concerned only to find what Christ and the apostles did to make the spirit of love and truth effective in their day in order that he may transport those principles over into the hearts of men to-day. To him religion is life—a spirit which, dominating his life, results in righteous conduct.

I am not expecting an early revolt among the denominations in church government. The masses within the Church are slow to break with traditions. However, indications are not lacking that a new type of church is emerging, in which fellowship and open-mindedness will be dominant factors. The close corporation type of church, assuming all light and authority because divinely governed, is slowly passing. The discovery is being made that one thing is vastly more important than any particular form of church polity,—namely, to do the thing that Christ wants done for the salvation of the world. Some day we shall learn that the Church is only an expedient; that the Bible, instead of handing down a finished form of church government as Moses gave explicit directions for building the tabernacle, has rather enunciated the principles that must govern the body through which the Kingdom of God is to manifest itself.

It is likewise an alluring quest to study the sacraments of the Church. All religious communions are agreed that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are rites to be observed. Oftentimes a rather wide divergence of view exists concerning the Eucharist. Who shall administer it? Who shall partake of

it? And what purpose does it serve? These are questions from which we shall receive varying answers, depending upon the affiliation of the one to whom the interrogation is directed. And yet, one can easily discern a growing tendency toward a new evaluation of this Feast of Love. The old theories of the atonement, of which the Lord's Supper is the symbol, though still much in evidence in our phraseology, have long since dropped out of our religious thinking. More and more the emphasis is being placed on the truth that the Master, in breaking his life day after day and giving the last drop of his heart's blood for men, was showing us the way by which we, too, may become saviours. So it is in the sacrament of Christian Baptism. The emphasis to-day is on the purpose and not the mode of Baptism. It comes at the beginning of the surrendered life, and with all religious bodies stands for enlistment in Christian service. Christ dedicated Himself to a wonderful programme of service by Baptism in the Jordan. Years afterward, when Paul would sum up the entire purpose of his own ministry in a single sentence, it was this: "I am determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." The cross came at the close of Christ's life and interprets the purpose to which He bound Himself all through his public ministry. It explains a love so deep that day after day it sought out men and seized upon them like an all-consuming flame that could not be quenched. It represented sympathy and understanding that could never be at home in a sinful world until it got itself crucified. Baptism coming at the very beginning of a life of service is the guide-post at the entrance of the way that winds its difficult course up the steep ascent of sacrifice until it ends at the "green hill far away." Without this interpretation it is meaningless. It must always be followed by the self-forgetfulness that causes one to present his body a living sacrifice, which is the spiritual service of men.

Turning to the consideration of doctrines, one is driven to the conclusion that this is the point at which the churches have wasted valuable years in fruitless contention. Indeed, if it were only time that had been wasted, while constituting a

major sin, we might in some sense excuse them. A few centuries in the sweep of God's vision might not be so serious, but, while with painful monotony these controversies have persisted, generation after generation has disappeared from the earth without ever experiencing any vital relationship with the great Master of Men who alone has interpreted life at its highest and best. For my part, I am weary of it all. What I want in religion is reality. Mr. Lloyd George, in a recent address before the students of Edinburgh University, gave voice to this rather startling utterance. Said he, "Government nowadays is government by talk." Whether this be true in the world of politics, I know not, though I am much inclined to accept it at face value. Certain I am that no truer word could be spoken of the Church than that she is attempting to bring in the Kingdom of God through much talk and discussion. It would seem that most churches are acting on the belief that they have but one thing to give to the community, provided, of course, that the community will come to the church. That thing is preaching. And mark you, the preaching must be of the type approved by a council deliberating in another age far removed from our own and without access to the cumulative knowledge that science brings to our hands to-day. I do not discount the value of preaching. The gospel must be preached as a preliminary to its being lived, but, as Principal L. P. Jacks has truly said, "When the highest things have been turned into themes of eloquence, or into subjects for the war of minds between contentious philosophers, and when everybody is eager to talk about them, there is a terrible danger that the habit of argument about these things, and talking eloquently and learnedly about them, may become a substitute for doing them." To quote further, he says: "One of the tasks awaiting Christian theologians to-day is to sift out those parts of Christianity which cannot be acted and to stand firm on those which can." In the same lecture on "Education and Religion" Dr. Jacks sums up his argument in the following terse sentence: "Treat Christianity as an actable religion, and distrust all forms of it which consist in merely saying this or saying that."

After all, does this not offer a keen and fundamental interpretation of the religion of Jesus Christ? "Not every one that sayeth unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven." What was the doctrine of Christ? Let any group of leaders come together and spend six months studying his life and programme and then outline his doctrine if they can. They will discover that a summary of his entire ministry and teaching could be made in a single sentence: God is your Father and all men are your brothers, and you must live and act in accordance with that truth. The Master's emphasis was on life and not doctrine. Had the Apostle Paul been less zealous in his effort to bring about an intellectual reconciliation between the teachings of Christ and the principles of Greek philosophy, we would not have substituted doctrine for service. A careful analysis of Paul's writings is bound to leave one with the impression that here is a man who is trying to make his new-found religion compatible with an intellectual philosophy, largely Grecian in its concept. There are times when he breaks through the superficial veneer of the intellectual process to a most practical Christ-inspired altruism, as in the twelfth chapter of Romans and the thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians. Indeed all his teaching is saturated with Christ-like principles which had become inwrought into the very fiber of his being. But always there is the interplay of his philosophic mind and his peculiar conceptions of Christ's second coming and the end of the world upon the problems of human conduct. Doubtless this reasoning, in the end, tended as much toward the creation of thought-molds for approach to religion as to the emphasis of Christ-like examples of simple human service in revealing God's will. Paul, like most intellectuals, missed in part the important discovery which Christ gave to the world,—namely, that character is as much a revelation of God as is the written word of truth.

A similar study of Christ's ministry discloses the attempt to divest Judaism of its outworn forms and ceremonies by the simple injection of love and service as its motive power. He

predicated heaven and our assurance of it on one condition—that we serve the needs of his “little ones.” In that most graphic picture of the judgment in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew our Lord places the sheep upon the right and the goats upon the left, saying to those upon the left, “Depart,” and those upon the right, “Come, inherit.” Why? Because ye believed in and preached some particular system of faith and doctrine? Not so! Although faith and doctrine are important when rightly conceived and are by no means to be handled loosely. Because ye believed in some particular form of church polity? Not so! Although there is a true ideal of church organization, and that ideal needs emphasis. Because ye were baptized and never failed to exalt the purpose of the Communion? Not so! Notwithstanding these must ever symbolize the Master’s dedication and life of service. Read it with care. Come, because ye ministered to one of the least of his children. Our passport to the life abundant is obtained through service.

If I have succeeded thus far in interpreting the vision of my own heart in this paper, you will understand that, while praying for release from present day denominationalism, I am not blind to the fact that each communion has given a valuable accent to Christianity. Denominationalism is not wholly good, but it is far from being wholly bad. All truth is collective and each religious communion has its peculiar contribution to make to the sum total of truth. The Atlantic Ocean represents the combined waters of the St. Lawrence, the Hudson, the Mississippi, the Amazon, and a thousand other streams that sing their way from the snow-topped mountains to their ocean home. Ten thousand years hence, when truth gets a hearing and becomes ultimate, the discovery will be made that it is the resultant of many streams of influence which the denominations have contributed in their search after the living Christ. Having paid my compliments to the denominations, let me hasten to remark that, judged by their fruits, each communion has been guilty of too much emphasis of the notion that it holds a monopoly on truth, and that the world cannot be saved except through its categories of faith. It is time to throw away all

but the Master's measuring-stick for determining spiritual value. Here it is: "By their fruits ye shall know them." In the light of this standard the discovery will be made that church forms and ceremonies and doctrines can only be interpreted by the spirit they help to create. When once that spirit becomes vitalized, Christian unity will become an assured fact. Christ prayed for union, but the union He desired can only be determined by observing what He did. He did not talk much about it. He was quite content to live in unity and accord with God and man. He proved this by service. Service, then, is the key to Christian unity, and all the preliminary steps must lead us to that high goal. Therefore, it is time to get acquainted with our world and its needs, as did Christ. This involves first getting acquainted with each other. Ray Stannard Baker, in *The Friendly Road*, was asked by a capitalist if he was a Socialist. His reply was: "I hardly know what I am, but I know what I should like to be." "And what is that?" said the man of affairs. "I should like to be an introducer and introduce the employer to the employee, that each might get the other's view-point." In this day of the world's rebuilding, many of us can render no greater service than to be introducers, introducing one denomination to the ideals and purposes of another as they are yoked with Christ. For, be assured Christian unity will never come until we understand and are able to evaluate the beautiful and worth while things of each sister denomination.

The truth of God is like a mountain which must be viewed from all sides to really comprehend its entirety. The denominations have been referring to their way and saying this is the path of approach and this is the view you must get, if you would truly know the mountain. The weakness lies in the fact that it is only a partial view. You must have all the varied views of all sides of the mountain to be able to say you have encompassed it. Even then you do not know it. Indeed, you are only just ready to begin the acquaintance of the mountain itself. Each path must be traversed and the things of beauty all along the way must be explored and appropriated. "If any man willeth to do the will of my Father he shall know of the doctrine." Doing, not doctrine, leads to the truth.

Our contention is that, when Christian unity comes, it will be on a basis of service. When once we become passionately enamored with the purpose of Christ to minister to the needs of wayward humanity, questions of doctrine and polity will take a secondary rank. We shall be ready to do what our Lord did in service for the world. Yonder, in a beautiful valley in Ohio, I once knew a happy couple that had linked their fortunes for life in the bonds of marriage. They seemed so well mated that the entire community prophesied only happiness for their future. After two or three years had passed, and a little child had come into their home, the entire neighbourhood was shocked one day with the news of a separation. Finally, proceedings were instigated and a divorce granted. By some technicality of law which I have never understood, the custody of the child was given to the father. Then the young mother went out to earn her living and the child was taken to his grandparents, while the father, who was a traveling man, plunged deeper into business in the hope of forgetting the past. But, as he laboured, he was constantly reminded of the fact that he had brought disgrace to his child; he was robbing the boy of the things which only a Christian home could deposit in a child's life. At the same time the mother's heart was pining for her son, and she, too, was reasoning that she was denying to the child of her heart a wealth of mother love, and to that extent crippling his future. Their common love and the desire for a common service in behalf of the child bridged the differences and brought them together again to be reunited in a bond that is deep and abiding and has continued through the years. So, when our hearts are centered upon the great programme to which our Master committed his life, theological disputes, differences in church management, forms, and ceremonies will seem as nothing compared with a united service that shall feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the fatherless, and thus minister as did the Master of Men to the children of his Father. Nothing but a union of service will satisfy the needs of humanity to-day, and only such unity will meet the desire of the Father's heart.

L. W. MCCREARY.

GEORGE CALIXTUS

BY MATTHEW SPINKA, PH.D.,

Professor of Church History, Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio.

FOR a professedly irenic theologian, George Calixtus managed to stir up so much vitriolic polemics that the controversies of our day, in comparison, pale into insignificance, and the very thought of wading through those acrimonious, bulky volumes, written in refutation of his programme, fills one with dismay. And they knew how to use the Latin language vigorously in those day! So much the more, to think oneself back to the heyday of Protestant scholasticism, some seventy or eighty years after Luther's death, and to realize the moral courage which was needed to make a proposal of union among the Lutherans, the Reformed, and the Roman Catholics, it is to become imbued to a respectable degree with the most wholesome admiration and respect for George Calixtus. For he possessed that moral courage in the fullest measure.

Having been born in 1586 at Medelbye, in Schleswig, the son of a Melanchthonian preacher, John Calixtus, George was trained from the earliest infancy in the tolerant spirit of the Melanchthonian school. When seventeen years of age, he was sent for his advanced studies to the University of Helmstedt, because of its irenic spirit and its humanistic and philosophical fame. The Julian University, as it was called, had been founded in 1576 by Duke Julius of Brunswick, who was at first a strict adherent of the Lutheran orthodoxy, but after he had his eldest son ordained bishop of Halberstadt, and his two younger sons to receive the tonsure, he changed in his attitude toward the Formula of Concord. Thereafter the university professors were required to swear loyalty only to the *Corpus Doctrinæ Julium*. This made the Julian University a target for such strictly orthodox centers as were the Universities of Witten-

berg, Tübingen, Strassburg, Greifswald, and, to a less degree, by Leipzig and Jena. After completing his studies in humanities, Greek, and oriental languages, as well as theology, Calixtus received his Master's degree.

In 1609 he decided to supplement his education by a tour through the neighbouring countries. He visited the Universities of Jena and Giessen, and the modern student is somewhat startled to learn from one of his letters that "the art of boxing flourished there along with the more distinguished studies."¹ In that stronghold of Roman Catholicism, the city of Maintz, Calixtus had a long talk with a Jesuit, Becanus, and even then had "thoughts of mitigating the feuds and dissensions of Christians." His irenic predisposition received further inspiration from intercourse with David Paræus of Heidelberg the outstanding Reformed irenic theologian of the earlier generation. Calixtus returned to Helmstedt in 1610, and became a *privat-docent* at the University.

But the next year he was again seized by the *wanderlust*, and, in company of his wealthy Dutch friend, Overbeck, he made a more extensive journey. The two friends spent the winter at Cologne, the "German Rome," then went to Leyden, where, however, they did not stay long but pressed on to England. There Calixtus made his acquaintance with the distinguished French theologian Casaubon, who had joined the Church of England, and visited Oxford and Cambridge. From Casaubon he received an introduction to the French historian De Thou, who was, according to Grotius, a Catholic "with thirty exceptions." At Paris the two friends parted, Overbeck going on to Italy, while Calixtus, in 1613, returned home.

In the meantime, an incident occurred which had an important bearing upon the fortunes of Calixtus. A young nobleman, Ludolf von Klencke, during a visit to Rome was nearly won over to Catholicism by that prince of Jesuit controversialists, Bellarmine. But, before taking the final step, he agreed to listen to a disputation between two champions of the

1. Dowding, W. C. *The Life and Correspondence of George Calixtus*. Oxford and London, 1863, p. 48.

evangelical faith, of whom Calixtus was one, and a defender of Roman Catholicism, the Jesuit Augustinus Turrianus. In this disputation Calixtus denied the infallibility of the Pope, affirming, on the contrary, the infallibility and sufficiency of the Scriptures. He held that all things essential to salvation are to be found in the Holy Writ. Even though the victory was awarded to the two evangelicals, Von Klencke went over to Rome, nevertheless.

Calixtus had shown himself in this disputation a man of rare parts, and the Duke of Brunswick was so impressed with his talents that he nominated him, on December 12, 1614, professor of theology at the Julian University. This appointment was bitterly resented by the personal as well as the theological opponents of Calixtus, but with no result; he was sworn into his office on January 18, 1615, when only twenty-eight years of age.

Next year, two important events occurred: Calixtus received his doctor's degree, and was married to a wealthy widow, daughter of the burgomaster of Helmstedt, Catherine Gartner. A number of children were born of this union, of whom Frederick Ulrich succeeded his father in the chair of theology at the Julian University, and spent his life in a spirited defense of his sire's memory and programme. During the Thirty Years' War, when the enemy troops invaded Helmstedt, Calixtus' family suffered acute distress and privation. For a time, he received no salary from the University; in recompense, and because his services "have not been sufficiently remunerated," Duke Frederick Ulrich conferred upon him, in 1627, the abbacy of Königs-lutter, which he retained to the end of his life.

Being permanently settled and provided for, Calixtus was free to turn his energies to the accomplishment of his life-task, the reunion of Western Christendom. His work may be conveniently summed up in a brief description of his proposals to the Roman Catholics, on the one hand, and the Reformed, on the other. As for the Eastern Orthodox Churches, they were so little considered that no special provision was made for them. The basic postulate of Calixtus was the same as that of the

Jesuit Antonius de Dominis—a distinction between the fundamental and the non-fundamental in the Christian doctrinal systems, and the affirmation of an essential unity of the three communions in the primary beliefs of Christianity.

Calixtus found an opportunity to address the Catholic Universities of Germany by reason of the publication of a polemical treatise addressed very directly to himself, written by a convert to Catholicism, Neuhaus by name, under the title *Ars Nova*, etc. He answered this book in a treatise, *Digressio de arte nova*, addressing himself not to Neuhaus, but to the learned Catholic institutions, especially the University of Cologne. In this book he tried to prove that the Lutheran and the Roman Catholic Churches fundamentally rest upon the same doctrinal basis—namely, the Holy Scriptures as interpreted by the tradition of the first five centuries. Luther, he said, introduced nothing new, only sought to correct the abuses of the old, which had crept in. He taught nothing but what was contained in the *Apostolicum*, the Niceno-Constantinopolitan, and the Athanasian Creeds; the Lutheran Church joins with the Ephesian Synod in condemning Nestorianism, with the Chalcedonian in condemning Eutychianism, and with the Synods of Mileve and Orange in condemning Pelagianism. Thus it condemns everything that the ancient Church united in condemning, and teaches everything the ancient Church taught, and without which truths no one can be saved. Thus, resting upon the same fundamental doctrinal basis, the two communions are in essentials at one. And “where the foundation is safe, we can bear with differences of opinion upon less weighty and speculative by-questions; as we can, also, bear with differences in usage.”² His zeal for the great ideal was so genuine that he could not forbear, but cried out: “If I may but help toward the healing of our schisms, I will shrink from no cares and no night watchings; no efforts and no dangers . . . nay, I will never spare either my life or my blood, if so be I may purchase the peace of the Church.”

The Lutheran orthodoxy stood aghast at this bold recog-

2. Quoted in Dowding, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

dition of the Roman Church, and then, aroused to fury, fiercely fell upon the bold reformer. The champion of Lutheranism was found in Statius Büscher, preacher of the Aegidien Church in Hanover. He published, in 1640, a book which he originally entitled *The Abomination of Desolation in the Holy Place*, but, in the last instant, changed it to *The Cryptopapism of the New Theology of Helmstedt*. He charged Calixtus with six main errors. But the Duke of Brunswick summoned the champion to prove his charges, and, when the doughty warrior failed to appear, pronounced Calixtus' cause sustained. Büscher died the next year, and with his death the episode was closed.

But Calixtus' proposal received no better reception from the Catholics. Neuhaus again resumed his attack in a number of scurrilous publications. Calixtus replied in his *Iterata compellatio ad academiam Coloniensis* (1642), again plainly avoiding a merely personal polemic. He reiterated his assertion that the two communions are at one in essentials, and that the strife between them is waged over mere by-questions. But his proposals again remained unanswered, save for another personal attack by a French priest, Veron by name, appointed by Cardinal Richelieu to the post of "*predicateur du Roi pour les controverses*." Calixtus was calumniated by his opponents as "the chief teacher of half-Christians, and the high-priest of an utopian general Church composed of those who hold any faith which pleases them,"³ and the Jesuit Ebermann, in his *Anatomia Calixtina*, resolutely rejected his scheme, declaring any conference between the two bodies chimerical, and charged him with aiding the Antichrist.

Calixtus replied once more, explicating further his position and reiterating his fundamental thesis. He urged that the *Apostolicum*, as the minimum required for salvation, is a sufficient creed. "As the primitive Church admitted catechumens to Baptism when they had learned the creed, and called them, as well as held them to be, of the faithful; it is evident that this same primitive Church must have thought that the creed contains those heads of doctrine, the knowledge of which consti-

3. Schmid. *Geschichte des synkretischen Streites*, p. 67.

tutes the true and faithful Christian, and which is necessary to the obtaining of salvation." Then he pointed out that the common people, as a rule, know nothing more than the Apostles' Creed. "Either, therefore, this is enough for salvation, or these people are not in a state of salvation."⁴ As for the claim of the Catholic Church, that, besides the Holy Scriptures and the *Apostolicum*, the ruling of the Pope is essential, Calixtus replied that the proof lies with the Catholics, to be made good in a conference; but, as for his own view of the matter, it is to be found in a later treatise on *Ecclesiastical Monarchy*, in which he argued against the necessity of the papal office.

Such were Calixtus' proposals which he made to the Catholic Church; as for the other major Protestant communion, the Reformed Churches, he conceived the task of bringing about a union with them of still less difficulty. His irenic efforts, as far as the Reformed were concerned, came into greater prominence from the time of the Colloquy of Thorn (1645), and the resulting "syncretistic" controversy—the most violently vituperative affair of that intemperately controversial age—continued to embitter his life to the end of his days. In 1644 the Great Elector of Brandenburg, Frederick William, who was a member of the Reformed Church, invited Calixtus, through his court chaplain John Bergius, to join the Brandenburg Lutheran theologians as one of the representatives at the Colloquy, called by king Wladislaw IV for the purpose of uniting the three chief confessions of Poland.

When Calixtus came to Thorn, he found that neither the Königsbergers nor any other of the Prussian theologians had as yet arrived. Moreover, because of a dispute in regard to rank, the Elector had forbidden any of his delegation to participate in the Colloquy, until his demands as to the rank of his delegates were acceded to. The Lutheran theologians of Elbing and Thorn requested Calixtus to join and aid them by his counsel, but against this the Dantziger Lutheran theologians protested most vigorously on the ground that he is not a true Lutheran. Among his Lutheran opponents, Calovius of Dantziger

4. *Responsum*. I, pp. 38-67; quoted in Dowding, *op. cit.*, pp. 237-38.

and Hülsemann of Wittenberg were the chief. Speaking of the causes of this violent opposition to himself, Calixtus says: "Dr. Calovius was well-conducted and reasonable, till he found that I hesitated to anathematize the Calvinists, or to exclude them from the number of Christian men; and that, likewise, it would not be contrary to my feelings if Lutherans and Calvinists were to hold together in the points which they are agreed upon against the Papists. Then he became, forthwith, wrathful and violent in such a sort that it was a distress to me so to converse with him; and I broke off the conversation by a hint that with one so bigoted and hot as he was I had no wish to speak on the subject further." "And this—that I could not go so violently against the Calvinists—I hold to be the true reason of that fierce hatred and inextinguishable enmity which he has continued to exhibit against me, up to this very hour." ⁵

Thus Calixtus found himself denied any co-operation with the representatives of his own communion, for the Königsbergers, to whom he was assigned by the Elector, came too late to attend any public sessions of the Colloquy. On the other hand, the Reformed solicited his help. He was, of course, well aware of the danger involved in such an act, but "seeing that Hülsemann and Calovius thought well to have everything their own way, instead of admitting any others to their side, I did not, on that account think myself justified to neglect to serve God in so far as I might, and in company of those who desired it from me." ⁶ But he never appeared with the Reformed delegations publicly at the meetings, limiting himself to the giving of advise in private. In spite of this precaution, the circumstance was seized upon with avidity by his heresy-hunting opponents, and they descended even to such puerile charges as that he went about in clothes unbecoming a theologian, "like a bourgeois school-master," with a short mantle, an old battered Brunswick hat, and a neck-cloth hanging behind as if he were an old army officer. ⁷ When criticized that he crossed the street several times in company of the Reformed, Calixtus could bear

5. Quoted in Dowding, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

6. Quoted in Dowding, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

7. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

it no longer and burst out in righteous indignation: "Is it possible that hatred has risen to such a pitch among us that the Reformed are not fit for a man to walk across the street with? I will not debar myself from the company of reputable people, be they Calvinists or be they Papists." And, true to his word, he actually did attend a meeting to which he was invited by the Catholics.

Such having been the spirit which prevailed at that so-called "*Colloquium Charitativum*," no wonder that the conference accomplished nothing. Calixtus passed this fitting judgment upon it: "The conference was no conference; much less it was loving (*charitativum*); it was rather a cause of wrath (*irritativum*)."

From that time on, Calixtus was openly and most viciously assailed for heterodoxy. Taking for their occasion two disputations, in which Calixtus and his colleague Horneius were implicated, the Universities of Wittenberg, Leipzig, and Jena sent them, in 1646, *Admonitionem fraternam ad theologos D. G. Calixtus et D. C. Horneium de phrasibus et sententiis ipsorum scandalosis*. The University of Königsberg, which was largely Calixtine in tendency, likewise shared the denunciations. But not all at Königsberg were supporters of Calixtus. Mislenta, of that city, in his *Anticrisis*, charged Calixtus with "papism, Calvinism, Arminianism, Synergism, chimerism, and lastly with atheism."⁸ and described his theology as a "*Babylonica religionum mixtura*." The attacked sent out an open letter to the Elector of Brandenburg as well as all the universities of Germany, pronouncing *Anticrisis* a slander. This brought forth a series of defensive pamphlets, on the one hand, and recriminatory, on the other, which embittered the regrettable controversy still more. Finally, the Wittenberg theologians wished to call a general Lutheran theological conference, at which the Calixtine doctrines would be examined. There is no doubt that in such an event they would have been most severely condemned, but, because of some internal dissensions, the conference was not called. Nevertheless, the opponents of Calixtus attempted

8. *ibid*, p. 19.

to accomplish the same thing by their untiring literary labours. Hülsemann published his *Dialysis* and other works (one of them exceeding 1600 pages), and Calovius his *Institutiones, Synkretismus Calixtinus*, and the *Harmonia Calixtino-hæretica* (of 1200 quarto pages), and other polemical volumes. Their final effort represented an attempt to have the Formula of Concord superseded by their hyper-orthodox *Consensus repetitus fidei vere Lutheranae* as the standard of Lutheran orthodoxy. In this document, Calixtus was charged with no less than eighty-eight errors, which number was increased in later writings to one hundred and twenty. But Calixtus was spared answering this final blast, for he died on March 19, 1656, and the defense of his programme was committed to his son and successor Frederick Ulrich.

What, then, was the proposal of Calixtus which stirred up so much acrimonious controversy? As already indicated, he held that all three Christian communions—the Roman Catholics, the Lutherans, and the Reformed—are based upon the same common substratum: the Holy Scriptures and the tradition of the ancient Church. The Scriptures are the *unum primum et summum principium*, while tradition is subordinated to it, and dependent upon it for authority. Tradition is the *testimonium et consensus ecclesæ priscae catholiceque*. But this tradition is determinative and authoritative, for “in articles of belief necessary to salvation the Church cannot err.”⁹ The marks of true tradition are comprised in the familiar definition of Vincent of Lérins: *universitas, antiquitas, consensus*. But since, as a matter of historical fact, errors did enter the Church, a time limit must be set which would separate the pure from the tainted. Calixtus pronounced the first five centuries—*consensus quinque sæcularis*—as the period of doctrinal purity, and the *Apostolicum* as the creedal norm containing all that is necessary to believe in order to gain salvation. All development beyond this ancient symbol is only of secondary importance, and is not necessary to salvation. Later symbols are only amplifications or illucidations of the

9. Friedrich, op. cit., p. 23.

Apostolicum, and as such do not share with it in primary authority.

Consequently, as far as the various communions are concerned, Calixtus found no fundamental difference among them in the matter of primary doctrines. He, therefore, claimed that there exists, between the Lutheran and the Roman communions, a *communio virtualis et interna*, although as yet this virtual communion has not become a *communio actualis et externa per sacramentum*. The actual communion is at present not possible, he said, because of the Catholic teaching regarding the power of the Pope, the number of sacraments, the transubstantiation, the purgatory, the auricular confession, the treasury of merits, celibacy of the priesthood, monasticism, and worship of the Virgin Mary and the saints. But these differences do not belong to the realm of the primary beliefs, and as such are to be relegated to theologians for discussion, and are not necessary or even useful for private members.

As for the differences within Protestantism, these are of still less import. The two communions differ in the doctrine of unconditional predestination, which, however, is not important. The Lutheran teaching regarding the ubiquity of the body of the Lord cannot be considered as fundamental, either, for even the Lutherans themselves are not at one on that point, and it is not as much as mentioned in the Augsburg Confession and the Schmalkald Articles. The greatest difference exists in the teaching regarding the Lord's Supper, but since sacraments are to be defined merely as *quid sit* and not *quomodo sit*, this difference should not prevent brotherly recognition of each other as brethren in Christ. It may be remarked that Calixtus, quite naturally, regarded the Lutheran Church as nearest to the pure doctrine of the ancient Church, although he was not blind to the imperfections existing even within that communion.

Calixtus differed from the accepted Lutheran orthodoxy in a significant way in several particulars. He never quite fully accepted the doctrine of ubiquity, and, likewise, differed in details of the doctrine of the original sin, the free will, and justification by faith alone. In regard to the last named he

held that faith must show itself through works, although he did not say that works are necessary to salvation. His practical emphasis, which later contributed to the rise of Pietism, as well as a brief recapitulation of his entire programme, is found in his *Desiderium et studium concordiae ecclesiasticæ*, formulated in nine articles:

Such matters as are necessary to salvation shall be distinguished from the unnecessary; mutual toleration shall be exercised.

All mutual recrimination shall cease.

All questions which do not contribute to the upbuilding of piety or have no importance for the sacraments or the whole Church, shall be passed over, and, above all, shall not be discussed before the common people.

The differences which the people must be informed about shall be explained in a fair and kind manner.

As for the sacraments, the *quod sit* shall be considered important, and an absolute unanimity regarding the *quomodo sit* shall be required as necessary.

Acceptance of the simplest doctrinal formula shall be regarded as sufficient.

All propositions which were disapproved of, shall be avoided; no one who had formerly held such, shall be exposed to dishonour on that account.

All men shall strive to understand the newly adopted teaching in its rightful meaning.

The teaching of the several confessions shall be taken from their official creedal statements.¹⁰

The chief meaning of the programme of Calixtus is to be found in his distinction between the fundamental and non-fundamental in the dogmatic affirmations of the Christian Churches, and the assertion that all are virtually united by reason of accepting the same fundamental dogmas. This was not conceded in his day; would his programme be found any more acceptable to-day? All things considered, it appears highly improbable that the programme of Calixtus would pro-

10. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

duce an effective union of Christians, or would even offer a satisfactory basis of negotiations to that effect. The inherent weaknesses of the plan are greatly augmented by reason of the differences of the spirit of the seventeenth and the twentieth centuries. To begin with, an increasing number of earnest Christians are not thinking of their religion in terms of creeds and dogmas to be accepted, but in terms of an all-pervading and all-dominating spirit of Christ which changes men's lives. That, of course, does not preclude the necessity, or at least the propriety, of an exact formulation of the religious realities into an organized and systematized body of knowledge, or, in other words, a theological system. But this system is increasingly conceived of in terms of dynamic religious realities and experiences, in terms of vital relationships with God and men, and not in terms of a static "deposit of faith," transmitted from the apostolic age through all the succeeding centuries to our own day in a form both unchanged and unchangeable, both in essence and mode of formulation. Even if it were granted that the form in which this vital faith is expressed may and properly ought to change from time to time, provided that the essence remains forever the same, the modern Christendom would find it quite impossible to accept the dictum in its fullest literal meaning. Thus, for instance, for Calixtus the *Apostolicum* contained all things necessary to salvation, and all further theological development was regarded non-essential. But that ancient document, understood in terms of its historical development, is now commonly held not to have been designed as an all-comprehensive statement of all the essentials of Christianity, but merely a defensive measure against the various ancient heresies. Every major conflict through which the ancient Church passed left a sentence, which like a scar mutely bears testimony to the struggle. Thus, for example, it says nothing about the Kingdom of God, although that was the goal of all the ministry of Jesus. Moreover, as for the affirmations which it makes, there are several which certainly are not considered essential to Christianity by modern Christendom, and which cannot be held in their literal and historical

sense. Modern Christendom does not profess to believe in any literal sense in the descent of Christ into the mythical Sheol of the Hebrews, or Hades of the Greeks, and "spiritualizes" the meaning in one way or another. Nor could modern Christendom be expected to affirm, *ex animo* and in the literal sense, the phrase which asserts the physical resurrection of the body, and it is increasingly chary in affirming the physical implications of the traditional doctrine of the Virgin birth. Thus to offer the Apostles' Creed as the quintessence of Christianity, as a *sine qua non* of salvation, on the basis of which the reunion of Christendom is to be attained to-day, would be to offer a less satisfactory and a less adequate expression of the real dynamic faith of Christendom than it was even in the days of Calixtus.

And yet, in spite of these criticisms, which could be greatly expanded and which militate seriously against any thought of a literal acceptance of the plan of Calixtus, the truth remains that the main features of all Christian thought have been determined by the Scriptures and the ancient Church within the period of the first five centuries down to the Chalcedonian Council, and that those features are not likely ever to be lost by historical Christianity. Those ancient dogmatic decisions will undoubtedly undergo unending series of re-interpretations and modification in the light of the advancing knowledge of the changing centuries, and it must be expected that many features which were considered essential or absolutely necessary by one age may be held lightly by another age which prizes more highly some other aspect of the truth; but, when all is said, the revelation of the love and truth of God in the person of Jesus Christ will remain for ever central. There may be but little hope of uniting Christendom on the basis of a doctrinal system, but unity in the spirit of loyalty to the person of Jesus Christ and his revelation of God's purpose for humankind in the establishment of the Kingdom of God remains the great goal of the future of Christendom. In that sense, George Calixtus had not lived and laboured in vain.

MATTHEW SPINKA.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

Is Reordination the only Obstacle to Reunion?

APART from Rome, there are the Orthodox Churches of the East, there are the Old Catholics, and the Scandinavian Church and the Danish Church, and perhaps, some other bodies of Christians, in addition to the great body of American Methodists. I should like an effort to be made to unite these various Christian communities with the Church of England and the Presbyterians and Methodists of Great Britain. And I would postpone the question of the ministry until it had become clear whether the difficulty about holy orders was or was not the only obstacle to reunion between these bodies. I fear that it would be found that there are other obstacles. But, if the controversy about the ministry alone blocked the way, I would have it removed by all the Protestant Christian communions, including the Church of England, soliciting conditional ordination from the Orthodox bishops. By such ordination two great objects would be gained: First, the bishops of the Church of England would set, as it is fitting they should, an example of humility and charity to their Protestant brethren. Secondly, the question of the ministry would be finally disposed of and it would be out of the way whenever it should become possible to attempt the ultimate reunion with the Romans. Frankly, I do not sympathize with or understand reluctance, whether among Anglicans or Presbyterians, to accept conditional ordination. What harm can it do? Can any one suppose that it would be displeasing to the Holy Ghost?—which is, after all, the only question we ought to care about. Can any one deny that we ought to do whatever is not sinful to promote reunion? Or can any one maintain that conditional ordination would be sinful? Reluctance to accept it, whether among Anglicans or Presbyterians, seems to me quite indefensible: it is unreasonable, uncharitable, stubborn.

[From Lord Hugh Cecil in *The Spectator*, London.]

An Irish Bishop on Anglican Reunion

WE anticipated that the conversations between Cardinal Mercier and representatives of the Anglican Church on the

question of Christian reunion would not meet with an altogether favourable reception among Roman Catholics in England, and certainly not in Ireland. Therefore, we rubbed our eyes in astonishment when we came across the following kindly and hopeful statement from the Most Reverend Dr. McRory, Bishop of Down and Connor, the first Irish prelate to comment publicly on the conferences at Malines. We quote from the N. C. W. C. News Service despatch from Dublin as reported in *The Catholic Columbian*:

Is it any wonder, in view of the clear Scriptural teaching as to the unity of Christian doctrine, that earnest Christian leaders should come together in the hope, however slight, of finding some way out of the present confusion? Doubtless, they feel that the Christian world at present is very far indeed from representing the mind or satisfying the heart of the Divine Founder of Christianity. I abstain from saying anything as to the solution that ought to be sought or the creed on which all should agree. What I want to insist upon is, that the present divisions are a disgrace to Christianity and a most serious obstacle to its spread, and that the men who are honestly, and at the risk of misunderstanding, seeking some way to end them, so far from being blamed, ought to be admired and commended for their sincerity and courage.

Humanly speaking, I do not see any chance of present corporate reunion, but with God all things are possible. However, even if complete success or anything approaching it be not attained, at any rate we may hope and pray that lasting good will result from the conferences. Where such momentous issues are at stake, no church will seek merely a victory for herself and there can hardly fail to be good results of some kind if all seek earnestly the victory of truth.

[From *The American Church Monthly*, New York.]

The Roman Catholic Church on Unity

As non-Catholics desirous of promoting union between the Church and the sects are, at last, beginning to realize, the precise meaning of the word "Church" must be determined. To the vast majority of Protestants the Catholic Church is an aggregation of people, professing to be Christians, and acknowledging the Pope as their head; their religion being a mass of error and superstition, with occasional flashes of Christianity. The necessary consequence is that Catholic doctrine and history and historical characters are given by Protestants, not as they are, but as they ought to be on such an absurd assumption.

To its own members, the Catholic Church is an institution founded by Christ to spread the glad tidings of redemption, its supreme object being to sanctify and save souls. We hold that to it He left his authority to govern mankind; that to its keeping He entrusted the truths which He taught, making it the dispenser of all those means of salvation destined for the world.

To Catholics the Church is the empire of Christ, his spirit ever abiding with it; its claims on the allegiance and love of all mankind being identical with those of Christ Himself. In this sense, we maintain that the Church is absolutely perfect, and that to assert it ever erred or ever needed reform, is blasphemy.

Taken as an aggregation of people of all nationalities, classes, and conditions, more or less religious, one might, for the sake of argument, admit all the accusations ever made against the Church, save that its head ever led his followers into error concerning the faith that is in Christ. Wicked popes, hireling bishops, profligate priests; tyranny, lust, superstition, —what matters it how many or how much? The first Christians needed reform, as is plain from the Epistle of St. Paul; and every succeeding generation has needed it; and the popes have never ceased to repeat the Apostle's admonition and reproofs.

For human weakness, the Church is all pity. It has condemnation only for wilful error and deliberate sin. With all the stress laid on its dogmatic teaching, it has the justice that comes of sympathy for persons who misunderstand, or are in ignorance of, its real doctrine. As a Protestant polemic frankly admits: "She condemns no goodness; she condemns even no earnest worship, though it be outside her pale. The holy and humble of heart who do not know her, or who in good faith reject her, she commits with confidence to the uncovenanted mercies of God.

No delusion could possibly be greater, general as it is, than to suppose that the head of the Church will ever give up, or change, what is now declared to be integral parts of its creed, or ever abate one jot or tittle of its claim to be the sole repository of divine truth, or ever cease to assert its demand on the allegiance of all Christians. This was understood by intelligent Protestants as far back as 1640, when the British House of Commons sent a message to the Lords "on the increase of popery." The speaker of the House, recognizing the unchanging character of Catholic truth, deprecated any effort to promote reunion with Rome. "For," said he, "the Pope being fastened to his errors, even by his chair of inerrability, he still sits unmoved; and so we cannot meet unless we come wholly to him. A man standing in a boat tied to a rock, when he draws the rope doth not draw the rock to the boat, but the boat to the rock." It is now for our separated and much-divided brethren to fasten their ropes to the rock, and pull.

[From *The Ave Maria*, Notre Dame, Ind.]

Unity Along Spiritual Lines

IT is quite clear that, for the present, the unity of Christendom must be sought along the lines of spiritual fellowship and practical co-operation rather than in organic reunion. Dr. Charles Brown is quite pessimistic of organic union between the Anglican and Free Churches, but he is heartily in favour of conference and united action whenever possible. He is convinced that the first steps toward unity among Christians are not ecclesiastical but spiritual. The Bishop of Coventry thinks that we shall not see corporate reunion for a long time to come, but he believes the way is being prepared for future generations. Dr. J. E. Roberts (Dr. Alexander McLaren's successor at Manchester) says that, unless spiritual unity is translated into organic unity, it remains a mere sentiment, unable to achieve anything. True, but why should not separate bodies interact and co-operate—just as the planets revolve round the central sun? Dr. D'Arcy, Primate of All Ireland, is convinced that, if a reunion led to the creating or restoring of a universal hierarchical system, dominating human life in all its parts, and dictating its doctrine and practice with professedly infallible authority, it would be the greatest disaster which could befall mankind.

Bishop Henson, Dean Inge, and Canon Barnes are all strongly opposed to any attempts toward reunion with Rome, and hold that the immediate duty of the Church of England is to set its own house in order, to grapple with internal problems. "We need," says the canon, "out of the present chaos to recreate a national Church, inclusive, not sectarian, where ancient dogma has been harmonized with modern knowledge, and where the great ethical and spiritual fundamentals of the life and teaching of Christ are duly emphasized." A correspondent of *The Times* makes a thoughtful contribution to the reunion discussion and raises some pertinent questions. He suggests that Christians may be too anxious to agree with each other: "Have we not thought more of agreeing among ourselves than agreeing with Him whom all acknowledge as the center and source of unity? It is not so important that men should agree with each other as that they should agree with Christ. If they start with the demand that they must agree in their views of the ministry or the Sacraments or the Creeds, they are putting things in the wrong order. The first question is, Do they agree in their obedience to Him, who is the source of their faith? Are they dominated by the desire to serve Him as

He demands?" What, this writer asks, are the things about which Christ thought most? What are the conditions He lays down for discipleship and fellowship? Where does He look for unity? And he answers: Let faithful men try to accept the mind of their Master as the law of their lives, and unity will be found in his Lordship and their combined endeavour to live according to the standards of life, both individual and social, which He presents to them. Here is the first step.

[From *The Churchman*, New York.]

A World Association of Churches

FOR the last hundred years the American churches in their work of World Evangelism, have largely tried to expand as denominations. Thanks to our Federal Council of Churches, in some aspects of our international work, we are on the way to a new method. The Council has presented a system where each denomination may have entire freedom in its own expression of the Christian faith, and yet where all may co-operate in such a way as to present a united front. It is only natural, therefore, that the American churches should now be encouraged to look to closer relationship with our sister churches across the Atlantic; and particularly at this moment of need and opportunity in Eastern Europe and Western Asia, our churches are feeling the importance of closer relations with the great Eastern churches. In response to this feeling, the Executive Committee of the Federal Council has organized a permanent committee on relations with the Eastern churches. The Committee has already begun to function and is in correspondence with different Christian leaders in Near Eastern lands. Last year, the Rev. George B. Montgomery, secretary of the Committee, was present at the first Lausanne Conference and took a trip through the Balkan States, Turkey, the Caucasus, Russia, and the Baltic States, making contacts with the heads of the various branches of the Christian churches. The Committee has authorized Rev. William C. Emhardt, who is now in Western Europe, and Rev. F. W. Burnham, who is going abroad this summer, to represent it on their travels. It hopes also to send one or two special visitors who may have time to learn the needs and to discuss the best opportunities for mutual helpfulness. The Committee is particularly interested just now in helping the church at Jerusalem. The Orthodox Patriarchate traces its history back to

the earliest Jerusalem church, organized under James the Less, the brother of our Lord. The expression of good-will toward that church will have wide effect in the Near East, for the tide of pilgrims from Russia and other orthodox churches will sooner or later flow to Jerusalem once more, though in diminished stream compared with days before the war. Our good-will toward the Jerusalem church ought also to help the churches to share their blessings with each other. Already one Jerusalem church, the Gregorian, i.e., the Armenian, is securing the counsel of an able young American Episcopalian for the reshaping of its theological course. The Committee of the Federal Council has it in mind to encourage deputations from the Eastern churches to visit America, and believes that it may provide opportunities for promoting the drawing together of the Eastern churches among themselves, all looking toward a world association of churches whose specific form remains yet to be determined.

[From *The Christian Work*, New York.]

Church Union In Canada

THE movement, now running through fifteen or more years, by which three of the free Protestant denominations of Canada have been steadily advancing toward organic union, is being watched with keen interest on this side the border. It has now reached the final stage. A bill has been introduced into the Dominion Parliament by which the action of the ecclesiastical bodies is to be given legal civil sanction, and the property is to be assigned to rightful owners. Organized opposition to the move has not developed, or else has speedily dissipated, in two of the three communions, the Methodist and the Congregational. Among the Presbyterians the case is different. There the opposition has been sustained, and, in the final event, is found to be irreconcilable. A division of the church is accepted as inevitable; the denomination itself has made up its mind to a permanent disagreement between the factions, and the proposed civil programme of adjustment of property squarely faces the issue.

There have been four decisive votes in the Presbyterian General Assembly of Canada. The first was taken in 1910. All of the four have shown a remarkably fixed alignment of approximately four for and one against the merger. The final vote of 1923, by which the union was consummated, so far as

ecclesiastical procedure can avail to effect it, stood 406 to 90. This irreconcilable opposition in the Presbyterian Church alone is perhaps largely accounted for in the fact that a considerable proportion of the membership and of the ministry in the denomination are Scotch. There have developed several striking similarities between this movement in Canada and that of a generation ago in Scotland, when effort was made to unite the divided Scottish kirk. The opponents of the church union in Canada show a disposition to take advantage of the standing which the Wee Frees gained in the final decision in the long-drawn-out controversy, "back home."

DOCTRINAL PRESBYTERIANISM

The Scotchman is open-minded, always; he boasts of it. He holds himself open to conviction at all times, but adds under his breath, "I'd unco' weel like to see the mon wha ca' canvince me!" The traditional Presbyterian elder devoutly prays that the Lord may set him right at the start, for both he and the Lord understand full well that there is small chance of changing his mind once it has been set. The opponents of union in the Canadian Presbyterian Church have a doctrinal grievance against their too-liberal fellow-churchmen. In the writ, by which they hope to estop the proposed action of Parliament looking to the division of the denomination's property on the basis of the popular choice within the communion, they assume to set forth the essential doctrines on which the denomination rests, and deviation from which, they maintain, constitutes a kind of apostasy which disqualifies any professing to be Presbyterians from sharing in the rights of its fellowship or from advancing claims upon its property.

This doctrinal statement is stern and uncompromising in the style of the staunchest Calvinistic traditions. It not only sets forth, in positive terms, the doctrine of election, but it runs the full gamut of predestinational logic; some are chosen to everlasting life, and, with not less final determination, God has chosen others to everlasting death and punishment for disbelief. Manifestly the opposition leaders do not scruple at supralapsarianism. The sovereign divine will would seem to have fore-ordained the fall and consequent doom of man as a logical and necessary precursor to a degree of creation, not to speak of salvation.

Now that this statement has been issued, more liberal-minded, but stalwart, leaders of the denomination, who have

espoused the union cause, are saying: "Well, if that is Presbyterianism, the only and true-blue, then we are not Presbyterians. For we do not believe such doctrines; we do not now preach them; we have never knowingly subscribed to them, nor have we ever preached them." "Precisely," reply the opponents of union, in effect; "we are conscious that you are not now and have perhaps never been real Presbyterians, else you would not be championing your subversive and heretical course. Sadly, but decisively, we would purge the church of your presence. Your proper course is to withdraw, leaving Presbyterian doctrines, traditions, and property behind, to the custody of those who are true to them and to whom alone they are properly entrusted." In short, Wee Free doctrines are being pressed to a triumph, hoped-for in Canada, which they won in Scotland.

LEGALIZING THE UNION

The member of parliament who has introduced the bill providing for the legal union of the denominations, is himself a Presbyterian, a member of one of those numerous churches scattered throughout the dominion, and especially western Canada, which have anticipated the organic union of the three denominations, and have formed union congregations whose standing is to be made regular and secure by the anticipated legislation. While a convinced union man, he resolutely stands for a just and even generous policy toward that element in the Presbyterian Church which has persistently opposed the union. The bill provides for turning over to them, at least, their proportionate share of ecclesiastical property. Not only are they to take over the property of local congregations which they may control, but the denominational institutions, colleges, missionary machinery, and vested funds are to be divided equally.

To effect this a commission of nine is to be formed, three chosen by the advocates of union in the denomination, three by the opponents of union, and the six are themselves to choose the other three. In the event of their failure to agree upon the additional three, a minister of government is to make the appointment. This commission is to handle details of property adjustment on the basis of popular sentiment in and the official decision of the denomination. Wee Free doctrine, as has been pointed out, does not admit of such procedure. Those who hold true to true-blue Presbyterianism, which, by its very nature, admits of no such truckling "fiasco" as organic union with other religious bodies, are the only proper or legal custodians

of Presbyterian doctrines, tradition, or property; the property all belongs to them, however small may be their numbers and however numerous may be those who would "sell out" to a seducing "union" cause.

There is no provision in Presbyterian polity for "popular vote" upon any question, either of faith or ecclesiastical procedure. The government is "representative," its authorities in polity are emphatic in declaring. The people elect their representatives, but their right or power to affect decisions rest there; the decision in all matters of doctrine and ecclesiastical order is the function alone of those ordained representatives. Though Canadian leaders recognize this essential feature of the system, there have been two occasions when a plebiscite, or popular referendum, on the question of the union has been taken among Presbyterian members. The vote in each case has been in favour of union, but the first was thought not to have been conducted with sufficient care to reveal the popular will. Special effort in the second resulted in a vote from fifty-two per cent of the membership, and more than sixty per cent of those voting supported the union proposal. It was agreed by all that this popular referendum had no official standing in the Presbyterian system, nor could the result be decisive.

DENOMINATIONAL SUICIDE

Both the presbyteries and the General Assembly have repeatedly taken decisive votes on the question, however, and through them the denomination has been officially and finally committed to the union. So declare the unionists, at any rate, interpreting Presbyterian polity in support of their contention. But the opponents of union declare that not even the presbyteries and the General Assembly have the right to suicide the denomination; which they point out is the real issue. The Presbyterian Church is a spiritual entity which recreant human votes cannot dispose of in this reckless fashion. Whatever authority Presbyterian polity may lodge in the representative assemblies of the spiritual body, they are not vested with power to dissolve or put themselves and the church out of existence.

Manifestly, there can be no adjudication of such differences short of the fiat of civil courts disposing of the property in question. Of course, civil courts in Anglo-Saxendom, at least the Anglo-Saxendom of the Western Hemisphere, will not assume to adjudicate the purely theological issues thrust

forward. That is not their province. Though ecclesiastical bias has betrayed some American courts into encroaching upon this purely ecclesiastical domain, as, for example, in certain decisions of state courts in the hotly contested union of the Presbyterian U. S. A. and the Cumberland Presbyterian churches, yet such headiness has usually survived to regret its precipitation and usurpation. Canadian ecclesiastical traditions are not precisely like those of the United States, and the issue of the present controversy may take a somewhat different turn from that which would be inevitable under the laws and traditions of the States, yet the ideals and sentiments of the two societies are substantially the same. If the Wee Frees actually win in Canada, as would seem quite inconceivable, it will be to the even more exuberant gaiety of North American society, than has been the humorous issue of the controversy in Scottish history.

The merest layman can understand something of the difficulties this proposed parliamentary commission will face. Division of denominational property presents a nice enough problem of itself. But consider the complications in a local community where a city church has a membership of six hundred—an actual case—five hundred of whom favour union, and one hundred are opposed. The national opponents of union, by the contentions of their writ, would turn over this entire property to the hundred. How will the parliamentary commission, instructed and pledged to even-handed justice, dispose of the one plant? By only the most blundering process, which King Solomon's wisdom long ago scorned, can the property be divided. Perhaps the five hundred will be required to pay over to the hundred a prescribed indemnity, which they may employ in erecting a plant of their own. Yet, how flagrant the injustice to them in robbing them of the dear traditions of the old kirk! The commission faces no easy task, at its simplest.

TIME WILL ADJUST

As a matter of fact, though deep-seated Scotch convictions are to be reckoned with, time will adjust local differences in vastly the larger proportion of cases, if ecclesiastical meddlers will keep hands off. Probably the most of the membership which voted against the union during the popular referendum, will quietly acquiesce in it, if professional busy-bodies do not persistently embroil them. The articles of union allow the largest local freedom. The aim of the union is not to disturb existing

congregations in any of their cherished methods or traditions, but to insure spiritual and financial economies in church extension. On the frontier the union will put one strong church where, under the divided system, there would be two or three feeble and languishing denominational organizations. In the suburbs of the larger cities, the new "strategic center" will not be invaded by two or three "missions," but a statesmanlike extension policy will give the new city development one effective church organization.

All this is quite as sound American doctrine and policy as it is Canadian, and every American zealous for the conservation of our spiritual forces will watch the further development and consummation of this great Canadian experiment in organic church union with ever deepening solicitude and gratitude.

[From Joseph Ernest McAfee in *The Christian Century*, Chicago, Ill.]

The Will to Fellowship

READ the words from the prayer of the Son of Man for his disciples: "That they may all be one, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." Here are tremendous words, in which Jesus makes the proof of his person and the power of his Gospel to depend upon the unity and fraternity of his followers. Surely he is dead of soul who can hear that prayer and not be moved by its pathos and its challenge. Read in the light of actual Christian history, it well nigh smites one mute. The trouble is not that we have failed to take the words of Jesus literally; the trouble is that we have failed to take them seriously. The prayer of Jesus is literally true. The world will never believe in Christ until those who love Him love one another well enough to live and toil together in the spirit of his life and the service of his faith.

No wonder an intelligent man, after reading a volume on *The Credibility of Christianity*, quietly remarked: "It surely must be a doubtful religion which requires so much learning to prove its credibility." But the proof of Christianity is not learning; it is living. Not logic linked and strong, but a love strong enough to overcome apathy, antipathy, and unkindness; strong enough to melt prejudice and pride of opinion; strong enough to teach men to think and let think; strong enough to discover unities underlying diversities, and, above all, to unite willing hands in the service of the bitter need of men.

Alas! too often the history of the Church has been a history of bitter and persistent hatred, of inconceivable bigotry and brutality. What sins, what atrocities are recorded in the annals of the Christian Church! Even the sacrament of fellowship, with its symbol of that unutterable reality for which words were never made, has become a shibboleth of separation. No failure of the Church has been more pitiful than its failure of fellowship, its bankruptcy of brotherliness. The plain truth is, while there have been Christians in the Church in every age, the Church itself has seldom been Christian. The epigram of Dean Milman was justified: "Christianity has been tried for more than eighteen centuries; it is about time that we should try the religion of Jesus."

Happily, in our time a better mood and brighter hope prevails, and there are signs that sanity may triumph over schism. Never, one may venture to say, has there been a more profound yearning for Christian unity, or a deeper sense of the necessity, if the de-christianization of the modern world is to be averted. Once again, the facts are the voice of God for such as have ears to hear. Faced by issues such as those which confront us to-day, the old sectarianism is not only inadequate, but absurd. It does not signify; it is a stupendous stupidity. Many are beginning to feel that, if it is possible for men to be united in fellowship in the service of Christ, then Christianity is either an idle dream or an empty legend. None the less, deep in the Christian heart the wish for a larger fellowship has never been so evidently and vividly alive. When the wish becomes will, where there is a will there is a way to overcome inertia, intellectual difference, and, perhaps, by the mercy of God even the institutional selfishness in which all of us have to share.

[From Rev. Joseph Fort Newton, in *The Christian Century*, Chicago, Ill.]

The Way of Hope

WHEN Christians are divided into a number of competing groups, they exercise little influence on the community as a whole. Being separated, they have no collective opinion, and no organ by which to express an opinion, if they had one. St. John tells us that our Lord prayed that his disciples might be One—"that the world might believe." We know by experience that lack of unity is a terrible handicap in the conversion of

the world—a handicap in the Mission Field and a handicap at home. When the people who profess and call themselves Christians, who declare to the world that there is one God who is the Father of all, one Lord and Saviour in whom his will for human life has been revealed, and one Spirit that is calling us all to that way of salvation, are divided into competing groups, their testimony is blurred, they give the lie to the Gospel of the one Lord. If Christians continue organized in separate and hostile groups, what use is their pretending the Christian Church is a great unifying influence, a great Society which transcends all division of nation, race, or status; in which in Jesus Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, nay more, in which there is neither male nor female, all divisive barriers swept away.

I need not elaborate the point; we all realize that the days of individualism are past, that the divisions which have grown up are more than “unhappy divisions”—they weaken our testimony. Because we are not one the world will not believe. A house divided against itself cannot stand, and often has to surrender to the enemy. Had it not been for the rivalry of the Churches, the Christian instruction in our schools would be far better than it is. We have all come to realize the evils of disunion. Every church assembly talks about it. Everywhere Christians are recognizing that the only hope of the world is the establishment of Christ’s law of peace and righteousness and love, and that, until the churches are visibly united, they cannot proclaim that law effectively.

But how can union be accomplished? Is it to be by unity of organization? Are we to aim at re-establishing a world-wide organization in which there shall be uniformity of creed and uniformity in the ministry? That is the way which is being pursued by what is known as the “Faith and Order” movement.

I do not want to disparage that movement. It is right and it is useful for the members of various groups of Christians to meet together, endeavour to understand each other’s point of view, and ascertain the greatest common denominator of agreement.

What has taken place in recent years shows that in the near future the number of divisions may be reduced where there are no serious differences as to doctrine or to the ministry.

In Scotland the Established Church and Free Church have come together again, and the Church of Scotland is now negotiating with the United Presbyterians. In England the various bodies of Methodists are well on their way toward

union. In Canada, Congregationalists, Methodists, and Presbyterians have reached almost the final stage of union. In the Mission Field, notably in India and China, under pressure from the converts, there is a drawing together. In Germany, since the war, driven by necessity, the Protestant Churches have come together and formed a United Protestant Church which claims 35,000,000 baptized members.

But where there is difference in faith, in intellectual opinions, and differences in the conception of the constitution of the Church, which have age-long controversies behind them, there is no immediate prospect for union.

In 1920 a Conference on "Faith and Order" was held at Geneva. The Conference did good by bringing Christians of different nations and different churches together. Personal knowledge does much to remove antagonism. But, as regards removing the great vital causes which hinder union, little was accomplished. Churchman and Nonconformist, Lutheran and Calvinist went home, each of the same opinion still. Since then we have had the Lambeth Appeal to All Christian People for Reunion—in tone and temper admirable, a great advance on any previous approaches to Nonconformity, in that it acknowledged all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized into the Name of the Holy Trinity as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is his Body.

The right of Nonconformist groups to be called churches was also admitted, and the spiritual reality of non-episcopal ministries conceded on the ground that they have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit. All that was required for reunion was the acceptance of the Faith as expressed in the Apostles' and Nicene Creed, and an episcopally ordained ministry.

Some sanguine people had visions of a speedy union. In the two and a half years which have elapsed it has become clear that a union on "Faith and Order"—a union of organization—will not be achieved for many years, as there are fundamental differences of conviction which cannot be bridged over or compromised. Personally, I see no hope of organic union in the near future.

But are we to wait till the churches can agree on definitions of faith and the necessity of episcopal ordination? By no means. There is a unity which already exists and which is capable of development. We all believe in Jesus Christ, we all regard Him as the supreme revealer of God and, there-

fore, of the laws of life for men who live in this world. Whatever denomination we belong to—whether the most rigid Roman Catholic, the stiffest Anglican, stern Calvinistic Presbyterian, or unbaptized Quaker—we find a real unity in our loyalty to Christ, and our belief that, if his teaching is carried out, men will find well-being.

In brief, there already exists a real unity of principle, a unity of ideals, a unity of Spirit which springs from our unity in Christ. What we have to do is not so much to talk about unity, as to find means of expressing the unity which exists. Dr. Talbot, Bishop of Winchester, has rightly said that in the region of moral and social questions we desire all Christians to begin at once to act together as if they were one body in one visible fellowship. This can be done by all alike without any injury to theological principles.

Doctrine divides, service unites. Whatever may be the final answer to the problem of unity among the churches, the path of present advance lies through the field of increasing co-operative action. We both discover and reveal our oneness when we touch shoulder to shoulder in great common tasks.

[From Very Rev. W. Moore Ede, Worcester Cathedral, England, in *The Modern Churchman*, Oxford.]

The Discussion of Doctrinal Differences

MANY parts of the missionary world to-day are distracted by the keen discussions of certain doctrinal questions, and it is the purpose of this paper to treat the matter quite frankly, and to make suggestions as to the principles on which, and the temper in which, such discussions may be conducted. While some may feel that so thorny a subject had better not be touched in these pages, it is surely true to say that *The Recorder* cannot fulfil its function unless it boldly attempts to grapple with even so difficult a problem. While the problem may not be as acutely felt in China to-day as it was a year or two ago, it is still one on which clear thinking and a right attitude are urgently needed.

There always have been, and probably always will be, strong differences of opinion among those who are, all alike, seeking to be loyal to our Lord and to the truth as they see it in Him. Such differences have, in time past, been the cause of divisions in the Church, and not infrequently of bitter controversy and, therefore, of discredit to the cause of Christ, whom all wish to honour. They may, on the other hand, be made the means of enriching our knowledge of Him and our apprehen-

sion of his many-sided truth, and may serve to bind us together in a fellowship all the more significant and fruitful because we still hold our different points of view and express ourselves in different ways. A Church firmly united at the center, but showing many facets to the world, cannot fail to impress upon those outside the reality of the bond which makes us one in Christ.

Of course, the problem on which we frequently differ is just this, what *is* the bond which makes us one? Is not the answer to be found in the fact that we share the same attitude of devotion to a Person,—Jesus Christ, who lived and died for our sins and rose again? He is known to us in the inward sanctuary of each heart. He is the center, the Head, the One in whom the whole body is joined together. Whatever words we use to speak of Him and our love to Him, it is He Himself who unites us, for the truest unity in human experience always is in the realm of human relationship rather than in the realm of verbal agreements.

It is no part of my argument to suggest that the expression of our faith in words is an unimportant matter. It may be, it is, less important than the expression in life, for are there not to be many who say "Lord, Lord," but who will hear the terrible words, "Depart from me for I never knew you"? But the attempt to express the truth in words is one of the grandest tasks which can engage the mind of man. It has been attempted by the noblest souls in the Church. The truth needs to be put into words if it is to make its full appeal to other minds. In words, as in deeds, there is a fundamental distinction between what is right and what is wrong. No good end is served by trying to call black white. It leads to moral disaster as well as to intellectual futility.

But, at this point, what I wish to urge is that there is a fact which lies behind all words, just as the life of the tree is essential to the production of leaves and flowers and fruit. This fact may be poorly understood and wrongly expressed, and it may become a great necessity to understand it better and to correct wrong expressions. But, even so, the fact itself should never be lost sight of, and, to the spiritually minded, it may be discerned in spite of all such mistakes.

There have recently been several keen discussions in the home lands on these issues. In one case, a national convention could not arrive at unanimity. Strong things were said by each party, things which, in some cases, were no doubt afterwards regretted. Those whose views did not carry the day met later

in a separate convention in order to express their views without any qualification. In another case, a separate organization was formed, after such a division of opinion, and each group felt freer to go its own way. The history of theological divisions, even on vital issues, leads one seriously to question the advisability of such a split. How many might have been avoided with more patience and sympathy on both sides, or even on one! It takes two to make even a theological quarrel.

Let us contrast with such action another gathering in America where deep differences were manifested. There was a very frank discussion, which led to a simple confession of faith, avoiding terms likely to raise needless difficulties. The resolution which embodied this statement of faith continued, "Hardly less important (than free personal loyalty and devotion to a living Christ) for the promotion of our spiritual influence and power in the world is an increase of faith, trust, and confidence in one another, a love that suffers long and is kind and seeks to explain his grace ever can be adequate to the needs of the case, just because the imperfect symbols of human language are all we have to rely upon, and, moreover, the same language means entirely different things to different persons and in different epochs. Scarcely anything is harder or more necessary than to distinguish clearly in our minds between our experience of God and the form in which it first came to us or in which we have habitually described it. Yet, this effort we must all make. We need to see that the one thing which really matters is that the soul should come into vital relation to God. Because this transforming experience came to me through a certain presentation of truth, I have no right to say that others, whose presentation of truth may, to my limited vision, seem inconsistent with mine, have not as deep an experience. We may together seek to find who is right and where the truth lies. But neither has any right to excommunicate the other. Controversy that leads to virtual excommunication, i.e., to refusal of Christian fellowship, grows out of this failure to make a distinction which we all admit in theory but often deny in practice. Concentrating on words only may mean either the appearance of a deeper difference than really exists or (equally dangerous) the appearance of a unity which is only gained because of the ambiguity of the definitions. Is it any good to unite on a form of words which is interpreted in a very different sense by the various parties concerned? The unity is Christ. It never can be our definition of Him.

[From Dr. H. T. Hodgkin, in *The Chinese Recorder*, Shanghai.]

What Kind of Union?

PROGRESS of the churches to unity is hindered by a radical difference in the kind of unity wanted by various people who want unity.

Some want a unity that is ascertained.

Some want a unity that is realized.

And as long as various groups divide their working aims in this fashion, none get much closer to the goal.

If the unifiers were unified, unity might be achieved.

Which then of these two ideals, it is worth inquiring, would be the more practicable to concentrate on?

Let us distinguish more clearly the practical bearings of the two attitudes just named.

First comes the party wishing to ascertain unity.

These go about to investigate the creeds and polity of the Christian denominations now in existence. They spend a deal of study too on the lines of connection that can be traced between present Christian bodies and the original Church founded by the Apostles.

Then they undertake to estimate how much accommodation on the part of each fellowship would be necessary to get all of them lined up on one basis of faith with an identical heritage from history.

They are of course equally particular about beliefs. Their aim is also to achieve an absolute agreement on doctrine, so theological dissent shall be forever excluded.

Some would go even further and insist on one invariable form of worship for every Christian solemnity.

If all Christians in the world could thus be brought to acknowledge the same authority over them, to affirm an identical and unvarying statement of Christian theology, and to observe the same laws and ceremonies in all matters ecclesiastical, then there would be no line left to divide Christ's followers; they would simply have to become one church—the inevitable coalescence of identity.

And that would be unity ascertained, because it would be entirely visible to all observers.

But could it be accomplished? There's the rub.

The other party expects unity to come by realization.

This plainly enough means that there is already a united church in existence but Christians don't realize it.

Here is not only an appeal to a different set of facts but the proposal of a different theory of what the Church is.

For obviously the man who says that the Church of Christ

is a unity already actual in the present moment, is not talking about the unconscionable mass of formal organizations which in America and elsewhere take the name of churches. That view shows confusion worse confounded.

Something of spiritual rather than external character must be in his mind—inherent fact rather than outer form.

And surely one is not deserting reality who searches beneath appearances of division for vital ties that actually unite Christians.

The first of those ties is common faith in Jesus.

Dares any man to call that an unreal brotherhood which is bound together by the joint conviction that of all possible objects of life in this world the supreme one is to live and love and think and pray as Jesus did?

And when to that is added the deep persuasion of men that this Jesus has the right and the power to dominate life because He is the One exalted over all whom the heavenly Father sent into the world to atone for sins and lift men into the life of God—when this Divine estimate of the eternal personality and universal kingship of Christ is what his followers agree on and are unitedly desirous of getting other men to believe—what else in the way of creed or practice could bring people closer together than that?

As a matter of fact, however, church members generally are not half as much impressed by their inner brotherhood with people who are at one with them in this mightiest of all faiths about the mightiest of all Figures, as they are by their external association with people who read out of the same prayer book or sing out of the same hymn book to which they are themselves accustomed.

Passing a church of another name than that with which he is most familiar, the typical Christian of these times will bethink himself that this house belongs to a denomination different from his own before he takes into account that his Christ is loved and preached there.

And thousands cannot satisfy themselves that a given community really has religion of any account if their demoniation is not there.

Assuredly the straightest, simplest cure for all this is for men of good will and unselfishness in all the churches to set themselves to keep in their own consciousness, and to work into the consciousness of other men, the basic fact that persons who bear a like loyalty to the Lord Christ are now united—and ought to act united.

This unity, they ought moreover to insist, constitutes a church. Methodists should not say "their church" speaking of Presbyterianism, nor should Presbyterians mention "them" speaking of Methodists. It ought to be "we" and "our church" all the way around.

In a new community, for example, Presbyterians should say, "The Methodists are putting up a new building for us in that place"—"us" signifying the Church of Christ. And Methodists should talk the same way about Presbyterians.

That mental attitude once established would put off most of the urgent need for church union.

But union would come all the faster—

Because then nobody's thoughts would be blocking it.

The question returns then: Which of these ways is the most practicable means of attaining unity?

Can the men who are trying to plot out union by blue print on a drafting board, really tell themselves in the honest secret of their hearts that they do expect to bring about a day when all Christians will be satisfied to state their religious faith in the same terms, accept the same interpretation of church history, acknowledge with uniform satisfaction the powers of prelates, confine themselves to the same unchanging formularies for the sacraments, and require every preacher of the gospel of grace to be set apart for his work in an invariable manner?

Certainly anybody can see that the Church never had unity of that character. Even in the days of the Apostles—yes, even in the days of the Saviour—different men had different notions about the way that Jesus could be best served and pleased.

And so they have yet. So they ever will have.

But if everybody would work for unity by trying to make church men feel the unity that already exists in their common allegiance to their Lord, then speedily Christians would be entering into the sense and realization of one church—his in all and any of its forms.

[From *The Continent*, New York.]

The Reasons for Broken Unity Exist No Longer

LET this be said, that the causes of our divisions have ceased to exist. It was natural that the neglect of one phase of Christian truth, departure from our accepted order of church life, should have made earnest and conscientious men feel the neces-

sity of establishing a new church or a new movement to bear witness for what was deemed essential. The causes which seemed to good men sufficient to make separation are not sufficient to warrant its continuance. There is room and freedom now for the presentation of every truth which may fairly bear the Christian name, without separation. The reasons for our broken unity exist no longer.

There was fault on both sides because the spirit of toleration was wanting. It has taken a long time, but toleration and charity have come with a better understanding of the Christian religion and its message to men, with a fairer judgment of the value and importance of different parts of Christian truth, with the guidance of the Spirit of Christ into a larger outlook. We are often severe judges of those who were before us, forgetting their limitations and difficulties. We say that with the possession of the Holy Scriptures, they ought to have known that persecution, intolerance, and discord among brethren were against the teaching and will of Jesus Christ and, while the spirit of their time explains, it does not excuse their conduct. It is not for this generation, however, incapable and helpless through selfishness and intolerance, to prevent the massacre of Christian nations, to restrict race hatreds, to end lynchings, to criticize the fathers for not having had more wisdom, more tolerance, more sense of Christian brotherhood. My contention is that the causes and reasons for our broken unity no longer exist and are best forgotten.

Neither will I spend time demonstrating the absolute need of greater unity if the Church as organized religion is to do its work, to lead the world back into the development of Christian civilization, and to enthrone the Christ not only in Asia and Africa, but in Europe and America. It would be useless for me to argue with any one who tries to minimize the ills or to defend the existing disorder and division among Christian people, as in accordance with the will of Christ or as capable of excuse.

[From Bishop Edwin S. Lines, Newark, N. J.]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The Present Status of Unity in the East.

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY,

Dear Sir:—Archbishop Nikolaos of Nubia has submitted to his Holiness Photios, Patriarch of Alexandria, a report entitled *The movement for union of the Churches during 1923 and the present status of the question*. This report has been printed in two successive issues of *Pantainos* (weekly supplement of the *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* or Church Beacon, official organ of the Patriarchate of Alexandria). Unfortunately, only the second part of the report has reached me.

Here the Archbishop begins by referring to the trials imposed upon the Eastern Orthodox in 1923 by the Bolsheviki in Russia and the Turks in Constantinople. Because of those difficulties, the Eastern Orthodox Church made no very notable progress in 1923 with regard to the rapprochement of the churches, despite its continued good-will and sense of obligation in the matter. The movement is progressing steadily. [Here the Archbishop mentions six points, which I shall now translate.]

Prayers and supplications have been offered for the Church.

Articles and essays with regard to unity have been published by individual theologians in church papers and in the secular press. The movement in Europe and America for the rapprochement of the churches is being followed with interest by the Orthodox Church and comments with regard to it are being published from time to time.

Visits and greetings on official occasions have been exchanged by the representatives of the several churches. We mention in particular the visit of the learned Bishop Charles Gore of England (formerly Bishop of Oxford) to Constantinople and Athens, where he was welcomed with great joy and honour, and views were exchanged and prolonged discussions took place between him and the members of the Holy Synod of Athens and other Eastern theologians.

Mention should be made here also of the last conference at Helouan, initiated by the Anglican Bishop Gwynne and attended by clerical and lay representatives of the Patriarchate of Alexandria.

If God wills it, and the proposed great Ecumenical Council takes place in the near future on the 1600th anniversary of the First Ecumenical Council of Nicæa, we hope that one of the most important subjects of discussion will be the method and the bases upon which the rapprochement or union of the Churches can be furthered.

[At this point there is a sub-head, *Collaboration with regard to dogmatic difficulties*. I continue the translation:]

The differences as to doctrine and faith between the Eastern Orthodox Church and the other churches are numerous and important, especially as concerns the Protestant churches. This is the greatest, or rather the only, impediment to union of the churches, because other difficulties, such as those relating to "order," can be settled.

This matter was the subject of a discussion between the American theologian, W. J. Lhamon, and myself in articles published in *The Christian Union Quarterly* (504 North Fulton Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland, U. S. A., in the issues of January, 1922, April, 1922, April, 1923, and July, 1923), where those who so desire will find the details. The outcome is summarized below.

Dr. Lhamon thinks that we ought not to pay any attention to the Church Councils and should not accept their decrees on questions of doctrine or take any heed of creeds, even the Nicene creed, unless each question is first submitted to our own examination and our "crucible." This modern method, he thinks, makes possible the cultivation of individual apprehension of the faith. It is didactic rather than dogmatic. It calls us to research. It is not tied to tradition. Evolution, Criticism, Social Science, Democracy, Modernism, and, if need be, the reconstruction of religion itself, are permitted. If an ancient dogma helps the modern man, he keeps it: if it cramps and limits him, he rejects it. His ultimate purpose is, under the guidance of his own soul, *to create the truth and Christ and God*. This is a return to the New Testament, to the primal creed of the primal Church. As the Very Reverend W. R. Inge has said of Protestantism, its three leading motives are to revert to primitive Christianity, to inspire moral and political reform, and to accept the religious witness of the inner man.

[Cf. *Christian Union Quarterly*, July, 1923, pp. 39-42. The Metropolitan has gone beyond Dr. Lhamon's statement of his own position, especially in the phrase italicized by the Metropolitan as to creating the truth and Christ and God: nevertheless, the entire passage, beginning with the words "we ought not to pay any attention to the Church Councils" and ending with the words "religious witness of the inner man," is printed in quotation marks.]

My answer is, in brief, as follows:—In discussing the foundations on which the union of the churches ought to be attempted, we must not forget that we shall have to agree upon a common basis. This basis must be the teaching of the Gospel as interpreted and formulated in the seven Ecumenical Councils, whose decisions admit of no misinterpretation or change. These aids, which the Church furnishes without hindering the study of the Holy Scriptures, protect the Christian from all fallible interpretation and from rationalism. The Christian, in no wise, prejudices or binds his own free judgment or his inquiries by following sacred tradition (that which has been believed always, everywhere, and by all men, in the words of Vincent of Lérins), because tradition is a precious aid and an infallible guide in searching the Holy Scriptures, wherein, according to the Apostle Peter, "are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest unto their own destruction" (II Peter 3:16), just as the Christian is

not considered to lack moral freedom because he conforms to the moral law and follows the way of virtue with the help of God and by the grace of the Holy Spirit. In searching for the truth in its very source, that is, in the Gospel, we cannot apply the principle of widest freedom as in the case of literary compositions.

With regard to the Nicene Creed, which Dr. Lhamon does not accept, even as he accepts no other creedal statement, we prefer the Nicene Creed and that alone, because it was drawn up by wise and holy Fathers of the East and West, and, in words and phrases of the Gospel, to serve as an exact guide, as an Orthodox confession of faith: because it sets forth clearly the saving truths of religion: because the changelessness and unity of the Orthodox faith is manifested by it.

I hope that Dr. Lhamon does not express the opinion of the Anglican Church: that he does not, appears from many official and unofficial indications of the Lambeth Conference, which regards the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the corporate faith. [Here a footnote ought to be inserted to the effect that Dr. Lhamon is neither a spokesman for nor a member of the Anglican communion.]

Each church has its own historical past, its evolution, and clings closely to its own traditions. In particular the ancient churches, the churches of the East, believe steadfastly that the decisions of the seven Ecumenical Councils on questions of faith are infallible and not susceptible to discussion and to change.

How can we bring into doubt that which has been proclaimed throughout the ages as indubitable and infallible? Our hearts tighten and are oppressed with grief because we cannot find a way to overcome this great barrier and attain more quickly to the union of the churches.

We cannot change the ancient faith of the sacred tradition of the centuries. The more recent churches have not such difficulties, because they have not such well-defined dogmas.

We have no Pope: we do not demand to absorb other churches: God guards us now and in the future from constraining consciences in matters of faith: but we want to have a common church-opinion as to every question of faith, and not liberty for each man to believe as he pleases with regard to important and fundamental questions of faith.

We trust that the efforts exerted by the various churches throughout the world have, beyond a doubt, Divine Providence as their guide and will, therefore, attain to gratifying results.

May the God of love and peace lead the Gospel labourers speedily and surely to the desired goal, which is the triumph of the truth. *Amen.*

[Here follows a brief reference to the conferences at Helouan. In a concluding paragraph, the report is submitted to his Holiness the Patriarch of Alexandria. It is signed +*Nikolaos of Nubia* and dated Khartoum, January 27, 1924.]

Sincerely yours,

RALPH W. BROWN.

Boston, Mass.

Fellowship for Christian Unity

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY,

Dear Sir:—The unity of the Church requires haste. Problems of world-wide social significance wait for solution upon the healing of the wounds of the broken Body of Christ. Until unity among God's children shall be achieved in an appreciable measure, much that demands solution must go on haltering and faltering.

Present day movements and organization looking toward and working for Christian unity have all had their beginnings in parties in the Church and are to some extent under party auspices and supported by party contributions. Out of this condition have come party platforms, methods, and plans, all of which are admirable and commendable, but which do not meet the need for a fellowship for Christian unity among Christians of all parties that shall be entirely free from any organization plan, method, or platform and that does not depend upon party contributions for its support.

A second consideration for the proposal herein contained lies in the fact that there seems to be, at least to the writer, an imperative need for individuals as such, regardless of party name and allegiance, to commit themselves openly to a sympathetic attitude toward the Christian unity idea and to give to individuals an opportunity for fellowship with others who are like-minded.

A third consideration is that the work of propaganda for Christian unity must, after all, be carried on by a method of personal evangelism for unity, each one winning another one to the idea, by personal conference, and then all uniting in a fellowship for the dissemination of Christian unity intelligence among the rank and file of church members in all communions, for prayer and for conference.

The fourth consideration is that such a fellowship would not commit itself to any plan, method, or platform, would be free from party control, would consider its task to be the cultivation and development of a *will to unity*, trusting in the presence and leadership of the Spirit of God in his Church to eventually achieve the One Body, the One United Church of God.

You will note, of course, that such a fellowship would not be concerned in approaching organized bodies of Christians for unity from a corporate point of view. Its approach to the problem would be from the individual point of view. This means that each individual would have to see to it, first of all, that his own heart is right in this matter, that he is penitent for any party spirit in his own heart, that he confesses his sin of partisanship in the Church before God and the world, that in his relations with other Christians he will assume an attitude of aggressive brotherliness, that he will work in love and Christian co-operation with all who name the Name of Christ, that he will study the problems of unity, read literature to be well informed, that he will engage in a fellowship of prayer

and conference with others who are like-minded, and that he will definitely endeavour to enlist his friends and acquaintances by personal solicitation and conference in this great cause.

Finally, the consideration that leads to this proposal is that for all who have definite sentiments for Christian unity and for others who may be cultivated for this cause, there ought to be a point or issue on which they can declare themselves and definitely align themselves by direct participation in a movement in which they believe.

Such a fellowship for Christian unity could be based upon a commitment or confession like the following:

With deepest penitence before God for any party spirit in my heart, I humbly confess before Him and the world my sin, praying for light and strength to remove from me this spirit of unbrotherliness, in order that I may approach the problem of achieving a united Church of God with a sympathetic attitude of mind, and that I may have the courage to constantly search my own heart to see that I myself am right in this matter as the nearest point of human contact.

I promise before God to approach all who name the Name of Jesus and accept Him as Saviour in the spirit of aggressive brotherliness, working out in my own social relations the idea of Christian unity.

Without committing myself to any plan, method, or platform for Christian unity, I will unite with others in a fellowship of prayer, conference, study, and work to cultivate in the church a *will toward unity*, leaving the ultimate basis for unity to the leading of the Spirit of God.

In order that I may have direct participation in this great cause to achieve the unity of all of God's children, I will solicit the interest and cooperation of my friends and acquaintances by personal conference and prayer.

Name

Address

Date.....

A. W. GOTTSCHALL,
Baltimore, Md.

BOOK REVIEWS

CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT ELEMENTS IN CHRISTIANITY. By Oliver Chase Quick, M. A., Canon of Carlisle. New York and London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Liberalized Protestantism and modernized Catholicism are two sides of truth which should be brought into supplementary relation, rather than holding extreme positions, antagonizing each other. To leave Catholicism out of any plan for union by extreme Protestants, or to leave Protestantism out by extreme Catholics, indicates a superficial approach to the subject of unity. Canon Quick has given a frank presentation of one of the most important subjects for our study.

It is difficult to define modern Protestantism as a whole. Troeltsch has shown in his *Protestantism and Progress* that, even when it carries the orthodox dogmatic traditions, it has in point of fact completely changed. This applies equally true to Catholicism. Nevertheless, these lectures elicit and define some of the different values for which Catholicism and Protestantism have stood and aim to set them first in opposition and antithesis to one another and then to suggest that reconciliation is both a need and a possibility. In the early history of the Church the main subjects of interest and controversy in the Church were not historical but dogmatic. The controversy was not so much what Jesus said and did as regards the true doctrine of his Person and the true meaning of the sacramental system. The human example of Jesus was left in the background.

On the rise of Protestantism it appealed to origins over against developments and to individualism over against society. Catholics claimed their development had been according to the Holy Spirit. This Protestantism denied, but maintained that the Holy Spirit was the Inspirer of the individual soul and conscience over against the development of the official hierarchy. The Bible was set up against the Pope. Biblical criticism arose and weakened the infallibility of the Bible. Consequently, out of all this controversy, a one-sided religion developed. Origins, developments, individuals, society—all have their places in the Christian religion.

Canon Quick maintains that Catholicism has developed primitive Christianity, and is capable of developing it further. He regards the characteristic genius of Catholicism as liberal and Protestantism as conservative. He might have elaborated on this somewhat paradoxical statement beyond emphasizing the Protestant contribution of the vision of the human Jesus to the thought of the age as at once the mirror of the Godhead and the example of men. We need to keep clear our historical vision of Jesus as the test of spirits.

In the popular mind Catholicism is supposed to stand for sacramental religion and Protestantism for the religion of the spirit, but this is not the whole truth, as Canon Quick shows. Catholicism has no monopoly on sacramental religion, nor has Protestantism a monopoly on the spiritual. With both the essence of religion is spiritual life, and the outward and visible express and minister to the inward and spiritual. They stress their interpretations due to their methods of approach. One emphasizes what was done and the other what was said. Thus, the use of Latin in the Mass has the value of action and the action, the value of words. On the other hand, the Protestant minimizes what was done because he desires to appeal to the understanding through what was said. The broader Protestant and Catholic doctrines are not so far removed from one another, "though the Protestant prefers to say that the Eucharistic offering only represents or signifies symbolically the self-offering of Christ, while the Catholic maintains that the two are really and actually one, so that Christ's offering of his manhood before God is truly effected, as well as represented, in the Mass."

Just as the approach of Paul started from the vision on the Damascus road and the approach of John was by the way of imitating Christ in conduct, taking his commandments as the practical way of life, these two modern elements in Christianity have two orders of realization. One starts from consciousness and goes on to conduct, and the other starts from conduct and goes on to consciousness. One seeks Christian action through faith. The other seeks Christian faith through Christian action. Protestantism, together with Catholic mysticism, has usually emphasized the first; institutional and legalistic Catholicism, the second. Both are, in a measure, right, but this tracing of the swing of the pendulum through history, from one set of ideas to another, is very fascinating.

Roughly speaking, there are four periods: (1) The early Church was predominantly of the other-worldly type, when Christians had nothing to do with the affairs of the empire; (2) the reign of Christ on earth with his saints was manifested in the life of the Church, marked particularly by the epoch-making thought of Augustine; (3) the rise of Protestantism and its efforts to restore primitive Christianity; and (4) the rise of Socialism, which is not essentially Christian or religious, yet to many it has taken the place of religion, with its restored hope of the Golden Age in the future.

The upshot of all these contrary movements is the distracted perplexity of the modern world. Catholicism has essential affinities with Socialism. Typical Protestantism, on the other hand, retains its affinity with primitive Christianity. These present religious values that must be reconciled and preserved. This earth must be made fit for the next world. To do this, Canon Quick affirms, we must unify our standard of values with Plato as our tutor and the best of the mediæval Popes as examples. Everything in the world which is good—art, politics, business, science—

must also be good Christianity. "There can ultimately be no true discoveries of science which can prevent our believing in God's love, and no real economic laws which make it impossible for men to live and work to God's glory."

The book is a fundamental contrast between two ways of thinking in the realm of the historical facts, the sacraments, religious experience, and the Kingdom of God. It penetrates to the fundamental difference in thought which has to do with the theological controversies and the present day divisions of the Church. It needs to be read by both Catholics and Protestants. In both are values for the discovery of each, and that is the first step toward reconciliation.

THE CLASH OF COLOUR. A Study in the Problem of Race. By Basil Mathews, Author of *Livingstone the Pathfinder*, etc. (Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, London). Nearly nine-tenths of the whole habitable area of the world is under white dominance. Of the four hundred and sixty million subjects of the British Empire, only about sixty-five million are white. The World War has brought the race problem to the front in all parts of the world. Japan and China, with enormous overflowing populations, look to countries largely unpopulated, in comparison with their own dense masses of humanity, such as Australia, New Zealand, South America, Canada, and the United States; but in the interest of race-protection, rather than race-discrimination, laws have been passed with the decree—"Thus far and no farther." Can that decree be sustained and, at the same time, maintain the attitude of brotherhood? is the real question. If the English claim England, the French, France, the Italians, Italy, why may not the Negroes claim Africa? So argues Marcus Garvey, a native of the West Indies and creator of the Negro Improvement Association. Race-antagonism is not rooted in primitive instinct; it is put there through suggestion and education by adults. What is needed is some real and powerful force that will fuse the separate national and racial spirits into unity. The future of this world lies by the way of the spirit of Christ. The whole subject is approached without prejudice and the way out is argued with marked fairness.

THE TEACHING PASTOR. The Samuel A. Crozer Lectures in Crozer Theological Seminary, 1922-1923. By William C. Bitting, D. D. (Judson Press). Dr. Bitting has been for many years the pastor of the Second Baptist Church, St. Louis, and few pastors are better qualified to speak on the subject of these lectures than he. The subjects of the lectures are "The Need and Opportunity for His Ministry," "Reactions of His Ministry on His Life," "His Oneness With the Educated Community," "His Ministry to the Young," "His Relation to the Problem of Christian Unity," and "Some Spiritual Values of His Ministry." In the lecture on Christian unity, Dr. Bitting shows the harmfulness of sectarianism, conditions that demand teaching pastors, and the specific contribution of the teaching

pastor, who must lead his people out from the shelter of denominational names, temperamental peculiarities, and temporary historical consideration. He well says: "No reality can ever be inconsistent with any other reality. Truth is one. The nearer we approach to reality, the nearer we come to one another." He appeals for a fresh study "of all mooted questions in the spirit of love and of absolute intellectual honesty, emancipated from preconceptions and historical considerations, and seek to discover just what are the principles that the Bible, which is 'the rule of faith and practice' intended men to believe and live." All the lectures are healthy in tone, and the one dealing with unity is particularly practical and strong.

BUILDING OF THE AMERICAN NATION. By Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University (Scribner's). With history as a process, not as a chronicle, Dr. Butler presents the interpretation of the origin and development of the American nation as an intermingling of constitutional history and development with a fine treatment of ten outstanding personalities that figured prominently in that history and development, as follows: Samuel Adams and Benjamin Franklin, forerunners of the nation; George Washington, father of his country; Alexander Hamilton and James Madison, master-builders of the nation; Thomas Jefferson, spokesman of the democratic spirit; John Marshall, Daniel Webster, and Andrew Jackson, welders of the nation in law and in public opinion; and Abraham Lincoln, defender and preserver of the nation's unity and power. The last chapter, entitled "Fifty Years of Growth and Change," is a most illuminating discussion of a remarkable period. It closes with an unusually large appendix, including the Declaration of Independence, Constitution of the United States, Amendments to the Constitution from Articles XI to XIX, and other valuable papers. The whole presentation is vivid and dramatic.

MAHATMA GANDHI. By Romain Rolland (Century Company). Since Leo Tolstoi no man has held the attention of the world as Gandhi. He is now fifty-six years old. He is by profession a lawyer. From 1893 to 1914 his field of operation was Africa; since 1914 he has lived in India, which is his native land. He has espoused poverty and teaches the doctrine of non-resistance. Although he opposes all forms of violence, nevertheless, when any of the people of India commit violence, he offers to take the punishment upon himself. He is a Hindu in religion and acknowledges his debt to the New Testament and Ruskin and Tolstoi. He insists upon the plow and the spinning wheel and the knowledge of Hindu philosophy for India's return to prosperity. His policy of non-co-operation with the Government is the first step for civil disobedience, which he aims to establish over all India when the time is ripe. His trial before and sentence by Judge Broomefield is one of the most outstanding instances of court proceedings in history. The whole story is told with thrilling fascination. A gifted man had for his subject a remarkably gifted soul.

WHY I BELIEVE IN RELIGION. By Charles Reynolds Brown, Dean of the Divinity School, Yale University (Macmillan). This is the first series of lectures delivered on the Washington Gladden Foundation in the First Congregational Church, Columbus, Ohio. The subjects are "The Belief in God," "The Person of Christ," "The Power of Atonement," "The Value of Prayer," "The Use of the Bible," and "The Hope of Future Life." Like everything from Dean Brown, these six chapters are full of good things and are presented with such clarity and force that after reading one there is an eagerness to read all. They deal with the fundamentals of Christian belief in popular rather than technical terms, furnishing a powerful appeal to every day people. It is wonderfully satisfying.

LIFE OF JESUS. By Ernest Renan (Little, Brown, and Company). While many are reading Papini's *Life of Christ*, a revised version of Renan's *Jesus* has appeared, in which every sentence has been recast, so that it is practically new. It is beautifully printed and radiates with the brilliancy of the distinguished Frenchman, who started in training for the priesthood, but later abandoned it for literary work. This book first appeared in 1863. It has passed through many editions in many languages. Its present appearance recalls the controversy it precipitated in the nineteenth century. Those who differ with the boldness of some of its utterances will find illumination in some of its interpretations.

MARCUS AURELIUS. A biography told as much as may be by letters, together with some account of the stoic religion and an exposition of the Roman Government's attempt to suppress Christianity during Marcus' reign. By Henry Dwight Sedgwick (Yale University Press). This is an interpretation of the character, life, and religion of Marcus Aurelius, intensely human and fully identified with the life of his time. The exposition of the Stoic philosophy in the first chapters is a presentation of it as a real religion in the discipline of the will and the cultivation of the ideal of an unblemished soul. Mr. Sedgwick has put us under obligations to him for the charming, and somewhat new, picture of the noble Roman emperor.

SUBURBS OF CHRISTIANITY. By Ralph W. Stockman, Pastor of the Madison Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, New York City (Abington Press). Judge Henry Wade Rogers, who writes the Foreword, says that Dr. Stockman has so endeared himself to Madison Avenue Church that he has had no other pulpit during his ministry. Dr. Stockman says of the sermons of this volume that they are the "sparks from the anvil of a hurrying pastor." Some of their titles suggest their worth: "Suburbs of Christianity," "The Layman's Heresy," "Life's Extra Dividend," and "Two Trends in American Protestantism." All of the twelve sermons are of a high character and bear a worth while message to these times.

THE LOST RADIANCE OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. By L. P. Jacks, D. D., LL. D., D. Litt., Principal of Manchester College, Oxford (Doran). This is one of the Essex Hall lectures, which was established upon the foundation providing the opportunity for the free utterance of the thoughts of selected speakers on some religious theme of general interest. This lecture by Dr. Jacks is of exceptional beauty. It emphasizes the Person, the religion of the Spirit, the light, and the resolution, thereby making possible the first step toward the recovery of the lost radiance of the Christian religion. It has in it the beauty of a poem and may serve for years to come as a gift book.

WILL PROTESTANTISM BE OVERTHROWN? By Henry Wallace Dowding, Author of *The Man from Mars*, etc. (International Christian Unity League, Norfolk, Va.). Because of the author's indebtedness to Phillips Brooks this book is dedicated to his memory, and the frontispiece bears a picture of the distinguished Episcopal bishop. The book is a blunt argument for unity, going straight to the issue, pleading for unity on the basis of love, pointing out some dangers in present day organizations, methods, and means, emphasizing such unity as already exists, and contending for spiritual unity and suggesting how it may be secured. Its impatience over present day conditions is as refreshing as its appeal.

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE. An Exposition. By Charles R. Erdman, Professor of Practical Theology, Princeton Theological Seminary (Westminster Press). For a brief commentary on the Gospel of Luke, we have seen nothing better than this little book, pocket size, of 229 pages. It is clear in its exposition and devotional in its spirit. It follows the same line of interpretation as Dr. Erdman's *Gospel of Matthew*, which, likewise, is a most valuable study of the first book of the New Testament. His *Acts* and his *General Epistles* are of the same merit. All these are well suited for text books or for devotional reading.

ONE MAN'S RELIGION. By Robert Quillen (Macmillan). A very unusual little book which has attracted more than ordinary attention. It is a brief, plain, and thoughtful expression of what one man has come to believe because of what experience has taught him—the very best kind of belief, and the very best kind of testimony. It is a book of simple, sensible, practical, earnest, heart-felt religion and all who read it are the better for having done so.

TWELVE TESTS OF CHARACTER. By Harry Emerson Fosdick (Association). These essays appeared in the *Ladies' Home Journal*, where they first awakened wide interest. We are glad that they are put in this permanent form. They stress some fundamental tests of character which the present generation is inclined to treat lightly. Consequently, it is a good book to put in the hands of parents and young people.

MOBILISING FOR PEACE. Addresses Delivered at the Congress on America and the Permanent Court of International Justice. Edited by Frederick Lynch, D. D., Educational Secretary, World Alliance for International Friendship (Revell). This book, with its thirty-odd addresses covering 324 pages, furnishes a kind of encyclopædia of the peace attitude. All of the speakers are of one mind that war is unchristian, that there cannot be two ethics, one for individuals and another for nations, that the League of Nations is the most promising experiment in the community life of nations, and that America should abandon her isolation. It is a valuable book of reference.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF HEALTH. A Handbook on the Relation of Bodily to Spiritual and Moral Health. By Lily Dougall, Author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*, etc. (Macmillan). The practice of God's presence as the source of physical health is receiving such consideration at the hands of many wise physicians as to lead them into a larger understanding of the action of the mind or the spirit on the body, and use it for the benefit of the patient. This book argues for a healthy soul and a healthy body and that any attempt to separate the spiritual from the material and to live a merely spiritual life must end in spiritual lack. It is well thought out and argued with convincing force.

ACUTE AND CHRONIC UNBELIEF. Its Cause, Consequence, and Cure. By Albert Clarke Wyckoff, Professor of Psychology of Religion in the Biblical Seminary, New York, N. Y. (Revell). Over against the belief, the unbeliever, and the interpreter of the belief, which are the factors that enter into the problem of religious belief, is the power that causes the action of unbelief. This book is devoted to a remarkably able and interesting study of that portion of unbelief in which the personality of the unbeliever plays a dominant part. In its reaction against the cosmic factors in religious belief, it creates psychological disturbances of such magnitude as to seriously interfere with the normal functioning of one's intellectual, moral, and spiritual machinery, which, if too long neglected, may keep open a psychological wound around which the growth of misbelief develops. Dr. Wyckoff is a pioneer in this field of religious research and his findings are reasonable. This book is of worth to all students who value psychological approaches.

PHYSICAL TRAINING OF PUBLIC SPEAKERS. Martin S. Sommer (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis). A little book of practical value to preachers and other public speakers. It presents a brief discussion of the primary principles of speech and outlines a helpful system of exercise and practice.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the Work of Thomas Campbell, a Presbyterian Minister, of Washington, Pa., 1809; present organization, 1910. President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences, and distribution of irenic literature—"till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for, and sermons on, Christian Unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857. President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering, and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910. President, Rev. Nehemiah Boynton; Secretary, Rev. W. C. Emhardt, Newtown, Bucks Co., Pa. For the promotion of Christian Unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMAN'S UNION, 1898. President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Secretary, Rev. John H. Bentley, Souldern Rectory, Banbury, England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian Communions.

CONTINUATION COMMITTEE OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910. Chairman, Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent; Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918. Ad Interim Committee—Chairman, Rev. Joseph A. Vance, Detroit, Mich.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908. President, Dr. Robert E. Speer; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the co-operation of the various Protestant Communions in service, rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911. Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Colue Bridge House, Rickmansworth, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895. President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford; Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and co-operation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK, 1920. Chairmen, Archbishop of Upsala, Archbishop of Canterbury, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Rev. A. J. Brown; Secretary, Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For union of the Churches in common, practical work, and to insist that the principles of the Gospel be applied to the solution of contemporary social and international problems.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914. Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury; Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1; Chairman, American Council, Rev. William P. Merrill; General Secretary, Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the Churches and the avoidance of war.

WORLD'S EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE, 1846; Incorporated 1912. Chairman, Sir Andrew Wingate; Hon. Secretary, Rev. R. C. Gillie; General Secretary, Henry Martyn Gooch, 19 Russell Sqr., London, W. C. 1. To enable Christians of British and foreign nations to realize in themselves, and to manifest to others, that living and essential union which binds together all believers in the fellowship of Christ. Universal Week of prayer organized by the Alliance since 1846.

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

The Editor's Notes:

Spiritual Leadership—A Scientific Study of Theological Schools—Spiritual Life

The Federal Unity of the Churches—Fifteen Years of Progress

CHARLES S. MACFARLAND

Church Union in Canada

R. P. MACKAY

John Ruskin's "The Construction of Sheepfolds"

W. J. LHAMON

Christian Union in the Seminary Curriculum

FREDERICK D. KERSHNER

The Unification of American Methodism

JAMES CANNON, JR.

Some Objections to the Proposed Plan of Methodist Unification

COLLINS DENNY

The Balance of Values for Christian Unity

JOHN B. COWDEN

The Church of To-morrow

G. FRANK BURNS

What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity

Robert Hallowell Gardiner—Modernists and Traditionalists as Factors in Christian Unity—Intellectual and Social Forces Working for Reunion—The Eastern Church and Reunion—Union Congregations in China—Release Bishop Roots—The Springfield Declaration of the Congregationalists on Unity—Protestant Federation in Czecho-Slovakia—Union at a Standstill in Scotland—Protestant Union a Possibility—The Cross of Christ and the Reconciliation of the Nations—Denominational Christianity in China—Date Set for Canadian Union

Book Reviews

Church Principles, etc.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

504 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York

Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

Hopbush, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4; 100, Princes Street, Edinburgh

CONTENTS

OCTOBER, 1924

VOL. XIV.

No. 2

<i>THE EDITOR'S NOTES</i>	117
<i>THE FEDERAL UNITY OF THE CHURCHES—FIFTEEN YEARS OF PROGRESS</i>CHARLES S. MACFARLAND	130
<i>CHURCH UNION IN CANADA</i>R. P. MACKAY	143
<i>JOHN RUSKIN'S "THE CONSTRUCTION OF SHEEPFOLDS"</i>W. J. LHAMON	154
<i>CHRISTIAN UNION IN THE SEMI- NARY CURRICULUM</i>FREDERICK D. KERSHNER	161
<i>THE UNIFICATION OF AMERICAN METHODISM</i>JAMES CANNON, JR.	165
<i>SOME OBJECTIONS TO THE PRO- POSED PLAN OF METHODIST UNIFICATION</i>COLLINS DENNY	174
<i>THE BALANCE OF VALUES FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY</i>JOHN B. COWDEN	180
<i>THE CHURCH OF TO-MORROW</i>G. FRANK BURNS	190
<i>WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY</i>	193
<i>BOOK REVIEWS</i>	219

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is seventy-five cents a single copy, or two dollars and fifty cents a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion contributing annually \$5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive two copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copy to some designated person or institution.

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ, and that the Unity of his disciples is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and, equally free, to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the Reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ—growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in his own words,—“By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another.”

The Christian Union Quarterly

Edited by Peter Ainslie, D. D.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

- | | |
|---|--|
| DR. HAMILCAR ALIVISATOS,
Athens, Greece. | PROF. CHARLES FOSTER KENT,
New Haven, Conn. |
| BISHOP CHARLES P. ANDERSON,
Chicago, Ill. | BISHOP EDWIN S. LINES,
Newark, N. J. |
| REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. | DR. FREDERICK LYNCH,
New York, N. Y. |
| BISHOP CHARLES H. BRENT,
Buffalo, N. Y. | VERY REV. J. A. M'CLYMONT, D.D.,
Edinburgh, Scotland. |
| DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn. | PROF. SAMUEL MCCOMB,
Cambridge, Mass. |
| PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N. Y. | BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL,
Pittsburgh, Pa. |
| REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass. | BISHOP WILLIAM F. MCDOWELL,
Washington, D. C. |
| BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR.,
Washington, D. C. | THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER,
Manchester, England. |
| REV. RUSSELL CECIL, D.D.,
Richmond, Va. | REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. |
| REV. S. D. CHOWN, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada. | DR. JOHN R. MOTT,
New York, N. Y. |
| DR. FRANCIS E. CLARK,
Boston, Mass. | BISHOP HARALD OSTENFELD,
Copenhagen, Denmark. |
| DR. J. A. CRAMER,
Utrecht, Holland. | BISHOP EDWARD L. PARSONS,
San Francisco, Calif. |
| PROF. DR. ADOLF DEISSMANN,
Berlin, Germany. | PROF. ARTHUR S. PEAKE,
Manchester, England. |
| ARCHBISHOP F. H. DU VERNET,
Prince Rupert, B. C. | PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa. |
| REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky | PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England. |
| DEAN H. E. W. FOSBROKE,
New York, N. Y. | REV. J. H. SHAKESPEARE, D.D.,
London, England. |
| MR. ROBERT H. GARDINER,
Gardiner, Me. | PASTOR FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND
SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany. |
| DEAN W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill. | REV. NEWMAN SMYTH, D.D.,
New Haven, Conn. |
| PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England. | DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N. Y. |
| MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor. | THE ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA,
Upsala, Sweden. |
| PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C. | DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J. |
| DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Shanghai, China. | REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich. |
| REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. | BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio. |
| DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England. | BISHOP LUTHER B. WILSON,
New York, N. Y. |
| PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa. | |

GREAT IS THE CRAVING AFTER UNITY,—SO GREAT, SO DEEP, SO UNIVERSAL. THAT WE KNOW IT IS A PART OF GOD'S FIRST PURPOSE FOR HUMANITY, AND NEVER CAN DIE OUT TILL IT HAS FOUND ITS SATISFACTION. BUT IT IS TOO GREAT AND DEEP EVER TO FIND ITS FINAL SATISFACTION IN IDENTITY OF ORGANIZATION. YOU CANNOT MAKE THE UNIT TO BE A UNIT BY THE EXTERNAL UNITY OF ONE HARD SHELL. IF THE FRUIT WHICH YOU TRY TO ENCLOSE IS ALIVE, IT WILL BURST YOUR SHELL TO PIECES AS IT GROWS. IF IT BE DEAD, YOUR SHELL WILL SOON HOLD ONLY A DRY AND RATTLING REMNANT, TO WHICH IT CAN GIVE NO LIFE. NO, THE REAL UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM IS NOT TO BE FOUND AT LAST IN IDENTITY OF ORGANIZATION, NOR IN IDENTITY OF DOGMA. BOTH OF THOSE HAVE BEEN DREAMED OF, AND HAVE FAILED. BUT IN THE UNITY OF SPIRITUAL CONSECRATION TO A COMMON LORD.

—PHILLIPS BROOKS.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

OCTOBER, 1924

THE EDITOR'S NOTES

Spiritual Leadership

WE look to the ministry for our spiritual leaders. However, spiritual leadership does not belong exclusively there. Ministerial inefficiency has made it necessary for other than ministers to be our prophets. It may be better for religion, and doubtless is, that its prophets are not confined to any special group or special class. But it does raise the question as to ministerial inefficiency, and the mere raising of this question involves ministerial training. Do our theological seminaries meet the requirements of these times? Can a denominational school give its students the best equipment? Is not a fundamental part of education the consciousness of a universal brotherhood? How can a theological or a denominational school teach that which its very existence denies?

Nothing is more closely related to Christian unity than ministerial training. According to that training, denominationalism may be perpetuated or Christian unity may be advanced. In the first instance, if by its teaching or its policy it contributes to the perpetuation of denominationalism, it raises the question, To what degree is the denominational school hindering Christianity? In the second instance, if by its teaching or its policy Christian unity is advanced, it raises the question, Why may not all theological seminaries, as well as all denominational schools, be unified, thereby hastening the larger Christian fellowship? In either event this is a problem of such vast consequences that the Church must not be afraid to fearlessly face it and find its solution in some method that will produce a larger unity for which the whole world impatiently waits.

A Scientific Study of Theological Schools

Because it is a widely-held belief that the machinery and methods used in educating Protestant ministers are inadequate, a thoroughly scientific study of three years has been made of one hundred and sixty-one theological schools in the United States and Canada under the skillful leadership of Robert L. Kelly, LL.D., Executive Secretary of the Council of Church Boards of Education, and his associates, Miss Lura Beam and Dr. O. D. Foster, with the assistance and approval of an Advisory Committee, of which Bishop Charles H. Brent is chairman. The results of this study are included in one of the most valuable volumes of this year under the title *Theological Education in America*, published by George H. Doran Company, New York.

The study raises such questions as the following:

1. Are seminaries as constituted to-day effective in furnishing the churches with competent pastors and prophets? If not, why?
 2. Are seminaries producing a high grade of scholarship such as will fit men for academic leadership as well as for the pastoral office?
 3. What is the relation of the seminary to the university?
 4. Are the curricula of the seminaries covering the whole field of responsibility of the ministry to-day?
 5. What types of ministerial character are created by the seminaries?
- (p. VI.)

The study teems with interest. It has furnished copy for a column or more on the front page in many daily papers. There are approximately 9,000 theological students in the United States, or one for every 2,600 church members, and about 880 students in Canadian seminaries, dispelling the idea of a shortage of Protestant ministers, but the study regards the quality as too mediocre. However individual seminaries may hold to Christian unity, the study affirms that the general influence of theological schools tends toward divisiveness, and says:—

As a group of schools they certainly are not contributing to unity, however much individual seminaries may hold to that ideal. There is great diversity in the seminary product. There is ground for fear that the influence of some of the seminaries goes deeper than this and tends toward divisive-

ness. Denominations, Occidental in origin, partly through the influence of seminaries, are being perpetuated even in Oriental countries. As the seminaries are frequently the bulwarks of special doctrines, this is not surprising. The question is, shall we look to the seminaries for leadership in finding the answer to the Master's prayer that they all may be one? Or, shall we look elsewhere? (p. 233.)

This is altogether reasonable, when it is observed as the study says:

Some seminaries safeguard the denominational or theological point of view by requiring faculty members to take pledges that frankly and clearly commit them in advance to definite and sometimes to very limited interpretations of truth. Other seminaries, while not making definite stipulations in this respect, call for a definite pledge of loyalty to well-recognized seminary traditions. In other words, the seminaries, for the most part, recognize themselves as professional schools founded and perpetuated for definite types of training. They are producing a specialized product. (p. 216.)

Instances of stipulated legal requirements of the faculties are as follows:

In Bishop's College the faculty members are required to sign the Thirty-nine Articles and to sign a statement of allegiance to the synod.

In Wycliffe College the faculty members must accept the doctrines and standards of the Church of England and Canada.

In the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary all members of the faculty shall be "Missionary Baptists."

In the Kansas City Baptist Theological Seminary, if any members of the faculty differ seriously with the New Hampshire Confession, they will voluntarily withdraw.

In the Lutheran Theological Seminary the members of the faculty must accept the Bible as the Word of God, the Augsburg Confession, and Luther's Small Catechism.

In the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary they must subscribe to the Lutheran Confessions as found in *The Book of Concord*.

In the Bonebrake Theological Seminary they must teach a modified Arminianism.

In the Garrett Biblical Institute they must be in hearty sympathy with the doctrinal standards of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

In Drew Theological Seminary they must be members of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

In the Pacific Unitarian School for the Ministry Unitarians are preferred.

In the McCormick Theological Seminary, Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Omaha, and the San Francisco Theological Seminary, they must be loyal to Presbyterian confessions of faith, catechism, and form of government.

In the Reformed Theological Seminary, Ohio, they must be sound on Calvinism.

In the Episcopal Theological Seminary, Cambridge, they must subscribe to a declaration of justification by faith.

In Queen's Theological Seminary they must be members of the Presbyterian Church and assent to the Westminster Confession.

In Wartburg Theological Seminary they subscribe to the same as the Lutheran ministers in their ordination vows.

In the Bethany Bible School they must be members of the Church of the Brethren.

In the Theological Seminary of the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran National Church of America they must be members of that church.

In Crozer Theological Seminary and Rochester Theological Seminary they must be members of the Baptist Church.

In the Protestant Episcopal Seminary of Virginia they must be fully ordained clergymen in the Protestant Episcopal Church, except in case of instruction in elocution and music. (pp. 35, 36.)

In one instance the charter provides that every professor shall, on entering upon his duties, make the following declaration:—

I do solemnly profess and declare in the presence of God and the Directors of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Kentucky, that I receive the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Catechisms of the Church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, and that I will not teach anything contrary to the standards common to both the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and the Presbyterian Church in the United States, according to the Charter of this Seminary. (p. 37.)

In another instance the charter provides :

The Seminary shall rest upon the Divine Word of the Old and New Testament Scriptures as the absolute Rule of Faith, and the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as in conformity with that Rule. Each professor, at his inauguration, obligates himself to conform his teaching to the Word of God and the Confessions of the Evangelical Church. The churchly character of the institution is safeguarded by the provision that its Directors must be elected by the Ministerium of Pennsylvania upon nomination of the Board of Directors. (p. 37.)

The formula which the professors of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America at New Brunswick, N. J., are required, by the constitution of the Reformed Church in America, to sign is as follows :

We, the underwritten, in becoming Professors of Theology in the Reformed Church in America, do by this our subscription, sincerely and in good conscience before the Lord, declare that we believe the Gospel of the Grace of God in Christ Jesus as revealed in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and as set forth in the Standards of the Reformed Church in America. We believe that these Standards agree with the Word of God, and we reject all errors which are contrary thereto. We promise that we will diligently teach and faithfully defend the doctrines contained in the said Standards, and that we will not inculcate or write either publicly or privately, directly or indirectly, anything against the same, and that we will exert ourselves to keep the church free from such errors.

Should it happen that any objections against the doctrines in the Standards of the church arise in our minds, we promise that we will not either publicly or privately propose, teach, or defend the same by preaching or writing until we have first fully revealed such objections to the General Synod to whom we are responsible, that our opinions may receive a thorough examination in that body. We hold ourselves ready always to submit to the judgment of the General Synod, under penalty of censure or deposition from our office in case of a refusal, reserving to ourselves the right for a rehearing or a new trial in case we conceive ourselves aggrieved by the sentence of the Synod, without disturbing the peace of the church, pending such trial. We promise, furthermore, to be always willing and ready to comply with any demand from the General Synod for a more particular explanation of our sentiments respecting any article in the Standards. (p. 38.)

It is bad enough when the faculties are pledged not to think beyond their denominations, but in some instances students

must take an equally definite pledge. The Xenia Theological Seminary illustrates this, as follows:—

Before being admitted to the Seminary every student shall, in the presence of the faculty, subscribe to a written declaration to the effect that while he is a student in the Seminary he will regularly, punctually, and diligently attend upon all the instructions of the Professors and promptly comply with all lawful requisitions of the Faculty, and be subject to their lawful authority; that he will honestly conform to all regulations of the Seminary and that he will not propagate any opinion in opposition to the principles of the United Presbyterian Church. (p. 40.)

While many seminaries have no such published stipulations, their selections for members of the faculties are based on denominational relationships. But the hopefulness of this whole situation is in the liberal interpretation that some seminaries are putting on their charters, many of which documents long ago ought to have been abandoned or severely revised. Dr. Kelly and his associates have been frank and clear and unbiased. They have revealed conditions that are not only unsatisfactory and discouraging, but that are most difficult to change. A denominational school is a part of the denomination. It can only go so far as the denomination thinks. If a denomination is backward, so will the schools of that denomination be backward. The boards of trustees and faculties are not wholly to be blamed. In most instances the same dead hand that guides the denomination guides the school likewise.

According to the study, most of the trustees are amateurs in education, sometimes too old or too full of the affairs of the world to give the most adequate attention to the problems of the school. Their chief function appears to be to look after the finances, but in many instances they appear not to know how the money is spent; or as Dr. Kelly continues: "If they know they do not tell. The books of a large number of seminaries need overhauling and modern methods of accounting need to be introduced. Many financial reports are well nigh worthless because of flagrant inaccuracies." And further: "They fail to recognize their obligation to the community as public service corporations. Their attitude is that it is none of the public's business. Sooner or later the laws of all the states will require

a public accounting from the corporations authorized to do business within the several jurisdictions. It ought not to be necessary for the law to step in and require a theological seminary to render an account of its stewardship." (p. 233.)

With a general lack of business responsibility on the part of the trustees and the members of the faculty hedged in by pledges not to think beyond their own denomination, it is not surprising that there is a preponderance of mediocre students and a general hostility between science and religion. The study affirms:—

Some of the seminaries are virtually untouched by the progress and the method of science. They are conducted on the assumption that science and religion occupy mutually exclusive fields, if they are not indeed in actual conflict. In others a scientific view of the world is taken for granted, but little effort is made to enlarge the conception of theology so as to include the remarkable advance of scientific knowledge and to arrive at a unified world. There is an increasing number of seminaries that are formally committed to the scientific procedure, whose teachers know and speak the language of science, use its methods in the classroom and the laboratory, and undertake to interpret the life of the individual, the community, and the world in terms of principles found in harmony with scientific theories and discoveries. In the hands of such teachers science becomes an ally of religion, deepening and clarifying insight and confirming faith. It is joyfully recognized as a way to truth. (p. 229.)

Spiritual Life

The most vital thing in ministerial training is for men to have first hand experience with God. The methods of teaching in the seminaries are not conducive to this. The lecture and text-book methods are so abused that an extraordinary student may easily find himself by his second or third year in the mediocre class. Some ministers never recover from their denominational college training; some recover in ten or twenty years and find their way back to freedom. The study affirms:—

The seminaries, along with other types of higher institutions, need thoroughly to inspect their teaching methods. The prevailing methods now in use are the lecture method and the text-book method. The lecture method is in common use in nearly all the seminaries.

While neither of these methods, unless well supplemented, is adapted to develop most effectively the resourcefulness of mature students—since they both presuppose student receptivity and often allow student passivity rather than demand a large measure of student initiative and activity—it is, nevertheless, true that both methods are used successfully by able teachers. These teachers, who are found here and there within all types of seminaries, rank as masters of the profession. They possess what we call scholarship, often highly specialized, together with practical wisdom, power of clear analysis and interesting statement, power to stimulate student initiative, sympathetic interest in student attitude and attainment, personality. On the other hand, much of the teaching where either method is used is dull and uninspiring. It is frequently puerile and intellectually benumbing. However well or ill done, the purpose of the lecture is instruction, the end sought, knowledge. The minister needs knowledge—and much else.

The cases in which the lecture method is used with stimulating effect and with evidence of extensive outside work by students are outnumbered by those exemplifying its abuses both on the part of the teacher and the taught. Nor is this impression drawn from the lecture alone; it is confirmed by the fact that the libraries in seminaries visited were sometimes found locked and unheated, with little to indicate workshop conditions. Some lectures, many in fact, should rather be called sermons. Often they are rhetorical, rambling, hortatory sermons. Too often the prevailing atmosphere is that of the church rather than that of the school. In numerous instances entire periods are spent in reading from old manuscript lectures, line by line, as the students copy verbatim. On the margin of some of these manuscripts have been seen dates reaching back a quarter of a century, indicating the point the professor had reached in his annual journey over this well-traveled course. In other cases, more care has been taken in the preparation and revision of the lectures, but the manifest interest of the lecturer lies in his highly specialized subject rather than in the student; or the lecture may be marred by rapid or monotonous reading with very little "time out" for incidental observations by the lecturer, or by hasty or evasive replies to questions propounded. When the lecturer makes persistent effort to secure student response, the responses are sometimes given timidly and by a limited number of students. The students do not have the habit of free participation.

Some masterly teachers in the use of the text-book method were found guiding the organization of the material in most stimulating fashion. They showed great skill in building up the recitation around concrete situations with fine application of the Socratic method to the text-book material and to general student knowledge and experience.

But the abuses of the text-book method are quite as common, relatively, as those of the lecture method. Cases have been observed in which the assignments, as in the high school, were by pages or chapters in text-books of elementary character. The recitation sometimes displays lack of mastery of

the assignments both by the professor and the students. In one seminary, the text-book consists of a series of questions and answers. The aged professor read both the question and the answer and made elaborate hortatory and homiletical comment. In another instance, the students in succession took the floor and gave expositions of the text-book by sections. In another the teacher, who is the president of a well-known seminary, asked the students, during the first half of the period, to write on the first part of the assignment, with the text-book open; and during the second half he gave a rambling and reminiscent talk, with frequent and copious readings from the same text-book. Another professor read from the text-book during the entire hour. (pp. 54-56.)

Much of the training of the theological school tends to weaken, rather than increase, the spiritual life of the student. He is an exception if he rises above the deadening influence that surrounds him. The study continues:—

Recognizing that the spirit of consecration and Christian zeal is in danger of evaporating in an atmosphere dominated by intellectual and technical studies, and that the development of the inner life of prospective ministers is a fundamental element in their education, an effort was made to ascertain the success with which methods of discovering and developing spiritual gifts and promoting the spiritual life of students have been used.

The executive officer of one seminary reported that his faculty members were "presumably Christian gentlemen"; another reported "not interested"; and a third asked why the seminary should concern itself with such matters. At the other extreme, one seminary reports three required chapel services daily. No fewer than 120 seminaries gave information on the methods which they had found successful in promoting the spiritual life of the seminary. These replies indicate that the chief dependence of the seminary, in meeting this phase of their responsibility, is in prayer. Prayer, individual and in groups of varying kinds, is mentioned by no fewer than eighty seminaries. Other agencies in order of frequency in the schedules are "the chapel," "personal work," "special services," "student societies," etc. Evidently not so much effort is put forth with individual students as with groups; but of seventy-five seminaries that report some such effort, forty-one make "personal interest and work" prominent, while others mention "conferences," "prayer," the seminary "atmosphere," "volunteer religious work," etc. Several seminaries have professors or lecturers on personal evangelism. It is probable that the seminaries have not generally done themselves full justice in indicating the seriousness with which they apply themselves to this phase of ministerial education. Some seminaries emphasize the spiritual value of daily work honestly done; some fear the demoralizing effect of cant.

Certainly the minister must have first hand knowledge of God and of the

Book which contains so much of his revelation. Much prominence apparently is given to the devotional life in the seminaries with priestly ideals (Anglican and Lutheran). Even here, not much reference is made to communion, private and public, to Bible or other devotional reading, and to retreats. (pp. 58, 59.)

Practical training, such as the interne gets in hospital work, is almost unknown in theological training. The preference is given to keeping the student loyal to his denomination by instruction in the historical background of his denomination, much of which is valueless. Regarding clinical training, the study says:—

The seminaries as a class of educational institutions do not offer clinical training to their students. Their programmes have to do largely with the minister's acquaintance with the historical background and the roots of his religion. They teach a modicum of facts about the four traditional fields of theological study. In the general field of practical theology they spend most of the time on the building of the sermon—with a smaller amount of attention on its delivery. The instruction in pastoral methods and practices is usually treated academically and theoretically. It is rare to find a case where the student is really trained in actual parish work; especially as an "interne"—an assistant to an experienced minister. The assignment to "student churches," with perhaps an occasional visit by the more favoured to the city institutions, is in many instances looked upon as constituting sufficient training in this aspect of the minister's work. In most schools a member of the faculty has supervision of securing employment for the students, which is considered field work. Inspections are not usually made nor are reports called for.

To the question asked of all seminaries, "What supervision do you give to the field work of your students?" a wide variety of answers was returned, nearly all revealing practical neglect. A few typical replies may be quoted: "The professor of Pastoral Theology sends men to assist the Missions as he considers desirable." "Students go out every summer under supervision of nearest clergyman." "Under direction of Principal." "Left to local church authority." "Students placed under priest when on mission duty in summer." "President advises with all students." "Supervision in general through appointments." "Advise them as to proper field." "Very little." "Unsupervised."

Many schools failed to reply. The systematic supervision of the student practice work is not attempted by seminaries generally. Here and there an institution is entering this field. Union Theological Seminary (New York) gives much attention to practical work with boys. This institution pays the salaries each year of some forty or fifty students as workers in

carefully selected centers. This plan makes possible a careful choice of centers, full co-operation between the centers and the seminary, and definite control of the types of work students undertake. The Biblical Seminary in New York carries on several lines of field work, including inspection and report on philanthropic institutions and welfare agencies operating in that city. The Divinity School of the University of Chicago has had for some years a director of vocational training, under whom all candidates for the B. D. must take at least a year's work. A second man is now being added. Hartford Theological Seminary is entering the field of co-operative parish work.

The Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary in Virginia has a remarkable clinic for training men in the actual work of the pastorate, especially as regards rural churches. Within a radius of five miles of the seminary are ten mission churches, in all respects similar to the average rural church. Under the direction of the professor of pastoral theology, these churches are served entirely by students. A senior student, nicknamed "the bishop," is in charge of each mission under the professor; with him serve men of the middle and junior classes. Except for the visits of the professor to administer communion, these men take entire charge of the services and preach. They visit the people in sickness and in health, and conduct the organizations of the mission. To this end they usually give one afternoon a week in addition to the Sunday work. Because the students attend their own chapel service at the seminary on Sunday morning, the Sunday mission work is confined to Sunday afternoon and evening when Sunday-school and church service are both conducted.

Many famous men have received their first training in these missions. Phillips Brooks preached his first sermon in Sharon mission. The students receive no salary and to this unselfish service, rendered on foot in all kinds of weather for three years, many attribute the missionary spirit of the Virginia Seminary. (pp. 145-147.)

The cost in 1920-21 per capita for a theological education ranged from \$100 to \$5,000, being based on the reports of forty-five seminaries, in comparison with the public elementary school work, which is \$39 per child; for secondary school work, which is \$127; and for college, university and professional school work, which is \$466. With this cost and necessity of the larger emphasis on the prophetic side of the ministry, there is no escape from a general readjusting of the whole educational work of the ministry. Many schools are going beyond their former limitations, while many lag behind. In answer to the question, Are the seminaries neglecting the prophetic gift? the study says:

There is general agreement even among those immediately responsible for the seminaries that very largely they are. The disproportionate emphasis on the past, and the theoretical view of much of the curriculum material, assists in strengthening the *status quo*. The stipulation of creeds and oaths of allegiance to special doctrines that are found in many seminaries, contribute to the same result. The didactic if not dogmatic methods of teaching, which are very prevalent, tend to emphasize in the student's mind the authority of men. Prophetic preachers may be spoiled through theology if that theology is after the tradition of the elders and not after Christ.

On the other hand, men undoubtedly are going in streams into the seminaries, and after three or four years' work going out into the churches, with transforming power because they have received a new vision and have been free to pursue it. They feel the urge of Christ's message and the adaptability of that message to their own disturbed age. Prophets are men who have had a first hand experience with God and who have the courage to proclaim the truth that has been delivered to them. The seminaries that make possible this experience and that assist in developing this courage, are not failing "to produce a prophetic ministry." After all, it is not so much a question of curriculum subject-matter as it is a question of spiritual contacts. Some seminaries are attempting to prevent spiritual short-circuiting. They make central contacts easy. (pp. 236, 237.)

There is not another field of science in the world where men are so safeguarded against thinking as in the field of theology. Were these conditions in some other sciences we would smile at the humor of serious men and pass on. But there is a pathos about all this that reminds one of a prison. The convict may go so far. He is reminded of his limitations at every turn from the time he rises from his prison bed in the morning until he hears the klick of the iron door that locks him in for the night. Some one has called theology "the queen of the sciences"; is it true? Whose theology sits upon the throne—Roman Catholic, Anglican, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Baptist, etc.? Theology has a right to be a queen, but her way to the throne has been blocked by sectarianism.

The condition is serious. Things ought not to go on as they are. There ought to be a universal bridge building between the theological seminaries of the world.

The Church is divided. Hundreds of prisons in America hold would-be prophets, once youthful fellows of catholic soul with the love of all mankind within their bosom, then trained to

love a class, a group, a denomination, and going forth true to the denominational model, whose fictitious glory is to remain faithful to the denominational standard as long as life shall last. As long as schools teach men *what* to think rather than *how* to think there will be division. The function of the school is to educate the soul into freedom, and a free soul will find brotherhood "It is not true," says Lessings, "that speculations upon these things have ever done harm or become injurious to the body politic. You must find fault not with speculations, but with the folly and tyranny of checking them." Before him both Milton and Locke pleaded for freedom. It was the call of Channing, Emerson, Bryant, Longfellow, Lowell, Whittier, Mill, and others. Danger is not in freedom; but danger always lurks in forbidding to think.

What our forebears thought a hundred years ago or three or four hundred years ago is not our limitation. No one of these thinkers of the past ever required such a thing of posterity. They would have scorned such servile following, for all who have thought at all have thought toward freedom. Yet the average theological school, according to this study, presents a condition of completed thought. It ought not to be. The schools themselves must say: "It must not be." We ourselves are incomplete. Our thinking is incomplete. Instead of setting up limitations for fear of offending denominational thought, we need the opening of every door in order to have more light in our search for paths that will lead to brotherhood. The present paths will not; then others must be found. Out of the exceptionally fine work done by the Institute of Social and Religious Research they must find a way for the unifying of the theological schools in the United States and Canada. Nothing can save the situation other than the unifying of the methods of training young men for the ministry of the Gospel.

PETER AINSLIE.

FEDERAL UNITY OF THE CHURCHES FIFTEEN YEARS OF PROGRESS

BY REV. CHARLES S. MACFARLAND

General Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ
in America, New York

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT

WHEN the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America held its annual session at Columbus in December, it observed, in a quiet way, the fifteenth anniversary of the organization of the Federal Council.

With the exception of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, which, up to the time of the organization of the Federal Council, had served simply as a consultative body, all previous movements and organizations, uniting Christians in their common service, were of a voluntary nature, the most important being the Evangelical Alliance. The weakness of these movements lay in the fact that they did not represent the churches, or, perhaps, it would be truer to say that the churches did not recognize them, in the corporate capacity of the church.

Meanwhile, men who were dealing administratively in carrying out the programme of the churches, came into consultation, in a simple and natural way, upon the common problems of their administration. They were thinking, not simply in general terms of Christians, but in terms of the Church. Out of their prayer and conferences, fifteen years ago, the Federal Council came into being, marking a new development in American Christianity. Then, for the first time, there was created a federal unity of the denominations, based upon a Constitution officially adopted by each of them, provided with governing bodies made up of the official representatives desig-

nated by the denominations themselves and giving authoritative sanction to a definite plan of common action and service.

The Constitution of the Council was marked by great simplicity. The preamble declares that the general purpose of the Council is "more fully to manifest the essential means of the Christian churches of America in Jesus Christ as their divine Lord and Saviour." More particularly, the functions of the Council were defined in the following terms:

For the prosecution of work that can be better done in union than in separation, a Council is hereby established whose name shall be the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. The object of this Federal Council shall be:

1. To express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian Church.
2. To bring the Christian bodies of America into united service for Christ and the world.
3. To encourage devotional fellowship and mutual counsel concerning the spiritual life and religious activities of the churches.
4. To secure a larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life.
5. To assist in the organization of local branches of the Federal Council to promote its aims in their communities.

From the very beginning, the authority sought by the Council was that of moral influence, which, in the last analysis, after all, is the highest form of authority. The framers of the Constitution, therefore, added these words to their preamble: "This Federal Council shall have no authority over the constituent bodies adhering to it."

The Federal Council came into being because a spirit of unity already existed in the churches. Its existence and its work in carrying on co-operative enterprises have been a potent influence in deepening and extending that spirit of unity. The tasks which the churches have undertaken together through this agency have demonstrated that co-operation is a thoroughly practicable programme and that far larger co-operation is possible than we have yet undertaken. They have shown clearly

that the pathway of advance toward larger unity lies not so much through the field of discussion and argument as through the field of action. It is by joining hand-in-hand in concrete programmes of service, in the name of a common Lord and Saviour, that the churches are coming to appreciate each other, to discover how far they are already one in spirit and purpose, and to realize what a united body can achieve in building the Kingdom of God, what the separate members, acting independently of one another, can never hope to accomplish.

The progress of the Council and of the co-operative movement, of which it is the chief exponent, has been normal. Some of the church leaders have been impatient because it did not go fast enough, while others, more cautious, have occasionally warned the churches that the movement was proceeding too rapidly. Certainly the men who have been charged with the destinies of the Council and the movement it represents, have oftentimes been called upon to manifest their willingness to wait for things. Nevertheless, I think it may be said that no movement of the churches has really proceeded with greater rapidity, during this decade and a half, than the co-operative movement as a whole, and the Federal Council in particular. What we call the co-operative movement exists now in several forms and organizations besides the Federal Council, mainly those which unite the Boards of the denominations in their common activities. There is no doubt, however, but that the Federal Council has been in large measure the motive force of the whole movement and, although these several departmental co-operative organizations have maintained their autonomy, they are coming to realize that they have common problems requiring mutual consideration. This has led the Federal Council to bring into the membership of its own Administrative Committee, the representatives of these several bodies co-operatively engaged in carrying out special phases of the work of the churches. These affiliated, co-operating, or consultative bodies are as follows: Home Missions Council, Council of Women for Home Missions, Federation of Women's Boards of Foreign Missions, Council of Church Boards of Education, In-

ternational Council of Religious Education, American Bible Society, International Committee Young Men's Christian Association, National Board Young Women's Christian Association, Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of N. A., Committee on Co-operation in Latin America, and Student Volunteer Movement.

THE PERIOD OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

There can be no doubt that, if the Federal Council had not been in existence, it would have been necessary to attempt the organization of such a body during the World War. As it was, however, the Administrative Committee of the Council met within twenty-four hours after war was declared and within three weeks there gathered in Washington official representatives of our entire Protestant Evangelical Christianity to consider the duty of the churches in this time of emergency. Among the few compensating advantages of the war was the influence of united service in this time of national trial upon the whole movement for Christian co-operation. The year 1919, therefore, marked a new epoch in the movement as it went forward under the impulse which had been gathered from such close and intimate service during the conflict.

The development of the Council can best be indicated by a brief review of some of the more outstanding phases of its work at the present moment.

THE SPIRIT OF EVANGELISM

There is special satisfaction in the distinctly spiritual emphasis given to the Council's work by the Commission on Evangelism. Other phases of work may have received more publicity; none is of such indispensable value. The central place of evangelism in the life of the Church has been emphasized. The Secretary of the Commission has proclaimed the Gospel with winning power in hundreds of communities, coming to them not in the name of any single denomination, but in the name of all the churches federated in the Council. Teams made up of the secretaries in charge of evangelism in

the various denominations have jointly visited many of the larger cities, bringing all the pastors together to plan a year's evangelistic programme for the city as a whole, in which each church and its pastor has its part. By such concerted effort the imagination of a city has been captured as it could not be by isolated denominational activities; a publicity has been secured that no church could secure alone; an atmosphere has been created that makes the subject of religion an important and vital interest of the community as a whole.

The Council has given its attention, even more than in other years, to the development of the devotional life. The general observance of the Universal Week of Prayer and of a special Easter period of prayer and evangelism is carefully planned. The "Fellowship of Prayer," prepared for use in all denominations throughout Lent, has had a circulation of over 350,000.

THE WORK OF SOCIAL REDEMPTION

In accordance with the original purpose of the Council "to secure larger combined influence for the Churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social conditions of the people so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life," the Council has been helping the churches to deal more effectively with urgent issues that have to do with the building of a Christian society.

Noteworthy progress has been made by the Commission on the Church and Social Service in bringing the churches into co-operative service in behalf of prisoners in county jails, a better recreational life in communities, the abolition of child labour, and better industrial relation. An outstanding illustration of the way in which the united action of the churches on social questions secures results that no denomination can achieve independently was the vigorous and successful effort to create public opinion against the twelve-hour day in industry. The facts in the case were brought together and published by the Research Department in a bulletin, which is an excellent concrete example of the point of view of the Council in such matters. It made no pretense of being warranted in speaking

on the technical sides of the issues involved, but it declared that a twelve-hour day, by depriving men of their rightful opportunities for leisure, for education, for family life, for spiritual interests, commits a moral trespass and challenges the churches in their own field. Within a few months the greatest steel organization in the world announced that in response to the demand of public opinion, immediate steps were being taken toward the abolition of the twelve-hour day.

CHRISTIAN RELATIONS BETWEEN RACES

The recent work in developing more Christian relations between the white and the Negro races has been a clear justification of the venture in faith begun two years ago when the Commission on the Church and Race Relations was created. Among its special efforts has been a campaign to mobilize united Christian sentiment against the lynching evil. The increased interest throughout the churches has been, in the judgment of close observers, no small factor in reducing the appalling lynching record of America to by far the lowest figure of recent years. The development of interracial committees in the more important cities, with white and Negro churches taking the lead, has been persistently carried on. The home mission text-book, *The Trend of the Races*, prepared by one of the Council's secretaries, has had a circulation of 75,000 copies.

INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE AND PEACE

In no way has the Federal Council been of greater service to the churches than in its work in behalf of a more Christian international life. A world shattered by war, and yet carrying on its international life in a way from which war will come just as surely as fever comes from an undrained swamp, looks to the Church for moral and spiritual leadership in finding a better way. In the Commission on International Justice and Good-will, the churches have had an indispensable agency through which to voice, in a vigorous and united way, the Christian ideal for the nations. The programme for developing intelligent support of the Permanent Court of International

Justice is only one of the many illustrations that might be given of the Council's work in this field. A document prepared in conference both with church leaders and with expert authorities on international law, entitled, "The Churches and the International Court of Justice," reached practically every pastor in the twenty-nine denominations that compose the Council. In November special conferences were held with the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, at which representatives of the many denominations that had taken official action in support of the World Court presented their denominational resolutions, thus making a most convincing demonstration that the concern for the World Court was not simply that of a single agency but permeated the life of the churches.

The International Ideals of the Churches, drafted after long study and designed to crystallize the sentiment of the churches against war and in support of constructive agencies of international co-operation, have been officially adopted by many of the denominations and promise to be as notable a platform of the churches as "The Social Principles of the Churches" has been for more than a decade.

The development of friendship with the Orient, which has a vital bearing on the foreign missionary movement in every denomination, has been a matter of special concern during the recent troubled period. Through the Council clear and united expression was given to the conviction of the churches that, in dealing with the restriction of immigration from Japan, methods of friendly conference should be followed rather than the proposed method of abruptly abrogating the former treaty agreement with Japan. Even though the exclusion act was adopted, the attitude of the churches, as expressed through the Council, was a great factor in maintaining a spirit of goodwill between the peoples of the two countries. The appeal for the suffering children in Germany, made by the Council's Committee on Mercy and Relief, has resulted in a strong testimony of Christian love from the churches of America and has gone far to serve as a ministry of reconciliation with those with whom we were lately at war.

The friendly approach to Mexico has promise of future service to the people of that nation.

CHRISTIAN SERVICE IN EUROPE

At a time when, in large areas of Central Europe, as a result of the shattered economic life, Protestantism is face to face with the greatest crisis of its history, the united support of American evangelical forces is of cardinal importance. Through the Council about \$1,500,000 has been contributed to the rebuilding and strengthening of devastated French Protestant churches, in addition to the large amounts forwarded directly by the denominations themselves. The original programme of assistance to the French churches has been nearly completed during the past year, but a far vaster task of support for the churches of Central Europe is now being carried forward. Two steps taken during the year by the Federal Council are of great significance. The first is the appointment of Rev. Chauncey W. Goodrich, the honoured pastor of the American Church in Paris, to serve in America as the representative of the Central Bureau for Relief of the Evangelical churches of Europe, which came into being overseas chiefly as the result of initiative taken by the Federal Council. The second step is the appointment of Dr. Adolph Keller, of Zurich, Switzerland, one of the great Protestant leaders of the Continent, to serve American Protestantism as its representative in Europe. The organization for carrying on an effective mission of help to our fellow-Christians in Europe is now provided.

Of unique interest are the influences that have lately been bringing American Christianity into a new fellowship with the churches of the Orthodox Eastern faith. The experience of confusion and suffering, through which the Greek, the Russian, and the Armenian churches have been passing, has led them to turn more naturally to the Christian forces of the West and has caused the hearts of the latter to expand in sympathy. In the new relations thus established each has been coming to appreciate the other and to desire a deepened fellowship. To increase this fellowship and establish contacts of mutual help-

fulness a Committee on Relations with the Eastern Churches, under the Chairmanship of Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent, has been appointed by authorization of the last meeting of the Executive Committee of the Council.

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

The separation of Church and State does not mean that Church and State shall have nothing to do with each other. Indeed, this separation has its greatest advantage in the fact that it leaves the Church free to express its judgment to those who control the affairs of State, on all great questions affecting human welfare. The Washington office of the Federal Council is not, and never has been in any sense of the word, a lobby. Strictly political affairs have never been taken up. No attempts have ever been made to secure special privileges. The influence of the churches has simply been brought to bear in a simple and natural way upon those great national and international issues which called for the application of Christian principles. The Army and the Navy, composed of 200,000 of our young men, have been the special care of the General Committee on Army and Navy Chaplains, with the co-operation of the government, in the moral and spiritual interests of this great host of young men.

THE LOCAL APPLICATION OF CO-OPERATIVE SERVICE

It is, of course, necessary that the Federal Council should have a headquarters located at the center of the nation's business life. There has been, however, an earnest effort to find the way of geographical extension, first through the establishment of the office in Washington, and more recently, through the establishment of a headquarters for the Western section, in Chicago. It is hoped that this outreach may be further extended and also that there may be similar centers in the Far West and in the South.

For the most part, however, the distribution of the co-operative movement has been through the formation of Local

Federations and Councils of Churches. During these fifteen years about fifty city and state Federations have been thus developed throughout the country as fast as local conditions and processes of education have made it possible.

This service has extended to the Canal Zone, where help has been given to the Union Churches.

RELIGIOUS PUBLICITY

It has been discovered that the press of the country is much readier to convey to its readers information regarding the Church and religion as a whole than it is to distribute what it believes to be denominational propaganda.

The Federal Council's service in this field is in its infancy, but has proceeded far enough to indicate the great possibilities of a co-operative plan for acquainting the people with the aim, progress, and work of the Christian Church.

AN INCITING AND INITIATING FORCE

Much of the work and influence of the Federal Council is unobserved. The officers of the Council have never hesitated to render service in which its own name has been lost to sight. For example, the Central Bureau for the Relief of the Eastern Churches is now an independent international organization which had its inception in the Federal Council. In the notable Citizenship Conference held in Washington in October, and followed by a series of similar conferences throughout the country, in support of the eighteenth amendment and law enforcement, the staff of the Commission on Council of Churches played a central part. It has initiated and carried forward this movement for public righteousness, enlisting the co-operation of a host of good agencies without any attempt to claim the credit for the Council itself. The Council is often called upon to assist in the organization and development of such movements as the Conference of Allied Christian Agencies and the Conference on the Christian Way of Life. Almost the entire administrative staff of the Council is, at the present time, serv-

ing the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, to be held at Stockholm next year.

The Council, through its staff, with its opportunities of reaching the churches and Christian people of the country, serves from time to time on such occasions as the Huguenot-Walloon New Netherland Tercentenary recently observed.

A WORLD-WIDE MOVEMENT

In a recent statement, Archbishop Söderblom of Sweden averred that the present co-operative movement, in its world-wide aspects, would have been impossible without the example, influence, and service of the American Federal Council, and I think it may be said frankly that the Federations of Churches in foreign lands have been, in large measure due to the initiative of our American Council and its contact with the churches of these countries.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE COUNCIL

Sometimes I am asked to give a definition of the Federal Council indicating its significance. Perhaps this is not easy but it might be summed up as follows. The Federal Council is:

1. A clearing house of information. Conference, consultation, and publicity on matters of vital common interest to all the churches.
2. A center of co-ordination in the several fields of denominational service.
3. A pioneer agency initiating and carrying on, in behalf of the denominations, new types of work for which they have no organized agencies and which they could not do alone even if they had such agencies.
4. An agency for developing organized co-operation among the churches of local communities throughout the country.
5. An organ of communication and co-operation with other agencies, national and international, including the churches of other lands.
6. Finally, an agency of the churches ready, upon call, to undertake any common task that may arise.

RELATIONS WITH THE CONSTITUENT DENOMINATIONS

In an organization, which has a directly representative character and is the official agent of the denominations for their co-operative work, the maintenance of the closest contact with the denominational life is of cardinal importance. To maintain such contacts with twenty-nine national bodies, differing widely in organization and in point of view, and to secure sufficient agreement to make a working programme possible, is no easy task. But the attempt to do so is being made constantly and honestly, and, we believe, with an increasing measure of success. In addition to the monthly meetings of the Administrative Committee, including one official representative of each denomination, groups of denominational representatives are brought together, often almost daily, for consultation and conference on special phases of the work.

A conservative financial policy has kept the expenditures of the year well within the annual budget of \$300,000 authorized by the last quadrennial meeting of the Council. The disbursements for 1923 were \$262,676.56. Of this amount \$82,000 was provided directly by the constituent denominations. It is earnestly hoped that all the denominations may now find the way to match the advances in financial support already by several, in keeping with the settled policy of placing both the direction and support of the Council increasingly in the hands of the denominations themselves.

The work of the Council is not an outside or independent work, but the work of the denominations that compose it. Its achievements are their achievements, its failures their failures. It is not a super-organization. It has no life but a derived life, no authority but a delegated authority. It exists to serve the common needs of the denominations that called it into being. It desires, above all things, that they shall constantly exercise the control and assume the full responsibility that is rightfully theirs.

The work of the Federal Council has been by no means simply that carried on by a group of employed secretaries. It has had, from the very beginning, the consultation and active

voluntary service of great leaders of the churches, one of whom, its President, Robert E. Speer, has indicated the outstanding questions which ought to be seriously considered by the denominations represented at the Quadrennial Meeting of the Federal Council at Atlanta in December. In a recent address he said:

In the first place, if the Federal Council is to render that help to the churches which they need and which it ought to render, the denominations themselves must discern more clearly than they do just what is the business of the Church, what its duties are and what its problems.

The churches would be vastly stronger and more effective in their own distinctive denominational character and action, and could use far more fruitfully and powerfully their common agency in this Council, if they could come to some clearer, common conception of their real duties and their true interests and their most vital problems, and if they could discern—as they surely would in case they reached those clearer conceptions—how large is the measure of their unity in these things, how kindred and similar they already are in their character and work, and how fully prepared for and desperately in need of a collective agency through which to express the unities of spirit and purpose and activity and duty which already exist.

In the second place, in order that the Federal Council may better serve the churches, it is desirable that the churches should cultivate and cherish a sense of ownership over the Council, and exercise an actual control.

In the third place, the denominations should actually utilize this Council for their collective tasks and for the new common duties which arise instead of leaving these to the individual, independent undenominational agencies.

And now, the last and most important thing. In order that the programme of the churches through the Council may be realized and that it may serve the churches as they ought to be served, there must be more of a spirit of trust among us, inside every denomination and between denomination.

From its very inception there has been an earnest attempt to make the one note of the Council that of service. In the last sacred hour of the Master's life, when He gathered the disciples together to set before them the symbol of their fellowship, He simply took a towel, girded Himself, performed a humble act of service and left. That was his last message for them and for all those who should join their fellowship. It suggests also the great way in which increasing unity among the churches will come.

CHARLES S. MACFARLAND.

CHURCH UNION IN CANADA

BY R. P. MACKAY, D.D.

Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church in
Canada, Toronto

JESUS CHRIST enunciated eternal principles which He left his followers to interpret and apply. We have been dull learners. It took centuries to discover the application of the law of Christian brotherhood to the problem of slavery, yet how simply and beautifully the Apostle expressed it to Philemon concerning the runaway slave, Onesimus: "That thou shouldst receive him forever, not now as a slave but as a brother, beloved."

Our Lord's prayer for the unity of his Church is another of these fundamental laws that has not yet found its proper setting, even after centuries of earnest endeavour. "The glory which Thou hast given Me I have given them that they may be one as We are one, I in them and Thou in Me that they may be perfected in one, that the world may know that Thou didst send Me, and that Thou lovest them as Thou lovest Me." Every sentence in that prayer seems beyond the range of human thought. "As Thou Father art in Me and I in Thee." "I in them and Thou in Me." "That they may be perfected in one." "The glory which Thou hast given Me I have given them." "That Thou lovest them as Thou lovest Me."

These words are high; who can attain? They seem to unlock the secrets of the Godhead. We are tempted to say "Thou knowest not now but Thou shalt know hereafter." Yet they are for present use. He says: "The glory Thou has given Me, I have given them, and I have given it to them that the world might believe that Thou didst send Me." Yes, it is something given now, for present use, in this present world, that the world may believe. The glory of which He speaks is that eternal life, that fellowship which He had with the Father before the world was, "That life was manifested," John says, "and we have seen it and bear witness and declare unto you that life, that eternal life

which was with the Father and was manifested unto us." The power of the Father was the power of the Son. The righteousness of the Father was the righteousness of the Son; the blessedness of the Father was the blessedness of the Son; the glory of the Father was the glory of the Son.

"The Word became flesh and dwelt among us and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only Begotten Son of the Father full of grace and truth." From the beginning of his ministry He was continuously teaching that He had come to give men eternal life, which He Himself had and which He received from the Father. This was not something reserved for another world. It was given for present experience. The same truth He taught to the woman at the well when He spoke of the living water. It was what He told the multitude to whom He spoke of the living bread. It was what He meant when He said to Nicodemus: "Ye must be born again."

All this that they might be one with Him and one with each other. And then, by the revelation in life of that Divine unity, the world will be impressed and believe that He was sent of God for the world's salvation.

Is it not evident that He cherished the thought that his followers should be perfected in one, as a part of the programme by which the world is to be redeemed? In the light of such declarations, who can estimate the possibilities and grandeur of the Church of Christ, and, as well, the solemnity and responsibility of disobedience to his command? "That they may be one as We are one." Yet the Church does not see and believe, and because of her unbelief all attempts at the realization of this unity are hindered. That misapprehension lies at the bottom of the opposition and paralyzes effort.

Paul caught the vision of that day when there would be neither Jew nor Greek, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free—when all would be merged into one harmonious family. Then will there be no more strangers nor foreigners. All will be fellow citizens of the household of faith, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone—the whole building fitly framed together, an holy temple to the Lord, a habitation of God through the Spirit. The

soul thrills at the thought of such a consummation. What a panacea for the ills of a world and Church wrecked by discord, the history of which has been written in blood! The vision has never vanished from the earth. It is the Golden Age of which prophets and poets have sung, when the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, when they will neither hurt nor destroy in all God's Holy Mountain.

Although the vision has not yet been realized, down through the centuries efforts have been put forth. The trend of history has been in that direction. The crudest, as well as the most comprehensive effort, was made by the Church of Rome. The Roman Empire came nearest being a world-empire yet known. She ruled from the Euphrates to the Strait of Gibraltar, from the tides of the Solway to the sands of the Sahara, and she ruled with a rod of iron. It seemed but a natural development that the Church should seek a corresponding spiritual dominion to bring the thoughts of men into subjection to her will. It was her conception of our Lord's prayer, and still is, that unity might be secured by compulsion. It proved impracticable. The soul of man is born for freedom. Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty. "If ye continue in my word then are ye my disciples, indeed; ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." If the truth shall make you free, you shall be free indeed. Such freedom fire and sword cannot extinguish. It is a lesson hard to learn. The sanguinary series of persecutions in Rome, in Switzerland, and in Scotland were but manifestations of the same ambition to crush individuality and compel submission to the will and behest of another. The same spirit quickly appeared amongst the Puritans in America, the land of liberty, and still the cloven foot appears in the antagonisms known as Fundamentalists and Modernists amongst the churches of to-day. Has the time not come when men can recognize that the unity for which our Lord prayed is not to be won in that way?

If suppression and persecution failed in ages of despotism, what hope of success where the very atmosphere is charged with a spirit of democracy, when every man claims the rights and privileges of his own vine and fig tree, none daring to make him

afraid? Inscribed on the archways of the Columbian Exhibition was the sentence—"Toleration in religion, the best fruit of the last four centuries."

The multiplication of divisions in the churches is simply an expression of protest against spiritual compulsion. Men will think for themselves though the heavens fall. The presence of six or eight struggling congregations of different communions in a village, which could be amply served by one, whilst a pitiful spectacle from the standpoint of economy and efficiency, yet, on the other hand, is a declaration of independence, of man's right to follow in matters spiritual the inclination of his own heart and mind. The highest ideal of human development is not in all men thinking the same thoughts, speaking the same words, walking according to the same rule. It is rather in freedom of expression of the inner life, allowing that variety and colour characteristic of the life of God within the soul.

How then, amid such freedom of thought, can unity exist? It consists in such co-ordination of all the agencies and functions of the Church as exists in the co-ordination of all the complexities of the human body. The foot cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee, nor the ear to the eyes, I have no need of thee. There are diversities of gifts but the same spirit. There are diversities of administration, but the same Lord. There are diversities of operation, but it is the same God who worketh all in all. He is not the God of suppression and of death. He is the God of freedom and of action. He giveth the word of wisdom to one, to another the word of knowledge, to another the gifts of healing, to another the working of miracles, but to all the working of that self same spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will. What a glorious conception of a living Church it is! A perfected organization "that, speaking the truth in love, we may grow up into Him in all things who is the Head, even Christ, from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." That is the Divine plan, the Master's ideal, perfect liberty exer-

cised in perfect co-ordination. What an infinite distance between that and the Inquisition or the fires of Smithfield!

One of the most spectacular and far reaching of the many attempts at realization was the Westminster Assembly which was called for the purpose of framing a basis of union for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland. It was a notable assembly of ninety-eight divines of the English and Congregational Churches, and five Presbyterian ministers and three elders appointed by the Church of Scotland. They drew up the Westminster Confession of Faith, one of the greatest creedal documents of history. But the attempt miscarried in England and Ireland through political unrest. The Westminster Confession was adopted by the Church of Scotland which, along with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, prepared by the same Assembly, are still recognized as the subordinate standards of the Presbyterian family throughout the world.

The union in Canada of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches is but another similar movement, although the Canadian Movement has attracted special attention. Even from Czecho-Slovakia and from Russia requests have come for copies of the Canadian Basis of Union, in order to find help in building upon a united basis. It is thus evident that Canadians are but sharing in a movement that is practically world-wide, and may we not believe inspired by that same Spirit who brooded on the waters at the beginning, and brought life, order, and beauty out of confusion and chaos.

Canadians have had long training. The first settlers came from Scotland when there were many divisions, and they carried their divisions and prejudices with them. The first presbytery was organized in 1786, known as "The Burgher Presbytery of Truro." In 1795 "The Anti-Burgher Presbytery of Pictou" was organized. The difference between these two illustrates the subtlety of the Scottish mind and how political distinctions affected religious life. There was in Scotland a State Church controlled by the State and supported by state funds. There were certain incorporated burghs or cities, and each citizen had to take an oath pledging himself to have nothing to do with the Church of Rome, and to support the Protestant religion, before

he could become a burgher and have a vote. One party in the Secession Church interpreted the oath as involving approval of the State Church of Scotland, of which they could not approve, and so declined to take the oath, and then became "Anti-Burghers" and organized a separate Presbytery.

Into Canada this ancient division was imported and persisted in, although neither State Church, nor incorporated burgh, nor oath was known. But there did exist a great need of co-operation amongst a new and scattered population. Negotiations began and it took twenty years, but finally the United Presbyterian Synod was organized, consisting of the two Presbyteries—Burgher and Anti-Burgher—together with three ministers of the Church of Scotland and two Congregational ministers. This was in 1817, and three years later, in 1820, a somewhat similar Methodist union followed. Into the two provinces, then known as Upper and Lower Canada, now known as Ontario and Quebec, two streams of Methodism had flowed—the Methodist Episcopal of the United States and the British Wesleyans of England. After prolonged negotiations, it was decided that all the Methodists in Quebec should unite under the British Methodist and all in Ontario under the Methodist Episcopal, and that they should respect each other's territory.

Thus, as the population grew and mission interests became more pressing, union succeeded union so that the Presbyterian Church in Canada of to-day is itself the result of nine different unions, the last of which was in 1875. In addition to these nine there were seven absorptions of formerly independent bodies which without formal negotiations came into the united body as independent congregations. The existing Methodist Church in Canada is the result of eight unions, in which sixteen different bodies are included. Similarly, the Congregational churches are the outcome of a succession of unions, the last having taken place in 1907. Thus, in Canada the spirit of Church union is in the blood and what is now transpiring is but a further development along familiar lines. The fathers were not lacking in reverence for the past, nor in affection for old associations, but they had higher ideals as to what the Church of Christ ought to be and were willing to sacrifice sentiment to

that end. There were, of course, heartburnings and animated discussions and separations at every stage of the process, but as time passed these separations were healed and antagonisms forgotten, and the event justified all that had been done.

The rapid expansion of all these churches in the last fifty years, at home and abroad, whilst gratifying in itself, did not prove adequate to the need. Canada's development in the twentieth century gives promise of becoming what American development became in the nineteenth century. The tide of population in Canada began to rise rapidly at the same time that the Orient was awakening. The appeals from Home and Foreign fields were so insistent that the new situation was accepted as a challenge to wider unions with a view to greater efficiency. The experience of former unions encouraged the expectation that larger results would follow.

In 1899 the Presbyterian Assembly invited the Methodist General Conference to appoint a committee to consider co-operation in Home Missions. During these conferences there emerged the larger conception. Delegates from the Presbyterian Assembly to the Methodist Conference in 1902 threw out the challenge for consideration of organized union, which challenge was accepted, and thus began negotiations between Presbyterians and Methodist and Congregationalists that have culminated in the union of 1924. Anglicans and Baptists had been invited to share in the negotiations, but the invitation was declined. In 1908 a basis of union was prepared, which had to run the gauntlet of presbyteries, annual conferences, and congregations. All proposed amendments were duly considered and finally adopted in 1916. The consummation was, however, delayed by the war. Both they who favoured and they who opposed union agreed to suspend all agitation until the second Assembly after the close of the war, when consideration was resumed. Final action was taken in 1922 by the Methodist Conference, and in 1923 by the Congregational Union and the Presbyterian General Assembly. There remained but such legislation by the Federal and Provincial Parliaments as would give necessary legal effect to all property transactions.

Details of ecclesiastical procedure in church courts involve

wearisome detail, but those interested may wish to know the issues raised during the long period of discussion, for there were keen legally and theologically cultured minds on both sides and intensely exercised over what was taking place. Whilst there were evidences of merely local and personal considerations on the part of some, to others the issues involved were matters of life and death.

The first and fundamental contention was that already considered, whether organized union is implied in our Lord's prayer. Anti-unionists contended that denominationalism is in itself a good thing, that denominations provide spiritual homes for different types of religious life and can co-operate under their captain as the battalions of an army co-operate under their military leader.

To that contention the late Principal Caven gave the following effective reply: "The idea of having persons in separate communions according to such diversities finds no support in either the Old Testament or the New, and is alien to the genius of Christianity. It cannot be that the Church's Head assigns to one denomination of his followers the duty of emphasizing the Sovereignty of God, to another the duty of maintaining the freedom of man; appoints one community to minister to the intellect in the clear apprehension of religious truth, another to pursue the cultivation of the affections; one to adapt the public services to the cultivated and refined, another to study the edification of the rude and illiterate; one to enforce the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith, another to declare the necessity of good works. Every church should set forth, in due proportions, all the elements of Divine truth, should keep back nothing that is profitable, should declare the whole counsel of God." That is the view that prevailed, recognizing as it does, the beautiful variety of gifts of the Spirit given to them who constitute the body of Christ.

2. For many years there has been more or less co-operation amongst the churches, especially in home mission fields, and some contend that all requirements are thus met without the dislocations involved in organized union. Co-operation has been carried on sometimes by delimitation of territory, some-

times by either denomination withdrawing and leaving an undivided field to the other. Whilst such methods were helpful in some respects, yet they allowed the impression that, whilst larger congregations were not willing to lose their own separate identity as a church, they seemed quite ready to hand over their weaker brethren to other denominations. Nevertheless, in view of anticipated organic union, co-operative arrangements multiplied until in 1923 there were 1245 changes reported, including 3100 preaching points where old denominational rivalries had disappeared, and the people worshiped and worked together. But this arrangement was always entered into on the understanding that organic union was in the near future. It could not be accepted as a permanent arrangement. Had organic union miscarried these co-operative communities would be lost to all the negotiating churches, and would organize themselves into yet another independent denomination. No church could afford to encourage such a process of disintegration as that. If a church is to become a force in the land, to have a strong home base enabling her to bear a worthy part in the foreign field she must care for her own people, and minister to them wherever they may be found. The surrender of territory made by the three negotiating bodies in the interests of co-operation were not with the expectation of ultimate loss of territory or of people, but with the expectation of greater enlargement in the future.

3. The doctrinal basis of any such union is rightly regarded as fundamental. There are men who discount doctrine as of secondary, if not of minor, importance. It is possible to go to the other extreme, and identify religion with intellectual assent to certain logical propositions. The Church of Christ is founded upon truth. He said: "I am the way, the truth and the life." Truth in the sense in which He used it included the whole man—our intellectual, emotional, and social nature. It was not to Him mere intellectual assent on the one hand, nor mere emotionalism on the other. Both are indispensable and inseparable elements in every true life; hence, the importance of a doctrinal basis—a clear statement of the essential truth for which the Church stands. The doctrinal bases in this case is brief, con-

sisting of twenty articles, centering about the person of Christ and his redemptive work. In it are named, as foundational, the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, the atonement of Christ, justification through faith in Christ, sanctification through the Holy Spirit, the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the Holy Catholic Church, the Resurrection, Christian service and final Judgment. All truths are important, but not all equally important, and it will be admitted that those must be given a first place. Yet, strangely in the stress of debate, the Basis of Union has been severely decried and the united body designated a creedless church. On the other hand, another man not sympathetic with the union, but not less scholarly, has written as follows of this same doctrinal basis: "Its excellence must impress any thoughtful reader. It is full, simple, and scriptural. It will be a standing testimony to the essential unity of the Protestant Evangelical Churches both in this and in other lands and may serve as a standard of model to other churches contemplating union."

4. Subscription to the Confession or Doctrinal Basis has been a bone of contention. The practice in the Presbyterian Church in the past has been to ask the candidate for ordination certain simple and direct questions as to his acceptance of the Old and New Testament as the Word of God and his belief in the Confession of Faith as founded on and agreeable to the Word of God, and his purpose in his teaching to adhere thereto.

Such questions answered by a "yes" or "no" leave indefinite room for private interpretations or mental reservations. As time passes, and in the light of the historical development of truth, it is increasingly difficult to answer honestly by a "yes" or "no."

In the United Church the candidate for ordination will appear before a committee of the ordaining body and by conference, more or less prolonged, satisfy them as to his essential agreement with the faith of the Church, before ordination is granted. Hence, the charge that men are to be ordained to the ministry unpledged is founded upon a misapprehension of the facts.

5. The procedure as to the settlement of ministers under

the new order has been called in question, and it has been charged that the rights of the people to extend a call to the man of their choice has been taken away. That, too, is a misapprehension. The right of call is not taken away, but, if as sometimes happened, too much time is lost in securing a settlement by regular call, the Presbytery claims the right in the interests of the whole Church to settle a minister in a congregation. This power always existed in the Presbyterian Church, but was rarely exercised. By the new arrangements the Methodists are giving up the term service and giving more place to the voice of the people in the choice of their pastor. In all churches the settlement of the minister is recognized as exceedingly difficult. Much time is lost through frequent and extended vacancies and many ministers are without charge who ought to be at work. The attempt has been made to take advantage of the best in both systems, but even this, as time passes, may require modification.

Space will not allow further reference to other questions that arose in connection with legislation, with the right of a church to change her name and doctrinal basis although having accepted trust funds, with the exclusive rights and powers of the United Church to legislate in all matters concerning doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, including the right and power from time to time to frame, adopt, alter, change, add to or modify its laws, subordinate standards, and formulas.

These and others are interesting problems giving room for much discussion which has greatly clarified the atmosphere as to many points hitherto somewhat nebulous.

The sound of battle has not altogether subsided, but the union is practically an accomplished fact. What is now needed is "the inspiration of vision, the dynamic of prayer, and the venture of faith." We then shall see the other sheep which are not of this fold, and that them also the Lord must bring.

"A sweeter song shall then be heard
The music of the world's accord
Confessing Christ the inward Word."

R. P. MACKAY.

JOHN RUSKIN'S "THE
CONSTRUCTION OF SHEEPFOLDS"

BY DEAN W. J. LHAMON

Liscomb, Iowa

ONE does not need to say that John Ruskin was a genius. It is more to say that he was a prophet. He has the fire, the poetic vision, the intuition, and the chivalrous voice of the prophet. The real prophet sees for himself. He sees not what others point out, but what they do not point out, and, having seen, he throws his words about with a hazard of hitting somewhere. He may even take deliberate aim and find pleasure in a good shot. John Ruskin was essentially a poet, only he seldom took the trouble to herd his thoughts into rhymes, sextets, quatrains, or blank verse. His prose style is musical without such expedients, and facile and felicitous without being hampered. He is the greatest master of English prose. It will be recalled that Gladstone made him poet laureate of England.

The scope of his writings is remarkable. He might have been more exact had he not been quite so close to omniscience, and more reliable had he attempted less. But artists still read his *Mornings in Florence*, and students of sociology read his *Fors Clavigera*, and his *Veins of Wealth*, and preachers may read with profit his *Construction of Sheepfolds*.

The *Construction of Sheepfolds* is dated, "Denmark Hill, February, 1851." The science of biblical criticism was yet in its swaddling clothes. But John Ruskin knew the Bible about as well as it could be known in his day. He tells us that when he was growing up his mother compelled him to read it through, "hard words and all," once a year, and he attributes to that whatever "felicity" he may have in the use of his prose English.

In his *Advertisement* he says:—

Many persons will probably find fault with me for publishing opinions which are not new; but I shall bear this blame contentedly, believing that opinions on this subject could hardly be just if they were not eighteen hundred years old. Others will blame me for making proposals which are altogether new; to whom I would answer, that things in these days seem not so far right but that they may be mended.

What he wants “mended” is especially made plain in the last paragraphs of the essay. It is disunion, schism, sectarianism among Christians. He says:—

The schism between the so called Evangelical and High Church parties in Britain is enough to shake many men’s faith in the truth or existence of religion at all. It seems to me one of the most disgraceful scenes in ecclesiastical history, that Protestantism should be paralyzed at its very heart by jealousies based on little else than the mere difference between high and low breeding.

In a word, John Ruskin is dealing with the problem of Christian union in his day. He wants the folds so constructed that the sheep shall not be divided. He saw clearly and stated boldly a number of the fundamental features of the problem, and my aim in this paper is to revive his work. The author goes off into a little by-path occasionally to take a look and a hit at politics or socialism or some other *bete noire* of his. We shall not follow him everywhere, but only where he keeps close to his “sheepfolds.”

Mr. Ruskin begins with a definition of the Church. He tells us that the word occurs a hundred and fourteen times in the Bible. He should have said in the New Testament, for it does not occur at all in the Old Testament. He finds four meanings of the word.

1. There is the use of the word as in Col. 1:18, and Eph. 5:25, 27, 32: “The entire multitude of the elect; otherwise called the Body of Christ; and sometimes the Bride, the Lamb’s Wife; including the faithful of all ages; Adam and the children of Adam yet unborn.”

2. As in I Cor. 10:32; 15:9, and Gal. 1:13: “The entire multitude of professing believers in Christ existing on earth at a given moment; including false brethren, wolves in sheep’s

clothing, goats and tares as well as sheep and wheat, and other forms of bad fish with good in the net."

3. As in Acts 7:38, 13:1; I Cor. 1:2; and 16:19: "The multitude of professed believers living in a certain city, place, or house. This is the most frequent use of the word."

4. "Any assembly of men, as in Acts 19:32 and 41."

This last one may be dismissed at once, though it is interesting to note that the Greek word, which is otherwise translated church, is here used of the mob, or "assembly," of Diana worshipers in Ephesus, who would have killed Paul if they could.

The first may be dismissed also, since the invisible Church, for that is what it really is, is not involved in our question of union. The Lord Himself attends to that.

The third use of the word has reference to the local congregation, which is usually, but not always, sufficiently united within itself.

It is "the entire multitude of professing believers in Christ existing on earth at a given moment," that concerns us. This multitude is far from being united. The fold is not properly constructed, or more pointedly, it is quite improperly constructed as John Ruskin sees it.

Infallibility he limits to the invisible Church on the simple basis that none but the "elect" are infallible, and since the elect are elected of God, and by nobody else, nobody but God knows who they are. The "constant opinions of the invisible Church" would be infallible if we could get at them, but we cannot. We must get along, then, without infallibility, or even the assumption of it. This opens the way for a direct hit at Puseyism, and Ultramontanism, and every other dogmatism with the assumption of infallibility lying back of it. John Ruskin is right in this. There is no breeder of discord more fertile than the fallacy of the infallible. What could fallible creatures, such as we all are, do with infallibility if we had it?

But Ruskin draws from this the conclusion that "there is in matters of doctrine *no such thing* as the authority of the Church." "We might as well talk of the authority of the morn-

ing cloud. There may be light *in* it, but the light is not of it, and it diminishes the light that it gets; and lets less of it through than it receives, Christ being its sun.” Again: “We might as well talk of the authority of a flock of sheep—for the Church is a body to be taught and fed, not a body to teach and feed. And of all sheep that are fed on earth Christ’s sheep are the most simple, always losing themselves; never finding themselves; always found by Some One else; getting perpetually into sloughs and snows and bramble thickets, likely to die there but for their Shepherd, who is forever finding them and bearing them back, with torn fleeces and eyes full of fear.” Of course, it is the “visible Church” that he is speaking of here, the Church to which the Master Himself said, “Go teach,” and to which He never did say, “Go drive.” Jesus thought of his Church as a school of life, a great, free, teaching organization, a college of souls—little and big, grown, growing, and ungrown—wherein there is no heterodoxy but that of soul stagnation, and no orthodoxy but that of growth into the Divine likeness. Jesus gave no hint of a politico-ecclesiastical state with wheels within wheels within wheels of government, with dogmatic yardsticks for measuring souls, and cast-iron scales for weighing them. The visible Church has been treating souls too much as though they were ingots of pig iron. The Master Himself had a school of young men, intellectually alert but crude, saturated through and through with outworn Judaism, impossible Messianism and un-Godly militarism. He was wonderfully patient with them. He never called them heretics. To Him they were just un-grown Jewish boys, needing impetus here, and restraint there, guidance and rebuke, practice and criticism, “line upon line, precept upon precept.” His life was spent in making Apostles of them. His method was purely pedagogical and psychological. There is no sectarianism in our college class-rooms and laboratories and museums. There is no denominationalism in the microscope and telescope and crucible. When we make the “visible Church” once more the Master’s school of life, with a curriculum of childlike prayer and Samaritan activities we shall be far on the way to union.

Ruskin will not have a body of "clergy" with stereotyped lines of "authority" over his "sheepfolds." "Robinson Crusoe on his island wants no bishop, and makes a thunderstorm do for an evangelist. The University of Oxford would be ill off without its bishop; but wants an evangelist besides, and that forthwith. The authority which the Vaudois shepherds need is that of the Son of Consolation; the authority which the city of London needs is that of James, the Son of Thunder." That is, officers and authorities should come in response to needs and emergencies. As to Apostles and Prophets—we can have no more of them since they are "the foundation" on which the Church is built, and there cannot be two, or three, or more than the one foundation, Jesus Himself being "the chief cornerstone." "St. Paul almost always calls himself a deacon, St. Peter calls himself an elder, and Timothy, generally understood to be addressed as a bishop, is called a deacon, I Tim. 4:6—forbidden to rebuke an elder, 5:1, and exhorted to do the work of an evangelist, II Tim. 4:5. But there is one thing which, as officers, or as separate from the rest of the flock, they *never* call themselves, which it would have been impossible, as so separate, they should have called themselves; that is, *Priests*." This last Ruskin elaborates in the most positive way. He says with warm emphasis:—

The whole function of the priesthood was, on Christmas morning, at once and forever gathered into His Person who was born in Bethlehem; and, thenceforward, all who are united with Him, and who with Him make sacrifice of themselves; that is to say, all members of the invisible Church become, at the instant of their conversion, *Priests*; and are so called in I Pet. 2:5 and Rev. 1:6, where, observe, there is no possibility of limiting the expression to the clergy; the conditions of priesthood being simply having been loved by Christ, and washed in his blood. The blasphemous claim on the part of the clergy of being *more* priests than the godly laity—that is to say of having a higher holiness than the holiness of being one with Christ—is altogether a Romanist heresy, dragging after it, or having its origin in, the other heresies respecting the sacrificial power of the church officer, and his repeating the oblation of Christ, and so having power to absolve from sin; . . . with all the other endless and miserable falsehoods of the papal hierarchy; falsehoods for which, that there might be no shadow of excuse, it has been ordained by the Holy

Spirit that no Christian minister shall once call himself a priest from one end of the New Testament to the other, except together with his flock. . . . The office of Lawgiver and Priest is now and forever gathered into One Mediator between God and man; and they are guilty of the sin of Korah who blasphemously would associate themselves in his Mediatorship.

This is bringing us squarely up, face to face with the democracy of Jesus. Ruskin does not use the word; perhaps he would have resented it. But he has the substance of it, and there is nothing to be gained by shying from it. The fact and the spirit of democracy function for union; any kind of aristocracy militates against union. Jesus disclosed the soul of this matter when He said to his disciples:—

You must not let people call you “Rabbi,” for you have only one teacher and you are all brothers. And you must not call any man on earth your father, for you have only one father, your heavenly Father. And you must not let men call you master, for you have only one Master, the Christ.

It is noteworthy that, immediately following this, Jesus proceeded to tear the mask from Pharisaism (Mat. XXIII) and expose its hollowness, one of the most deadly aristocracies of his day. Think of Pharisaism as a basis of union! There you have an anticlimax to the teaching of Jesus—and of John Ruskin.

Another great root of the evil, as Ruskin sees it, is “Vicarianism.” He calls it, “One of the most pestilent of Romanist theories,” and says that “ecclesiastical tyranny has, for the most part, founded itself on the idea.” Men say, “We are vicars of Christ, and stand on earth in place of Christ.” Even Protestant ministers quote Paul in his ardent cry, “We are ambassadors for Christ,” and assume that Paul meant minister plenipotentiary, and further assume that what Paul was they are. But, says Ruskin, “Paul never uses the word ambassador at all. He simply says, ‘We are in embassy from Christ; and Christ beseeches you through us.’ Most true. . . . Suppose, when we went to draw water at a cistern, that all at once the leaden spout should become animated, and open its mouth and

say to us, 'See, I am vicarious for the fountain. Whatever respect you show to the fountain, show some part of it to me.' Should we not answer the spout, and say, 'Spout, you were set there for our service, and may be taken away and set aside if anything goes wrong with you. But the fountain will flow forever.' " Ruskin distinguishes between the authority of the *messenger* of the King and the *representative* of the King. "There is all the difference," he says, "between humble service and blasphemous usurpation." This is another feature of Ruskin's sheepfold democracy. And all the time he is pleading for union. He will have not a syllable of the mingled authority and obscurantism which says, "My men, tie your belts over your eyes, throw down your muskets, and follow me steadily as you can through this marsh, into the middle of the enemy's lines. . . . It might be questioned, in the real battle, whether it would be better that a regiment should show insubordination, or be cut to pieces." The Puseyism that so aroused the ire of John Ruskin's blazing soul was the reactionary, dogmatic, Rome-ward movement of the middle years of the nineteenth century, the "Fundamentalism" of that period, perfectly comparable in its traditionalism, its bigotry, its assumption of infallibility, and its persecuting spirit to the "Fundamentalism" of to-day, only the latter is more out of date in the twentieth century than its brother was a hundred years ago. The way to union does not run in the direction of Romanism, Puseyism, or Fundamentalism. It goes rather in the direction of a school of disciples of the one Master, a school in which all are learners and none are finished; in which all may teach but in which none should teach except those who are capable; a democracy of living, changing, growing people of God; a militant army of faith, charitable and fraternal, not afraid of laboratories, museums, or microscopes; as conservative as yesterday, as modern as to-morrow; seeking sincerely, prayerfully, brotherliness and intelligence, "sweetness and light."

W. J. LHAMON.

CHRISTIAN UNION IN THE SEMINARY CURRICULUM

BY FREDERICK D. KERSHNER, LL. D.

Professor of Christian Doctrine, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa

It has been suggested by the editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly* that a brief outline of the course in the history of Christian union, offered annually in Drake University, might be of interest to the general Christian public. The course in question is part of a two-year study of Christian Doctrine in general and occupies the last semester of the second year of the above mentioned course. It runs for a full semester and meets four hours weekly, three hours being devoted to lectures and an occasional quiz, while the fourth hour is a discussion period. During the past semester, the proposals of the World Conference on Faith and Order Continuation Committee were discussed in detail at the meetings of the class and a reply to the questions embodied in these proposals was drafted by a committee representing the class and forwarded to the Secretary of the World Conference. The fullest possible freedom is always permitted in these discussions and there is an effort to secure unanimity of decision before any conclusions are reached.

The lecture outlines for the course are included under the following headings: Part I, The Original Unity; Part II, The Unity of Roman Catholicism; Part III, The Rise and Progress of Denominationalism; Part IV, Modern Movements Toward Unity; Part V, The Future. Under Part I the lecture heads are: (1) Christ's Teaching and Unity; (2) Paul's Teaching and Unity; (3) The Apostolic Church and Unity; (4) Unity in Early Theology; (5) Nature of the Early Unity; (6) Schism in the Early Church. Under Part II the lectures cover the following items: (1) The Rising Problem of Schism; (2) The Theological Safeguard; (3) The Ecclesiastical Safeguard; (4) The Evolution of Papal Unity; (5) The Schism Between East

and West; (6) The Mediæval Heretics; (7) The Unity of the Middle Ages. Under Part III we have: (1) The Great Protestant Schism; (2) The Birth of Denominationalism; (3) The Progress of Denominationalism; (4) The Branch Theory of the Church; (5) Denominationalism and Nationalism; (6) Denominationalism and Freedom; (7) The Evils of Denominationalism; (8) Erasmus and Luther; (9) The Reformation Period—Advocates of Unity; (10) Post-Reformation Period—Advocates of Unity; (11) Denominationalism and Vital Christianity; (12) Denominationalism and Missions. The lectures under Part IV are as follows: (1) The Nineteenth Century and Union; (2) The Occasion of Thomas Campbell's Movement; (3) The Declaration and Address; (4) The Campbells' Idea of Union; (5) Presbyterian and Congregationalist Union Efforts; (6) Union in Missionary Work—The American Board; (7) Union in Educational Work—The American Bible Society; (8) Union in Evangelistic Work—The Evangelical Alliance; (9) Union in Evangelistic Work—Union Meetings; (10) Union in Christian Service—the Y. M. and Y. W. C. A.; (11) Union in Young People's Work—the Y. P. S. C. E.; (12) Union in Sunday School Work—the International and Graded Lessons; (13) Union in Foreign Missions—the Student Volunteer Movement; (14) Union in Layman's Work—Men and Religion Forward Movements; (15) Specific Twentieth Century Movements; (16) The Federal Council; (17) Federated and Community Churches; (18) The World Conference on Faith and Order; (19) The American Council on Organic Union; (20) The Inter-Church World Movement; (21) The Lambeth Quadrilateral and Later Proposals; (22) The Mission Councils; (23) Unity on the Foreign Field; (24) Particular Church Movements; (25) The Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity. The outline under Part V is as follows: (1) Present Obstacles to Union; (2) Artificial Difficulties; (3) Inherent Difficulties; (4) The Way Out; (5) What Further Contribution Can the Disciples of Christ Make Toward Christian Union?

In connection with the lectures, a rather extensive bibliography on Christian union is suggested for collateral reading

with a definite minimum of required work. On the required list are the following books: (1) Brown, *Christian Unity: Its Principles and Possibilities*; (2) Ainslie, *If Not a United Church—What?*; (3) Ainslie, *The Message of the Disciples of Christ for the Union of the Church*; (4) Kershner, *How to Promote Christian Union*; (5) Headlam, *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion*; (6) Grane, *Church Divisions and Christianity*. Other books assigned for collateral reading include: (1) Ashworth, *The Union of Christian Forces in America*; (2) Smyth and Walker, *Approaches Towards Church Unity*; (3) Cowden, *Saint Paul on Christian Unity*; (4) Macfarland, *The Progress of Church Federation*; (5) Froude, *The Life and Letters of Erasmus*; (6) Firth, *Christian Unity in Effort*; (7) Morton, *The Way to Union*; (8) A. J. Brown, *Unity and Missions*; (9) Young, *Historical Documents Advocating Christian Union*; (10) Kershner, *The Christian Union Overture*; (11) Söderblom, *Christian Fellowship*. In addition to these books, complete files of *The Constructive Quarterly*, *The Christian Union Quarterly*, The Federal Council bulletins and reports, *The Christian Work*, and other publications dealing with the subject of unity are placed at the disposal of the students. The publications of the World Conference on Faith and Order, of the Federal Council, the Inter-Church World Movement, and other similar data have likewise been kept on file. Dr. George W. Richard's admirable brochure entitled *The Historical Significance of Denominationalism*, published by the American Council on Organic Union, has been extensively used by the class. Many other books, dealing with church history and with the general historical and theological field, have been required as collateral reading in connection with particular lectures.

The enrollment in this class has always been large and much interest has been manifested in its work. It is given as a part of the regular course in the College. It appears, to the writer at least, that some course such as this, if given in theological seminaries generally, would greatly simplify the problem of Christian union in the years to come. Most preachers

in all churches know too little of the history of Christian union. An acquaintance with the historical data is absolutely essential in order to secure a proper approach to present day problems. Moreover, the subject of Christian union looms large in the field of Christian Doctrine. If we accept the four primary marks of the Church as given to us from time immemorial,—Unity, Apostolicity, Catholicity, and Holiness,—there must be considerable emphasis placed upon the first on the list. This is the more true because the first and the third cover much the same ground. Until our seminaries come to appreciate the importance of Christian union in their curricula, we can scarcely expect the young men who go out from their halls to be filled with the passion for union.

FREDERICK D. KERSHNER.

THE JOURNEY

When Death, the angel of our higher dreams,
Shall come, far-ranging from the hills of light,
He will not catch me unaware; for I
Shall be, as now, communing with the dawn.
He will not need to drag me from the night,
For I shall make all haste to follow him
Along the valley, up the misty slope
Where life lets go and Life at last is born:
There I shall find the dreams that I had lost
On toilsome earth, and they will guide me on,
Beyond the mists, unto the farthest height.
I shall not grieve, except to pity those
Who can not hear the songs that I shall hear!

—*Thomas Curtis Clark.*

THE UNIFICATION OF AMERICAN METHODISM

BY BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR.

A Member of the Commission on Unification from the Methodist
Episcopal Church, South, Washington, D. C.

FROM 1784 to 1844—sixty years—there was one undivided
Methodist Episcopal Church.

WHY THE DIVISION?

From 1844 till 1924—eighty years—there have been two churches—the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. In 1844 the church divided, technically and legally, on the question of the powers of the General Conference and the rights of the episcopacy; practically, because intensely divergent views among the Northern and Southern people as to State rights and slavery required division to prevent destructive strife in the church itself, and large secession of members to other churches in both North and South, because of unwillingness in each section to receive as bishops connectional officers, or as pastors men from the other sections holding divergent views concerning slavery. The division in 1844 was wise Christian statesmanship. It enabled Methodism in North and South to carry on an effective ministry, unimpaired by any sectional political difficulties. Eighty years have passed since division. The situation of 1844 became increasingly difficult, culminating in the "War Between the States." Nearly sixty years have passed since that war ended. In the Spanish-American War, under a Northern Republican President—McKinley, in the World War under a Virginia born, Southern reared President—Wilson, the boys of the North and the boys of the South fought side by side, under the same flag and for the same cause, and a few days ago a New England

born President spoke on Memorial Day words of highest appreciation of the valour and sincerity of our Confederate dead.

PRESENT CONDITIONS

During these years there has been a gradual mingling of Northern and Southern people, especially in towns and cities. Men of the North are found in the South from Virginia to Florida and Texas, and wherever this interchange has occurred there has usually been identifications with the business, social, and religious life of the several communities, and many of the leaders in our Southern churches are Northern men. Inter-marriages are continually taking place, children are being born of these marriages, and distinctly sectional antagonisms have steadily decreased. Moreover, whenever the Northern people are brought face to face with difficulties arising from race relations, they usually appreciate and sympathize with the efforts of the Southern people to solve these exceedingly difficult problems, in the interest of an intelligent, stable and just government for both races.

THE BORDER STATES

The constant pressing need of unification is in the Border States—Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, and in Florida, Eastern Tennessee, and portions of Texas. In these states there is in varying degrees duplication of effort, involving inexcusable waste of men and money and hurtful unchristian rivalry. It has become increasingly evident to thoughtful, conscientious, progressive workers that it is both silly and sinful to waste not only the Lord's money, but the talents and the efforts of men who, having been called to the Christian ministry, find themselves sent to maintain a church in a town or district not because there is any real need for it, but because forty, maybe sixty years ago, political strife was so fierce that men could not speak peaceably to each other and, therefore, could not worship together, and, therefore, (?) money and men must still be spent to perpetuate a hurtful rivalry. In many of these com-

munities this strife has been far greater between the two Methodist Churches than between either Methodist Church and any other denomination, or the sinful world outside, and sometimes there has been more satisfaction at the weakening of the sister (?) Methodist Church than at the surrender of a detachment of the army of the world, the flesh, and the devil. It is difficult for our people in Conferences like Virginia, South Carolina, and Alabama, to realize the extent of this border warfare and the effect upon the growth and spiritual life of the Church.

A recent estimate states that at least 1,000 ministers of both churches are tied up in this border warfare. Is it warfare against the devil, or against a sister church? When one considers that only about 275 missionaries were sent to the entire field by the Centenary Movement, the waste in duplication looks to be shameful indeed. It is furthermore estimated that about \$700,000 is expended yearly in the maintenance of this competitive Christian (?) warfare. Our whole budget for the Foreign Missionary Department's General Work is about one million and a half. What a criminal waste of money this is!

MISSION FIELDS

There are somewhat similar conditions in mission work in the United States. The Home Mission and Church Extension Boards of both churches now frequently act on *ex parte*, prejudiced statements, and appropriations are made by boards to build houses to support workers in places where only one church would labour, were there a unified Home Missions Board. In the foreign fields the two churches have been obliged to make some kind of arrangement for division of territory to keep from being continually shamed before the native church. But to-day both organizations are carrying on work in Japan and Korea, and both are in Shanghai. In Mexico, while they are in central Mexico, and we are in Northern Mexico, the native Christians can only wonder why there should be two separate organizations of a church preaching the same interpretation of the gospel under the same form of government.

In Europe it would be far better if the work of Methodism in all continental Europe was under the direction of one great organization. The reasons given for the divisions are not convincing to men in Europe or in Latin American countries, who are faced with a powerful united Roman Catholic Church.

UNIFICATION PROPOSED

The General Conferences of both churches have expressed a great desire to remedy the present conditions. Our own General Conference in 1914 declared its belief that unification was both desirable and feasible, and appointed a commission to meet a like commission of the Northern Church to develop a plan of unification by re-organization. The Northern Church did appoint a like commission, and the Joint Commission worked together for four years, and our General Conference in Atlanta in 1918 continued the commission with fresh instructions to present a suitable plan for unification. The Joint Commission did prepare a very carefully wrought-out plan in 1919, and that plan was presented to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1920. But that General Conference was not prepared to adopt a plan as sweeping in its character as was the plan which had been prepared, and many in our own church thought that the plan was too drastic and mechanical, and it was requested by the Northern General Conference that the negotiations be continued either for the modification of the proposed plan or the preparation of an entirely new plan. At the General Conference of 1922, Judge John S. Candler, the acting chairman of the Commission, presented the report of the Committee on the Church Relations in a speech from which the following is a quotation: "I believe that the greatest thing that could be done for the Methodism of the world, the greatest thing for the Church of God in the world, would be a joint effort by these two great churches to get together for the purpose for which they were organized. If two-thirds of your commission, two-thirds of their commission and two-thirds of their General Conference adopt it (a plan of unification), don't you think you are ready for a meeting down here?"

This speech by Judge Candler was received with great enthusiasm, and the Conference, with only two or three dissenting votes, affirmed its agreement with the report of the committee, and apparently with the sentiments of Judge Candler's speech.

PRACTICALLY UNANIMOUS RECOMMENDATION

The Joint Commission on Unification has held several meetings since 1922, and, finally, by a unanimous vote of the commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and by an affirmative vote of 22 to 3 of the commission of our church, adopted a plan of unification. That plan was submitted to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Springfield in May, and was adopted with a very few dissenting votes. The bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, called a special session of our General Conference, to meet July 2nd, and that Conference approved the plan by a vote of 297 to 75—four to one. The plan now goes to the annual conference to be voted upon by them.

A MODERATE BROTHERLY PLAN

What is this proposed plan? It is a moderate, generous, brotherly plan. It was framed and approved by men who recognized the real differences of training, thinking, habits of life, and general surroundings of the people they represented; and yet by men who not only worship the same crucified and risen Redeemer, but who honour and revere the same earthly leaders—Wesley, Whitfield, Clarke, Benson, Fletcher, and Asbury; who hold to the same articles of faith, who believe in the same church policy, who emphasize the same doctrines of repentance, faith, justification, regeneration, sanctification, the witness of the Spirit, and the duty to carry the evangelistic message to the uttermost parts of the earth. And these men determined that, if they could not adopt a plan which would require the immediate administrative union of the churches and conferences in a common territory, they would certainly adopt one which would join forces wherever possible, in the United States

or in foreign countries, in evangelistic work here or missionary work abroad; in educational, orphanage, and hospital work; in all social and reform work in this and in other lands; in short, in every endeavour to combat and to overthrow error, whether of worldliness, materialism, or narrow nationalism, and to bring in the Kingdom of God, which is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. It was clear to these men that mechanical union could not be secured in many places without much friction, bitterness, and open strife. And so it was agreed that a progressive plan should be formulated—a plan which would provide for doing all the work together which could be done together without any more friction than arises in each branch of the church to-day. And when in any neighborhood or state, individual churches or conferences are ready to unite, the plan will make it easy to do so, but where they are not yet ready, they can stay apart and carry on their work as heretofore. While the plan does not force union at any local point, yet it does hold up to each congregation the ideal which has been adopted by the two churches as the goal to be attained. It is not doubted that there will still be friction and misunderstandings, and some secessions of members who cannot adjust themselves to any change of attitude to their former rivals till death brings them together, it is to be hoped, on the same (the right) side of the throne.

It is urged against the plan that it still perpetuates waste of men, money, and duplication of effort. That remains to be seen. The plan certainly does not peremptorily abolish these things, but the plan stands not only as a protest against them, but as a clear, strong call, from the great United Church as a whole, to every neighborhood and to every state to get together, study the conditions, and do what is best for the salvation of men and the coming of his Kingdom.

TWO JURISDICTIONS PROVIDED

It is in this spirit and with this thought that the plan provides for two jurisdictions, one comprising the present churches and territory of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the other

the present churches and territory of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, with the clearly stated provision in the constitution that the General Conference can make no transfer of any member, churches, or conferences, unless requested so to do, in which event it is given full power. No man, no church, no conference can complain that the plan is drastic or unbrotherly or an arbitrary invasion of the rights of the humblest member of either church.

EXCEEDINGLY GENEROUS PLAN

Furthermore, the plan is exceedingly generous. The Methodist Episcopal Church (North) has about 4,750,000 members, the Methodist Episcopal Church (South) has about 2,450,000 members. It has been rather puzzling to formulate a plan which would protect a minority from the domination of the majority. But the Northern Commission generously yielded any right to greater voting power in the General Conference on the score of numbers, and agreed that the General Conference should be composed of the members of the two jurisdictional conferences, and that "every vote in the General Conference shall be by jurisdictions and shall require the accepted majority vote of each jurisdiction to be effective"; that is to say, that in every matter which comes before the General Conference of the united church, although it is little more than one-half as large as the Northern jurisdiction, the Southern jurisdiction will have equal voting power. How could the Northern Church be more generous or show a more brotherly spirit or demonstrate more clearly its genuine confidence in us, than by giving us equal voting power with themselves in the General Conference? Surely no man can demand that the Southern Church, with one-half the membership, be given more than equal voting strength!

INDEPENDENT JURISDICTIONAL ADMINISTRATION

It is, furthermore, provided that each jurisdiction shall administer its own affairs through its own jurisdictional General Conference, except such matters as may be delegated to

the General Conference, and in these matters each jurisdiction, as indicated above, has equal voice. The plan leaves each jurisdictional Conference the right to elect bishops, and while the General Conference is given the right to determine the number of bishops, the recommendations of each jurisdictional conference will doubtless be adopted. The objection that the General Conference can determine the number of bishops for the Southern jurisdiction is fully balanced by the fact that the General Conference will also determine the number of bishops for the Northern jurisdiction. The plan, furthermore, provides that a bishop cannot administer in any jurisdiction other than in the one by which he was elected, except with the consent of the majority of the bishops of the jurisdiction involved.

ORTHODOXY

There has been some objection to the union on the ground of supposed Modernism in the Northern Church. The writer is neither a Modernist nor a Fundamentalist but he is an aggressively conservative Methodist, if such a descriptive phraseology is permissible. He has been thrown with the Northern brethren at home and in foreign lands. He has discovered no greater difference of view on doctrine among them than among ourselves. The Episcopal address at the recent Northern General Conference rang as true and clear on great fundamental doctrines as the addresses of our own bishops, and the vote in the General Conference on an issue presented showed a determination to protect the doctrinal life of the church at its source—in the Sunday-schools.

PROVINCIAL OR WORLD CHURCH

I give full weight to the arguments of those opposing the union and respect them as men who truly love our great church. But on this question I cannot agree with them. I believe that the hour has arrived when our church must join forces with our sister Methodism in this country and throughout the world, and become one of the greatest forces in the world for carrying on his word; or she must agree to a distinctly circumscribed

sphere of activity and influence, become in the United States a distinctly sectional church and do comparatively small work in the evangelization of the world. It is oftentimes more pleasant to live in the country or village or town or city or state where one was born and be satisfied to go no further and to bring no great influence to bear to shape the activities of the great world in which one lives. But the Master calls us to go out into the world to be the "light of the world," the "salt of the earth," and to "go into all the world." That is the call to Southern Methodism to-day. Will our church answer the call and join forces with those of like faith to do the Master's work?

JAMES CANNON, JR.

IN CHRIST

In Christ there is no East nor West,
 In Him no South nor North,
 But one great Fellowship of Love
 Throughout the whole wide earth.

In Him shall true hearts everywhere
 Their high communion find,
 His service is the golden cord
 Close-binding all mankind.

Join hands then, brothers of the faith,
 Whate'er your race may be,
 Who serves my Father as a son,
 Is surely kin to me.

In Christ now meet both East and West,
 In Him meet South and North,
 All Christly souls are one in Him
 Throughout the whole wide earth.

—*John Oxenham.*

SOME OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED PLAN OF METHODIST UNIFICATION

BY BISHOP COLLINS DENNY

Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Richmond, Va.

WHEN two great and prosperous churches propose to unite prudence demands that the basis of agreement shall be definite.

Every Christian heart responds gladly and hopefully to a call for a closer union of the followers of our Lord; but it must be a union that preserves the usefulness and life of those who unite. A so-called union that sacrifices the essentials of usefulness and life is to be avoided, because it is a delusion. It is not life but death. This plan permits rival Methodism in the same community, and, at the same time, declares that "these two churches are essentially one church." Unification on this plan leaves too many essentials of a constitution unsettled. The churches are entering a union blindfolded. They are experimenting with success. In the words of the brother who claims to be the author of this plan, "It is a loose federation." Another advocate publishes that the plan "is an experiment."

Not thus do men deal even with property. An acceptable title must be unclouded. In matters of government people properly demand that constitutions shall be specific, that property, freedom, all rights shall be securely guarded. Virginia refused to adopt the Constitution of the United States, until assurance was given that the first ten amendments would be added. North Carolina refused until Congress had passed those amendments. Rhode Island refused until eight states had adopted those amendments.

Can the Church of God show less caution, especially when it is remembered that within the first fifty-eight years of organized American Methodism there were seven divisions, most of them relating to government?

Except with the church in the South, in no part of the world has the Methodist Episcopal Church been unwilling to make and keep agreements touching geographical divisions. The official records show that the frictions growing out of invasion, overlapping of the work of the two churches, waste of men and means, led to the appointment of commissions to correct these defects. The present plan does not correct them; it legalizes them and provides for a continuance of the very troubles from which relief was sought; indeed it specifically provides for their possible increase. The Northern branch covers our entire country. This plan sanctions that; yet confines the Southern branch to its present territory. The Southern General Conference in 1902, the Northern in 1904, enacted: "Where either church is doing the work expected of Methodism, the other society shall not organize a society nor erect a church building until the bishop having jurisdiction in case of the work proposed shall be consulted and his approval obtained."

In January, 1914, the two commissions *unanimously* agreed: "It is apparent that the agreements entered into by the General Conferences make it inconsistent for the Federal Council to approve the use of missionary, church extension, or other connectional or conference funds to enter communities where the other church is doing the work expected of Methodism." In Atlanta, December 17, 1914, the building of the Methodist Episcopal Church on Ponce de Leon Avenue in that city came for adjudication before the Federal Council. The Methodist Episcopal members announced in open session that, in spite of the enactment of their General Conference, their bishops and boards could not be controlled. A Southern bishop offered the following resolution, which was adopted: "This Federal Council is convinced that any decision it could reach in this case under existing circumstances would be futile, and would hurt American Methodism more than it could help either of its branches." The Northern commission proposed in addition, and the Joint Commission adopted: "It is the sense of the members of the Federal Council of Methodism, until the authority and binding power of the Federal Council, as constituted by the two General Conferences of our respective churches, is

fully recognized by the entire appointing power and the boards, which make appropriations, it would be unwise and involve needless expense to have further sittings."

A joint commission of the two churches on exchange of territory met in Cincinnati, February 14, 1923, and agreed: "That neither church shall organize a new society in any community in which the other church has a duly organized society, except by the consent of the Quarterly Conference of the existing society." In July, 1923, in the Commission on Unification, substantially the same resolution was introduced and received not a single vote from the Northern commissioners, and two Southern commissioners, who voted for it in February, voted against it in July. Further, with a Southern bishop in the chair, numerous interruptions of this writer were permitted and questions asked, and this writer submitted and courteously answered every question; yet when he asked a question touching an agreement made by the General Conferences of the two churches, using the very words contained in that agreement, the chair on his own motion ruled the question out of order, and was sustained by every commissioner from the North.

It is evident that this plan is not unification, but is either the absorption of the church in the South, or it will lead to unseemly wrangling and ultimately another and worse division.

Liberty is a priceless possession to Americans, including Methodists. Nothing can compensate for the loss of it. Wars have been fought to obtain it and to preserve it. By the million our boys went to Europe because our liberty, as well as the liberty of others, was threatened. This plan says: "Every vote in the General Conference shall be by jurisdictions and shall require the accepted majority vote of each jurisdiction to be effected." Heretofore each church has for eighty years been free to conduct its own affairs according to the accepted wisdom of God. This plan puts each church in bondage to the other. It has been repeatedly said in the South that we can hold our own against the North, and that we are willing to try. Certainly we have, under difficulty, held our own as a separate church. We have prospered as no other Methodism

in the world. To enter a new organization in which we must sink, or swim in turbulent water, makes not for peace, but for war. Not by matching wits can we be expected to promote the Kingdom of God. The one reply to the question, How will this plan promote the interests of Methodism? is a pursuit of the delusive phantom of hope, it is a forsaking of the solid ground of experience and reason, it is a refusal, indeed, at times a contempt to profit by the lessons of history.

Again and again, we are informed particularly, though not exclusively, by our Northern brethren that this plan is but "a first step," the ultimate goal being the absorption of the South. Then what will become of the "protection of minority" so much lauded?

Four years ago, at the Northern General Conference, in turning down a plan signed by every member of the Northern commission, yet not voted on by that General Conference, it was said: "In view, however, of the fact that there appear to be in each church considerable numbers who are not entirely satisfied with the plan suggested for consideration, many of whom would be distressed if it were adopted in its present form, and in order that the members of each church shall be in full accord when unification is accomplished, it is our conviction that every possible effort should be made to reach an early conclusion that may be acceptable to all members of both churches, at home and abroad." Now we hear nothing of "considerable numbers" "who are not entirely satisfied with the plan suggested for consideration," who are "distressed," deeply distressed. In the South, not simply "considerable numbers," but unnumbered thousands, whose hands hang down, whose knees are feeble, are crying out because of the possible loss of that to which they have given their lives. This plan so far from being "acceptable to all members of both churches," is producing such divisions among us as never before existed.

When eighty years ago the plan of separation was adopted, it was submitted "through the Southern Conferences," "to the members of the Annual Conferences, and the local ministry and membership of our entire territory, amounting to nearly

500,000," and "the declaration had been sustained, and a separate organization called for by as great a majority as 95 to 5." At the recent Chattanooga meeting, a motion to submit this plan to the 2,500,000 members was laid on the table. The people who built and continue to support the church were not given an opportunity to state whether they were willing to dispose of what they owned, nor yet in the determination of the organization to which they should belong.

From the beginning the basis of the government of organized American Episcopal Methodism has been the Annual Conferences. Ultimately, they determined the fundamental law of the church. An effort in the commission to preserve these Annual Conference rights was defeated, and it was asserted and argued that it was desired that the Annual Conferences should have as little to do with the government of the church as was possible. So far as this plan provides, the sole right of the Annual Conferences is to elect delegates to the Super-General Conference, and that General Conference can, on its own motion, without the consent of the Annual Conferences, reduce the representations of those Conferences to "one ministerial delegate for every 120 members of each Annual Conference and an equal number of lay delegates." This reduces representative government almost to a vanishing point.

This plan expressly put into the fundamental document of the proposed new church the interpretation adopted by the North in 1844, the interpretation the South then insisted was erroneous, the interpretation which, because the majority could lawlessly enforce, caused the division of the church. The plan gives the Super-General Conference "full legislative power" "to define and fix the conditions, privileges, and duties of church membership"; "to define and fix the qualifications and duties of" preachers; "to define and fix the powers, duties, and privileges of the episcopacy." What did the men of '44 say to these powers then claimed by the General Conference though not legally then existing? "Will assurance be given . . . that there will be no further curtailment of right as it regards the Southern ministry? . . . We protest against the act of the

majority because the act must be understood as the exponent of principles and purposes, as it regards the union of the North and South in the Methodist Episcopal Church, well nigh destroying all hope of perpetuity The entire action of the General Conference (that of '44) must be understood as belonging to the premises and language employed as including all the principles avowed, as well as the action had by the late General Conference."

Later, participants in those proceedings state: "Certain principles were developed certain constructions of the powers and prerogatives of the General Conference were assumed and acted on, which we considered oppressive and destructive of the rights of the numerical minority represented in that highest judicatory of the church."

Still later, our fathers said: "In our view of the subject, the reasons for the separate existence of these two branches of Methodism are such as to make corporate union undesirable and impracticable. The events and experiences of the last thirty years have confirmed us in the conviction that such a consummation is demanded by neither reason nor charity. We believe that each church can do its work and fulfil its mission most effectively by maintaining an independent organization. The causes which led to a division in 1844, upon a plan of separation mutually agreed upon, have not disappeared. Some of them exist in their original form and force, and others have been modified, but not diminished."

To attain a phantom union we are asked to depreciate the fathers who gave us the church heritage we now possess. Multitudes in the South say they cannot, they will not thus belittle the men to whom under God they owe all the religious life they have. Surely some solution of the distressing existing difficulties can be found which will not demand of us such a reflection on the men whom for a lifetime, we have honoured. If these fathers sinned, we can sorrow; if they were in error we can correct it; but let it be shown that in this matter they were in error or that they sinned. They did neither, and we cannot by our action condemn them.

COLLINS DENNY.

THE BALANCE OF VALUES FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY

BY REV. JOHN B. COWDEN

Author of *Saint Paul on Christian Unity*, West Nashville, Tennessee

CHRISTIAN unity is largely a problem in essential values, and the final solution is to be found in the true balance of the same. Those things that have essential values must be found and properly related in value and position, and all other things must be relegated, or placed in the realm of Christian liberty. It is not so difficult to determine the essential values of Christianity as it is to strike the true balance between them. We differ as to the relative value and position of these things and our differences are, for the most part, matters of emphasis. One emphasizes one essential, and another emphasizes another; and these differences of emphasis have been largely responsible for the divisions in the Church, and stand to-day in the way of unity. The question of the true value and position of spiritual things and the proper balance of the same contains the crux of the Christian unity problem; and, although it is of difficult and doubtful solution, yet it is open to the study of all, and presents its challenge to every one interested in the subject of Christian unity. A study, therefore, of the essential principles of Christianity, with the view of finding the true value and balance of the same, is herein proposed.

The essential principles of Christianity are few and simple, yet wise and comprehensive, which is the wonder and glory of Christ's teaching. No religious teacher ever spoke fewer and wiser words. Those that heard Him "wondered at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth"; and we to-day wonder no less. No better or truer statement of the eternal truths of God has ever before or since been made. Countless volumes have been written in exposition and elaboration of his words, but no change or improvement of the same has been

made. They are the perfection of art and wisdom, and are final with most people. There may be wide differences in deductions from his words, but there is unity on the truth and beauty of the same. It is, therefore, difficult to state the fundamental essential principles of Christ's teaching except in his own words, because any other statement is apt to be a deduction; and, while there may be differences in statement of the essentials, there is large agreement on the essentials themselves; and with these alone this article has to do. Furthermore, the difficulty of any complete summary of these principles is realized, because no human statement can be made to contain the Divine. Accordingly, the statements in this article are to be taken as approximate, tentative, and in no sense dogmatic. They are made and offered to be received in the light of reason and Christ's teaching.

Let us determine first what are the essential principles of Christianity that are to go into the programme for Christian unity. We shall endeavour to determine these from the light of Christ's own statements and the statements of his Apostles, who were inspired to speak his mind. From no other source can we be sure of his mind. Any attempt to learn the mind of Christ by going back of those who profess to speak his mind in the New Testament is folly, and ends only in confusion. Dr. Robinson, in the last issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly*, truly asks: "But, after all, are we not entirely dependent upon 'secondary expressions' for our knowledge of Jesus?" Indeed, to whom shall we go, if not to those that "accompanied with Him from the beginning," and could say, "I heard and saw"?

The essentials of Christianity, as proclaimed by Christ under the general subject of the Kingdom of heaven may be stated as follows: Christian righteousness, or Christian ethics, which has to do with the nature, the principles, and life in the Kingdom of heaven (Luke 17 :20-21 ; Jno. 18 :36 ; Matt : 5-7, etc.) ; Christian loyalty to Christ as king, prophet, and priest (Luke 14 :25-33 ; Acts 3 :22-23 ; Matt. 17 :5 ; Heb. 5 :5-6, etc.) ; and Christian liberty (Jno. 8 :31-36 ; Matt. 16 :19 ; Gal. 5 :1, etc.), which includes all things beyond the scope of Christian loyalty.

These three,—Christian righteousness, Christian loyalty and Christian liberty,—broadly speaking, are the essentials of Christianity which should go into the programme for Christian unity. There are also other sub-essentials under each one of these general heads, which need further analysis and study in their relation to the problem of unity.

First of all, Christianity is an ethical religion; and the ethical claim is of first consideration in the programme for Christian unity. It is a practical ethical life to be lived rather than preached, which is incarnated in the life and character of Jesus Christ and set forth in his teachings. Its ideal is a person—Jesus the Christ—more than a system of ethical teaching; but it is also clearly revealed in the New Testament Scriptures under such terms as “the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ,” “holiness,” “godliness,” etc., and consists of a character of such traits as “love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control,” etc. Its positive requirements are clear, high, and imperative, and must be individually complied with and collectively held, and are, therefore, an essential part of Christian unity. It is also negatively stated in detailed prohibitions (See Matt. 6-7; 23; Gal. 6:19-21; Eph. 4:17 to 6:9, etc.), which are just as binding as the positive requirements. Christ spoke both a positive and a negative ethic, which aims at the development of a Christian character, and which is of first consideration in the programme for unity. So Christian unity is, therefore, to be found with those who live the Christ-life, and embody the same in their characters and teaching.

However, Christian ethics is not the whole of Christianity, but only one-third of the religion of Jesus Christ. The second third is Christian loyalty, which expresses itself in a system of worship through Jesus Christ as king, prophet, and priest. Christianity has a system of worship as well as a code of ethics; and this is centered about Christ just as the code of ethics. Jesus is our king (Luke 2:11; Matt. 28:18); He speaks, and we obey (Luke 14:22-33), notwithstanding the modern cry against legalism. This cry finds little to support it in the New Testament.

Christ denounced the Pharisees for their strictness to their self-imposed traditions, which set at naught the law of Moses; but never did He denounce them for their obedience to the law of Moses. He stood for the least "jot and tittle" of this (Matt. 5:17-20). While He stood for the letter of the law, He exalted the spirit of the same, and founded his law upon the emotions within (Matt. 5:21-48); but there is no conflict between the two in any command that He gave. In fact, there is a satisfying reason and a deep spiritual significance in every one of his commands. Any one, therefore, who neglects or refuses to obey these cannot be said to be loyal to Jesus. In fact, he comes under Christ's condemnation—"Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Doing what Jesus Christ say is not crass legalism, but simple loyalty to Christ as Lord of our lives, without which one cannot be his disciple. It is faithful Christian service, which is essential ground for Christian unity, and which is to be found only among those who serve Jesus Christ.

Furthermore, Jesus is our prophet or teacher (Acts 3:22-23); and what He speaks we believe—not because we have to believe, but because He speaks the word of God and appeals to that which is highest and best in us (Jno. 7:16-17). "Thou hast the words of eternal life," said Peter, who believed them, though he did not fully comprehend them, which is the Christian attitude toward Christ as the highest Christian authority. "All authority hath been given unto Me in heaven and on earth," was Christ's claim for Himself; and He spoke always as one having authority and placed a high estimate on his teaching. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." The importance of doctrine is both Scriptural and psychological. In the sense of a producing cause, everything in Christianity depends upon Christian doctrine, because the ideals of Christianity must be taught and known before they can be realized in the lives and characters of the people. For this reason "Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom." This teaching was "the seed" of the Kingdom

(Matt. 13)—as essential to the existence of Christianity as physical seed is to vegetable life and fruitage. You cannot have a living, fruitful religion without a vital doctrine from which it springs and develops. Accordingly, what one is religiously depends upon what he is taught,—the kind of spiritual seed planted in his heart. For this reason Christ and his Apostles insisted on true, sound doctrine (Matt. 7:24-27; II Tim. 4:1-4), and He put teaching and preaching at the center of the great commission (Matt. 28:19-20; Mark 16:15-16).

Notwithstanding the strong Scriptural and psychological grounds for doctrine, there is much opposition to it as an essential of Christian unity. In fact, it is largely an avoided and tabooed subject in connection with unity. This is due to the trouble that has arisen from debates and discussions of doctrine and the consequent divisions in the Church over doctrinal differences. The trouble over doctrine has arisen chiefly over the statements of Christian doctrine. There have been many uninspired statements, such as the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Augsburg Confession, Calvinism, Arminianism, Wesleyism, Campbellism, etc.; but no statement has been found satisfactory to all, and there has been trouble over each. Peter's confession of Christian faith (Matt. 16:16) and Paul's statement of the essential deposit of Christian doctrine (Eph. 4:4-6) are the most satisfactory of all, and have the added merit of being authoritative with all who accept such authority to speak for Christ. Both are clear and comprehensive and, without addition or subtraction, interpretation, or elaboration, offer a possible creedal and doctrinal basis for Christian unity; and as such we commend them to all who are looking for common creedal and doctrinal ground.

Also, Christ is our high priest, who is head of the Church and the worship therein (Matt. 16:18; Eph. 1:22-23; Heb. 1-13). As such He is our mediator and advocate with the Father, to whom He has opened up a new and living way through his Atonement on the Cross; and we approach the Father in worship in his Name. "No one cometh to the Father but by Me"; "I am the door"; and any one that seeks to enter by any other

is "a thief and a robber." Such disloyalty to Christ as high priest of Christian worship is blasphemy of the deepest dye. Christ gave a system of worship as well as a code of ethics, which is an essential part of Christianity. The ritual of Christian worship is brief and simple (Jno. 4:23-24); its orders are few and universal (Heb. 5:5-6; I Pet. 2:9); and its sacraments and ordinances are the Lord's Supper and Baptism. While Christian worship is in no sense formal, ceremonial, and legalistic, yet the few simple essentials, prescribed by Christ, are binding upon all who desire to be loyal to Him, because He gave them and incorporated them into Christian worship. Furthermore, the Church of all ages has found them to be channels of God's grace, supplying every need of the soul.

In line with the above I quote a paragraph from Dr. W. Robinson, of Birmingham, England, as published in the last issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly*, as follows:

"Jesus was anti-legalistic, and so was Paul, and to those who regard Baptism and the Lord's Supper as mere legal commands to be obeyed, there is little wonder that some of the messages both of our Lord and of Paul mean for them to-day freedom from these *bonds* and *shackles*, and a sole dependence on right conduct. But Jesus gave both Baptism and the Lord's Supper to the Church, and they were never from the first regarded as mere legal commands to be obeyed, but as meeting supreme needs of the human soul in its religious and social aspirations, and as being channels of God's grace—as operations in time and space of the spiritual energy of God. Together with *belief* they cannot be separated from *morals*, and, however tired of our divisions we may be, we shall not hasten the day of the undivided Church by ignoring them, or seeking to avoid them by a return to the ethical teaching of Jesus. Every ethic must have its belief: a man's conduct is influenced by his belief, and in the Christian religion belief is bound up with communion with God, which communion, our very nature demands, must be partly conditioned by certain manifestations in time and space."

However, beyond the few essentials of Christian worship,

prescribed by Jesus, there is large liberty, and much trouble and division have been caused by insisting on uniformity in this realm; and even within these few essentials of Christian worship there is broad liberty of details, which must be recognized. Just here lies the battle-ground of the conservatives and liberals, which has been the scene of many religious wars and which have been destructive of the unity of the Church. This brings us to the consideration of the third and last essential of Christian unity—Christian liberty.

The question of Christian liberty gave much trouble in the Apostolic Church; consequently, there is much in the New Testament on the subject which is difficult to summarize. How to have liberty and at the same time preserve unity has been a troublesome question from the beginning. This was the rock on which Protestantism went to pieces, and it has continued to divide down to the present. Christ died that Christians might be free; but He prayed that they might also be united; and they may be both by following his teaching. Christ taught that Christian liberty is not freedom from law, but freedom within law. It is not the liberty to do or not to do what He commands, but the freedom that comes from obedience to his commands. It is the complement of Christian loyalty. Loyalty has to do with the things "bound," whereas liberty has to do with the things "loosed" (Matt. 16:19). Liberty begins where loyalty leaves off, and it is often hard to draw the boundaries between the two, because there is a blending of these realms on the edges. However, Paul deals clearly and specifically with this problem (Rom. 15; I Cor. 8-10; and Galatians), which is too lengthy for study here. Suffice it to say that there must be the largest liberty that Christian loyalty will permit; and, when the two are thus kept in mind, Christian unity will follow, because the Church must be both loyal and free before it can be united.

The three above essentials, namely, Christian righteousness, Christian loyalty and Christian liberty are the *sine qua non* of Christian unity; but it is easier to find these essentials than it is to balance these values in such a way as to insure

unity. Most Christians would agree on the above essentials, but would differ widely as to the emphasis and importance to be assigned to each. One would emphasize one above the other, and *vice versa*. Almost every writer and speaker on the subject of Christian unity is given to the emphasis of one or the other. In fact, all of us are more or less biased and prejudiced in our views and given to over and under valuation of things. To effect and maintain the proper balance of values is the key to all right thinking and living. I suspect that the old Greek would have had more difficulty in finding the truly balanced man than he did in finding an honest man. While none are perfect in this respect, it does seem that we ought to be able to balance the few essential values of Christianity for Christian unity, which is the crux of the unity problem. What place shall be given to Christian ethics? What value shall be attached to Christian loyalty? and what importance shall be assigned to Christian liberty?—these are the troublesome questions to settle.

In the first place, there is a difference in the emphasis of Christian ethics in the programme for unity, some emphasizing this alone and others having little to say upon the subject. Both need to consider the relative value of ethics and to see the ethical life in balance with the other essentials of unity. Righteousness is not all; nor is it little; it is on a par with the other essential values. This is evident when we take into consideration all of Christ's teaching and living and not some favorite part of the same. He did not teach ethics alone but stressed it along with the other essentials of Christianity. He was truly balanced in all his thinking and living. When we exalt one above the other, we become biased in our views, and lose the true balance for unity.

Also, the same is true with reference to Christian loyalty. There are wide differences as to the value and extent that this essential should have and how far it should enter into Christian unity. To what extent should we be loyal to Jesus as king, prophet, and priest, is doubtless the most troublesome question of all. Some are extreme in their attitude and position on

Christian service, others on Christian doctrine, and others on Christian worship. Some go to the extreme of omitting doctrine altogether from the programme for unity and give Christian worship a very small place. They emphasize practice and belittle preaching, attaching little importance to what one thinks or says, but much to what he does, as if it were impossible and unimportant for one to think, speak, and act rightly all at the same time. This is the ideal and true balance of Jesus.

On the other hand, some overemphasize Christian doctrine, stressing the Scriptures that bear upon the true and sound doctrine and having little to say about other essentials. They bring to trial for heresy and excommunicate all who do not think and teach just as they do. Furthermore, there has been much trouble and division in the Church as a result of differences in emphasis of the items in Christian worship. One emphasizes orders, and another, sacraments and ordinances. One exalts the letter and says little about the spirit, and *vice versa*. One is careful and strict for the proper ritual,—“all things according to the pattern that was shown thee in the mount”—while another has little regard for the manner and form of worship.

So these differences in emphasis have produced and perpetuated divisions in the Church and constitute the greatest barrier to Christian unity to-day. Wherefore, I ask, is there no happy medium or balance of values between character and doctrine, faith and works, service and teaching, practice and preaching, worship and living, the letter and the spirit, etc.? We hold that there is, and it is to be found in Christ's valuation of each. The expression of Christianity both by word and life, the one balanced by the other, is the ideal taught and realized by Jesus and set for our emulation. As to Christian worship, He said much on both sides of the controversy and balanced the one against the other. He insisted on worship being “in the Spirit,” but He also said that it must be “in the truth.” While He exalted the spirit of worship, He was careful to observe every form and letter of the law, going from Galilee to Judea

to be baptized of John in the river Jordan and defending the same on the grounds of "righteousness." While He made the Lord's Supper a spiritual feast, He put literal bread and wine into the same and gave to each a spiritual significance. While He denounced the Pharisees for their traditional worship and unethical lives, neglecting the weightier matter of the law for little things, yet He taught that these should be done also (Matt. 23:23-26), and He was careful to observe the least thing of the law. While He had little to say on the subject of priestly orders, He sent those cured of leprosy back to the legal Levitical order at the Temple; and, while there was an Apostolic order in the first Church, yet the Apostles said little beyond the high priesthood of Jesus to bind the same upon the Church and nothing to prohibit a regularly ordained historic order.

Finally, in view of all that He said and did, He taught and lived a highly ethical life, required a strict loyalty to Himself as king, prophet, and priest, and granted the largest liberty that morality and loyalty permit. His ethic was ideal, yet practical; his loyalty strict, yet tolerant; and his freedom broad, yet restricted; and in everything that He did and said there is the true balance of values, which is the crux of the unity problem; and in his life and teaching is to be found the solution of the same, which will bring all into the unity for which He prayed. To this end, "It is time to throw away all but the Master's measuring-stick for determining spiritual value. Here it is: 'By their fruits ye shall know them,'" writes Dr. McCreary, of Baltimore, in the last issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly*. But we must apply this measuring-stick to all the values of Christianity and not merely to a few that we judge to be worthy of a place in the programme for Christian unity; and we must be willing to abide by Christ's estimate, because in his life and teaching we find the only true balance of values that can secure and maintain Christian unity.

JOHN B. COWDEN.

THE CHURCH OF TO-MORROW

BY PROF. G. FRANK BURNS

Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tennessee

IF many clergymen seem scarcely aware of what is going on beneath the surface of life, if they are failing to hear the sound of the going in the tops of the mulberry trees, if church attendance is on the decline, if sermons are dull and commonplace, if men have become pessimistic and think that the world is going bad, then this is the opportune time for the churches to find a remedy. It will not do for our people to sit in the seat of satisfaction and ignore these things. If the Church we love is not measuring up to the needs of the hour, we want to know why. If church people are asleep to the situation, we want to know why. If the present Church is not meeting the demands of modern life, we want to know why, and what kind of Church must we have for to-morrow?

The Church of to-morrow must be full of the Holy Ghost. That is, it must have the power from above to prompt to service, without quibbling at petty differences and unessential doctrines. It must emphasize the truth which is in Christ Jesus. Its ministry must endeavour to centralize thought about the personality of Jesus Christ, the Lord.

We find in reading the account of the events in the Upper Room during the prayer meeting held there, that they were all with one accord in one place. Even though we have two or three branches of the great Church in one town, there should be unity of purpose in teaching the truth of Christ.

The Church of to-morrow will be a united Church. The failure and crime of Protestantism is sectarianism. The Church is divided against itself, with the result that we have duplicated interests, waste of forces and money, and lamentable lack of efficiency. The Church of to-morrow will be a "Community Church" with the word Christian written over it and all its

activities. We are reaching a point in our development where more emphasis must be placed upon the importance of getting together around the Communion Table where we can worship the same Lord in unity of spirit.

Educators are showing wisdom. They are combining the little school houses sitting apart and centralizing them in one common, advantageous site with better buildings and equipment and where children, from all the neighbourhood, can attend and secure up-to-date education. Business is combining. The necessities of modern life demand that men get together. But here is the Church which was established to reach Jerusalem, and all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth, presenting a weak front to the enemy, in broken parts, when it should move as a whole. Here is the Church of God, whose chief message is to teach love and good-will, divided; often there are a number of churches in one village or town where one would be sufficient. It is poor business. It shows lack of wisdom and efficiency.

The Church of to-morrow must have a more practical faith. And it must go back to Jesus Christ for that faith. The great things He emphasized group themselves around such words as Life, Truth, Righteousness, Love. Somehow the Church of today seems to be dominated by creeds and religious philosophies. Some churches are insisting that salvation can be obtained alone through their sacraments. Others are insisting upon certain views of the atonement and of church government and modes of baptism. Do they get such teachings from the Master? When the Church pays less attention to philosophies and theological disputations and concerns itself with the wounded along the Jericho road, with prodigal sons and daughters, with the facts of real life, then it will make a stronger appeal to men.

The thought of Jesus was to make the facts of religion coincide with the great facts of life. He was more concerned with publicans and sinners than with the empty show of the Pharisees. Perhaps our churches would be better filled with people hungry for the simple message of the Gospel if we would

translate our ancient theology into terms of life. Church religion is of value only as it is transferred into every day religion. Bible religion should be vitalized in the lives of all who read and honour the Great Book. The Church of to-morrow needs a faith that does not evaporate into thin air on Monday.

The Church of to-morrow must be willing to write, emblazoned on the skies in glowing letters, the word "Service." That should be the ultimate desire of every citizen of this Kingdom, the visible Church. Differences in beliefs must find substitution in service for the whole community. Let there be erected a modern structure with equipment in which the physical, the mental, the social, and the spiritual life can be ministered to and developed. Let us train workers for different phases of service so that the Church of to-morrow may be filled with substantial members who have been well directed in the new lines of development. With such a Church the Kingdom will be more quickly realized and more souls will be born into its citizenship. I would like to learn here something of what heaven is going to be over yonder, where there will be no apartment houses, but one big Kingdom.

G. FRANK BURNS.

PRAYER

These are the gifts I ask of thee, Spirit serene—
 Strength for the daily task;
 Courage to face the road;
 Good cheer to help me bear the traveler's load;
 And for the hours of rest that come between,
 An inward joy in all things heard and seen.

These are the sins I fain would have thee take away—
 Malice and cold disdain;
 Hot anger, sullen hate;
 Scorn of the lowly, envy of the great;
 And discontent that casts a shadow gray
 On all the brightness of a common day.

—*Henry van Dyke.*

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

Robert Hallowell Gardiner

ROBERT HALLOWELL GARDINER has made the great enterprise of death, calmly and victoriously as he lived. He was always ambitious to be quiet and I never knew him to be beaten in an undertaking. There was no jolt or break in the continuity of his life in his going. One Sunday he held fellowship in the Sacrament with the only Master he ever knew. The next, his Communion was face to face. A glad prisoner of hope he passed from the steady expectation of visible unity on earth according to Christ's promise to its more perfect realization beyond.

The profound impression made upon the Christian world by what he was and did, baffles description. It is not too much to say that there is not a church in Christendom, great or little, ancient or new, that does not know his name and feel kinship with his lofty soul. Better than that, his name carries with it a vision, a responsibility and a purpose, for it was not himself but Christ whom he exalted. He counted himself but the cup bearer of the King. He was one of those rare souls who are able to see that the unity of Christendom always outstrips its divisions. His catholicity was not a theory but a character. His greatest weapon was his considerateness and his ability to understand others when they were busy misunderstanding him.

Early in his career "he gave his heart to the Purifier, and his will to the Sovereign Will of the Universe." More than that, he never took back that which he once for all surrendered, and his deepening life became yearly more firmly rooted in the unseen. There was no part of his life and activity which was not Christian. His ancestral home with its gracious hospitality, his business office with its ordered activities, his citizenship in the nation and in the world, his benevolences, whether in his local community or in the uttermost parts of the earth, were all swept under the control of the living Christ whose he was.

His rounded character, while it rejoiced and grew in the fertile soil of home, could not be purely domestic. He had an international mind because he had an international heart. He aimed to love all whom Christ loves and to serve all whom

Christ serves. With him this was no pale idea but a steady flame of a noble passion. When the moment came to proclaim, as no one of our generation has proclaimed as he has done, responsibility for the recovery of the unity of the Church "that the world may believe that thou hast sent Me," he did not hesitate to stoop his shoulders to a burden such as few outside his family and more intimate friends have ever measured or can measure. Had it not been for him practical steps to make a World Conference on Faith and Order an enterprise would have been wanting. No cost was too great to pay that he might give his best, which was his all, to the cause. It held him in thrall and he was content that it should be so. When others criticized and faltered, when pristine interest wilted before difficulty and discouragement, when financial anxieties darkened the horizon, he, the chief burden-bearer, kept the fire of his loyalty burning with the pure flame of undiminished ardor and hope and expectation. Once and again he was warned that he was taxing his vitality beyond the safety point, but he continued his course with but little diminution of activity. To the shame of us who remain be it said that, had there been a more general sharing of responsibility,—responsibility that was no more his than that of every Christian and Churchman,—if there had been a more generous financial support by those who could easily have lifted entirely that pressure for money which should never have been his at all but which he patiently accepted and frequently met from private resources, Robert Hallowell Gardiner would have been with us still. An undue burden, carried on behalf of mankind first at the behest of his own church and then of all the churches, has shortened his days and taken away prematurely a force making for Christian good-will which we can ill afford to lose. Even though it be true that "greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends," we ought not to have allowed to happen that which in this instance has happened, to our impoverishment and discomfiture.

Ordinary gratitude should and must rouse us to take up the torch he held so high and carry it with the same gallantry and consecration that characterized his course from first to last. Frequently it happens that a great-souled man can accomplish by his death that which his life alone fails to do. It is for us to do now those steady, inconspicuous tasks without which the noblest vision will fade and the sanest programme fail. The date of the World Conference is set for 1927 and the time is all too short for that which must be done between now

and then. We have no excuse for hesitation. His last week on earth was not idle. Ill unto death though he was, his mind was filled with his old school and the World Conference. He worked to the end until his tired heart ceased to beat and his great soul entered into a rest and peace that was won.

Grief were idle without purpose born of sorrow. The faithful and the true need not the praise of tongue or pen to give them their rightful place in life. They live by earned right in the fabric of human society. In relation to Robert Hallowell Gardiner mere threnody or pious eulogy is idle chatter. He is to-day more fully alive than he ever was. We did not know how heavily we were leaning upon him while he was by our side, so modest was he, never seeking his own, hiding himself that his cause might be the better seen. He was like the underground streams that bathe the feet of violets and feed the verdure from beneath by hidden service. Of him it may be said as it was said of another whom he knew and revered—"He wist not that his face shone." Now that we can take measure of him as never before, we discover him to be one of the foremost leaders and inspirers of our day. Without his sort, hope would wither, faith decline, and love grow cold. There is an ache in our hearts and a void in our fellowship which must abide. And yet all the while we rejoice that the Church raises up such men to enrich and inspire mankind. A bend in the road hides him, but he remains of our company, a little in advance of the rest, as he passes into the enjoyment of that unity for which he laboured diligently and well.

[From Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent, D.D., Buffalo, N. Y.]

NOTE: The office of the World Conference on Faith and Order, heretofore situated at 174 Water Street, Gardiner, Maine, has been moved to Boston, Massachusetts. Correspondents are requested to use the following address: The Secretariat, P. O. Box 226, Boston, Mass., U. S. A.

Modernists and Traditionalists as Factors in Christian Unity

IN ecclesiastical matters the English Modernist is a Liberal. He does not believe that uniformity of dogmatic belief, or a uniform type of Christian worship, is possible or desirable. He would urge that while there must be fundamental convictions if there is to be Church unity, yet no Christian Church can rightly insist on its members believing more than Jesus Christ asked men to believe. He would also have the professions of the Christian Faith as short, and as simple, and as scriptural as

possible; and he desires further that they should be professions of Christian duty, by emphasizing Christian ideals of life and service. As for Christian worship, the Modernist would have it varied, consisting of liturgical and non-liturgical services, and with alternative uses. The Modernists were the first to urge optional alternative services as a mode of Prayer Book revision; and this proposal is steadily gaining ground in English Church circles.

The Modernist is not in a hurry: "He that believeth shall not make haste." Goethe's refrain "Without haste, and without rest" is his motto. He believes that the future is his. He does not believe in linear advance, nor in oblique advance—his idea of advance is rather that of a sweeping or encircling movement. He is exceedingly anxious not to lose any of the values either of religion or science. "Not a hoof shall be left behind." It is so easy, as has been said,—it must have been a man, not a woman who said it—to throw out the babe with the bath water. It is so easy also to keep the babe with the bath water. The process which examines and separates, and then retains what ought to be retained and rejects what ought to be rejected, is so much slower and more difficult; and yet there is no avoiding it if the end is to be gained. The Modernist is quite sure that nothing is settled until it is settled right. Hasty decisions, prejudiced decisions, diplomatic decisions, popular decisions, have all to be undone.

"Oh, if we draw a circle premature,
Heedless of far gain,
Greedy for quick returns of profit, sure
Bad is our bargain."

The Secularist and the Traditionalist cannot regard the Modernist with complete sympathy or understanding. With the Secularist, the Modernist loves scientific truth; but he cannot share the Secularist's Lucretian antipathy to religion. Religion is, for the Modernist, a necessity. With Auguste Sabatier, he believes that "mankind is incurably religious"; and that the only option available to mankind is, not whether it is to have a religion or no religion, but whether it is to have a true and noble religion, or one that is base and false.

Hence the Modernist is at one with the Traditionalist in his love of religion, and regards the Christian religion as potentially, not actually, the purest and noblest form of it; but he cannot share the Traditionalist's antipathy to truth, whether scientific or historic, if it conflict with tradition. Scientific truth and historic truth must be retained—"Except these abide

in the ship ye cannot be saved." Yet they are sometimes very troublesome fellow passengers, and we hardly know how we can find room for them. But we are sure they will settle down comfortably before the voyage is over.

It may seem unnecessary to say so, but the English Modernist is convinced that Modernism is the medicine which the English Church, and, indeed, the Christian Church, requires to-day. It is quite true that it is a medicine which the Traditionalists show no inclination to take; but when it is realized that it is death and dissolution, or Modernism, there can be little doubt what the result will be.

In the English Church, we look to Modernism to achieve a synthesis of those vital elements which constitute the essential ideals of the Catholic, the Evangelical, and the Liberal schools or parties in that much-tried body, which is said to be engaged in housing three religions under one roof. We hope to see Modernism produce a type of churchmanship in the near future which will unite the Catholic ideal of membership in a historic society, and the value of symbolism and beauty in public worship, with the Evangelical experience that the essence of Christianity is the realization of personal relationship to Christ, together with the Liberal conviction of the need for the spirit of truth and freedom in the Christian life.

It, therefore, seems to the Modernist that Modernism is the great liberator of religion. Human history teaches that religion is the most conservative thing in the world; it is always ready to become the slave of the past, and to wear the fetters of superstition. Modernism is able to act as the liberator, because it thrives to distinguish the reality from the form, the essence from the mode, and to insist that while the essential reality is of permanent value, and must be retained, the forms and modes are non-essential and transitory, and may be discarded or transmuted.

Thus Modernism is not only the great liberator, but the great purifier of religion. What is the primitive relation of magic to religion is a matter that is in dispute among the anthropologists; but their modern relation is only too clear. Magic, the sister of superstition, is religion's false friend; and, unless religion can get rid of them both, there is no hope of a really useful existence for her. Without the active co-operation of Modernism, this is impossible.

The Modernist regards Modernism not only as the reconciler of religion and science, but as the real unifier of the Christian Church. The problem of Christian reunion is in the main

an educational one. Modernists in every Christian denomination would have little difficulty in achieving Christian unity; it is the Traditionalists who, with the best intentions, keep Christendom divided. It is quite true, as one has said, that they have recently scraped the broken glass from the top of the dividing walls; but the walls themselves are still intact, and no amount of ecclesiastical diplomacy will level them to the ground. The spirit of Modernism—the product of modern education united with the spirit of Christ—permeating the rank and file, the leaders and ministers of the Church will achieve reunion, and that too without tears and without guile. Love is not enough for the attainment of reunion. The truth is also needful, for knowledge and the acceptance of the truth can alone give freedom; and a reunited Christendom which is not permeated by the spirit of freedom would be far worse than our present divided Christendom. Yet herein the Modernist differs from the Liberal Protestant. The Liberal Protestant desires ecclesiastical peace and good-will; he does not really desire reunion. But the Modernist regards the reunion of Christendom as needful and profitable. His doctrine of the duty and destiny of the Church is that of the writer of the *Epistle to the Ephesians*. He views the Church, not simply as intended to provide corporate fellowship for all Christians, but as also intended to secure the unity of mankind in Christ. Yet it is not ecclesiastical diplomacy nor even Christian good-will which will reunite the Church: a needful preliminary to reunion is a prolonged Modernist educational mission. Before we can have reunion, we must have, in the simplest and most comprehensive form, unity of thought—not in details, but in a few fundamental principles. We must be sure of our centre; we need not be so sure about our circumference. It is only the spirit of Modernism which can achieve what Dr. Sandlay called “the unification of thought, the fusion of all secular thinking and all religious thinking in one comprehensive system”; and “such unification,” said he, just before his death—I know not with what amount of prophetic foresight—“is nearer in sight than it has been for a very long time.”

[From Principal H. D. A. Major in *The Hibbert Journal*, London.]

Intellectual and Social Forces Working for Reunion

1. The desire for unity can not be realized without due respect for the spirit of truth. This should not be stated in the

usual bigoted terms: "I can not and will not sacrifice my convictions for the sake of unity." Whenever the writer is conscious of the presence of any such nascent popishness within his own spirit, he finds it profitable to recall a sentence he once heard I. J. Spencer pronounce: "If you have principles that you refuse to sacrifice in the cause of Christian unity, the sooner you get a new set of principles the better." Rather than to speak as men who seem to oppose the principles of unity and truth to each other, let us speak as men who have courage to believe that ultimately they will be found not twain but one in the Lord.

2. Insistence on definition of doctrine leads inevitably away from unity. The whole history of the Church, particularly since the second century, supplies the indubitable proof of this. Fully to accept this does not necessitate that we should adopt the opposite standard of looseness or evasion. It necessitates nothing more embarrassing or costly in that direction than the fullest and most genuine loyalty to the principle that every approach to the problem of Christian reunion shall be accompanied by the candid, however humbling recognition of the fact that there have been false assumptions, of greater or less importance, and a lack of comprehension on all sides. A general repudiation of insistence on definition together with a general inculcation of the spirit of humility and brotherliness, should carry us certainly, even if not with the velocity that satisfies desire, in the direction of a reunited Church.

3. Unity, as respects the ordinances and the ministry, not to speak of other items, does not require that we shall regard them as offering to us rigid doctrines that must be believed, but rather as involving principles of life and devotion. To be explicit, it is not required that we shall think alike about their meaning and their function. What is essential is that by our manner of loyal observance as regards the ordinances and by our attitude as respects the ministry, as in all things else, we shall make clear that we fully intend to do the Lord's will. That was the position of our fathers, and that ought to be our position as well as the position of all Christians. One Christian may see in a given ordinance that which another Christian does not see; but no Christian has right or authority to say that his insight must be taken as normative. Nor is it given unto us to say that men shall not think deeply about such matters pertaining to faith as the ordinances and the ministry. Let men think as deeply as they will. Bare facts may fully satisfy one type of mind, whereas they may utterly fail to satisfy another

type of mind. This only is required that no man, or group of men, shall depart from the facts of the Gospel and impose their opinions of those facts upon their brethren. Furthermore, until we have something more nearly like an adequate consensus of judgment as to what constitute the absolute essentials of Christianity, all of us, and all Christian men everywhere, may well walk humbly, conscious of the fact that personal predilections and prejudices have had a perfectly intractable and scandalous habit of assuming the guise of faith in preference to that of opinion.

If in addition to these deductions a word of comfort and of hope may be indulged, let that word be this: Forces other than denominational heart-searchings and conscious efforts in the direction of theological *rapproachements* are abroad in the world and all working, subterraneanly, it may be, yet working mightily as our aids in the struggle for Christian reunion. In part those forces are intellectual, in part they are social. First and foremost among the intellectual forces we may posit a growing consciousness of the fact that neither magic nor dogmatism has rightful place in a universe where order and intelligence rule on every hand. Habits of well-disciplined thinking have interested men everywhere in the quest for reality, for fact and truth, thus aiding to dispel the very atmosphere wherein magic and dogmatism can possibly thrive. As chief among the social forces that lend powerful co-operation, let me name the groundswell of democracy that sweeps through the world. Checked and held for the moment on the reef of resurgent absolutism, we have abundant reason to expect that it will yet, and speedily, sweep on and make its force profoundly felt in every nook and cranny of the world's life. As democracy increases, ecclesiastical pretention must yield ground. As the true sense of man's intrinsic worth comes to general consciousness, the shadow of the priest is bound to grow less, else the character of his ministrations will suffer complete transmutation and he be found thenceforth, neither bigot nor mongerer in superstitious rites, but a Christ-like servant of the actual needs of men.

[From Prof. Vernon Stauffer in *The College of the Bible Quarterly*, Lexington, Ky.]

The Eastern Church and Reunion

IN an article entitled "The Orthodox Church in the Near East," which appeared in the *American Church Monthly* in

March, the writer was inclined to take a pessimistic view of the situation and to think that the cause of reunion between the East and the Anglican Communion was not in the least advanced. This article was written last December shortly after the writer's return from the Balkans, a journey that was fruitful of much disappointment. At the same time the writer tried to show that any opposition to reunion and recognition of Anglican Orders by the authorities of the East was largely due to the personal qualities of the late Oecumenical Patriarch rather than to any ill-will toward the Anglican Church. Certainly the Balkan peoples have no cause to show anything but gratitude to America and Great Britain for the magnificent treatment those countries have given their unfortunate refugees, the fruits of Turkish massacres.

Meletios was doubtless a great man individually but his failure lay in his inability to restrain himself, in his desire to imbibe Western reforming ideas which he must have known would have offended his conservative co-religionists, and in a lack of tact in the diplomatic world. He, too, was unable to make up his mind at the critical moment. He has made way for another, who, though he may not be a man of distinction, nevertheless has a better knowledge of the world and how to deal with it. On the Anglican side, the present Archbishop of Canterbury, though not a popular preacher nor a scholar of distinction nor even a man to be known very much by the non-churchgoing public, has carried through all the negotiations with a masterly hand, proving to the world that the Church still can produce the great statesmen ecclesiastic of the middle ages.

The few months of 1924 that have gone by have seen a great alteration in the situation. The most remarkable proof of this altered state of affairs can be seen in an article that appeared from the pen of the conservative Anthony, Metropolitan of Kiev, a great Orthodox theologian, though probably the most conservative one. He is the last person from whom could be expected a statement favouring Anglican orders. Yet the Metropolitan of Kiev, who is living at the moment in exile in Belgrad, wrote an article in February in a Russian paper, in which he asked the following question:

“Would it be possible, in the event of their reunion with the Church, to refuse the Anglican episcopate that which was conceded to the Nestorians and the Donatists by the Council of Carthage and by Basil the Great,—that is to say, reception

into unity by the Third Rite and Recognition of their existing Orders?"

It should be explained here that the Russian Orthodox Church divides non-Orthodox persons into three categories. Firstly, there are the unbaptised. These can only be received into the Church by baptism. Secondly, there are the Protestants, who have received no Confirmation. The Orthodox Church allows their baptism to be valid, but chrismates them, and ministers of such sects must be reordained, before they can exercise any ministerial function. Lastly, there are members of certain heterodox churches such as the Roman Catholics. The ministers of such churches becoming orthodox would be received into the Church without any reordination.

It is in this last category that Bishop Anthony would place Anglicans. In his view Anglican Orders are as equally valid as Roman Catholic. If reunion with the East were to come and Anthony's opinion adopted Anglican Orders would be considered valid and no reordination of Anglican priests would be necessary.

It should be pointed out that until the present distress of the Russian Church be ended, nothing can be done officially, but nevertheless these friendly words coming from the conservative Metropolitan of Kiev are a splendid augury for the future. Who knows what the future may have in store? At the time of writing the caliph has been expelled from Constantinople; it seems that Bolshevism is gaining ground in Turkey and that there is an effort to overthrow all religions in that unhappy country. The Oecumenical and Armenian patriarchs may be expelled next. A closer reunion with the West is doubtless desired by the East. So far all that the West has given her is the *libre-penseur* element of Paris and pseudo-Latin culture. Now, however, she may learn where true Grace may be found.

[From C. H. Palmer in *The American Church Monthly*, New York.]

Union Congregations in China

It may be a little difficult for our readers to grasp the question at issue which is raised by this heading without a few words of explanation, or better—if we can find one—an easily understood analogy. If we can imagine a small group of Chinese churchmen from Canton, knowing only their own language,

arriving in London, and finding there two or three other small groups of Cantonese—say, Baptists and Presbyterians—in like case with themselves, what more natural than that they should wish to get together on Sundays and have some sort of service in the language they all understand? As Anglican churchmen, the first group ought to join the nearest parish churches, where they will find much the same prayer book and the same sacraments to which they have been accustomed at home in Canton; but the unintelligible language is a real obstacle. Now let us go one step further, and suppose that the three little groups together can afford to invite a pastor from Canton. Two of the three can readily agree: the third would prefer a priest of their own church, but are in a minority of one. How is the church prepared to deal with such a case?

Or again, to give an actual concrete instance: the Union Medical College established in Peking by the Rockefeller trustees has invited a Chinese priest of our church to take up the office of director of social and religious activities. His congregation probably numbers fewer Churchmen than Methodists, Presbyterians, or Baptists—Churchmen at all events are only a fraction of the whole. What is to be the attitude of the church authorities towards his work? What his attitude toward them? and what his attitude toward his miscellaneous flock?

These two instances will help to explain what is meant by the problem of "Union Congregations," and it is a problem of which the urgency concerns the welfare not only of individuals but of the Church as a whole. Some of our leading Chinese Christians are already complaining that by too rigid rules or too uncompromising an attitude we are losing opportunities which are ours for the asking, and losing ground which once lost will be difficult to recover; and on the face of it they are right, or rather, as our French friends would say, "they have reason."

The Standing Committee on Christian Unity gave this problem a prominent place in its report. The following extracts will show the lines which it followed:

These and similar Union Congregations are likely to remain with us and to increase largely in number . . . we approve their formation as, perhaps, a suitable method of meeting the present difficulties which arise inevitably from our unhappy divisions . . . they need our avowed and active co-operation . . . we ought to be officially represented in them as occasion may offer . . . by formal co-operation . . .

The Committee went on to recommend the appointment of a Sub-committee of the Synod to report before the close of the Synod,

so as to secure . . . for members of our own church due opportunities for the ministry of the sacraments . . . and also that clergy of our own church should be able to accept responsibilities in such congregations, under conditions approving themselves to the Church as a whole.

The sub-committee was duly appointed under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Victoria, Hongkong, the Rev. P. M. Scott of North China being one of its members, and brought in a careful report, to which several resolutions were attached. The first recommended quite plainly that "where possible" Churchmen should join congregations of our own church. Where this was not possible, the second sanctioned their joining "Union Congregations." The third advocated Letters of Commendation addressed to the pastor of such Union Congregations, such letters to be asked for from him when leaving, and addressed to some clergyman of our own church. The fourth was rejected, and in its place was substituted an urgent reminder to any unconfirmed members of our church joining such congregations that they should seek confirmation by a bishop at the earliest opportunity. The fifth sanctioned, "under special circumstances and subject to the permission of the diocesan bishop," our own clergy accepting a call to minister to such Union Congregations. The sixth aimed at regulating such ministry on terms "providing that the ministry of the Word and of the two sacraments and the conduct of worship are consistent with Lambeth principles and also suitable to the needs of the congregation."

A seventh resolution was added in the course of debate in the House of Bishops, urging the bishop of the diocese "to establish friendly relations between himself and his clergy and the pastor of such Union Church."

The problem is a real one, and can only be solved *ambulando*: but the resolutions summarized above should go far—in our own case—to ensure that we walk wisely, with caution and yet with sympathy.

[From Rt. Rev. Frank L. Norris, Episcopal Bishop of North China, in *The East and the West*, London.]

Release Bishop Roots

No bishop engaged in mission work has displayed more statesmanship than Bishop Roots of China; none has sensed more keenly the pressing nature of the problem of Christian

unity as that problem presents itself in the mission field. That the special gifts of Bishop Roots have been recognized among large groups of Christian workers was made manifest when he was invited to act as executive secretary of the National Christian Council. Knowing the importance of the programme of the Council, which looks toward the bringing about of a more practical co-operation among the Christian groups at work in China, Bishop Roots desired ardently to undertake the task offered him by this invitation.

The action of the House of Bishops of the Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui, in stating their hope that Bishop Roots might continue as a member of the National Christian Council, but that they believed it inexpedient for him to act in the capacity of executive secretary, brought widespread disappointment to churchmen. Many people believed that in seeming to stress the bishop's task in his own diocese as of superior importance to that of undertaking the special piece of work for the Council the General Synod had confused essential values. In his letter to his fellow workers in the Diocese of Hankow, Bishop Roots expresses his opinion that there may accrue from the action of the synod values which at first were hidden potentialities. But the bishop does not conceal his disappointment. He writes:

I do not see how we can expect our declining the invitation of the National Christian Council to be understood by many, even among our best friends, as anything less than a denial in action of the affirmations which we so often make, protesting our eagerness to advance the cause of Christian unity. This, I believe, is a very serious thing for the Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui. I cannot but think what a help it would have been to good feeling and generous thinking and really Christian action all around had we officially, corporately, and whole-heartedly accepted the invitation extended to us by the National Christian Council, and this it is which makes the action of the bishops at Canton a profound disappointment to me, and the decision to accept their advice the hardest decision I have ever had to make.

The question now awaits the action of the American House of Bishops. Bishop Roots writes to *The Churchman*: "I trust that the whole matter will be cleared up when the House of Bishops finally meets again, and my chief regret at this present moment is that the House of Bishops was unable to meet in May, and we have, therefore, to wait until the middle of October at least before the issue can be settled."

The House of Bishops at Canton nominated Dr. Gilman for suffragan bishop of Hankow. It is to be hoped that our own House of Bishops will see the momentous need of releasing Bishop Roots for the great task that lies before him. It is a rare opportunity for Christian service on a large scale that

has been accorded the Episcopal Church through the confidence imposed in the Bishop of Hankow by the National Christian Council. Let the Church be large-minded enough to accept that opportunity.

[From *The Churchman*, New York.]

The Springfield Declaration of the Congregationalists on Unity

THE Springfield Declaration on Unity is divided into three sections, the last of which might again have been divided. It has also a Preamble, which states the two-fold purpose of the Declaration, first to prevent futile and ill-advised attempts at uniformity without the spirit of unity; and secondly, the encouragement of outward and visible expressions of the unity of the Spirit in the Church of Christ.

The first affirmation is that of the unity of the Spirit, which exists in spite of all denominational differences, a fact often ignored in discussions of this subject that there is a unity of the Spirit which makes the church one as the ocean is one, though separate waves and currents divide its surface.

The second reaffirms the Oberlin Declaration and declares the Apostolic character of our churches and the validity of our ministry. It says uncompromisingly that we cannot admit in any other denomination a more valid church organization or a more authoritative ministry than that which the Congregational Churches possess. We have said this before in a hundred ways, but it is time it was said again as it here is said, with unmistakable directness. The Congregational Churches are not waiting on anybody's doorstep to be taken in and adopted, nor to be told on what humiliating terms our orders might be validated by some organization arrogating to itself a higher authority than that which it acknowledges in us. If there is any apostolic succession we have it, or at least a share of it. If any church is built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, we are a part of that church. If there be an authoritative ministry in a modern church, Congregational ministers, ordained by a valid episcopate, with full intent to convey every adequate and appropriate prophetic and priestly function, possess a full apostolic ordination.

The third section of the report declares that while we occupy this high ground and will never consent to take that which is lower, we will meet upon that level plateau any and

every other branch of the true Church of Jesus Christ. We will neither submit to a creed imposed upon us, nor will we impose one upon others. We will not be content to fence up the blind alleys of fatuous approach to a unity that can never unite. We will make plain a broad and high avenue whereon we may meet all earnest souls and organizations desiring true church union.

If the third and last section had been divided, the last part of it would constitute a section by itself. It says, that while we are waiting for Christian union we will live in the spirit of it. We will not ourselves display sectarianism of spirit while waiting for other denominations to join us in union effort. Even now we propose to live in a faith which is the substance of things hoped for. We will display in our own unsectarian spirit the evidence of things not seen in actual and complete accomplishment.

I regard this declaration as of very considerable importance. I do not pretend to be its author. I must share that honour not only with William Ives Budington and Leonard Bacon, but with Richard Mather and Thomas Hooker. Nevertheless, I deem it of importance that the historic position of Congregationalism has been reaffirmed in modern language, and in relation to modern conditions. There are many matters in which we should be unwilling to permit these ancient worthies to express our faith, but they being dead still utter the cardinal principles of our polity and fellowship. As in 1648 and in 1871, the Congregational Churches, being in their nature self-governing units, organized on the New Testament model, are united nationally for co-operation in great tasks; and under the necessities of their relation to other Christian bodies, have accepted, though with some reluctance, a denominational name. This name they hold and honour; but they do not and will not hold it in a sectarian spirit. They believe in, and are an integral part of the Holy Catholic Church. Upon this plane we are to be met by all who desire to go forward with us into the realization of a more inclusive Christian unity.

[From Rev. William E. Barton in *The Congregationalist*, Boston, Mass.]

Protestant Federation in Czecho-Slovakia

THE endeavour to unite the Protestant churches in Czecho-Slovakia into a free federation is nearing its realization. It was not so easy a task as some imagined it would be, nor was

it as hopeless as some pessimists foretold. It has not succeeded to the extent of its final aim but it did not break up at the very beginning as some of the signs indicated.

For the benefit of our friends abroad who are interested in the progress of this movement we bring a report of the present state of things.

First of all, it was necessary to remove the distrust, which appeared where one would least expect it—among the smaller denominations. The Federation was proposed as an association of all churches, but principally for the protection of the smaller ones.

The larger churches cannot and have no need of counting on any advantages of protection. The Federation could be an organ of helpfulness and protection. But at first the smaller churches expressed fears that they might be overruled and hindered in their missionary and expansive endeavours, which was very surprising. We hope that these fears are dispelled. Without doubt, the Federation ought to be a forum for a common working-plan, according to which the work ought to be apportioned, divided, and regulated. Much could be gained by agreement and apportionment but nobody dreamed of limiting or hindering others through the Federation. We are convinced that the very existence of a Federation would mean greater efficiency as well as economy of forces in the future.

There was another great fear that the Federation might become a way for the unification of some churches. This objection was expressed definitely by members of the Lutheran Church in Slovakia, but even others held it, though they did not express it openly. This fear on the part of the Protestants in Slovakia is easily explained. They had to fight against the plans of the Reformed Church toward the end of the nineteenth century because they suspected that behind the union proposed by that church were plans of a non-religious character aiming to harm the national as well as the religious life of the Slovaks. This fear was soon and easily dispelled.

One of the fundamental decisions is that each church shall remain untouched in its independence and existence, and further that the Federation shall have no right to consider any unionistic plans. My personal opinion is that this is going too far in insuring independence and intactibility to the churches, but it may have been needful to secure contentment.

Finally, there arose at the very beginning a difficulty the like of which was not expected. Some expressed or indicated desire that a statement on the common fundamental beliefs on

which the Federation stands be placed at the head of the constitution.

Others argued that this is on the one hand not necessary, as each church has its own creed, and on the other hand very difficult, as the churches to be associated differ in forms of piety, in dogmatics. Our friends in America will readily understand these difficulties, though the differences are not as sharp as those between the Fundamentalists and Liberals in Christian dogmatics and Church practice. The opinion that it will be sufficient if the introductory clause emphasizes the spiritual union in Jesus Christ finally gained the victory.

That is as far as the preparatory work has advanced. The proposed constitution will now be brought before the executive bodies of the different churches.

There is not much uncertainty as to the standpoint which the Czech and Slovak churches will take. The proclamation to the churches is signed by official representatives of the Czech-Brethren Church, the Lutheran, the Congregational, the Moravian, the Baptist, and the Methodist Churches. Our negotiations with the German and Hungarian churches have been only of an unofficial and informative character. It was first necessary to insure the participation of the Czech churches, which have a larger membership, in order to form a basis for further work. Now the proposed constitution will be sent to all churches, including the German, Hungarian, and Polish.

Much will depend upon the deliberateness, wisdom, and opinion of these churches. If their synods decide to join in a free co-operation with the Czech churches, it will be a great stride forward, and the formation of such a Federation will be a glorious day in Christian brotherhood.

The Federation will be realized. That we are certain of. The question is, whether it will embrace all churches or only the majority. The plan and wish of the Czechs who proposed it was and is that the Federation be a common ground for Protestant work on Christian principles reaching beyond human and national limitations, but in the scope of the Kingdom of God.

[From Dr. F. Zilka in *Kostnické Jiskzy*, Prague.]

Union at a Standstill in Scotland

THERE were no negotiations between the two Scottish General Assemblies this year on the subject of union. There is

nothing more to be discussed jointly at present, since it is mutually agreed that no further steps are possible until the established church secures from parliament a law for the "teinds" or tithes (now collected locally as annual land taxes for the benefit of local parishes) to be consolidated in permanent endowment funds, which the denomination shall hold and administer independent of the Scottish taxing authorities. The leaders of parliament, however, notified the Church of Scotland that it could have no such legislation till it agreed within its own counsels exactly what was wanted. Disputes over the proper form of this adjustment continued still after the Assembly had convened, and threatened to make serious division. But at a private conference of chief men on the day before adjournment a formula was worked out which was satisfactory all around.

In the United Free Assembly, however, the theme of union failed to strike any such note of harmony. The delay in settling the matter of "teinds" for the establishment has left room for a new anti-union feeling to develop in free-church circles—especially among the former United Presbyterian contingent, which never did believe in a state-supported church. When this element found out that the Church of Scotland had no idea of abandoning its ancient public endowments nor any thought of giving up its status as an official national church, there developed an antipathy to union in many places where union sentiment had previously been enthusiastic. In fact, Dr. John Young, who had been the chairman of the United Free Church's union committee and a passionate pleader for consolidation, resigned when this new feature of the case came to light and made in the Assembly of 1924 a powerful speech against following the union idea any farther. His former colleagues on the committee urged, however, that the Assembly ought not to shut the door on union now—that the only fair way was to wait and see what solution the Church of Scotland would arrive at, and judge the duty of the hour when these conditions were crystallized. This plea carried by a vote of 375 to 138.

[From *The Continent*, New York.]

Protestant Union a Possibility

IRONCLAD doctrinal and even political agreement as a basis of union for all Christians will not work. It never has worked.

Men don't agree and, unless we all come to have one-track minds, never will absolutely agree. This ought to be all too obvious. Consequently the basis of union can probably never be made sufficiently broad to be all-inclusive. Postulate no creed but the Bible, and even then you do not get agreement, for the various inspiration theories fly wide apart. Not even the Apostles' Creed would be universally acceptable as the basis for an organic union of all Christians. Now to be sure, the gulf that separates Catholics and Protestants is much wider than that between the various denominations of Protestantism. But even here there appear to be vast obstacles.

Few will gainsay the desirability of a less divided Protestantism. All true lovers of the Church will note with satisfaction that every step toward a bridging over of differences of whatever character because this cannot but mean greater efficiency. A leader in the van of union movement for several years past is Canada. Before the war the Methodists and Congregationalists had declared themselves in favour of a union. The Presbyterians in 1915 voted 140,000 to 90,000 for the principle. Last year this union was agreed upon. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church finally voted 426 for union and 129 against. The new church, bringing together 29.56 per cent. of the Dominion's population, will be known as the United Church of Canada. "The value of co-operation and the futility of perpetuating slight denominational differences" are given as the chief reasons for the union. It seems as if the day of hair-splitting differences over slight denominational doctrines were becoming less popular in some quarters of the Christian world, making obsolete the classic doggerel: "The bells of hell ring ding-a-ling-a-ling for you and not for me." For a long time Canada has had union theological training. The union spirit of the Dominion is particularly strong in the prairie provinces where separate churches are practically impossible on account of distance and where the neighbourhood spirit is strong.

The Methodists and Congregationalists of Australia, according to a vote taken in 1918, are strongly in favour of a union of these two churches with the Presbyterians, the latter also favouring such a union, but by a small majority.

The Lambeth Conference (August, 1920) proposed the following terms: "The Holy Scriptures as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it

or the Apostles' Creed as the baptismal confession of belief; the divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ; a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole Body." The Lambeth Conference, of course, has no binding force, its resolutions standing simply for an expression of opinion, but the above platform having the almost unanimous approval of the archbishop and bishops of the whole Anglican Church cannot help having far-reaching effect.

Between 1890 and 1896 efforts were made by high Anglican churchmen for the recognition of Anglican orders by the Roman Catholic Church. As the result of a careful investigation Leo XIII issued his *Apostolicae Curae* on September 13, 1896, in which he declared that "ordinations carried out according to the Anglican rite have been and are absolutely null and utterly void." The recent proposal by the Commission on Faith and Order, asking for an ecumenical conference, was flatly declined by the Pope. Further advances to the Holy See would seem to be at present "love's labour lost."

A great deal would be gained through a union of the larger Protestant bodies on a broad basis similar to that proposed by the Lambeth Conference, as outlined above. Roman Catholics tell us that it is the nature of Protestantism to fly apart. Present indications are, however, that the leaders of Protestantism are becoming imbued more and more with the earnest desire to fly together. To realize that this is true one need only read that little book, entitled *The Problem of Christian Unity*, by the following representative clergymen: Drs. S. Parkes Cadman, T. J. Garland, Arthur Cushman McGiffert, William Fraser McDowell, Robert E. Speer, Henry Sloane Coffin, and Ethelbert Talbot. Dr. Speer's essay on Unity in the Mission Field is especially illuminating. He quotes Dr. Duff as saying that he "would as soon leap into the Ganges as take one step to entice a Christian believer away from another Christian body or to do work that fell in the natural sphere and was the duty of any other Christian organization." "I do not see," says Dr. Speer, "why if Northern and Southern Presbyterians can unite in the atmosphere of heathenism they can't unite in a Christian land." In the Y. M. C. A's. and Y. W. C. A's. the various denominations seem to get along altogether amiably. Apparently "where there is a will there is a way."

No less a leader than Archbishop Söderblom of Sweden,

who lately toured this country on invitation of the 600,000 American members of the Swedish Lutheran Church, The National Lutheran Council, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, the Church Peace Union, the Scandinavian Foundation, and Harvard University, came to tell us that it is his conviction that "unless the churches unite and work for harmony and good-will, the world cannot progress."

Let the Protestants unite. The things they have in common are vastly more important than the differences that separate them. Let them come together on some broad basis, and the act of contact will perforce produce a unity as real as need be, plus a variety sufficiently comprehensive to be wholesome.

[From Rev. A. C. Blunck, Pastor of the Lutheran Church, East Port Chester, Conn., in *The Biblical World*, New York.]

The Cross of Christ and the Reconciliation of the Nations

IN the power of the Crucified I am venturing to speak of reconciliation, not only of the individual's reconciliation with God, which we experience in Christ, but also of the reconciliation of the nations with one another. From the beginning the Gospel claimed to be both a power for effecting reconciliation with God and a power for effecting reconciliation of the nations with one another.

Jesus Himself, the bearer of the original Gospel message, laboured at first among his own people, with a programme of national evangelism; but under the impression of the desire for salvation and the sincere surrender of non-Israelites, He overcame the barriers of national religion and announced the day when many should come from the east and the west, from the south and the north, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of Heaven. He looked forward to the future of the human race, and set his disciples a task in the words: "Ye are the salt of the earth; ye are the light of the world."

To its most perfect expression this fact was brought by the world-Apostle Paul. St. Paul is the one who has made the idea of reconciliation the historical slogan of Christianity. In one of his greatest visions St. Paul gives expression to the supreme work of Christ: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself." Not only a few individuals, nay the world itself, all humanity has come from the condition of enmity with God to

the condition of peace with God, and it is God Himself who in Christ has achieved this work of atonement. For many among us these lines of Paul have long been familiar words; still we ought always to remember that it was in the days of Nero that an unknown tentmaker somewhere in Macedonia first brought together these thoughts for the ages; God, World, Reconciliation. The placing of these things into relation with each other was indeed a tremendous issue in the spiritual history of mankind. In heroic consciousness of their mission, Paul and the other disciples, following in the footsteps of Jesus, came to humanity proclaiming, "Be ye reconciled to God."

CHRIST'S SUBLIME UTTERANCE

But Paul is carried yet further by his prophetic-evangelistic inspiration. In the words to the Ephesians (II. 13-16) he put down that monumental confession that in Christ even the reconciliation of hostile nations is achieved. Jews and Gentiles, he said, separated from each other by the middle wall of partition and bitter enmity have been brought together and have been reconciled to each other in Christ by abolishing all enmity in his fellowship. For Christ is the body of which all are members, forming among themselves a virtual unity. Yet we must remember that Paul was speaking in the ancient East on a historical battlefield, where in ferocious cruelty one conquering nation destroyed another, only to be trodden down in turn by the Hittite, the Assyrian and the Egyptian. On such ground, St. Paul dares to make the unheard-of statement, "In Christ Jesus there is neither Greek, nor Jew, nor Scythian, nor Barbarian, nor freeman, nor slave, but all are one in Christ." The Apotle did not say this to deny or cancel national peculiarities. He himself was a Jew and proud to be one. He desired that the individual nations should not act as disintegrating powers, but that they might find the possibility of harmonious cooperation—"You are one in Christ."

If the glorious sublimity of this discernment could ever be excelled, it has been done in that prayer in the 17th chapter of St. John's Gospel, which, as if coming from another world, from out of the sphere of transfiguration, ascended from the lips of the Master to the Father Himself, as He viewed the great multitude from all nations—"That they all may be one." In the same manner Christianity, when it became a Church, a hard-and-fast legal organization, and when it formed its baptismal confession, was once more acting upon the evangelical and

apostolic principle, engraving, as it were, the Master's and His first witnesses' thoughts of union and oneness in brass and marble in the assertion of the one Holy Church. So much is sure, that in the creative age of the Gospel both are closely connected with each other: the reconciliation of the individual soul with God and the reconciliation of the nations among each other, and all this in Christ Jesus. Primitive Christianity is both; powerful popular religion, and far-reaching religion for the peoples; religion for the individual soul, and religion for the world. The Greek called this world *oikumene*, therefore it is an œcumenical, missionary religion, knitting the nations together.

A BANKRUPTCY OF CHRISTIANITY

How are we to interpret this historical fact? Is it, as Nietzsche said, a slave revolt in the realm of morals which we observe? Have perhaps new men, with the unhindered fancy and greediness of the beggar, stretched out their hands for ideas, the world-wide importance of which it would have been the privilege of only a few mighty and solitary thinkers to grasp? So much is correct in this putting of the question that we have here ideas of "new" men in a peculiar sense, such men as Paul describes and represents in his own person—men taken out of the unholy sphere of death and sin by Christ and saved in Christ into the world of God. Having become new men by the touch of the living God, they have dared to accomplish the unheard-of, pointing out to this world a divine goal, not an earthly one.

It is only with bleeding hearts that we can realize to-day this glorious dawn of our history, and it is with bitter pain that we feel the taunt which proclaims the whole time of the late world war not only the bankruptcy of Christianity, but even the bankruptcy of the Christian idea of reconciliation. I concede that this period of hatred was a bankruptcy, not indeed of Christianity, but a bankruptcy of Christians. Especially the fact that the great Protestant nations have mangled each other constitutes an awful descent in the history of Christianity. Or was it perhaps nothing but the revealing of a wasting illness that had long existed? I would believe the latter to be true. What we have experienced in this time of self-laceration of Christian, yea, Protestant nations, has revealed the fact that in all the long years before the war, in every Christian nation, we have not taken in real earnest one of the most vital revelations of the will of God.

Here we have to confess to a similar sin of omission as in

the parallel realm of the social question. Much too late the churches, at least on the Continent, have recognized the gigantic task which has grown out of the upward striving of the working masses. Thus the social movement, to a large extent, has slipped out of the motherly hands of the Church, and has been shunted upon the track of religious indifference or even of utter enmity to religion. The Christian churches have indeed recognized and taken up successfully the new tasks for humanity which arose for them out of a century of technical progress, of world traffic and world policy, but solely as missionary labour intended for the benefit of the Christless nations. The churches have not, however, treated seriously their special mission to the nations themselves, in the sense of the reconciliation of peoples and governments, till now torn asunder by economic interests.

A CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP TO PEACE

There remains, while we establish this fact, but one consolation. It lies in the observation that, corresponding to the contest of the nations which has passionately continued till this day, there is vividly growing a movement in all Christian lands, under the surface of general happenings, indeed, and therefore unnoticed by many, a movement which strives to fulfil at last the public mission of the Christian churches in the sense of the original Gospel of the solidarity of all Christian peoples. Concerning this movement, let me say, in the first place, this movement is a purely Christian and evangelical movement. There is a parallel movement, namely, the attempt to come to an economic understanding, which also operates with the idea of solidarity. This economic movement for reconstruction is so clear in its reasonableness and necessity that I do not need to speak a word about it. Its assumptions are just as evident as the recognition of a hygienic solidarity of all nations, as, for instance, the fact that the fight against spotted fever equally concerns Poland and Germany. But there is no need of a church gathering to recognize the inevitable economic solidarity of the people, and to demand and promote its re-establishment. That hatred destroys commerce is evident even to a mediocre intellect. And it seems to me a blind delusion to imagine that a sick Europe can be made healthy by bayonets. We Christians want to promote, of course, every endeavour toward economical reconciliation, but the ideal reconciliation which we mean when speaking of the Cross and the Reconciliation of the Nations, is not synonymous with commercial conciliation, but is based on

deeper reasons and aims. It is obvious that, if the churches promote the inward reconciliation of the nations, this will make for friendly intercourse in industrial, commercial and scientific circles. But we advance this cause of reconciliation, not on account of commerce, nor for the exchange of goods, but because we are fully convinced that God wills it, that the crucified Master commands it.

[From Dr. Adolf Deissmann, of Berlin, in an address in London.]

Denominational Christianity in China

CONFUCIANISM and Taoism came to the Chinese people, of course, as purely Chinese cults, while Buddhism came as a purely foreign religion soon after the commencement of the Christian Era. But although it came as a foreign religion, it came as a purely Eastern religion too, and made its appeal to the Chinese people partly from the fact that there was in it nothing of a character alien to an Oriental conception of life. Christianity should have a far greater appeal as a religion of Eastern origin, but by the unnecessary prominence given to the accretions derived from its long sojourn in the West, we have made the task of presenting it to the Chinese immeasurably harder than it need have been. No religion is more adapted toward allowing the Chinese Church to develop absolutely along the lines of its own genius than is Christianity; and yet in many ways we have instructed it in, and attempted to tie it down to, ecclesiastical practices and policies which are not only not essential to Christianity but are purely products of a Western environment.

It is for instance unfortunate that a *Denominational Christianity* has been brought to China. Under our Western Church polity when missionaries first came, such a thing was almost unavoidable; but it can be seen at a glance that while we have labelled certain Chinese Churches as Anglican, Baptist, Congregational, Methodist or Presbyterian, they are so purely because they received their first knowledge of Christian doctrines from the particular denomination concerned. That they are divided from each other by names, and by different practices and forms of church government is almost entirely an accidental matter; for under other inceptions the Baptist Church would have been an Anglican, and the Presbyterian a Methodist Church. We are all engaged now in an attempt to minimize

these distinctions, but we have made divisions which we may not find it so easy to bridge. The Chinese Church will do well, when it comes to know more fully the facts of the case, to demand a united, unlabelled, Christian Church in China, and refuse to be involved in, or bound by, Western distinctions which are purely a part of Western history. How far the sense of separateness has been instilled, and the seeds of division sown, may be conjectured when it is seen what slow progress has attended the efforts for federation and co-operation even among Missions of adjoining districts.

[From *The Chinese Recorder*, Shanghai.]

Date Set for Canadian Union

CHURCH union in Canada is not to be put off forever even by the unhappy resourcefulness of that unrelenting Presbyterian minority who have been fighting to obstruct it. Sometimes it has seemed as if their pertinacity would dishearten even those prophetic minds that have most clearly foreseen the vast advantage to Christianity certain to follow this consolidation of the Protestant front throughout the Canadian provinces. But faith and devotion have held steadfast against the backwash of sectarianism, and at length a date is set when the United Church of Canada, composed of Presbyterians, Methodists and Congregationalists, is actually to come into organized being.

This definite fixing of the hour of union results from the passage of a bill by both houses of the Canadian Parliament providing that this United Church of Canada shall begin its corporate existence on June 19, 1925. From that time the constituent churches will cease to exist. No effort, however, will be made to force objecting Presbyterians into the union. Congregations which vote to stay out will not only be left unmolested in possession of their own property, but will doubtless in the end be allotted a proportionate share of denominational property. The charter law which the Dominion Parliament has passed will forbid them, however, to profess to continue the Canadian Presbyterian Church. They will have to constitute themselves into a new denomination—with some new name to distinguish them from the church that has chosen to merge its identity into this new union of Protestant forces by which the future religious life of Canada is sure to be mainly molded.

[From *The Continent*, New York.]

BOOK REVIEWS

CHURCH PRINCIPLES. By P. Carnegie Simpson, D.D., Professor of Church History, Westminster College, Cambridge. New York: George H. Doran Co.

It is the result of notes made during the sittings of a joint committee on fundamental questions relating to church union. It does not propose to be an adequate discussion of the church doctrines so much as it is the sum of observations on essential principles which must obtain in the reunited Church.

The author is admittedly a Free Churchman, but with tolerant and sympathetic outlook upon the whole Church. He is modern in his approach, but conscious of the meaning of tradition to multitudes.

The main contention of the volume is that the Church is a living organism. It is so because it is related to the Living Christ. The secret of that life is through the individual Christian whose fellowship is divine toward Christ and human toward his fellows. The union is, therefore, not institutional but personal and spiritual. Christ is the Creative Fact of the Church.

The Church manifests itself unequally and with variety. It may have unchallenged unity in one period, together with strict observance of the Sacraments, and be grossly material, while in another period it may be divided, holding the Sacraments lightly, but be deeply spiritual. Evidently the facts are not yet all in or are not manifested simultaneously. At least, for the present, there is a trusteeship of the varied experience with God.

The ministry is likewise seen as the creation of Christ's call to men's hearts rather than the product of an institution. Such men are not responsible to the Church but to Christ. St. Paul remains for all time the illustration of spiritual ordination to the ministry independent of human interference. The Church may properly recognize such call but may not inhibit it.

Even the Bible is seen as the Word rather than words and is more than a "reference book of doctrine." It is the living record of God's transactions with the consciences of men.

The expression of the Church, therefore, is the Living Christ brooding over all of life. Worship and character are precedent to service. The unworldly assessment of possessions and humane sympathy remain its most compelling testimonies.

This volume should make a most worthwhile contribution to the consummation of the united Church toward which the passion of Christ leads on.

FINIS S. IDLEMAN.

ONE GENERATION TO ANOTHER. By Harris Elliott Kirk, D.D., Minister of the Franklyn Street Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, and Author of *The Consuming Fire*, etc. (Revell.) Recognizing the Old Testament as a part of the revelation of Jesus Christ, Dr. Kirk regards it as one of the most fascinating books in the world. He goes so far as to raise the question whether it is hazardous to say that from this point of view it is more interesting than the New Testament. The fifteen sermons are classified under three divisions, as follows: I The Making of a Great Tradition; II The Education of Moses; and III Prophetic Strains of Old Experiences. The sermons are fine instances of the best expository preaching. In them Old Testament characters, scenes, and messages are made to live again with a force and originality that makes the book a very attractive volume of sermons.

TOLERANCE. Two Lectures Addressed to the Students of Several of the Divinity Schools of the Protestant Episcopal Church. By Phillips Brooks. With an Introduction by Nicholas Murray Butler (Dutton). In the midst of the theological clashes of these times, or all times, for that matter, we need to be called to an understanding of tolerance, which is so generally misunderstood even by the educated. Locke's *Letters of Toleration* are as appropriate for these times as they were for 1689. A few years prior Jeremy Taylor's *Liberty of Prophesying* appeared. In the eighteenth century Lessing wrote his *Nathan the Wise*, and John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty* was the voice of the nineteenth century for tolerance. The reappearance of this little book by Phillips Brooks will take its place by the side of these well-known books. He refutes the error that tolerance is based on indifference, uncertainty, or weakness. Instead, it is based on a deep conviction in the love of truth and the love of man. If one loves only truth he may be a persecutor, and much of the persecution of the past may be traced to tolerance of that character; but, if one loves both truth and man, he will not only be sympathetic to man, but will rejoice in the man from whom he differs because he approaches truth from another angle. Tolerance does not mean forgetting differences, but clearly recognizing them and heartily accepting them and using them. There is nothing finer on the nature, history, and hope of tolerance, and the application of those principles in the daily behaviour of toleration. It is a wonderfully attractive and timely message.

PERSONAL RELIGION AND THE LIFE OF DEVOTION. By W. R. Inge, Dean of St. Paul's. With an Introduction by the Lord Bishop of London (Longmans). This is a beautiful book and its beauty is made more impelling because it is the unveiling of a great soul in its bereavement by the passing of a little daughter from the arms of the father "into the presence of the Lord of little children." One lingers in its pages as he does before a

great picture. Out of the vision of the mystic the mind is elevated by prayer to God. The process of faith begins as soon as one sets out to climb. Hope is a part of the new revelation brought into the world by Jesus Christ. Joy is an emotional experience which our heavenly Father has attached to those activities that have to do with inner growth and outer creativeness. By self-consecration the torch is handed to the long succession of runners in the midst of a society that has organized itself apart from God. In our bereavement, which is the sharpest challenge to our trust in God, faith comes by bringing the reality of the eternal world nearer to us.

Each of the eight chapters has great assurances of the faith that comforts, heals, and overcomes in the midst of our cordial human intercourses which are liberations and enchantments of our personalities. These are the channels of revelation, in which personal religion and the life of devotion get their inspiration and growth. The book is a sanctuary of prayer and devotion.

RELIGION AND MORALITY. By Rt. Rev. C. P. Anderson, D.D., Bishop of Chicago (Morehouse). This little book is a straight, plain message to the Church, being five Holy Week addresses. The first is on Religion, being that which "takes us to God"; the second is on Morality, being that which "we bring back" out of our fellowship with God; the third is on Sex Morality, the standard of which may be lifted "through a closer companionship between fathers and sons, and between mothers and daughters"; the fourth is on Sin, which "begins with moral responsibility," tends "to paralyze the will," making one a slave and leaving only one way out, being "the old way of religion, the way of penitence, the way of faith in the inexhaustible love of God"; and the fifth is on Spiritual Power, emphasizing the transforming, constructive, and spiritual power of the Christian religion and that power coming by contact with its Author. Some of its sentences burn like fire. It is a worth while message without ornamentation or dodging.

THE WAY OF JESUS. By Henry T. Hodgkin, M.A., M.B. (Cantab.), Author of *The Christian Revolution*, etc. (Student Christian Movement). Those who have read Dr. Hodgkin's *Christian Revolution* will be eager to read this inquiry into the way of Jesus as applied to human society. It was originally a study for Christian Chinese students, following the conference of the World's Student Christian Federation at Peking. In re-writing it, primarily for British students, it is given to the Christian students of the world, pressing the question Is Jesus Christ the leader we need in the world to-day; if so, in what sense is He to be our Leader?

The study sweeps over a wide range of subjects, such as the standard of Jesus Christ, the prevailing standards in the present social order, free-

dom and fellowship, justice and love, ambition and service, the means and the end, creative love in action—the individual and the group,—the next step, and the contributions of youth, closing with an appendix and a list of books suggested for further reading. It is arranged for studies covering ten weeks with seven studies for each week and notes and questions at the close of each week's study.

The method of the study is attractive. Instead of attempting to settle all the social problems of these times, Dr. Hodgkin frankly asks in each study those questions that are in the minds of students of social problems, presents Jesus Christ and leaves the student to find his answer. The method compels thinking. It is a fearless approach to the social problems, showing God as Father and ourselves as children of the Father in the great family of God, partaking of his nature because we are his children and making the family of God a reality in human society. It speaks with faith and assurance, refuses to be swept aside by a hostile world, and insists on maintaining the Christian revolution, which will bring the world to the standard of Jesus Christ. It is a fine word for these times of confusion and uncertainty.

THE GOD OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS. By Arthur Cushman McGiffert (Scribner's). With remarkable clarity and winsome calmness Dr. McGiffert shows in these Yale Divinity School lectures that the God of Jesus was the God of the Jews, with the emphasis upon moral reformation and moral judgment. His teaching of God lay not in its novelty, for it was wholly Jewish, but rather "in the insight and unerring instinct with which He made his own the best in the thought of his countrymen." He drew particularly from Deuteronomy, the Psalms, and Isaiah. Paul advanced upon Jesus in the use of the terms "Father" and "holy" and in extending the category of deity to include Christ Himself—not as God, but as the Son of God, which term Dr. McGiffert maintains, as applied to Jesus may have originated with Paul, under whom Christianity became ethicized through and through.

Paul thought of God as a personal being—creator and ruler of the world and Father of Christ and of Christians—but also as a spiritual substance, which can be shared by more than one, so that, though the Father and Son are two, they have the same Divine nature. John not only believed in the divinity of Jesus, but spoke of Him as God, as did Ignatius, Irenæus, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, and many Gentile Christians who knew no other God but Jesus. For the first time, apparently, since Paul and the early Christians of Jewish antecedents, Augustine maintained that God, and not Christ, was the primary object of devotion. Various influences gave the primary place of worship to Jesus and a secondary place, if any place at all, to the God whom Jesus and Paul worshiped, but after long and difficult

processes, the God of the Jews became permanently the God of the Christians—creator, ruler, and judge. There is a trenchant power in the author's analyses. It is a powerful book with a compelling challenge.

THE DISCIPLES. An Interpretation. By B. A. Abbott, Editor of *The Christian-Evangelist* (Christian Board of Publication). It is always interesting to delve into the origin and purpose of any one of the religious parties in Christendom. They have a similarity in origin and purpose. This book is a conservative interpretation of the communion known as Disciples, whose founders were Thomas and Alexander Campbell, Barton W. Stone, and others of little more than a hundred years ago. The first chapter is a history of their Presbyterian origin into a membership of nearly a million and a half. Alexander Campbell, who was their recognized leader, proposed "faith in Jesus Christ as the doctrinal basis of union, the New Testament as the only authoritative interpretation of the mind of Christ, and the life, the practices, the spirit, and the fruits of the Apostolic Church as the norm of methods and ideals."

In his accustomed lucidity of style, Dr. Abbott analyzes the proposal of the Disciples for the union of all God's people, presenting their position on the Bible, the Church, the ordinances, the Lord's Day, church membership, how the Disciples work among themselves and with others, closing with a chapter on the supreme purpose of Jesus Christ. As editor, author, pastor, and teacher, Dr. Abbott has made a careful study of the attitude and life of the Disciples and this book is the result of that study, which will doubtless have an esteemed place in the denominational literature of the Disciples.

RELIGIONISMS AND CHRISTIANITY. By Prof. W. I. T. Hoover, LL.D., Dean and Professor of Philosophy, La Verne College (Stratford). In these days when all sorts of religious interpreters are clamoring to be heard, Dr. Hoover has rendered a real service in combining their voices in a single volume and answering their claims. He discusses Spiritism, Theosophy, Swedenborgianism, Russellism, Dowieism, Eddyism, Mormonism, and Bahaism. Severely dissenting from all of these, with their history and interpretation, he devotes the last four chapters, which are the best in the book, to the claims of Christ, as applied to modern thought and modern life. His conception of the religion of the future includes the results of science and the placing of man in the center of Christian theology.

PRAYER AS A FORCE. By A. Maude Royden (Putnam's). Whatever Miss Royden says attracts attention because of her sane and brilliant way of thinking. She is foremost among the women preachers of these times. Some might not class her among the orthodox in the narrow use of that term, but she is not afraid to think and, in her thinking, she reveals the

reality of her experience with God. This little book on prayer is composed of addresses delivered on Sunday evenings at the Kensington Town Hall and the Eccleston Guildhouse. Their chief value is that, to Miss Royden, prayer is as real and living a force in the world to-day as any of the great forces revealed by natural science. She answers many questions for those who doubt the efficacy of prayer. Every chapter is full of practical sanity and her earnest words are witnesses of her trustfulness in God. No one with any desire for prayer can read this book without having awakened in him a desire to pray more.

FAITH AND HEALTH. By Charles Reynolds Brown, Dean of the Divinity School, Yale University (Crowell). This book first appeared about ten years ago, when it was eagerly read. Two-thirds of it has been rewritten; the remainder has been revised and enlarged, being brought up to these times, including the method of Coué. It discusses the healing miracles of Christ, modern faith cures, profit and loss in Christian Science, the Emmanuel movement, the method of Coué, the healing power of suggestion, the gospel of good health, and the Church and disease. It would be difficult to find a book in which more common sense is crowded than in this volume. Such a chapter as "The Gospel of Good Health" ought to be put in tract form and distributed from the door of every church in the country. The whole book is a remarkably fine contribution, as we would expect from Dr. Brown, in finding the pathway of sanity in the midst of so much confusion regarding physical health.

SOCIAL LIFE AND THE CROWD. By J. Lionel Tayler, M. R. C. S., L. R. C. P., London University Extension Lecturer on Biology and Sociology (Small, Maynard & Company). This is a fair criticism of the political theory of democracy, which is being triumphantly voiced in many parts of the world as the one and only principle of social progress; nevertheless many among the democratic leaders view the activities and trends of democracy with concern. Aristocracy and democracy need not be rival political alternatives, but there is a possibility of some kind of combination of these ideals—neither aristocratic nor democratic, but geneocratic, which, the author maintains, is what almost all past governments have been, being stronger than either aristocratic or democratic forms. The new structure must have its foundation laid in Social Psychology and Crowd Studies. The true social reformer must have the ability to see through incidental evils the deeper and lasting realities of human goodness. It furnishes a fine outlook.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the Work of Thomas Campbell, a Presbyterian Minister, of Washington, Pa., 1809; present organization, 1910. President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences, and distribution of irenic literature—"till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for, and sermons on, Christian Unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857. President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican Communion.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering, and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910. President, Rev. Nehemiah Boynton; Secretary, Rev. W. C. Emhardt, Newtown, Bucks Co., Pa. For the promotion of Christian Unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMAN'S UNION, 1898. President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Secretary, Rev. John H. Bentley, Souldern Rectory, Banbury, England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian Communion.

CONTINUATION COMMITTEE OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910. Chairman, Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent; Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918. Ad Interim Committee—Chairman, Rev. Joseph A. Vance, Detroit, Mich.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908. President, Dr. Robert E. Speer; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the co-operation of the various Protestant Communion in service, rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911. Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Colue Bridge House, Rickmansworth, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895. President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford; Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and co-operation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK, 1920. Chairmen, Archbishop of Upsala, Archbishop of Canterbury, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Rev. A. J. Brown; Secretary, Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For union of the Churches in common, practical work, and to insist that the principles of the Gospel be applied to the solution of contemporary social and international problems.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914. Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury; Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1; Chairman, American Council, Rev. William P. Merrill; General Secretary, Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the Churches and the avoidance of war.

WORLD'S EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE, 1846; Incorporated 1912. Chairman, Sir Andrew Wingate; Hon. Secretary, Rev. R. C. Gillie; General Secretary, Henry Martyn Gooch, 19 Russell Sqr., London, W. C. 1. To enable Christians of British and foreign nations to realize in themselves, and to manifest to others, that living and essential union which binds together all believers in the fellowship of Christ. Universal Week of prayer organized by the Alliance since 1846.

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

The Editor's Notes:

Is There Equality Among Christians? — Theological and Racial Equality —
Toward Equality

The Distinctive Ideals of the Life of Jesus . . . GEORGE W. RICHARDS

Loyalty to Christ JEROME DAVIS

An Adventure in Good-Will HOMER W. CARPENTER

How to Realize "Ut Unim Sint" HARALD OSTENFELD

The Catholic and Slav Orthodox Unionistic Congress . MATTHEW SPINKA

Aspects of Christian Unity in Near-East Relief . . . JOHN RALPH VORIS

What People and Papers are Saying About Unity

Unity and Truth—Whence Come Denominations?—Denominational Competi-
tion in Home Mission Fields—A United Church Required—The Problem of
Unity—Unity in the Crucible—The Mürren Conference on Unity—Longing
for Christian Unity

Letters to the Editor

In Hearty Agreement With Dr. Guth's Recent Article, etc.

Book Reviews

Problems of Church Unity—Aspects of Reunion—Christian Ways of Salva-
tion—International Christian Movements, etc.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

504 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York

Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

W. & A. Gifford, Ltd., 20 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4; 100, Princes Street, Edinburgh

CONTENTS

JANUARY, 1925

Vol. XIV.

No. 3

<i>THE EDITOR'S NOTES</i>	229
<i>THE DISTINCTIVE IDEALS OF THE LIFE OF JESUS</i>GEORGE W. RICHARDS	233
<i>LOYALTY TO CHRIST</i>JEROME DAVIS	245
<i>AN ADVENTURE IN GOOD- WILL</i>HOMER W. CARPENTER	256
<i>HOW TO REALIZE "UT UNUM SINT"</i>HARALD OSTENFELD	264
<i>THE CATHOLIC AND SLAV ORTHODOX UNIONISTIC CONGRESS</i>MATTHEW SPINKA	267
<i>ASPECTS OF CHRISTIAN UNITY IN NEAR EAST RELIEF</i>JOHN RALPH VORIS	273
<i>WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY</i>	290
<i>LETTERS TO THE EDITOR</i>	313
<i>BOOK REVIEWS</i>	324

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is seventy-five cents a single copy, or two dollars and fifty cents a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion contributing annually \$5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive two copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copy to some designated person or institution.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md.

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ, and that the Unity of his disciples is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and, equally free, to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the Reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ—growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in his own words,—“By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another.”

The Christian Union Quarterly

Edited by Peter Ainslie, D. D.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

- DR. HAMILCAR ALIVISATOS,
Athens, Greece.
- BISHOP CHARLES P. ANDERSON,
Chicago, Ill.
- REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.
- BISHOP CHARLES H. BRENT,
Buffalo, N. Y.
- DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn.
- PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N. Y.
- REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.
- BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR.,
Washington, D. C.
- REV. RUSSELL CECIL, D.D.,
Richmond, Va.
- REV. S. D. CHOWN, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada.
- DR. FRANCIS E. CLARK,
Boston, Mass.
- DR. J. A. CRAMER,
Utrecht, Holland.
- PROF. DR. ADOLF DEISSMANN,
Berlin, Germany.
- ARCHBISHOP F. H. DU VERNET,
Prince Rupert, B. C.
- REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky
- DEAN H. E. W. FOSBROKE,
New York, N. Y.
- DEAN W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill.
- PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England.
- MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor.
- PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C.
- DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Shanghai, China.
- REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.
- DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England.
- PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa.
- PROF. CHARLES FOSTER KENT,
New Haven, Conn.
- BISHOP EDWIN S. LINES,
Newark, N. J.
- DR. FREDERICK LYNCH,
New York, N. Y.
- VERY REV. J. A. M'CLYMONT, D.D.,
Edinburgh, Scotland.
- PROF. SAMUEL MCCOMB,
Cambridge, Mass.
- BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL,
Pittsburgh, Pa.
- BISHOP WILLIAM F. MCDOWELL,
Washington, D. C.
- THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER,
Manchester, England.
- REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.
- DR. WILFRED MONOD,
Paris, France.
- DR. JOHN R. MOTT,
New York, N. Y.
- BISHOP HARALD OSTENFELD,
Copenhagen, Denmark.
- BISHOP EDWARD L. PARSONS,
San Francisco, Calif.
- PROF. ARTHUR S. PEAKE,
Manchester, England.
- PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa.
- PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England.
- REV. J. H. SHAKESPEARE, D.D.,
London, England.
- PASTOR DR. FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND-
SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany.
- REV. NEWMAN SMYTH, D.D.,
New Haven, Conn.
- DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N. Y.
- THE ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA,
Upsala, Sweden.
- DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J.
- REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich.
- BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio.
- BISHOP LUTHER B. WILSON,
New York, N. Y.

I HAVE MAINTAINED, AND I MAINTAIN, THAT NO UNITY WORTH HAVING CAN BE GOT BY SURRENDER. I AM SURE WE CATHOLICS DO NOT MEAN TO GIVE UP OUR FAITH, AND I SPEAK FOR MYSELF WHEN I EXPRESS MY SINCERE HOPE THAT THE NON-CONFORMISTS WILL NOT GIVE UP THEIRS. I HAVE MAINTAINED, AND I MAINTAIN STILL, THAT GOD IS LEADING BOTH OF US FORWARD AND NOT BACKWARD. I REPEAT, I HAVE NO IDEA OF SURRENDERING, AND I DO NOT WANT ANYONE ELSE TO SURRENDER, ANY CONVICTION.

—HERBERT KELLY.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

JANUARY, 1925

THE EDITOR'S NOTES

Is There Equality Among Christians?

THERE is a denominational inequality among Christians as definitely marked as inequality among races and in society. Perhaps it has never been so clearly observed as in recent times. Because it is here a multitude of questions arise—What produced it? Ought it to continue? Can it be changed? Is it Christian? If it can be regulated, how ought it to be done? If it is to be abolished, by what method can it be done? Does Christianity offer any guidance for its solution? If so, are we prepared to be really Christian in our approach to the problem?

Society is built upon the basis of inequality. The evidence of that fact is seen in the distinct classes that encircle the globe and the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of one in a lower class passing up to the first class. The same condition exists racially and the clash of colour around the world is the evidence of the fact. It is the subject of discussion in New York, London, Calcutta, Tokyo, Los Angeles, Atlanta, and a thousand other cities. Race consciousness bulks large in these times. Racial unity, racial self-determination, and racial equality are ideas that will never perish. Our danger lies in the methods that find their way in the processes of development.

There is, likewise, a denominational inequality due largely to our arrogance in our theological interpretations. How far must we go in upholding these evidences of inequality? is one of the live questions of this day with people of learning and piety on both sides. Set up such dates as 800, or 1500, or 1700, or as late as 1900, by the side of this year of 1925; and, if the count is in centuries, the contrast is wonderfully striking; even the last two decades reveal a marvelous development. The

processes of development in these times evince a rapidity that was entirely unknown centuries ago. Then it was a group thinking together and, out of a group thinking together, Christian denominations were developed; now a member of one of these denominations will, perhaps, change in his own thinking in a single decade more rapidly from his denominational traditions than the group changed from other groups in a century. There are multitudes of instances of this character.

Changes rarely come easily. Usually their histories are written in sorrow; but sorrow touches such depths in the soul as to give a radiant colour to the coming day, thereby helping others to find a bigger, fairer, and truer world. Established customs do not yield readily to voices calling for a better way. It is due neither to stupidity nor impiety. Nature opposes hurry. A finely worded sentence from Isaiah comes echoing through the centuries: "He that believeth shall not make haste." Both in the natural and the spiritual are the processes for growth—getting away from the fictitious and artificial, which have made slaves of many of us, and getting hold of reality and truth, which furnishes a road to freedom, fraternity, and equality. The reversal of this order is temperamental, and need not be discussed here, but the possession of these are fundamental in spiritual religion.

Theological and Racial Equality

On a railroad trip of a few hours I had hardly taken my seat in the dining car when a well-dressed white woman arose indignantly from the table because a Negro woman, equally well-dressed, was given a seat opposite her. The incident furnished a theme for lively discussion with advocates all the way from extreme inequality to cordial equality between the races.

When I returned to my seat in the Pullman, a group of good natured business men were continuing the discussion, having found a humorous side to the incident, which had opened a pathway leading to denominational inequality. To one who has never traversed such a path it might appear at first thought to have not the slightest analogy, but the analogy was very

striking. One told of an Episcopalian leaving a certain Episcopal church because the rector invited a Methodist minister to preach in the Episcopal pulpit. Another told of a Baptist leaving a certain Baptist church because that church allowed other than a Baptist to partake of their Communion. Another told of a Disciple leaving a certain Disciple church because that church received into its membership a Presbyterian without rebaptizing him. It was a healthy turn from a tense discussion over racial inequality into another field of inequality where these laymen were not sensitive. Had a group of theologians been present, persons of conservative and liberal attitudes, the discussion would have been equally as tense as when those in the dining car were discussing racial inequality.

The fact must be faced that, whether it is a matter of society, or race, or Christian denominations, it is practically the same issue. It is the feeling of superiority—I have done something to make me better than you are, or I possess that which makes me better than you are, or simply a better-than-thou attitude. One cannot possibly think of Jesus as taking any of these attitudes in the midst of his brethren. Did his washing his disciples' feet have any significance? This is a field in which Christianity has got to function at whatever cost. It is not that these people are not Christian; they are, but it is a mild form of Christianity that is too far removed from the Christ to be any sort of factor in changing the attitude of the world. Our present day need is to produce a Christianity that is near enough to the Christ that a non-Christian can easily observe that peculiar equality which Jesus sets up for the world's standard.

Toward Equality

That we are moving in the direction of that standard is heartening. The processes of development are breaking the crusts of pagan isolation and inequality. These inevitable laws are making way for the soul's freedom and fraternity. That there are uncompromising advocates for denominational equality is the hope of the world. It is the natural instinct of the

soul urged onward by Christian faith. Can the dream of denominational equality find a practical basis of operation in this day, or must we wait for another day?

Too many voices for a more equitable adjustment have been released in these days to think of turning a deaf ear to their pleadings. Some are the voices of agony, crying out of long suppression, as in that of the coloured races from the saintly mystic, Mahatma Gandhi, to the brilliant Burghardt Du Bois, who stands out defiantly for the right of the Negro to a chance. There are a multitude of voices calling for the abolition of inequality among Christian denominations. Some day in this field will arise a Gandhi and a Du Bois, whose voices will awaken a sleeping Church to its task. It will come as sure as buttercups bloom in the spring.

One almost apologizes for raising such questions as these lines provoke. Are not all God's children equal before Him? The things that bulk most largely to-day as factors in inequality are not the things that hold places of priority in Christian living. Take any one of them and they are out of place in any attempt of a study of the fruit of the Spirit. They are less costly, less spiritual, less real. I was profoundly impressed recently with this in making the rounds of the penitentiary. Every denomination was represented there theologically. Several of the prisoners bore that air of superiority because of their affiliation with certain communions. But the fruit of Christianity—where was it? The same question may be asked of the Church at large. The fruit is in love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, and self-control. In the atmosphere of these virtues no one can think himself better than another. It is the practicing of these virtues that makes Christian equality a universal possibility. The test of Christianity is in its fruit—not in its creeds nor theological systems. Our tyranny and isolation have furnished foundation for false standards. The Church *must* become Christian else there can be no permanent unity. The Church *will* become Christian because Christ is in us—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, and Protestant—the hope of glory.

PETER AINSLIE.

THE DISTINCTIVE IDEALS OF THE LIFE OF JESUS

BY GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D., LL.D.

President of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the U. S.,
Lancaster, Pa.

IN view of the distinction which is now generally made between the transient and the eternal in Christianity, we naturally ask what was the permanent, the spaceless, and timeless, blessing which Jesus brought to men? Surely it was not a new doctrine, or a new ritual, or a new law. For Christianity is more than these; and Jesus was greater than Moses, Plato, or Cæsar. He was more than a prophet or the hero of a Messianic drama with its spectacular and catastrophic features. True, He may have won his first followers because of the apocalyptic form of his message, but He held captive the ages because of the character of his life. His *life* was the universal and the eternal element in Jesus, equally adapted to all men, regardless of colour, creed, or culture. Jesusism, if we may so call it, was more than Messianism, Logism, or Catholicism. These were garments woven from the stuff of the times for the Nazarene in whom pulsed the spirit of eternal life. Instead of dogma, He gave men disposition; instead of ritual, righteousness; and instead of law, love. With his disposition, his righteousness, his love, men must always work out their own Christianity in the intellectual and moral forms of their age and in answer to their needs. He gave men the "right to become children of God." For Christianity is Christ-like only when it is a life-giving spirit, constantly transforming men after its own kind. Christ's "deepest equation for 'salvation' is 'life'—not a state, but an energy, working now as a dynamic in the world of men, and finding its triumph in a universe remade." It loses its original purpose and quality when it ceases to be creative power in men and becomes a mere doctrinal and ecclesiastical tradition.

The great thing and the only thing great in Jesus was the life He lived, and his life was unique and unparalleled fellowship with the three ultimate realities of the universe—God, man, and the world. Jesus Himself may not have defined the mystery of his person in these terms, nor is it so taught in schematic form in the New Testament. For Jesus did not live his life according to a clearly formulated theory but in the enthusiasm of passionate convictions rooted in vital fellowship with God and man. Through his word and deed, through his effect upon his fellows, and through the evident sense of dignity and authority which He had, one can see the threefold relationship as the background of his life. Paulsen, in his *Ethics*, says of “the transmundane eternal life”: “It creates a new will, which strives after holiness and perfection, as the Father in heaven is perfect; it creates a new feeling of self-reliance, the feeling that we are children of God; it creates a new form of human intercourse, the community united in brotherly love; lastly, it creates a new relation to the earth and its goods; the Christian is the master of all things, capable of enjoying all innocent pleasures, and yet firmly attached to none.”

1. The distinctive thing in the life of Jesus, that which made him man in God and God in man, was his *attitude* and *disposition* toward God. “The Christian life finds its chief task, not in its relation to the world, but in its relation to God, the perfect Spirit; fellowship with God becomes the center of all activity and the source of all happiness.” He did not profess to reveal a new God, but He made known the old God in a new way. The God of Jesus is the God of the Old Testament. The newness of his revelation was the result of the uniqueness of his relation to Him. “What new thing, then,” asks Irenæus, “did the Lord bring in coming? Know that He brought all newness in bringing Himself.” That his relation to God was unmatched by men before or since, is generally conceded. How He entered into such relation is the perpetual and perhaps insoluble mystery of his person.

Many views about God He held in common with his kinsmen—God’s unity, omnipotence, omniscience, holiness, right-

eousness, even his kingship and fatherhood. But his relation to God and his fellowship with Him, neither Jew nor Gentile ever attained. He lived in communion with God, not as with force or fate or as with a despot or a master, but as a son with a father.

The consciousness of Divine sonship, of a unique and extraordinary relation to God, is the mainspring of his life. It explains the quality of his character and the power of his Gospel. One hears it in the first recorded words spoken by the boy in the temple—"Know ye not that I must be about the things of my Father?" and in the last word from the cross—"Father into thy hands I commend my spirit." His meat and drink was to do the will of Him that sent Him. He prayed to his Father. The Kingdom He proclaimed was the Kingdom of his Father—*the rule of holy love in the universe of matter and of mind*. His vision of the Father gave Jesus power to do and to die. It was the secret of his patience and his courage, the spring of hope and comfort, the inspiration of faith and love, the inexhaustible well of joyous, buoyant optimism in the face of a callous and irresponsive world. For where God rules, men have all things. Bound up with the Kingdom of the Father is every conceivable blessing. Suffering and sorrow must cease, salvation and the fulness of life come, corroding care and distressing fears are put to flight.

He therefore devotes Himself unconditionally and exclusively to the Kingdom of God, for that alone is the highest good. His primary purpose was to train men for the Kingdom "by making them sharers in his own thought of God." The blessings of body, family, property, and state, must be renounced, if need be, for the Kingdom; and only when the Kingdom has come will these things have value. On this account Jesus takes no interest in questions of society, politics, philosophy, art, and culture generally. Not that He despised them or was indifferent to them, but because He knew that when the Kingdom came, all else would follow. At a time when civilization had lost its power of re-creation or renewal, the question of reconciliation was the supreme issue. All others were sec-

ondary and even a hindrance, if they stood in the way of the one thing needful.

Jesus responded to his Father not in the spirit of fear, of defiance, of indifference, or of servile obedience. He had the disposition of filial reverence, of faith, hope, and love. He revered the Lord of heaven and earth, the King and Judge of men. He trusted in providence which cares for lily and sparrow, for sheep and men. He believed in unbounded love which seeks the lost, saves the sinner, and sanctifies the saved. He hoped in omnipotent goodness which overcomes demons and death and gives life and immortality. He served in love, doing his Father's will and saving his fellowmen. He lived in God and for God. Yet He was not a mystic merely enjoying God in solitude, not a philosopher merely thinking about God, not an ascetic merely preparing for the beatific vision. His fellowship with the Father compelled Him to action. "My Father worketh hitherto and I work." He worshiped God through filial obedience and fraternal service, not through sacrifices, sacraments, countless ascetic ordinances, or mystic contemplation.

2. The attitude and disposition of Jesus toward men corresponded to his attitude and disposition toward God. The two relations are united in the supreme command: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." His filial piety became fraternal piety.

While "Jesus was no social reformer," there was in his life and gospel a dynamic which will transform all social relations. The tendency of his gospel to fellowship and brotherhood was not a mere incident of it but the essence of it. He aimed to establish a community among men as wide as life itself and as deep as human need. Some one said his purpose was "to transform the socialism which rests on the basis of conflicting interests into the socialism which rests on the consciousness of a spiritual unity." Two simple and axiomatic principles pervade the doctrine and deed of Jesus, the infinite value of personality, and the unity of humanity whose corollaries are reverence for personality and service of humanity. These are the fountal springs of social progress and betterment in all ages. To state

the opposite is to make them stand out in bold relief, contempt for personality, and refusal to accept the social obligations of humanity.

Before and since his coming, men considered their fellows as strangers, enemies, slaves, subjects. They ignored them, hated them, enthralled them, and exploited them. Jesus saw men in the light of God, under the form of eternity. He knew them as children of God capable of friendship and companionship with the Father. He discerned the infinite worth of the human soul, the divinity latent in man "a God though in the germ." This estimate of man alone enabled Him to set for him so high a standard of life: "Be ye perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect." The infinite worth which the Christian life gives men makes them of greater value to one another. The new valuation of the soul enabled Jesus to make love the deepest motive and God the highest aim of action for men.

He treated man as a brother and abolished traditional and artificial distinctions between men. "Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and my mother." Family, racial, social, and ceremonial divisions are superseded by unity of life and action in God. Common fatherhood naturally leads to universal brotherhood. Here is the world-wide and time-long appeal of his message.

Controlled by these convictions Jesus cried in Nazareth: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He anointed Me to preach the Gospel to the poor; He hath sent Me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised." He proves his Messiahship to John by the fact "that the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them." The aspiration of his life is the welfare of man through the power and rule of God. His gospel, therefore, was a social message proclaiming solidarity and fraternity in favour of the poor.

He had a special care for the despised and rejected of men. His own fate taught Him sympathy for his kind. He came to

seek the lost, to heal the sick, to call sinners to repentance. He was the friend of publicans and sinners, and the common people heard Him gladly. He loved his enemies, blessed them that cursed Him, did good to them that hated Him, and prayed for them that despitefully used Him. He forgave the offender seventy times seven. The compassion of the Father is reflected in his treatment of men. He had compassion on the multitude,—the element in Jesus' life so offensive to Nietzsche—and declared that "the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many."

Professor Harnack says: "There can be no doubt, therefore, that if Jesus were with us to-day He would side with those who are making great efforts to relieve the hard lot of the poor and procure them better conditions of life." Yet Jesus had no definite social or economic programme. Vainly have men in the different periods of Christianity sought for it in the Gospel. While it contains clear teaching in reference to temporal things, such doctrine cannot be considered as economic law for the nations or the churches.

Here is the point of difference or line of demarcation between the kingdoms of the world and the Kingdom of God. "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so; but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve." Two ideals for which the world contended in the trenches of Flanders and of France.

In all his ministry Jesus was not concerned about developing the body or the mind of men for the making of a living and the support of the state. Neither the gymnasium nor the school came within the scope of his vision. He was primarily concerned about holiness and not about culture. Of efficient parentage or citizenship in the modern sense He had no thought. His aim was to lead men to God and to have them live in fellowship with Him. The blessings of the Kingdom were purely spiritual—deliverance from the ills of body and soul which are bound up with the satanic reign on earth, filial fellowship with the

Father, assurance of Divine providence and pardon, the comfort that comes from the hearing of prayer, the satisfaction of the desire for righteousness, and the joy that attends a vision of God. All these things were the elements of eternal life. This, Jesus knew full well, was given men through Him; for He said: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." He was Himself the Bridegroom. He could "forgive sin." He was "the way, the truth, and the life." For this reason He was not merely the servant of men but also their Lord. He was more than saint; He was Saviour. Notwithstanding his saviourhood, his sainthood is the ideal in flesh and blood which men may never quite attain, and yet are to seek forever.

3. Jesus' attitude toward the world of *things* in distinction from *persons* was doubtless determined by the spontaneous impulse of his consciousness of God, rather than by deliberation and argument. The term "world" includes the physical universe, so much greater for us than it was for Jesus, and the *things* which enter into the making of human life, such as food and drink, work and play, business and politics, school and state, literature and art—all that belongs to the intricate fabric of ancient or modern civilization and culture. The universe He considered the work of God. The Father was Lord of heaven and earth. Part of it was under the power of demons; yet He did not regard it as hopelessly evil. His disciples were told to have no fear because God is supreme and has given them power over demons. The will of God will be done on earth as it is done in heaven. It is a universe, therefore, which is friendly and in which we can trust, a mirror of God's power and love. Through its operations are realized the designs of holy love which God has for men. The material and temporal is not degraded to an illusive appearance as in the religions of India which seek to penetrate beyond a world of illusion to one of eternal verities. The transient is a parable of the eternal. "As the work of omnipotent goodness, the world cannot be other than perfect, perfect not only in the sense that under given conditions the highest possible has been reached, out of given

materials the best possible produced, but perfect in the strict sense of realizing all the demands of reason. We may have faith . . . that the omnipotent love is forming the whole world into the Kingdom of God."

In his disposition toward things He was neither ascetic nor libertine; He neither abhorred the world nor indulged it. If He shared the other-worldliness of his time, it was motivated differently from that of the pagan Greeks or Romans, who were world-weary and disgusted with the shallowness and hollowness of life as they found it. Jesus longed for the other world because He appreciated the riches of life in God, the treasures of the heavenly Kingdom. John came neither eating nor drinking. The Son of man came eating and drinking. He was master of things; He had perfect self-control and complete freedom from the bondage of things. Self-mastery and freedom were rooted in his unconditional consecration to God and his absolute devotion to spiritual ideals, and ideals themselves found their worth in the glory of God and the welfare of men. Whatever promoted these, Jesus would encourage; whatever hindered these, Jesus would denounce. Against three things He warned men; not to flee from them but to conquer them,—mammon, anxious care, selfishness. These are to be subdued by faith and love. We have not a word from Him on the dignity of work, the necessity of government, the value of education, the reform of the social order, and the maintenance of the arts of civilization.

Euken says: "The immediate expectation of the Kingdom of God made Jesus indifferent to all these questions of mere civilization and of the social order; hence, on these matters neither sanction nor counsel can be expected from Him. This separates Him definitely from those to whom the development of civilization is the chief substance and the sole aim of human existence; it tends only to attract to Him those who perceive the inadequacy of all mere civilization, and who see in the secure establishing of a new world upon the fundamental relation of man to the Infinite and Eternal the only positive salvation of the world."

He was so completely absorbed with God and men's personal fellowship with God that these things did not seem to engage his attention. Yet it does not necessarily imply that He opposed them. Nothing in his teaching contradicts them. He may have taken them for granted, and assumed that they would take their proper place in human life when the heart was set upon love and mercy, righteousness and truth, the perfection of God. It has been aptly said that "Christ views social phenomena from above, in the light of his religious vocation. He approaches them from within through the development of personality. He judges them in their end, as contributing to the Kingdom of God." As no one before or after Him did, He shows men the danger lurking in the richest results of civilization, scientific, artistic, industrial, political. For they may be a great bane. Man's only security for his personal life against the allurements of culture lies in the power of the Gospel to lift him to a plane above the pomp of the world. This requires an other-worldliness that ends not in flight from the world, but in subordination of the world to the eternal purposes of truth and love.

Underlying his attitude toward the world and his estimate of things, was his shifting of emphasis from the ceremonial to the moral, from the sacramental to the ethical, from deed to disposition. The test of an act or of a character is the condition of the heart. "A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil." The law forbids murder but Jesus forbids the angry thought or word. The law forbids adultery but Jesus forbids the adulterous desire or look. He puts an end to ceremonialism and legalism, the washing of pots and hands, the punctilious observance of a thousand and one man-made traditions which burden men beyond endurance, when He says: "There is nothing from without a man that entering into him can defile the man." He divorced ritual from righteousness forever when He cried in prophetic words: "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice."

Jesus not merely fulfilled, but advanced far beyond, the

law and the prophets. Sir John Seeley says: "No one who has felt, however feebly, the Christian enthusiasm could fail to find even in Deuteronomy and Isaiah something narrow, antiquated, and insufficient for his needs." In the paragraph following this statement the author defines the addition made to morality by Jesus, as follows: "It has been already shown that Christ raised the feeling of humanity from being a feeble restraining power to be an inspiring passion. The Christian moral reformation may indeed be summed up in this—humanity changed from a restraint to a motive. We shall be prepared, therefore, to find that while earlier moralities had dealt chiefly in prohibitions, Christianity deals in positive commands, and precisely this is the case, precisely this difference made the Old Testament seem antiquated to the first Christians. They had passed from a region of passive into a region of active morality. The old legal formula began 'thou shalt not'; the new begins with 'thou shalt.' The young man who had kept the whole law—that is, who had refrained from a number of actions—is commanded to do something, to sell his goods and feed the poor. Condemnation passed under the Mosaic law upon him who had sinned, who had done something forbidden—the soul that sinneth it shall die;—Christ's condemnation is pronounced upon those who had done no good. 'I was an hungered and ye gave Me no meat.' The sinner whom Christ habitually denounces is he who has done nothing. This character comes repeatedly forward in the parables. It is the priest and Levite who passed by on the other side. It is Dives of whom no ill is recorded except that a beggar lay at his gate full of sores and yet no man gave unto him. It is the servant who hid in a napkin the talent committed to him. It is the unprofitable servant, who has only done what it was his duty to do."

4. The exclusive place of life in God, the absolute sovereignty of the ethical demand, the indissoluble union of religion and morality, the conception of God as a righteous Judge requiring strict obedience and yet with prodigal love forgiving the sinner, the liberation of piety from national and ceremonial ordinances, and its definition as humility, trust, and love for all

men—all this blending in personal character is the purely religious ideal of Jesus which in his age was new and distinctive and which for all ages is normative and exemplary. “The impression of perfection which the Master made is entirely unique in the spiritual history of man. No one ever made it before, and no one ever tried to claim it.”

The new viewpoint of Jesus was the Kingdom of God. Whatever in nature or in men helped or hindered the Kingdom, He approved or disapproved. He sought to promote the life of God in men and the life of men in God. In other words, He lived and desired others to live the time-less and the space-less life, the eternal life. His criterion of values was not material or temporal, not utilitarian or hedonistic. It was spiritual and ethical and had for its end the making of personality—a quality of life such as He lived. In viewpoint and in disposition He differed from the materialist, the egoist, the philosopher, the artist, the statesman, the churchman, the labourer, the capitalist. Each of these views men and things from a different angle and measures their value by the extent in which they serve his purposes. The egoist seeks his personal advantage, the philosopher the unifying principle of the universe, the artist the idea of the beautiful, the statesman the prosperity of the state, the ecclesiastic the welfare of the Church, capitalist and labourer each his own aggrandizement. Jesus lived wholly and only for the reign of God, of holy love, in human life.

As the towering peak rises from solid earth, so He lifts his head majestically toward the heavens until it is lost in clouds. In unparalleled grandeur He stands against the background of the unknown before the gaze of an admiring and adoring world. He is man and yet more than man. None will ever be his equal and yet all may become like Him. He will forever be worshiped and yet forever be a brother. This is the paradox of his person—Lord yet friend, Saviour yet brother, God yet man.

To give men the spirit of sonship, brotherhood, and world-mastery is the mission of Jesus and the task of the Church. For men to live in relation to God, man, and the world, as

Jesus lived, is to transform the individual and society, national and international relations, in a word, to make the kingdoms of the world the Kingdom of the Lord and his Christ. This is to have the abundant life, the eternal life.

The dynamic by which this life is begotten in men is in Jesus, the power of God unto salvation. Even Eucken, speaking not as an evangelist but as a philosopher, says: "There is no hope of reaching the goal by a slow ascent, a gradual accumulation of forces. Rather the re-instatement of right relations to God—upon which everything here depends—must proceed solely from the Deity; and even He cannot affect the restoration by an interference from without, but must descend into the world of conflict, and there break the power of evil, there reveal Himself more completely than before."

Show men Jesus by word and life until they come under the grip of his person and follow Him. While they are on the way with Him, they will be filled with his spirit, enter into the threefold relation in which He lived, and become sons of God, brothers of men, masters of the world. The answer of the human heart to the appeal of the Father through Jesus, a Christ-like God and a God-like Christ, will be a life of faith, hope, love, which overcometh the world and abideth forever.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

PRAYER

Within the hollow of thy hand,
Where stars are millet seed to Thee,
Teach Thou my soul to understand
Why Thou dost love and care for me.

—Charles G. Blanden.

LOYALTY TO CHRIST

BY JEROME DAVIS, PH.D.

Professor in the Department of Social Service, Yale Divinity School,
New Haven, Connecticut

MOST of us like to think of America as the predominating example of a Christian state. We have a feeling that the familiar inscription—"In God We Trust"—is, after all, really indicative of our national attitude and practice. It is well to remind ourselves, however, that in so thinking we may merely be responding to the familiar malady of group egoism. A cold analysis of our society can scarcely affirm that we are practicing the best that social science has to offer, much less that we are Christian. The fact is that we are still confronted with class warfare: strike succeeds strike. We still face deep and bitter racial conflict; we have not yet entirely eliminated the lynching horror. Even today we find ourselves recoiling from the smoke of international strife; the world is still staggering from the effects of the most ruinous and sinful war humanity has ever seen. Sixteen millions are the toll in dead alone. In reality we are now living in a world and in a nation that is fundamentally imperfect and unchristian.

The president of the American Bar Association can scarcely be accused of a lack of patriotism; yet, in his recent presidential address, he is reported to have said:

"To be perfectly honest and brutally frank, the fact is that we, the people, are slaves. Slaves to indolence, we are too lazy to vote; slaves to selfish interest, we want everything from the government that other people pay for. We are slaves to faction, slaves to party. We, the people, in our madness to make money, frequently forget our obligation of citizenship, both to the State and to the Nation. . . . We, the people, have sold our birthright as American citizens for a mess of political pottage."

Although we may not entirely agree with this sentiment, we can yet recognize its partial validity. A distinguished judge in New York State condemns us as the most lawless people in the world.

Ex-president Eliot affirms that there are tens of millions of Americans who take no interest in religion. He says: "Their children get no religious instruction whatever at home or abroad and grow to maturity without knowledge of Christianity or any other religion and densely ignorant of the fundamental moralities. . . . No such experiment has ever been tried since time began" as this, bringing up children without any religious instruction or moral training.

Such conditions are a standing challenge and a warning. We must be constantly on our guard because, while our society is still largely pagan in practice, it calls itself Christian. We face here a very real danger. Since we term our society Christian, may we not confuse the Christian label with the pagan practices? Lynching is not Christian because it occurs in a so-called Christian community, education is not necessarily Christian because it is carried on by a school founded by Christian leaders, neither are the practices of our national life Christian merely because they are customary or legal. We must not confuse the law of State with the law of God. In so far as a single legislative enactment protects semi-pagan practices, it involves us all in the wrong. Because our society bases the criterion of success so often on monetary achievement and applauds the man with the large income, is no reason why such an accomplishment is Christian. We should be reminded again of the words of Isaiah: "This people honoureth Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me. But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men."

We have pledged our loyalty to Jesus Christ. We have dedicated our lives in his service. We do not want to "leave the commandment of God, and hold fast the tradition of men." We are not basing our lives on those of manufacturers, politicians, or men of standing. We are trying to pattern our lives on Jesus Christ. It is peculiarly appropriate, therefore, that we should pause to ask ourselves, soberly and conscientiously, what does loyalty to Jesus involve? What are its tests? How can we be sure that, following customary social practices with their Christian label, we are not all unconsciously disloyal to Him?

There is no certain touchstone to Christian morality, but a key principle is loyalty to truth. By his every utterance and practice Jesus magnified the imperative necessity of finding and living the truth. A gospel writer quotes Jesus as saying that his entire purpose was to "bear witness unto the truth."

First of all, then, loyalty to Jesus means loyalty to truth. We should dare to follow truth no matter where it may lead us. But how can we be loyal to truth? What is its talisman? Where can we find it?

Above all else, the key to truth is hard persistent work, constant and painstaking search for fact. We must try every truth, weigh every step. We must challenge every institution, every idea with the Socratic test. Is this true? Is it true to the spirit of Jesus? Is it true for my age? Is it true for me? In fact, is not the exact opposite true? Truth is not necessarily handed a man gratis, nor is it free like the air; it must be achieved. It necessitates mental daring and fearless experimentation with the universe and with one's own life.

We must be on our guard against bias in every form, especially that which twists our own mental processes. We may not be able completely to insulate ourselves against this well-nigh universal weakness, but we can at least recognize its presence. The irresistible force of our social heritage is so great that most men inevitably and unconsciously are moulded by the social pattern of those with whom they are associated. If we are thrown with a particular group of students, our ideas are modified in the process. If we are ministering to a wealthy congregation, we tend to look out on life from their particularistic slant. If we are working in a factory, we may not appreciate the employer's side. The mere fact that we have at some time in the past worked with first one group and then another, does not guarantee complete emancipation from partisanship now. Prejudices are like germs; a complete list of all the varieties has never been made. Some have not yet been isolated. Even healthy minds carry a miscellaneous assortment which break into consciousness when the vitality is lowered. If we are to cultivate a burning thirst for truth, if we are to be sincere and

earnest searchers after it, we must weigh well our own particular weaknesses. Which type of bias, stereotype or complex, is ours? We must always remember that mere intellectual power does not insure our finding truth. Gladstone, in his last campaign for home rule in Ireland, said that, in fifty years of public life, he had found that on every great social issue, the propertied classes, the aristocratic classes, and the educated classes have always been wrong.

Even if one does recognize in some measure his own bias, how can the minister ever hope to unravel the truth amid the tangled debris of social conflict? Social situations are complex; a strike, a lynching, a revolution, a war, are products of a thousand remote strands reaching, perhaps, to the far corners of the earth. No single individual, be he teacher, scientist, or student, can be sure that he has correctly appraised the various factors. Especially is this true of situations surcharged with emotion and deeply affecting community life. Class bias, partisan feeling, the warping effect of the customary, all play their part in colouring our outlook. How difficult it is for an individual to stand out against his own friends, his own home, and the unanimous judgment of the local press. The power of social suggestion is well nigh irresistible. Yet, because of this very social contagion, there is the more danger that all may be wrong. During the recent steel strike, the Pittsburgh press unanimously defended the steel corporation and attacked the strikers as "Unamerican," "Slackers," and "Bolshevists." Yet time has shown that the strikers, far from being disloyal, were probably patriotic and fighting for decent American standards. The corporation has since yielded to an overwhelming public pressure and abandoned the twelve-hour day.

One rigid imperative, if we are ever to achieve a Christian world where truth is to be found, is to hear *all sides*. We must be open-hearted, open-windowed to all truth. The Church must stand firm as a rock in demanding that each side be permitted to present its case fairly and completely. We in America must learn to welcome the man who sincerely says what he believes to be true, even if it differs sharply from our own point of view.

The more violently we oppose the theory of a Lenin or a Trotsky, the more gladly we should welcome their case. It may render immeasurable service by helping us to think through our own belief. The Christian Socialist needs to be heard even in a theological seminary. He may do more to stimulate real thought and genuine advancement for society than the more able champions of things as they are. America could far better afford a generous salary and an open platform to radicals than court the dangers that persecution and suppression bring. Even I. W. W.'s, Socialists, and Communists, if they are sincere, help us to reach the truth about wrong conditions in our social order. In so far as their statements are false, they should be controverted at the bar of public opinion. The forces of Christianity need to find truth through an integration of all that is true in every conflicting view-point instead of through suppression. At present America still fears freedom of speech. Following the war an agent of the American government was sent to speak to the Russians at Duquesne, Pennsylvania, on Abraham Lincoln and American democracy. Because he spoke in Russian he was arrested. It took the national government two days to notify the authorities that they had arrested their own agent. On his release he went to the mayor of the city and asked if he could not deliver his message to the Russians. The mayor replied that he would not let Jesus Christ Himself give an address in Russian in Duquesne. Such an attitude is, of course, the grossest disloyalty to truth.

More recently, in February of last year, President Hopkins of Dartmouth College, in an address at Chicago, stated that he believed that "truth has nothing to fear from error, if truth be untrammelled at all times and if error be denied the sanctity conferred upon it by persecution or concealment." He declared that, if Lenin or Trotsky were available, he would "be glad to have the students hear them and to have them form their judgment as to the dangers or merits of Bolshevism on the basis of direct evidence, rather than through the inconsistent and contradictory pronouncements of anti-Bolshevist propaganda."

The director of the American Defence Society retorted to the effect that "such remarks could well have been inspired in Moscow and are in strict accord with the well-matured plans of those who would overthrow the government by violence."

Because the president of Dartmouth sincerely sought to search for truth, the American Defence Society then sent out letters asking their recipients to bring pressure to bear on the Board of Trustees to oust Mr. Hopkins from the presidency. When an organization of such standing, claiming to be patriotic, and in defence of America, takes such an attitude toward a president of one of our best Eastern colleges, a loyal and patriotic American, we must be constantly on our guard.

Every church, every divinity school, every teacher, and every student must stand ready to welcome all sides of controversial issues and encourage those under fire for expressing the truth as they see it. Such an attitude will bring criticism only in proportion to the number of those who are pagan and disloyal to the truth. Loyalty to Christ means loyalty to truth and this demands freedom for all sides to make their contribution to the finding of it. What a glorious adventure this is, complete surrender of the soul to reality! It means that a man need be afraid of nothing.

In the second place, loyalty to Jesus means an active loyalty to the inner spiritual power house of the universe. The World War and its aftermath have crushingly demonstrated that intellectual progress and material prosperity alone are dangerous instruments. To be saved the world needs social and spiritual forces. But how are we to achieve spiritual power? How can we really come to know God? At the outset this demands the setting of our own house in order. Have we triumphed over personal temptations? Impurity, selfishness, materialism, hypocrisy are like dark clouds in the valleys, shutting us off from the radiant sunshine on the eternal mountain peaks of God's presence. We must never become blinded to the supreme value of prayer.

We are living in a mystery world the mechanism of which

we do not understand. Our little globe is but a speck in a universe of planets. In such a world, man has at length discovered the possibility of radio communication. He does not understand the forces which carry the message through space, but he appreciates the significance of the result. Man can speak to man providing he tunes in his receiver. Similarly man has found in all ages and in all places a value in prayer. He does not yet understand the mechanism, but he thrills before the consciousness of its effect. He can commune with his heavenly Father, providing he brings his own little receiver in tune with the infinite. Comradeship with God has been the dynamic power behind our religious leaders as well as some of the greatest figures in history. St. Paul says, "In Him we live and move and are." St. Augustine cries, "I heard God as the heart heareth." Edward Carpenter exclaims, "The prince of love touched the walls of my hut with his finger from within." George Washington finds prayer indispensable. Abraham Lincoln testifies, "In the darkest days of the Civil War when I knew nowhere else to go, I found strength in prayer."

In a materialistic world, shot through and through with pagan standards, we are in danger of losing contact with the spiritual dynamic forces. Jesus incessantly kept the inner springs of communion with God free by taking time to talk alone with his Father. In the busy scholastic world we may fail to be loyal because we do not pay the price of following Jesus in this great mystical side of life. Safeguards have been established in the daily chapel and in the group prayer meetings. These are admirable, but are not enough. Dare we pledge ourselves to that ancient spiritual stimulus, the morning watch? That is a severe test of loyalty to Jesus. How many of us can at the conclusion of the year report a one hundred per cent attendance at the morning spiritual communion table with our Lord? Loyalty to Jesus is no mere lip service of outward forms. It is time for Christians really to take their faith seriously. Even the morning watch is merely a means to an end, that we practice the presence of God in every detail of life. Have you ever stopped to ask yourselves how far God really

matters in your work? We need actually to feel ourselves within the sanctuary of God all through the day. The practice of his presence must become habitual. We must recognize God in the common round of mysterious trivialities; in the life-giving power of sunshine, in the oxygen of the air we breathe, and in all the daily goodness of life. We must take God into partnership in our workshop, study, and home. Go back over the inspiring religious traditions of Yale and you find it pulsating with men who have felt, and seen, and heard God. Perhaps the greatest revival Yale has ever had, that of 1831, which resulted in the conversion of Horace Bushnell, came through a mere handful of such students. The year 1925 needs spiritual power and the practice of the presence of God as much as that of 1831. In the materialistic world of the twentieth century can we not bear aloft the banner of spiritual power and grace? It is doubtful whether one can have "the mind of Christ" by any other means.

There is a religious hunger in our social order as deep and as vital as any movement in the land. Mr. Heywood Broun, of the *New York World*, says that the interest in religion has been greater during the past three years than in any he has ever known. How do we stand toward this great longing of the masses? Can we interpret God's power to men in a fresh and vital way? Do we have the spiritual dynamic to meet the temptations incident to our work? Is our contagion deep enough and abiding enough to kindle and set on fire the community to whom we minister? Is our religion radiant with a self-consuming love? There are dangers in study and books even in a theological seminary. We may become so encumbered by the multiplicity of little tasks that we grow apart from the practice of God's presence. At a certain Eastern college there are professors and scientists eagerly and persistently engaged in the quest for truth, but so engrossed with that task that the prayer side of life has atrophied. Each year in one of our large seminaries there are men who drop by the roadside because they lose their spiritual power. They have been blighted by a mere intellectualism and busy-ness until materialism breaks through

and obscures their highest loyalties. How can we be loyal to Christ without a deep and abiding sense of the realities of spiritual communion? The practice of the presence of God is one of life's greatest adventures. It is a living dynamic experience rarely to be achieved in a flash. We are called upon to develop and conserve the mystical side of life as completely as the intellectual side. One without the other is crippled.

Finally, if we are to be loyal to Christ in a semi-pagan world, we must *apply* our spiritual dynamic and our truth toward the problem of making a better world. We must have no inner spiritual closet which shuts us off from the world, but an electric current of spiritual power transforming us into dynamos of effectiveness for the common good. Prayer without the right kind of life is a contradiction. Character is caught, not taught. Religious power must be fused into and with a life of invincible good-will. As Mrs. Browning says:—

We must be here to work;
And men who work, can only work for men,
And, not to work in vain, must comprehend
Humanity, and, so, work humanly
And raise men's bodies still by raising souls
As God did first.

We must be doers of the word and not hearers only. In few ages of the world's history have there been more insistent problems for a vital Christianity to face. Confronting us now are the relationships between races, between classes, and between nations. We realize, perhaps as never before, that if we do not eliminate war, war will surely eliminate us. The Christian Church is awakening to this issue. We have not yet begun to face in any vital or constructive way the problem of sex from the Christian standpoint. The Church can no longer stand aloof from controversial questions; either she will face these problems or she will be found wanting. A recent writer, highly applauded by leading educators throughout the country, in a book called *The New Decalogue of Science*, states his belief that the Church has lost in both influence and numbers through its failure to emphasize the social side of religion. He asks whether

every religion of supernaturalism has "led men not to morality but to immorality, especially to social and political immorality"; whether it has not led them to lie down on the job of making this a better world. We do not need to agree with him to yet realize that religion must translate its ethical teaching into the concrete life of the world. Here is one of the most difficult testing points for the modern preacher. After all, as John says, "He that *doeth* good is of God."

But, here again, how are we to apply and live our religious message in a semi-pagan world? How are we to make the connection between sharing our faith and our ideals? Once more we find no certain road, no universal code of conduct. But of one thing we can be sure, it almost certainly involves going against the current. It means venturing forth on new paths, being an experimenter, an innovator, a constructive revolter for the common good. It means fearlessly denouncing wrong and injustice wherever it is found and encouraging sincere crusaders for a better order. God is not the God of things as they are, but of things as they ought to be—"A voice in the desert, if need be." We must turn the calcium-light of God's righteousness upon all the conditions of our day. The world is trying experiments on a colossal scale. The labour movement in England is but one index. Such statesmen as Ramsay McDonald, in their efforts toward peace and justice, call for the support of religious leaders. We need more men, not less, who enter directly into the service of organized labour as A. J. Muste has done. This inevitably calls forth opposition. The sincere follower of the Jesus Way of Life will be persecuted in this age no less than in those that have gone before, although in a different way. It is interesting to remember that Elder Knapp who conducted the revival in Yale in 1841 met with no opposition until he took occasion publicly to attack and expose the frequenters of a notorious gambling-house patronized by the students; then his life was threatened. Would that every "successful" American could annually ponder the words of Dr. Wilfred Grenfell: "Any man who reaches the age of thirty-five or over without having enemies, might just as well be dead; his epitaph

has been written already." Our schools want to train the best ministers in the land, but they want also to train prophets, men of far-sighted vision who will point out the wrongs in our present social order. This is the S.O.S. call of our age, a call for service and sacrifice along new paths.

We who are students of this age must face the problem of property, industry, and the profit motive. What is the wise use of property, not for individual power and enjoyment, but for the common good? Christian principles would seem to demand some form of industrial democracy; yet huge areas of industry still remain with hardly a vestige of it. America cannot permanently remain half democratic and half autocratic. The economic order stands indicted by labourers, by university professors, and by its own leaders. It is organized around the principle of selfishness. Religion brings a challenge to both the old order and to the creators of the new. Are you founding your society on selfishness? There is an irrevocable and eternal moral antagonism between the spirit of religion and the spirit of greed. America still needs the Divine discontent of the prophets. The clarion judgments of Amos should still peal forth—"Ye have sold the righteous for silver and the needy for a pair of shoes." After all, whoever grasps at wealth by using the labour of another living personality, be he man, woman, or child, without reverencing his soul and his equal human worth, is prostituting him. Social injustice means the sterilization of love. The Christian conscience of America must solve these crucial social issues or our nation will witness trouble and bloodshed. Prophetic leaders, men who will *really* take Jesus in earnest, are desperately needed. In deed and in truth the innovator and prophet is often the real conservative, for he is the conservor of great values. During this year let us set as our goal this threefold task; to find the truth, to appropriate spiritual dynamic power, and to think our way through to the application of the Jesus Way of Life to our social order. May we take as our verse for the new year that magnificent utterance of the Psalmist: "Blessed is the man whose strength is in Thee, in whose heart are the highways to Zion."

JEROME DAVIS.

AN ADVENTURE IN GOOD-WILL

BY REV. HOMER W. CARPENTER

Minister of the First Christian Church, Chattanooga, Tennessee

IN the realignment of the forces of religion in the face of the tremendous unmet needs of our world of to-day, the question of a united Church is being increasingly forced into the foreground. Even in the period of reaction, following the war, it was impossible to get away from the fact that "an unevangelized world is the price we have paid for a divided Church."

Out of the experiences of the past, it must be apparent to every one that, at heart, the Christian Unity Movement is an adventure in good-will. From the beginning, the matter of supreme and compelling importance had been the development of a mind for unity. Not infrequently, conscientious advocates of a united Church have been guilty of a fundamental error in thinking that the immediate problem was one of mechanics and external adjustment when, from the beginning, the problem has been one of fellowship, of confidence, mutual esteem, and good-will. It is not surprising that controversial efforts toward unity have broken down, and for the most part, have only cut more deeply the lines of denominational cleavages. These efforts, well intended as they were, and involving, as they did, men of high character and conscience, served largely to maximize the things about which denominational bodies differed, and through keeping these things in the foreground, which were frequently of secondary importance, served thus to minimize the major truths of our religion which all bodies have held in common, and which have always offered sufficient foundation for fellowship and good-will and mutual co-operation.

The period of more friendly discussion which followed the controversial period, likewise has been under serious limitation, in view of the fact that it treated the question as one of uniformity rather than unity. Failing to take into account the

historical, racial, and temperamental elements, its insistence upon the primacy of doctrines and polity gave to the movement a mechanical rather than a spiritual approach, and denied that principle of freedom in Christ which must be fundamental to the successful promotion of any plan for the answering of our Lord's high priestly prayer that all his people might be one.

The period of conference and prayer and distribution of irenic literature, into which we have come in our own day, finally gives wide recognition to the movement as primarily an adventure of good-will, and heartens its every advocate with the hope that, through a closer fellowship, a more intimate acquaintance, a wider co-operation in achievement of common tasks, we shall discover that fundamentally we hold a common faith in Christ as God's Son and the world's Redeemer and that the things which have divided the Church of God are largely superficial and external.

As Christendom has gone forward, through the various stages of this movement for a united Church, there have been multiplying manifestations, particularly in recent years, of the development of good-will. The controversial mind has given way to the conferential, the dogmatic method has yielded to the experimental, the competitive programme has been supplanted by the co-operative, and there is a growing conviction, to use the words of Dr. Robert Speer, "It is not enough to say one to another, 'hands off.' We need to say one to another, 'hands together.' It is not enough for us to agree to differ. We must agree not only to differ, but to co-operate and bend our energies unitedly to a great task, too big for all of us, vastly too big for any one of us to undertake alone."

Out of that period, in which the movement has been interpreted as primarily an adventure of good-will, have been born many co-operative agencies, which have not only widened the influence of the Church and multiplied its activities, but have heartened and given hope to those who have had a hunger and passion for the oneness of the now divided house of God.

Even a casual appraisal of the present situation with its widening fellowship and increasing sense of need for a

united Church, must reveal to one certain very definite opportunities for advance, through the development of good-will, toward the final inspiring objective. These opportunities are immediate and unusually prophetic.

The first is the opportunity for a cultivation of the inter-church mind. It is difficult in the face of historical cleavages, which run far back into centuries, to think in terms of the total group in the Kingdom of God. And yet it is imperative. No man is able to think with the mind of Christ, until he is able to think of the whole Church. It has been difficult for many of the ardent advocates of unity to include the Roman Catholic Church in the compass of their thinking, so widely separated is it from Protestantism in its doctrine and polity. And yet no plan for a united house of God is big enough which does not include, within its range, all of those "who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and share membership in the universal Church which is the Body of Christ," to use the phrase of the Lambeth Appeal. A less comprehensive conception of the movement sets upon it unnecessary limitations and does violence to the universal sweep of the thinking of Jesus. So long has the denomination rather than the Kingdom been kept in the foreground, so deep-seated have been the religious prejudices developed in the rank and file, so bitter and unfriendly have been the controversies between religious bodies, that it is difficult, even in our day of growing good-will, for Christians to think in terms of the total Church.

And yet the conviction is inescapable that the only path that leads to unity is that by the way of the inter-church mind. There must be a growing sense of appreciation among religious neighbours, the constant cultivation of mutual esteem, the objectifying of common tasks and the closest co-operation in their achievement.

The use of every opportunity to emphasize our identities, and to keep in the foreground the great fundamental things which we hold in common, will not only serve to cultivate a better temper among churches, but will gradually eliminate, through the process of neglect, many secondary and superficial

things which have marred fellowship and divided the forces of the Kingdom.

A recent exponent of unity was pointing the way toward good-will when he said, "We shall never have real unity until we are solicitous for safeguarding what is really great and true in our neighbour's conscience and achievement as we are solicitous for what is precious to ourselves. This means a unity which conserves all that is best in those with whom we unite." The churches must be led to see that only a pooling of Christian experience, that only a collective leadership, that only the total truth possessed by all the churches can approximate the plan of Christ and meet the insistent needs of an hour like this. Perhaps "a smoking room acquaintance," to use the figure of Lloyd George, referring to America and England, is what Christendom needs.

The second of these opportunities is the arousing of a sense of interdependence. It is impossible to put too great emphasis upon the peril as well as the prophecy of this hour for the Church. Unless there is enough of religion and practical wisdom in the Church to unite the divided house of God in the face of unprecedented perils to our civilization, the Church's programme must fail of reaching its objective.

Only the unthinking can fail to see the helplessness of a divided Church. One of the most tragic chapters in human history is that which records the story of the victors' losing the victory after having won the recent war. One may not hold that a divided Church was responsible directly, or indirectly, for the war, but one cannot escape the conviction that a united Church, if aroused, could have saved the peace and seized the opportunity which a helpless and bleeding world offered for the greatest crusade for Christ in history.

But a divided Church, unconscious of its interdependence, was hopeless in the face of an impossible undertaking and, along with other institutions, social and political, turned back from the lofty idealism of the war into reaction and into what some have believed to be denominational recrudescence.

Let us hope that this is temporary and that the lessons of

fellowship and interdependence learned from the united effort of the churches during the war, as they functioned through the General War Time Commission, in the face of a common danger, have not been lost and that when the Church's leadership, for a time bewildered by the tragic aftermath, shall point the way, the rank and file of the churches will welcome an opportunity for a closer fellowship as a definite advance toward a united Church.

And then there is the need for the development of a universal sense of mission. Whose responsibility is this movement toward unity? In any adventure of good-will, after a period of estrangement, the question as to who is to make the first advance is a difficult and delicate one. In this case we need to believe that the responsibility belongs to every religious body which is a party to the divided house of God. And thus appears the need for a universal sense of mission. In every service of the Greek Catholic Church, with its millions of adherents, there is to-day a prayer for the uniting of the followers of Christ. If all Christendom would share this responsibility not only in prayer but by the use of every opportunity, of whatever sort, to promote fellowship and good-will as steps toward the final goal, we should unquestionably see the consummation of the movement before many years.

The more one contemplates the Christian religion, the more one enters into the greatness of the task which Christ laid upon his Church, the more irrational and unintelligible must become the present condition of our divided Christendom. "There are many points in which men differ in their thinking about God, but they sink into insignificance in comparison with those in which they agree." It is doubtful whether there be a single major objective which it will be possible for a divided Church to reach in our modern world.

If one face the problem of the building of a new social order, an issue which is urgent and immediate to-day, he must be reminded that, until Christ's principles come to be recognized as the law of society as well as the law of individuals, there can be no adequate or permanent social adjustment. But

a just and harmonious social order is impossible at the hands of a divided Church.

If one think of the problem of a new internationalism, without which our present civilization is imperiled, he must be convinced that the only foundation for this is the foundation of good-will, and the only approach is through the programme of Christ. And yet only the most superficial optimist believes that a divided Church can effectively lead the way.

In the face of the gigantic enterprise of Christian missions, as indicated at the outset, the future is just as hopeless unless the churches can meet it together. They have tried separately and have failed.

Facts of such commanding importance should stir every communion in Christendom, which is not both deaf to the call of God, and blind to the needs of the world, to a mighty sense of mission in the movement toward a united Church. Bishop Nicolai, representing forty million Greek Catholics, challenges all Protestantism in his declaration: "The voice of many churches is no voice at all, except the voice of confusion. One united voice of all the churches must speak. If necessary let my denomination perish, but let Christ become the ruler of the rulers of the world."

And, finally, there is a need for the creation of a new sense of expectancy. A recent religious leader properly raised the question as to whether Christians generally really want unity, fearing that it will involve the giving up of something which they have held dear. Many others, who desire earnestly a united Church, seriously doubt its possibility, because of difficulties involved which seem insuperable. It is probably not an overstatement to say that the great mass of those who constitute the personnel of the Kingdom are not thinking anything about the matter.

If this adventure of good-will is to succeed, it is imperative that there be put into the thinking of the Church generally a new sense of expectancy—an abiding, inspiring confidence in the power of God to realize the will of Christ in his prayer for the unity of his followers. The whole Church should be heart-

ened by the fact that the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, recording in a recent volume the results of a careful and extended study of the unity movement, declare as their first conviction that the movement is irresistible.

But, in this adventure of good-will, it is imperative that we remember that the men who speak for the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, and other such groups, are far in advance of the body of the army of Christendom. They constitute the lonely and long vision vanguard, but the campaign can never be won until the army is brought up. And no movement toward unity can hope to succeed until there is stirred in the hearts of the multitude a passion and a hope for a united Church. The vision that has come to a few must come to the many. A new sense of expectancy must be created in the rank and file.

The issues involved are so very great that into the councils of every communion of Christendom the appeal for unity should be brought again and again. The masses of the Church should be effectively reached with the facts of the movement and every pulpit should ring with a call for a new crusade for the answering of the prayer of Christ.

Many facts of our day, if impressed upon the masses, would stir hope within the Church for the achievement of this cause. The rapid development of good-will among local churches, resulting as it does, in co-operation in the reaching of common objectives, the development of the sense of social responsibility on the part of the Church, with its accompanying tasks, too great to be achieved by any single congregation, the comparative study of religion with its resultant appreciation of others' points of view, the increasing sense of a common peril in an uncertain hour of our world's life, the emphasis upon the positive rather than the negative in our approach to unity, the magnifying of the things which Christians hold in common, the recognition of larger freedom in Christ, and the cultivation of sympathetic and open-minded inquiry — all these hasten the movement toward success and should inspire a sense of hope in the mass of Christians.

What an hour is this in our world's life for the promotion of an adventure of good-will! Kipling's drug and doubtful days are still upon us. The accumulated hatreds and suspicions and animosities of war still cloud men's judgment and mar the fellowship of the world. Half humanity is scanning the sky line with a strange and sometimes almost despairing eagerness, looking for some movement that will undertake to organize the good-will of the world in the fight of the race against avarice and greed and unbrotherliness, that trio of social vices which are the pathfinders for war. Millions have already lost hope, and there is a widespread feeling that Rudolph Eucken was right in saying that the moral solidarity of mankind has been dissolved.

The hour is striking for an adventure of good-will. The Christian Unity Movement offers to the Church an immediate and prophetic opportunity to lead the way. Civilization waits and must wait for its stabilizing upon the recovery of spiritual control, if one may use the picturesque figure of Bergson, who explains our present difficulties in the world by saying that the body has gotten too big for the soul.

In this situation lies the opportunity of a thousand years for the Church. But only a Church, aroused and impassioned for unity can lead the way in a modern crusade for the Christianizing of the social order, the building of a new internationalism, the evangelization of the non-Christian world, and the mobilizing of the good-will of the race for an era of peace among men.

In the magnifying and exalting of Christ lies our hope, not in the creeds which men frame concerning Him nor in the rituals through which they worship Him. "It was his creative personality, which focused all the idealistic trends in the religious and moral life of his day, and brought them to the white heat of a new religion," says Professor Ellwood. And in our day the creative Christ alone, enthroned in the life of his disciples, can gather up the broken threads of fellowship in his divided Church and fuse them under a passion for a redeemed world.

HOMER W. CARPENTER.

HOW TO REALIZE "UT UNUM SINT"

BY BISHOP HARALD OSTENFELD

Bishop of Seeland, Denmark

FICHTE is said to have uttered: "If Christ returned and found that men still remembered his commands, but had forgotten Him, He would rejoice." He, who has said so, betrays a complete lack of understanding of Christ, for Christ has not merely given the world a volume of commands, principles, and forms of life, but He has lived Life Eternal into this world of sin and temporality.

And now it is for the Christian community, focussed on the living Christ, who has granted it everlasting life, to live Life Eternal into a world marred by sin and death. It must have Christian principles and entertain Christian ideals, both in the life of the individual and in that of the community. This is difficult, because the conception of Christian principles and ideals is apparently changeable and widely differing—in an increasing degree the more we turn away from personal and domestic life and pass into commercial and public life, the latter to be understood in the narrower as well as in the wider sense of the word, both with regard to those social fabrics, which are in the making, and to those of long standing.

It strikes me as very appropriate to call to mind that, after all, the discussion of Christian ideals and principles and the way to their realization will be nothing but idle talk, if we forget that they can only be practiced in a *Christian spirit*. In themselves these principles have no force, but only when obeyed in a Christian spirit. It is not merely in our individual inward life and in our relation to those closely attached to us in domestic life that it is necessary to have a Christian mind and spirit, but also under the varying conditions of life that may fall to our lot, conditions more remotely connected with our inner life.

If we are to make any progress in Christian life and work, the following collateral requirements — supplementing each other like the two wings of a bird—must be fulfilled:

(1) We must understand and clearly realize the Christian principles and ideals, and (2) carry out what we have realized in a Christian spirit. The former, if not supplemented by the latter, will simply be a manœuvre on paper, lacking power to apply those rules and principles to actual life, because rules and principles have no force in themselves, but only when adopted and followed by personalities and communities. The latter, if detached from the former, will result in a narrowness of views with numerous inconsistencies to which we pay no attention. And now we know perfectly well that a child may be guilty of inconsistencies without any harm to its character, but not so with a grown person. A church in a people, with an imperfect understanding of social duties and interests, may be guilty of inconsistencies, but the more the church people become conscious of themselves as a community, the more the inconsistencies will be felt as such, i. e., as something wrong. This is exactly what is the matter with the nations and churches of our time; we are becoming aware of the incongruities.

In order to get out of this deadlock two things are necessary; we must understand the commands and principles of Christ and assume the Christian spirit. This is a life, i. e., a process not yet completed, but still in development. We cannot speak of Christian statecraft, and certainly not of a Christian customs policy, but we may very well speak of a Christian way of thinking as the foundation on which also questions of this nature ought to be settled. There is one peculiarity in the Christian way of thinking, however; it can only be applied to practical life by those who are striving to live in the spirit of Christ.

Therefore, it is important that the Christian Church hold together as a unity—a unity of spirit, not of substance—a unity clearly expressed in the old phrase "Unity in essentials, toleration in non-essentials, love in everything." With regard to the second part of the phrase, two things should be noted:

(1) We must understand to distinguish between essen-

tials and non-essentials, and this is only possible for those who have attained a firm spiritual status. If we falter and hesitate, even the most petty question may seem essential.

(2) We must know how to practice toleration, which should not be confused with carelessness. Toleration means that we strive to express ourselves positively without polemical and critical side glances to our neighbour, who, perhaps, because his range of vision is another, will express himself differently. It is possible that we shall have less to say then, but there may be more core and substance in it.

HARALD OSTENFELD.

THE SECRET PLACE

Each soul has its own secret place,
Where none may enter in,
Save it and God,—to them alone
What goeth on therein is known,—
To it and God alone.

And well for it if God be there,
And in supreme control;
For every deed comes of a seed,
And lonely seed may evil breed
In any lonely soul.

But none, except of his own will,
Need ever lonely be;
If he but quest, his Royal Guest
Will quick provide him with the best
Of all good company.

pJohn Oxenham.

THE CATHOLIC AND SLAV ORTHODOX UNIONISTIC CONGRESS

BY MATTHEW SPINKA, PH.D.

Professor of Church History, Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio

AMONG the most significant and important events in the realm of Christian union was the Unionistic Congress recently held at Velehrad, Moravia, in the Republic of Czechoslovakia, by the representatives of the Roman Catholic and the Slav Orthodox Churches for the purpose of discussing and furthering plans for union. To understand the implications of this modern attempt at union, it may be profitable to cast a glance at a rapid survey of its genesis and development.

The systematic plan of the Roman Catholic Church of healing the schism existing between itself and the Eastern Orthodox Churches since the famous excommunication of Patriarch Michael Cerularius (1054) may, for our practical purpose, be limited merely to that portion which deals with the Orthodox Slavdom, and which represents "*il pericolo e le speranze della chiesa romana*"¹—the danger and the hope of the Roman Church. As an instrument for the accomplishment of this purpose, the cult of the Slav apostles, Cyril and Methodius, has been sedulously fostered since the middle of the last century. Previously to this time, the two brothers were for all practical purposes forgotten. But in 1863, at the request of the Moravian bishops, the day consecrated to the memory of the two missionary brothers was transferred by papal order from March 6th to July 5th, evidently with the purpose of counteracting the celebration of the martyrdom of John Huss on July 6th. The reason why July 6th itself was not chosen was that that date was preempted by the octave of the holiday of SS. Peter and Paul.

1. *Bessarione*, XI (1901), p. 436.

On July 5, 1863, a magnificent celebration of the millenium of the coming of the Slav apostles was held at the renewed monastic church at Velehrad, the ancient archepiscopal seat of Methodius. In the same gorgeous manner the millenium of the deaths of the two brothers was celebrated in 1869 (Cyril) and 1885 (Methodius). The tremendous success and popularity attained on these occasions led Pope Leo XIII to pronounce the two saints, in his "*Grande munus*" of September 30, 1880, the apostles of all Slavs, of the Orthodox Serbians, Bulgars, and Russians as well as of the Catholic Czechs, Slovaks, Croats, and Poles. In 1890 Cardinal Fürstenberg placed the Jesuit Order in charge of Velehrad, and entrusted them for their chief task the fostering of union with the Orthodox Slav East, under the egis of the Cyrilo-Methodian idea. For that purpose the Velehrad monastery was transformed into a magnificent establishment, and became the center of numerous and splendid pilgrimages. Since then the Velehrad Jesuit band, as well as the archbishop of Olomouc, in whose diocese the locality is found, worked upon their grandiose plan with a never-ceasing energy. In the next year, "The Apostolate of SS. Cyril and Methodius under the protection of the most blessed Virgin Mary" was founded, and its members are pledged to aid by prayers and pecuniary offerings the cause of union with the Slav East.

Pope Leo XIII thus inaugurated a new era of the unionistic programme, which is detailed in his encyclical "*Praeclara gratulationis*" of June 20, 1894, addressed to all rulers and nations. In his direct appeal to the Eastern Orthodox Churches he affirmed that there is no fundamental difference between the Roman Catholic and the Eastern Orthodox conceptions of Christianity, and that no one in Rome would think of depriving the Eastern Churches of their indigenous historic liturgy, canonical discipline, and polity, nor would the patriarchs be deprived of their prerogatives. The "one thing needful" for a reunion is the acknowledgment of the bishop of Rome as the sole ecumenical ruler of the Christian Church with the *summa potestas imperii*.

The World War interrupted for a few years the direct

unionistic activity, but the idea itself survived. In fact, with the new circumstances conditioning the life of the Russian Church in the frankly anti-religious Bolshevist régime, the unionistic endeavours after the war appeared more hopeful than ever. Previously, the Czarist theocracy, making the Russian Orthodox Church a tool for its political programme, stood firmly opposed to any weakening of its theocratic powers such as unionistic efforts might in the end imply. That régime removed, the Russian Church was grateful for any manifestation of moral support from the West, and the Cyrilo-Methodian idea became a valued religio-cultural bond between the Eastern and Western Slavs. Thus in 1920 there was founded in Maribor "The Cyrilo-Methodian Student League," with its seat at Prague, for the purpose of propagating the ideal of church union among the Catholic, the Uniate, and the Orthodox students. At present students of all Slav nations are represented in the League with the exception of the Serbians, the Bulgars, and the Poles. In its manifesto of 1923, the League defines its purpose as follows: "The chief end (of the League) is the mutual acquaintance and fraternization among Slav students, their self-culture, as well as the popularization of the Cyrilo-Methodian idea among all Slav nations. Slav students of Catholic, Uniate, and Orthodox confessions have undertaken this task in the firm faith that a great future, so ardently expected for centuries, and foundations of which were laid more than a thousand years ago in the Great Moravian Empire by our Slav apostles—Cyril and Methodius—will finally be realized."² Besides, many organizations of a more popular nature also have become propagators of the idea of an all-Slav Catholic reunion.

The papal Oriental Institute in Rome, founded by Benedict XV for the study of the Orthodox culture, cultus, and theology, was likewise extended by Pius XI, with the purpose of subserving and furthering the project.

What are the present indications of the disposition of the Slavic peoples toward the idea of church reunion? To be sure, one could name a number of outstanding men among the literary

2. Quoted in the Czechoslovak Protestant Journal, *Kostnické Jiskry*, VI, No. 7.

leaders of Russia of the nineteenth century who were strongly leaning toward the Roman Catholic Church. The first among them—Chaadayev—because of his admiration for the Western—especially the French—culture, which he regarded as the fruition of the Western Roman Christendom, was powerfully attracted to that church. The greatest religious philosopher of modern Russia—Vladimir Solovyev—also passed through a period of deep sympathy with Catholicism, so that Abbé D’Herbigny somewhat inaptly called him “the Russian Newman,” for Solovyev in the end returned to the church of his fathers. The Slavyanophiles, on the other hand, opposed all connection with the West as detrimental to the still pure and unspoiled Russian East, and exalted the Russian Orthodox Church as the leading Christian body which alone preserved the primitive apostolic teaching and practice in its original purity. Their leaders—Khomyakov, Kiryeyevsky, and Gogol—passed a harsh judgment upon the Catholic Church for its programme of world-dominion and for non-preservation of the “deposit of apostolic faith” as defined by the seven ecumenical councils. Even the great Dostoyevsky, although technically not a Slavyanophile, was opposed to the Roman Church, and expressed its sharp condemnation in his *Idiot*, *Brothers Karamazov*, and *The Journal of a Writer*. He saw in Catholicism merely a continuation of the Roman imperialism in spiritual forms, which attempted to drag God from his throne in order to seat itself thereon. His “Grand Inquisitor” is for him a true picture of Catholicism. This opposition to Westernism developed into an Orthodox messianism—the exaltation of the Russian Orthodox Church as the only means of saving Christendom from decay, and, through regenerated Christendom, the world. As a recent Russian writer puts it, the Russian Church “alone having preserved the image of Christ otherwise lost to the world, must bring that word to Europe.”³ The same attitude of criticism toward Catholicism as well as Orthodox messianism is expressed in the lecture of Prof. N. Glubokovsky given last year at the diocesan Conference at Gloucester, and published in *The Christian East* (No. 2).

3. P. Novgorodtzev: *Pravoslavnaya Tzerkov* (The Orthodox Church) in *Russkaya Mysl* (The Russian Mind), Jan. 1922, p. 214.

As for the Poles, it may be remarked that that bulwark of Catholicism is not represented in the Student League spoken of above, and show otherwise no signs of interest in the undertaking. The reason is not far to seek. Their national history conditions their policy of opposition to Russia, which really is not a matter of policy but of instinct. This nationalistic opposition is typified in their religious affiliations. To be a Pole is to be a Roman Catholic; to be a Russian is to be an Orthodox. A union of the two churches might prove prejudicial to the nationalistic aspirations of the two peoples—therefore, the lack of active interest. Ukraine, on the other hand, was favourable to the Uniate propaganda largely because it served to further their separatist national aspirations and helped to accentuate their opposition to the Russian policy of centralization. To the Yugoslavs and the Bulgars the programme likewise presented itself in its political aspect. To both of them nationalism is closely bound up largely with the predominant national Orthodox Churches, and thus union with Catholicism might tend to weaken this nationalistic sentiment. It is evident, therefore, that there are many difficulties of a complicated nature in the way of the Cyrilo-Methodian Apostolate's aspirations.

The Apostolate held three congresses previously to the one convened this year. The congress which was in session between July 30th and August 3rd was unique in the sense that the papal *breve* made the project for which Velehrad had stood for the last fifty years a project of the whole Roman Church; yet, it was disappointing in the sense that it was not attended by any large numbers from the Orthodox Slav Churches, and did not accomplish any appreciably practical results. The delegates, consisting mostly of high church dignitaries, represented the Czechoslovak, Polish, and Yugoslav Catholics, but a comparatively small number of Orthodox Slavs. Speeches, dealing with the various phases of the problem of union, were delivered by speakers of various nationalities. Among them were the Basilian superior of Constantinople, Salaville, Polish Jesuit Tyskiewicz, two Yugoslav Jesuits, Sakatch, and Saritch, Abbé D'Herbigny of the Roman Oriental Institute, and an English-

man, Walker. One of the speakers, the Czechoslovak representative, Dr. Alfred Fuchs, was a recently converted Jew.

A great stir of disappointment was caused by the congratulatory telegram sent by a group of Russian emigré scientists, philosophers, and theologians, among whom men like Sergius Bulgakov, Kartashev, N. A. Berdyayev, N. O. Lossky, Florovsky, J. B. Struve, and Trubetzkoy are well known in the philosophical and theological world. They pronounced themselves in sympathy with the unionistic aim, but pronounced their opinion that before that goal could be consummated, Catholicism would have to consent to make many fundamental changes within itself. "Until there arises in the bosom of Western Christendom an opposition to the excessive development of the papal power, and until the Vatican dogma of 1870 shall be either totally abrogated or effectively mitigated, all real efforts to reconcile Catholicism with Orthodoxy will meet with obstacles." Besides, the proselyting among the Orthodox carried on particularly by means of the Uniates, was vigorously denounced as the real cause of much ill will and the obstacle to a closer fraternization. Baron Wrangel, who also spoke for the Russians, stressed the institution of the Patriarchate against the sole ecumenical authority of the Pope.

The congress accomplished no practical results, but it expressed the resolve of the papacy to continue its programme of attempting to win the Orthodox East back into an organic union with itself. As such, it is among the most significant signs of the times.

MATTHEW SPINKA.

ASPECTS OF CHRISTIAN UNITY IN NEAR EAST RELIEF

BY REV. JOHN RALPH VORIS

Associate General Secretary of Near East Relief and Director of Church
Relations, New York

IN Near East Relief I have had fascinating personal experiences in such an intimate and sustained contact with denominational leaders and official bodies, during the past four years, as few people in the country have had opportunity of going through. Although Near East Relief is a cause which receives a nearly universal courtesy and friendliness, yet my personal impressions are a medley of lights and of shadows. There are so many things one sees in connection with the official meetings of denominational bodies that disappoint and sadden, that both a sense of humor and of discrimination are needed to make these idiosyncracies and foibles sink into the background of the picture with their proper perspectives.

And yet, to tell the truth, my faith in the Church is greater now than it was even during the time I was in the active pastorate. Indeed, it is largely because the churches have been so universally fine in their response to the call of suffering that I possess the desire to bring this message and the facts to warrant it.

A further personal word will enlarge the background for the impressions that follow:

For more than twenty years I have been interested in movements looking toward Christian unity. I have watched their ebb and their flow; their whirlpool and their backwash. In Young Men's Christian Association work in New York City, in the War Service of the Association, in the fated Interchurch World Movement, with its close relationship to the Federal Council of Churches, as well as in pastorate, I have had many

varied opportunities to urge the co-operation of churches and to study the result of their division. I have been sympathetic, both with efforts leading directly toward organic unity and with methods of immediate co-operation, no matter how transitory or superficial, so long as they create a spirit of unity.

I have never in these years observed a movement which so nearly brought all the churches together for a single concrete achievement, and which, at the same time, held deeper possibilities beyond the scope of its own special field, as Near East Relief. It is perhaps this deep personal concern over a dis-united Church that makes the matter of Christian unity in Near East Relief so outstanding in my mind. It is true that the element of church unity is but one of many values in the work of Near East Relief. It is equally true that the co-operation of the churches in behalf of Near East Relief is but one tiny segment of the great movement for church unity and co-operation, and yet I am sure that this phase of the work of this organization, apparently a mere side issue now, may some time in the future be regarded as one of its most important contributions, if not indeed its greatest.

This statement may at first be doubted equally by those who value church co-operation above the work of Near East Relief and by those who, on the other hand, believe that relieving distress in the Near East, or anywhere else, is more important than working upon church unity because it is more practical. And yet I am sure that Near East Relief has a claim upon the interest of those who believe in the promotion of efforts making for Christian unity on two counts: The co-operation of American churches in behalf of the suffering in the Near East and the working together of American churches with the churches of the Near East.

Near East Relief is developing the sense of fellowship between the Eastern Orthodox and the Western churches. Only the merest beginning has been made by Near East Relief, just as only first steps have been taken by the Federal Council of Churches, the Young Men's Christian Association, and by such individual communions as the Protestant Episcopal Church.

For Near East Relief, as for these other groups, the bonds are still fragile. Indifference or lack of interest will sacrifice much of what has been developed. Although the need for money for physical relief will decrease rapidly and, therefore, the necessity of the continuance of American Near East Relief as an organization will last but for a few years, the work of relating the Western and the Eastern churches should increase year by year. The problem of training the children under the care of Near East Relief in accordance with the highest standards of their own native Eastern and Western Christian culture is one that now faces us. There is no more important missionary task facing the churches of America to-day. If Near East Relief cannot do this task effectively, the Church will not only lose its greatest immediate opportunity to open the doors wide to future relationship with the Eastern Orthodox Churches, but it will destroy much of the confidence that has been established.

I recognize that it is necessary for me to make a case in behalf of so radical a thesis. That is the purpose of this paper.

Near East Relief was organized neither to create church unity nor to be an organic expression of the churches. Nor has it in its earlier work intended making any contribution to the Eastern Orthodox Churches as such. Its governing board is not even now representative of the church constituencies, from which it receives the greater part of its support, and, yet, circumstances have brought Near East Relief to be, to all practical intents and purposes, an expression of the churches of America co-operating with one another to raise the necessary funds and also their self-expression, as well as stimulant, in creating relationships with the indigenous churches of the Near East.

I am convinced that it will be seen eventually that there has been developed during the past seven years of relief work not only new phases of what may be best called missionary work (for want of a more inclusive name), but a more important relationship between Eastern Orthodox and Western Christianity, and that in this achievement Near East Relief has been a significant factor.

Near East Relief, as an organization, is in itself a move-

ment the Church can support, because it expresses the spirit of the Church. In its executive leadership and in its personnel, both overseas and at home, it combines Laymen's Missionary Movement, Christian Association, missionary, social service, and ministerial elements, in such manner as to give unusual expression to a broad Christian spirit. It seems to inspire in its personnel the finest characteristics common to the churches, such as heroism, consecration to a task, reliance on prayer, and constant faith in Christ's purpose, as well as the usual fine qualities of character found in all workers in social service. On the whole, it has not been possible overseas to distinguish a Near East worker from a missionary and, at home, from a church executive. The personnel have interchanged in these lines of work, both here and overseas, without consciousness of changing relationship. And this is true of the members of all communions—Brethren, Seventh Day Adventist, Mennonite, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Baptist, Roman Catholic, or Jew. I know that this statement must be modified by the fact that here in America there have been a few workers who have been "campaigners" for money, rather than "crusaders" for a cause, while overseas there are some splendid young men and women who are self-denying and consecrated and yet who would not only not claim the term "educational" but would resent being classified as "missionary."

Near East Relief has been representative of the churches because they have dominated its spirit, purpose, and methods. It has been the church leaders who, informally or officially, have advised and determined the methods of the organization; church constituencies, which, by their gifts or by their refusing to give, very largely have determined the nature of the "campaign for funds," and, since this is the case, the "appeal" has been made upon an emphasis of spiritual problems in connection with the work which a merely humanitarian movement would neither care nor dare to emphasize—the note of Christian sympathy in suffering; the relationship of the Cross to it. I do not mean that there has not been a vast periphery of popular interpretation. That has been and is a strength. But at

the very center Near East Relief has had a message for the churches. This is in the very nature of the case and, if the organization had failed to interpret the sufferings of the persecuted people in the Near East in this manner, it would have been recreant beyond words.

The churches of America have given to this cause such continued support as they have never given to any other work of this kind, and that at a time when they were, for the most part, sinking back into a denominational consciousness, which was perhaps normal and explainable, but, nevertheless, inimical to most interchurch movements. Twenty-eight denominations have taken the initiative through their Sunday-school secretaries and boards in presenting the appeal. The Young People's Committee, representing the Epworth League (North and South), Baptist Young People (North and South), the United Christian Endeavour Society, the Lutheran League and the Universalist Young People's Societies, have co-operated, not only in making appeals for funds but, more significantly, in placing a topic bearing on the Near East, as a study theme, before the young people of the churches. Church conventions have heard the cause more frequently and with more continuous response than any other interdenominational overseas question, taking into consideration the number of communions involved. Church leaders have asked their people for funds for this need, notwithstanding the fact that such an appeal apparently interfered with their own work and was administered entirely outside of a regular denominational channel.

Thus the churches have indeed mobilized their forces in response to the call of distress in Eastern lands, although it is true that the initiative was often taken by some one connected with the Near East Relief organization and too often the message was not only a passing emotional one, little charged with its deeper significance but also narrow and without great vision. Yet, along with that, there was a feeling, perhaps almost unconscious, by these church bodies of a significance other than the surface aspect or they would not have permitted themselves to be thus influenced. They were moved by a spirit deeper than

mere co-operation, or friendliness or courtesy : it was the rising up to rescue those who were suffering, in behalf of a great principle. Local church leaders have met together in behalf of this cause until they have been welded together, just as they have in local co-operation in behalf of Sunday-schools, Evangelism, Anti-Saloon League and civic reform, with the added significance that they have included members of the Unitarian churches, Churches of God, and oftentimes Roman Catholic churches and Jewish congregations, as well as Congregationalists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians.

This fostering of the spirit of fellowship between national denominational leaders, as they meet together to discuss this cause at the very time of the apparent indifference to and revolt from interchurch work, is certainly not an unimportant matter, while the bringing together within denominations of men and women, who, ordinarily, are interested in their own special departments or boards into an inter-departmental and inter-board relationship has assisted. Near East Relief is representing the whole church and not merely a few denominations or merely the organized church boards. In order to secure, on behalf of the various communions, responsible advice as to the conduct of the work, both at home and overseas, Near East Relief invited and urged the general judicatories to appoint a responsible advisory committees to co-operate with and advise as to its work. Practically every major denomination and many of the smaller communions appointed such committees. These groups, which vary in size from twenty-five in the larger churches to six or eight in the smaller bodies, are remarkably representative of the Protestant leadership of the country. They really form a cross-section of each church, representing, as they do, mostly clergy and laity and, ordinarily, the church agencies as well as the pastorate. Potentially, they are amazingly important with respect to possible developments in the future, both within and without Near East Relief. They have already accomplished a most important work.

The larger part of Near East Relief's income, perhaps eighty per cent, is from the churches. To secure these funds

there has been necessary a vast campaign of education reaching virtually every church, Sunday-school, young people's organization and women's church groups in the country. Necessarily, as a by-product of this attempt to secure funds, there has been developed a larger degree of interest during the seven years of intensive effort in behalf of relief than in several decades of ordinary missionary education. A great organization, for the most part composed of volunteer workers, has carried the news of persecution, famine, suffering, and need. People have heard of the Near East countries, people and churches, who would not ordinarily have known anything about them. Imagination has reached out visualizing the inhabitants—real human beings in need; evaluating the people and their customs; sympathizing with and praying for those who have suffered. Congregations that have had no missionary interest in Bible lands, because they had not been allied with a missionary board working there, have been as deeply interested as those of the few communions which have for years had a special responsibility in the Near East. Children in the Sunday-schools have become little brothers and sisters to individual children in Armenia, Syria, and Greece.

Thus there has been an amazing response in this country upon the part of the churches. It remains for it to become sufficiently self-conscious to be regarded as a real crusade. One can easily conceive that it might have been a great crusade, if there had not been so much new ground to be plowed and if the church had been united so that there would not have been so much energy dissipated in creating an educational movement that would have to be adapted to so many different denominations. The division and this disunity have prevented the accomplishment of the largest elements of helpfulness with the least possible expenditure of energy. One must confess that only a very small part of the task that is before the world in the solving of the Near East Relief situation has been accomplished by Near East Relief. Had the churches been sufficiently united to have created a larger statesmanship,—a statesmanship which would have been able not only to take the whole

need of the Near East into consideration but also to mobilize the whole American church in leadership of public opinion,—there unquestionably would have been prevented in the Near East much of the starvation and persecution which have taken place.

The cause is worthy, not so much of a larger support by the churches as of a larger leadership from within the churches. For, indeed, this care of the Christian population's suffering because of their faith (for it is suffering for their faith, even though much of the persecution and sorrow has come about by wrong political ideals and by the Near East nations being cats-paws to the European nations), it is surely a challenge to the churches. It deals with the problem of suffering which, to the Christian mind, centers in the significance of the Cross; it deals with the stabilizing of Christianity in the land in which it was founded; it deals with the lands of the Bible which hold a peculiar sentiment for church people; it deals with the historic Christian churches, with ancient landmarks, with sacred places, and the greatness and lure of early cultures; and, finally, it holds the appeal of childhood and of youth, and of the training of childhood to be the leaders of a new idealism; it is the application of the Golden Rule to the problem of world peace through international relationships.

A striking appeal! I wonder if there has ever been anything quite like it? Based, as it is, upon famine, persecution, and martyrdom, it is irresistible. Surely, if this will not unite Christendom upon a single path, nothing will. In fact, as I survey the needs of the Near East, I feel that the lamentable thing is that we have not been large enough to meet the challenge in a strikingly big way. The churches and Near East Relief have not been properly synchronized to utilize this cause in the broadest possible manner. It should have united the Christian churches of England, France, Germany, Canada, Australia, and the United States in one great crusade—not against the Turks, certainly, but in behalf of a fading Christianity and Christian leadership in the Near East.

It is rather ours to wonder why, in the name of heaven,

there has not been a more confident and a more spectacular sense of united fellowship in behalf of this cause, rather than to applaud ourselves for what has been done. At any rate, the cause, in spite of our lack of statesmanship, has penetrated the sectarian consciousness of the churches.

Once more recognizing the supreme appeal of Near East needs as being the fundamental element in the matter, it is but fair to say that Near East Relief has consciously attempted to unite church forces in terms of denominations and of denominational leadership, with a good deal of wisdom in its methods. Indeed, I feel that a similarly careful plan will unite the churches on other causes which may have a more universal appeal or which may have local significance. I believe the friendly assistance of the Federal Council, in the organization of this work in behalf of the Near East with the various communions, is a prototype of what it can do for other causes.

Now to turn our minds to the overseas situation.

Near East Relief has been representing the American church idealism to the Near East, in general, and to the leaders of the Christian Orthodox churches in the Near East, in particular.

Whatever scepticism one may have here in America concerning the fact of Near East Relief's being representative of Christian America, there has been no doubt on this score on the part of Eastern Church leaders. They have continuously given thanks that Christian America has come to their aid.

This expression of gratitude on the part of Eastern Church leaders, coming equally from officials in the highest and lowest positions, and from every section of the Near East, has been overwhelming in its pathos and its magnitude. Near East Relief has been, of course, in only a small part worthy of it; indeed, I feel that the American people scarcely deserve such a degree of appreciation.

The first outstanding result of this united work upon the Eastern Orthodox leaders is, therefore, to create gratitude—a gratitude that will make for understanding and sympathy and for willingness to co-operate with the Western churches. The

second result is the assurance that American churches do not wish to proselyte from the Eastern Churches nor to disrupt them. The fine thing about this is that it is based upon the fact that, in the care of the children, there has been no proselytism. And this has been done with the knowledge and support of the American church leaders, and not merely as a worldly-wise attitude by Near East Relief administrators. It is perfectly true that the policy of the American Board (Congregational) has always been to work with and into the indigenous Christian Church and, similarly, that of the Presbyterian Foreign Board (the two boards to which, by common consent and understanding, have been allocated the major missionary work in Anatolia, Persia, and Syria); but due largely to the fact that the native churches were not yet ready for such co-operation, there developed a state in which relationships were not ideal and in which it seemed necessary for native Protestant churches, separate from the native Orthodox churches, to be established. The Church of England and the Episcopal Church held this same philosophy of support of native churches a little more emphatically, and they did not share with the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists the same result of misunderstanding. That native church leaders trusted the Congregational and Presbyterian leaders is shown by their confidence in mission schools and their willingness to co-operate in many enterprises, such as the School of Theology, formerly at Constantinople, now at Athens, and in a personal relationship that could hardly be improved upon. However, in general, native church leaders were reluctant to collaborate with Presbyterians and Congregationalists in a programme that involved ecclesiastical relationship, and they were scarcely conscious of the other American churches at all, except the Episcopal Church.

The passage of time has itself changed the attitude of responsible Eastern Church leaders, but more than the mere passage of years has been the response by all the American churches to the needs of the Eastern peoples during the past eight years. Now the Eastern Church leaders not only find

themselves able to believe in the unselfishness of the American churches, but also able to co-operate in a programme.

This confidence, created so largely through Near East Relief, reaches further still, for the interpretation of the broader American spirit, as shown by both the missionary and the special relief workers during this time of crisis, has done much, not only to break down all suspicion but to create a new faith in other people and a hope for the future. The fact that in Near East Relief there was a *unity* of American churches, so far as Eastern Church leaders could see, was an important element. Scrappy division of territory in these areas, each group working separately would have doomed this confidence forever. Had there been apparent rivalry, or had there been attempts to proselyte, the results would have been immeasurably tragic. There is more for which to be thankful here than appears on the surface. This is what unity will do in one section of the world in a few short years. What would it not accomplish if practiced the world over in missionary endeavours.

There are many other elements here in line with this thought, which will bear careful scrutiny in the future. Undoubtedly, the Eastern Church officials and more thoughtful laity begin to see in Western Christian expression something that they have not had heretofore that is tremendously valuable. Practical, social Christianity, which, in the name of Christ, organizes relief and reconstruction, builds hospitals overnight, feeds the hungry, clothes the naked, administers to the sick, gives sight to the blind (through the cure of trachoma), breaks the bonds of those that are in bondage, thus interpreted to them in and through a modern and efficient organization in which clergy and laity, men and women, work together to rehabilitate entire populations, cannot but create a desire to know more about the forces lying back of such a programme. These Eastern peoples see some of the Western methods of character building, through play and team work, as well as through study. They observe the spirit of tolerance toward other races and religions. It is true they have seen the same ideas promoted by the educators and the missionaries during the past years, but their

eyes have looked with far greater sympathy toward precisely the same thing accomplished in the name of the entire American people and under the pressure of starvation and suffering. One cannot measure this achievement, but, from what I can gather, it has been an inestimable contribution to the Eastern Churches and promises by the appreciation of their leaders a still more valuable potential contribution to future relationship. It is a development of practical Christianity which had been little dreamed of by Eastern Churches.

And the strangest thing about this is that more has been accomplished in seven or eight years by united efforts, with the co-operation of American missionary boards involved and with the leadership of individual missionaries, as well as other relief workers, than had been accomplished in a hundred years of denominational efforts along this particular line. What could not be accomplished in the past by denominational efforts, a united activity combined with suffering and want, on the one hand, and the response of sympathetic generosity on the other, have accomplished.

Dr. James L. Barton, veteran leader of the American Board, stated to Congregationalists, at the National Council at Springfield a year ago, that the work of Near East Relief was bringing to a fruition the efforts of the Congregational mission in the Near East, with respect to the Armenians, and that it had brought the entire American church into play and has done more during the short time of its existence to establish a sympathetic relationship with the Armenians than the American Board working alone had been able to achieve during its entire existence in the Near East—over a century. I can write at length of the contribution of the Foreign Boards working in the Near East and of the missionaries as individuals, together with other educators, in the making of Near East Relief, but that is not my purpose here. Suffice it to say that, had it not been for them, Near East Relief, as it exists to-day, would never have developed and the thing about which I am now trying to write would never have happened. But the problem of Near East Relief, as an organization, is a fairly constituted and definite

one. It does not relate to general relationships with the Eastern churches, except as such relationships are involved in behalf of its own job. Near East Relief has upon its hands the task of training something less than 60,000 children and young people, within its orphanages, or under its direct influence, and yet in these children during the next six to eight years lies the greatest opportunity of America in behalf of the Near East and the transcendent opportunity of the churches. The children themselves need to be trained in religious education, character, and worship. In themselves they present what is recognized by leading religious educators of our country as the greatest single challenge through an ideal programme of religious education that faces the Christian church, working unitedly, to-day. But there is an additional significance in the training of these children in that they are, for the most part, children of native Christian faiths, since there are among them but comparatively few who are from Protestant churches. Surely Dr. Vance, of the Southern Presbyterian Church, would not be regarded as representing a radical constituency; and yet he comes back to urge that the children be trained under the leadership of their own religious teachers to a knowledge of and a loyalty to their native faiths. This pronouncement is in line with the previously expressed conviction not only of those in Near East Relief who have been responsible for its progress, but more especially of recognized religious education advisers representing the World's Sunday-school Association, International Sunday-school Council, and denominational advisory committees. Drs. James L. Barton and Ernest Riggs, of the American Board, and Drs. Arthur J. Brown, Robert E. Speer, and Stanley White, of the Presbyterian Foreign Missions Board, have, before any of these conferences, not only committed themselves to but have initiated this policy.

But along with the leadership by native priests and trained laity, there should be stressed elements emphasized by the American churches, with special relationship to the building of character, to personal and social ethical training, to expression through organized activities, and to personal Christian ex-

perience, if these children are to bring into their churches what Western Christianity has to give. Therefore, these children offer, for the first time in Christian history, to Eastern and Western Church leaders, working with and through Near East Relief, the opportunity to blend in them the best of both movements of the Church, or, to put it another way, they offer the opportunity to supplement a native Eastern inheritance with a Western training.

I need not point out that there are many difficulties involved in such a suggested programme. It is true that confidence has been created, and that was a necessary beginning. It is true that certain elements of this programme are already under way, but, on the other hand, there is a vast distance between the theoretical programme and the achievement of the plan. In America, likewise, we have a problem. Most of the churches supporting Near East Relief have had a kind of a prejudice against the Eastern Orthodox Churches or, at least, have failed to have a sympathetic understanding with them. The leaders of practically every communion in the country have given their support to just such a programme as outlined; nevertheless, only wise procedure and profound reliance on the Spirit of God will continue to hold us all together as we work the problem out. Here the Near East Relief Executive Committee has placed the task of the religious education of its orphans in the hands of an advisory committee of leading American religious educators, representing all denominations, including Roman Catholic and Jewish. This committee includes the members of the Near East Relief Advisory Committee, appointed by the International Council of Religious Education, and the similar committee, appointed by the World's Sunday-school Association. This committee can probably carry with it the sympathetic support of American Protestantism. The Roman Catholic programme for Roman Catholic children, as well as the programme for the Jewish children, will have to be solved by working with the leaders of these communions. There will, of course, be the utmost fairness here. There can be no proselyting.

Need I point to the potentialities of this work, extending

far beyond the work of Near East Relief? Surely, as Samuel McCrea Cavert has been so aptly putting it, these children are the open door to a new relationship between the American churches and the Eastern Churches. If we fail now, we fail for the future. To succeed with these children may, perhaps, make it possible for some American church agency, representing the churches then as Near East Relief to a lesser degree represents them now, to carry on further to limits beyond the reach of the imagination, the relating of the American churches to the Eastern Armenian Gregorian, the Greek and the Russian Orthodox Churches, and yes, to the mountain Nestorians in Persia. Surely, the Commission on Eastern Churches, headed by Bishop Brent, and under the executive direction of Dr. George R. Montgomery, will give an intelligent and sympathetic leadership at this moment through the Federal Council of Churches.

But I would not stop without saying that I believe the American churches have already gained a great deal from the Eastern Churches and that they have much more to gain. Indeed I believe in the question of give and take, so far as the relationships of the two elements of Christian life are concerned America is beginning to appreciate the secret of the marvelous loyalty to Christ on the part of the Eastern Christians; of their reliance upon and their reverence for the Father; their self-expression through hymns and worship, even in the midst of suffering. These are elements that are quite beyond us at the present time. I look forward to the time when in our Sunday-school literature, young people's topics, sermons on Near East Relief, and other methods there shall be an education of our American children to not only the needs of the Near East children and their churches, but, likewise, to their strength and, therefore, to the gifts which they will give back to us.

The prophecy of this new plan of the united relationship to the Eastern Churches has not been initiated here in America, but by veteran missionaries overseas. Dr. McDowell, of the Persian Presbyterian work, urges that the relationship to the Nestorians, as well as to the Armenian Gregorians, be that of the entire American church, and not by any one branch of it. Dr.

Peet, international missionary leader, at Constantinople, not only spoke of the need for this effort when I talked with him about the question over three years ago in Constantinople, but in a recent letter he said: "To my mind, the great call of the present is for Christian unity, not necessarily in organization but in spirit and in action. Everything in nature shows that God loves variety in form and function of things for filling life's purposes. If we could hold and practice these differences in the unity of the spirit, we could cherish at once, yet fulfil Christ's prayer for Christian unity. I believe the Eastern world is fairly right for sympathetic approach to unity along these lines. Can we not take advantage of present conditions which favour an approach to practical Christian unity?"

I do not believe there is much danger of any slip in the relationship of the American churches to the work in behalf of the children, but I am concerned over what it would mean if any one or three or a dozen denominations should see in the Near East Christians an opportunity for sectarian promotion. I trust that those churches which best understand the situation,—the Congregational, the Presbyterian, and the Episcopal,—not to speak of the growing Methodist relationship to the Russian churches, will see eye to eye, and that they, together with all other American communions, will consider one another in their plans for the Near East, fraternize in the matter, and, despite the inconvenience or sacrifice of plans, keep friendly with mutual understanding.

Those communions which have not so much at stake should find little difficulty in joining those that have heretofore worked in this field. Their interests should be equally keen. The Episcopal Church should be able to hold to close relationship with the Church of England and thus unite both continents in this fellowship.

I have completed my task of trying to interpret for the moment the problem of the relationship of the churches of America and the Eastern Churches through Near East Relief. There will be developments and a better understanding of the

situation, including its difficulties, as time goes on. These can be analyzed later.

I cannot close without raising questions beyond my province and beyond my thesis. They are these :

If there can be unity under war conditions and emergency relief, why cannot there be unity under peace conditions?

If unity in behalf of the children of Christian communions, why not unity in behalf of all members of those communions?

If unity in behalf of Christians in the Near East, why not in behalf of those who are not yet Christians in all parts of the world?

If in behalf of children who suffer from persecution, why not in behalf of children wherever they suffer?

If in behalf of suffering, why not in behalf of ignorance and darkness? The needs of the Near East have overcome ancient inhibitions and have provoked and compelled co-operation and the spirit of unity.

Why should not these inhibitions be destroyed forever?

JOHN RALPH VORIS.

REVELATION

The doctors scan the flaming spheres
Yet doubt that God can be,
While I, who pluck this little flower,
Exclaim, How great is He!

—*Thomas Curtis Clark.*

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

Unity and Truth

EVERY age of the Church's history has its dominant passion, its own contribution to make to the development of Christian thought and life; and in every age this dominance contains within itself a danger. There can be no question that to-day the ruling passion is a desire for unity among Christians, and it is something more than the natural partiality of men who live in this present time which makes us say that it is a passion wholly admirable.

Many factors have combined to make many different minds concentrate upon the thought of a united Christendom as the evident call of God to our age. The events of ten years ago intensified the moral judgment, steadily gathering force even before 1914, that war was wicked, and that man was meant to live in peace. Internationalism, peace, co-operation—these had become the guiding lights of generous hearts, wherever men thought or felt. Faced with a situation such as this, the Church's mission of peacemaker came right up into the front of the Christian consciousness; and the actual disunity of Christian people was seen to be the scandal that it is.

Another factor which has assisted the process is the weakening of interest in theological dogma—in itself a by-product of the growth of science. Many of the things for which religious men had withstood one another to the face had come to wear a dim and shadowy air, and no longer were allowed to claim the unquestioned allegiance freely granted in times past. But the support which the movement drew from this source was not without its dangers. Weariness with discussion might spring as much from mental laziness as from generous aspiration. That there should be such weariness was natural. Since that September day in 1517 when Luther nailed his theses to the door of the Schlosskirche in Wittenberg, the Church has passed through a long period chiefly marked by a prevailing sense of the extreme importance of personal and individual salvation, a salvation which, in its turn, depended on correct notions as to the precise method whereby justification was

reached, and on an impossible certainty touching the operation of Divine grace. As a consequence, for three hundred years religious distinctions and differentiations became positive virtues, outweighing entirely the loss caused to the Body of Christ by the worship of peculiarity.

The strength of our forefathers lay in their persuasion that there were at any rate certain things which mattered enormously to the soul. Our weakness lies in a tendency to suppose that nothing matters very much so long as we can all agree. Saving truth has receded into the background, and we are in danger of leaving truth out of account altogether. The danger is most evident in the best people. In a sense these are the people who have all along created the gravest problems for the Church. The companies of heretics were not necessarily synagogues of Satan. More commonly they were composed of earnest men led into an impossible position by an overwhelming desire to commend the Faith they loved by a too complete translation of it into the current science of their day. Arius himself was, we may well believe, dominated by a missionary motive when he tried to subordinate revelation to philosophy. Similarly in the seventeenth century it was enthusiastic seekers for the souls of men who rent churches in twain by their insistence on the total depravity of man.

Now the same influence takes a different turn. In their eagerness to promote unity, men urge the adoption of practices in vogue in other religious bodies, in the sincere hope that in some way the procedure will bring the various separated portions of Christendom together again. It is impossible to withhold admiration from the zeal prompting these endeavours, but it should not blind us to the precarious character of the assumption on which they are based. No one can understand the eagerness with which certain proposals on Prayer-book revision were made who does not recognize the underlying hope that their adoption would promote reunion with those Christians who acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope. Others are apt to urge the insertion of an invocation of the Holy Spirit into the Consecration Prayer, less on the strong ground that it has theological value than on the weaker plea that it would bring us into line with the Eastern Churches. When we find ourselves faced by a custom which can claim in its support the agreement of East and West, this type of argument becomes, to many minds, well-nigh irresistible, and will deflect the sanest and most learned; for even they may succumb to the fascination of the doctrine that reunion is promoted by borrowing from

other churches observances of secondary importance without regard to the teaching they enshrine.

But it is by no means only those who look with longing eyes for a closer intercourse with Rome or Constantinople whose enthusiasm for unity leads them into courses unlikely to help much the object they have in view. The practice of casual intercommunion between members of churches not really in communion with one another may be an edifying proceeding for those who take part in it. It does next to nothing to promote reunion, and indeed it may do very much to retard it—and that in two ways. It tends to minimize the importance of corporate unity in the minds of those to whom the whole conception of Catholic order is difficult; and, by exasperating that large body of opinion which regards intercommunion as the goal of endeavour after unity, creates division where closer understanding is required. Further, may not the same criticism be applied to some of those who are most rightly concerned to express their Christian faith in terms of the knowledge of today? Does not their apologetic zeal lead them at times to reverse values, and to substitute for theology a philosophy which is after all of men, and therefore temporary?

Let us make no mistake; we are called to the adventure of unity; men have in the past laid too much stress upon theological niceties. But our subscription to these statements will only mislead us, if we do not, at the same time, recognize the importance of religious truth. The fact that other Christians use this or that custom or practice should prejudice us in its favour; but we help nothing, if sympathy leads us to adopt for ourselves anything which we are not convinced is based on a sound foundation. We shall, in the long run, contribute most to a reunited Christendom by being true to ourselves. As Mr. Milner-White writes, in a valuable pamphlet recently issued by the S.P.C.K. (*The Value of the English Tradition*), “English Catholicism has a work of its own to do for the whole Church, which can only be done in its own conditions of freedom, and which in large degree depends for its influence on maintaining its Englishry.” Among the most characteristic elements in this Englishry is a belief in truth, and we should do wrong to forget that, though unity is actually an attribute of the Godhead, and ideally a mark of the Church, to seek “the truth as it is in Jesus” is yet the greatest adventure to which succeeding ages of believers are called.

[From *The Guardian*, London.]

Whence Come Denominations?

THE Church of the Foreigners in Hinghwa prospered and, on the other hand, the temple of Confucius was ever less popular. Crowds grew smaller and smaller at the spring and autumn rites, and there were few to hear the booming of the great drum, the sound of the instruments, and the swelling calls to prayer. The few loyal followers of the sage called together at the temple all of those interested and, after much discussion, it was decided that the main reason for the growth of Christianity was the large place given to regular worship. The logical step was taken with non-oriental promptness. The Confucianists decided to hold regular services in the court of the temple.

A later date was set for organization and excitement spread. On the appointed day there was a truly large gathering of Hinghwa citizens and discussion was long and noisy. It was soon evident that there was a sharp division in the assembly, one part of the crowd wanting weekly meetings with a rather informal programme of worship, something much like the Christians used, the other group desiring monthly or at most semi-monthly meetings and the use of a ritual based on the true Confucian rites. The argument waxed so hot and the division proved so unbridgeable that finally they split apart into two groups. Each decided to follow its own plan, because it seemed the best one, and each hoped that ultimately the other would come around to the true way of worship.

The decision was carried out. Two types of worship were carried on in the name of Confucius by two zealous sets of followers. There were two actual denominations of Confucianists. It may be added, possibly as a moral, that at present neither group is carrying on any form of worship. The temple of Confucius when I saw it a few weeks ago was as empty and dusty as any other temple. How like unto some Christians are some of these heathen!

[From F. T. Cartwright in *The Christian Century*, Chicago.]

Denominational Competition in Home Mission Fields

IN the *Survey Graphic*, of which he is now associate editor, Rev. Fred Eastman in a strong article sets forth an array of facts concerning the use of home mission money for the support

of competitive churches in overchurched rural fields, charging a situation that is so serious and so foreign to the spirit of Christian comity and to modern thought of the Kingdom that we do not see how the various home mission boards will dare to ignore it. First let us quote some of the facts which he gives of the pathetic conditions in the rural localities. Here are some of the instances which he cites, instances which every one who knows anything at all about the field will recognize as not unusual, but typical of a vast portion of our country districts to-day:

Here is one eastern town with three churches and three resident ministers. None of the ministers, however, preach in any of these churches. Instead, they travel to stations scattered through three counties, the churches in the town being served by three men from without, one of whom travels nearly a hundred miles every time he preaches in this town.

A rich agricultural township in Pennsylvania has four churches. They are in sight of one another. One church has two services a month and is served by a pastor from another state. The second holds one service a month conducted by a pastor who lives ten miles away. The pastor of the third comes on a week-night from Washington, D. C. The fourth church has closed its doors.

In Gibson County, Tennessee, there are four little churches standing side by side, representing four denominations. Not one of the churches has a resident pastor. All are supplied by circuit riders who live in towns where they do not preach, and preach in the country where they do not live. I showed an enlarged picture of these four churches at a country life conference one time and had it labeled "Four in a Row" (a line). A farmer came along and read it, "Four in a Row" (quarrel) and he added, "I bet they be!"

Here is another county. In seven communities in this county there are seventy churches. Not one of the churches has a non-competitive field. Of the seventeen clergymen residing in the county only four live near any of the churches which they serve. Not one gives his undivided attention to any single church. Nineteen ministers living outside the county enter it to preach at various points. On an average they travel almost twenty miles to reach their stations. The parishes of some of these seventy churches compete with as many as twelve of their neighbours. Of the seventy churches only four have services every Sunday. Twenty of them have but one service a month.

Another county. This one has a population of 8,815. Not

over fourteen per cent are enrolled as church members. There are twenty-six churches in the county, but only eight have pastors, and only three of these give full time to the ministry. Five of the eight do not reside in the communities where they preach. Twenty-two of these twenty-six churches have no Sunday-school. Only two of the twenty-six have gained in membership in the past ten years. Only two of the twenty-six have boys or young men under twenty-one years of age; only five have girls or young women members under twenty-one years of age. In all there are only eight young men and thirty young women, under twenty-one years of age, who are members of the churches.

In this county consider one village of a thousand souls. It has three churches, and the total membership of all three is 120. None of these churches has a resident pastor; none has a Sunday-school; none has regular services; none has a financial record; none has added or lost in members during the past year under review. What possible service can these churches render to the community? And what must be the moral and spiritual condition of the young people of the county whose churches have lost their way in the maze of denominational competition?

Instances of this sort could be multiplied. They are not unique. A challenging book has appeared within the past year which summarizes the situation confronting the 100,000 Protestant churches in rural America. The book is by Rev. H. N. Morse and Dr. Brunner, is entitled *The Town and Country Church in the United States*, and was prepared under the direction of The Institute of Social and Religious Research already referred to, which took over certain of the surveys of the Inter-church World Movement and completed them. Here are a few of the facts revealed in this summary:

Only one-fifth of the rural population goes to church.

Two-fifths of all rural churches are standing still or losing ground.

Seven-tenths of all rural churches are served by circuit-riders.

One-fourth of all rural churches have no Sunday-school.

That is what denominational competition has done to the country church and to the community life of rural America! For the circuit system which still prevails among seventy per cent of our American rural churches is only an "excuse to keep together denominational groups for the glory of annual reports."

HOME MISSION MONEY USED TO SUPPORT COMPETITIVE CHURCHES

In the last sentence quoted above, Mr. Eastman gives the real key to this whole tragic situation. This condition among country and small town churches is continued simply and only to perpetuate denominationalism. We say the "condition is continued" advisedly. For none of these communities would ever think of starting so many weak and competitive churches if the slate were once washed clean and they had a chance to begin all over again—and none but the most denominationally infested mind would advise them to do so. That is, none of these communities would think of starting so many churches now if they had to pay for them and support them themselves. They do it in the new communities, in the West, and elsewhere, but only where and only because they can get home mission money from their various denominations to help them launch and perpetuate these many churches. Hundreds of examples of such grievous offense against the Kingdom of God could be cited. Let us quote Mr. Eastman again:

Edmund deS. Brunner, director of the town and county surveys of the Institute of Social and Religious Research, states: "I can conservatively estimate that the total amount of home mission aid given in the rural field to not less than 20,000 churches is \$4,240,000 a year. The amount of this aid which (on the basis of a fairly large sample of counties studied in our survey) goes to competitive points is seventy-one per cent, or roughly, a little in excess of \$3,000,000." This sum, large as it is, is small compared with the social and ethical values at stake. . . .

I have said that denominational competition, the results of which are quoted above, is fed and nourished by home mission aid. Here we have the findings of the careful investigations made by Morse and Brunner to substantiate the observations of critics of the system. They record the results of the study of 211 aided churches in twenty-five representative counties in various parts of America, and make certain more general statements concerning the rural church situation as a whole. They say that,

1. One-fifth of all rural churches receive home mission aid.
2. Of these subsidized churches a large number (more than half) are in active competition with other subsidized churches.
3. The aiding of small rural churches still occasions from

a third to two-thirds of the home mission expenditures of most denominations.

4. Of the 211 aided churches studied, 149 could be dispensed with without essential loss.

5. The average subsidy granted an aided church out of home mission funds is \$216 a year. By denominations the average ranges up to \$470 a church.

6. One-seventh of the aided churches studied have been receiving home mission subsidy for twenty years or more.

7. In general, the aided churches that face the stiffest competition are most energetically promoted and have the most pastoral oversight. Non-competitive fields are apt to be comparatively neglected.

8. A considerable portion of the aided churches are of the chronically non-productive sort.

9. The average active membership in the aided churches studied is thirty-eight.

10. In the twenty-five counties studied, 143 of the home mission aided churches were of the leading denominations such as Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, and Congregationalist. And of these 143 exactly 100 were in competition with other churches of this same general group. That is how home mission funds are being used to perpetuate denominational competition!

The surveys to which I have referred are convincing proof that every one of the major denominations is engaged in taking a certain portion of the money contributed to home missions and spending it in denominational competition.

ONLY HEROIC REMEDIES WILL CURE THE SITUATION

It is such expenditure of home mission money which Mr. Eastman deprecates and rebukes. We do not see how any but the most hopeless and inveterate denominationalizer could do other than agree with him that the situation is one of shameful "financial malpractice," producing great waste and inefficiency in the use of Kingdom money which has been given with keen sacrifice. Moreover the situation is one that is just as deplorable from the standpoint of Kingdom interests in these various communities as it is a reflection upon the efficiency of the Church at large. But it is more than that. It is deception and the misuse of funds—in that the men and women who gave the money did so with other phases of home mission work in mind, work of an entirely different character, work that is dreadfully needed. He says:

Protestant churches of the major denominations are raising their home mission money for one purpose and spending a goodly proportion of it for another. They are raising it on the appeal of the spiritual and social needs of the immigrants and the Southern mountaineers, the Negroes and the Mexicans, the Alaskans and the Indians, of other needy and neglected peoples. They are spending a portion of that money in establishing or maintaining denominational churches in rural communities, already overchurched. The economic waste and the social sin of competing denominations in small towns and cities have been denounced for decades by the churches themselves. Yet they are feeding that denominational competition with home mission aid to-day. And that aid is raised for another purpose.

It is Mr. Eastman's conviction, born out of a close and intimate touch with Christian folks and much experience in money-raising, that the givers in the churches do not want their money used in any such wasteful and competitive way. He is confident that the boards could not go out and raise any large amount of money to spend in such pathetically overcrowded and mishandled fields as those described above. The boards know that they cannot. And hence they resort to the plan of deception by which real mission objectives are featured in the literature and appeals sent out by the boards, and then a portion of the money thus raised is used in fields for which no one would be willing to give it. Such is the unethical plan that must be resorted to in order to perpetuate this malpractice against the Kingdom.

Mr. Eastman feels sure that the average run of church members to-day are too enlightened and too surcharged with the spirit of Christian comity to give money deliberately for continuing the desolation and waste that denominational competition is bringing about in our rural and small-town sections. In this confidence in the average church member, we share. But the evil lies far deeper than simply in the matter of spending home mission money. It roots down into the very system of denominationalism itself. If it is right to have denominations at all, it is right for them to compete with each other for the various fields. There is no gainsaying that logic, and those who have tried to do so have only succeeded in making themselves ridiculous. And if it is right to have denominational competition, it is right to support it with home mission funds. That is both good sense and inevitable strategy. Underscore the "inevitable strategy"!

The real trouble is in denominationalism itself. All of which

Mr. Eastman complains is an inseparable and inherent element of the denominational system. That these more offensive phases of the system are getting on the nerve of high-minded Christians and running counter to the financial discretion and good common sense of the average church member, is one of the most hopeful signs of to-day. Natural conditions in the mission and rural fields make it inevitable that the denominational system should break down and show its inherent and repellent defects first in these difficult fields. But to undertake any real cure of the situation in the rural and small-town fields, or on foreign mission lands, is to start the processes of deterioration and death in the denominational system itself. Mission boards and conference and denominational officials are shrewd enough to see that, and so they are bitterly resisting any inroads into the denominational structure in these fields, even if they do have to shamefully waste mission funds in both home and foreign missionary work in order to do it. And this condition will never be remedied until the membership of the churches themselves rise in their strength and demand something infinitely better than denominationalism for themselves and the Kingdom.

[From *The Herald of Gospel Liberty*, Dayton, O.]

A United Church Required

A DISUNITED Church, for one thing, cannot permanently continue to maintain itself in a world determined upon unification. And one cannot think aright about the question of unity among the churches without approaching it from the larger question of the unity of mankind as a background. The whole world, as never before, is striving, in spite of all setbacks, to establish some spiritual principle of unity which shall bind it together. The demand for a greater solidarity in the religious world is part of the tendency toward new integration of hitherto divided masses in all other departments of life. In all other spheres in our modern world, the effort has been toward consolidation. For the Church to be left outside this movement is also to be left behind. A highly disorganized Church is an anachronism in a highly organized world. From the Christian point of view, however, this statement is unsatisfactory and incomplete. For the Church has always claimed to possess the secret of unity, and to hold in its hands the spiritual principle by which the antagonisms of the world are to be reconciled.

But, how can the Church expect the world to believe that the Church can do for it what the Church is unable to do for itself? If the urgent task of the Church is to promote the unity of the world, how immediate and paramount becomes the duty of achieving unity within itself? The conscience of the Church is very sensitive on this point. It feels the reproach too keenly for it to be much longer endured.

[Rev. Raymond Calkins in *The Christian Church in the Modern World.*]

The Problem of Unity

MOST of us have a sense of entire helplessness when confronted with the problem of church unity. The union of Christ's Church is a most desirable end, our Lord prayed for its accomplishment and we are bound to pray for its accomplishment. But can we do more than pray? We are not ecclesiastical statesmen and, therefore, have neither the influence nor the knowledge of affairs necessary to go and treat with leaders of the divided forces of the Church Militant. Is there anything that we can do?

A recent Roman Catholic writer offers a very helpful suggestion. He says: "You desire the union of all Christians. Very well! Begin by improving yourself and strive to become nothing less than a perfect Christian. Strive to attain fully to the ideal preached by Jesus, live the life of the Gospel in its perfection. If the world were composed of such Christians, it would not be necessary to attack the barriers of schism; they would fall to the ground by their own weight, they would cease to exist. We become particularists, and therefore we are divided; the nearer we approach to perfection, the farther we are removed from particularism and the more Catholic we become. In order to become perfectly Christian, suppress your own pride, hatred, distrust, hasty judgment, obstinacy, and all anti-Christian vices, and on the morrow union will not be difficult. Consequently, to help another church to develop its religious life, to reform itself, to be of greater merit in the sight of God has the effect, not of confirming it in its particularism, but of bringing it nearer to unity. The more Christian it becomes the more Catholic it will be. No doubt its members will be less likely to leave it by way of individual conversion; but, on the whole and as a body, it will be more disposed towards union."

These words were addressed in the first instance to a group of retreatants in Paris. They seem to show that the key to the

situation is, after all, in the hands of the rank and file and that church union is not so much a matter of signing agreements as is sometimes supposed. As the author points out, in another paragraph, when there is that inward unity of spirit, the mere formality of signing papers will be very simple.

[From *S. S. J. E. Messenger*.]

Unity in the Crucible

The Older Man says:—"It is impossible at present. It is all right in theory, perhaps, and I yield to no one in my longing for unity; but the time for such things is not yet. There are many bridges to cross, you will find, before men of different countries and different denominations can unite permanently in a common religious life such as you speak of. It means dropping your differences if you are to unite really intimately, and that means leaving a pale residuum which . . . well, it amounts to rank undenominationalism. No loyal Anglican could be happy in such a life, or justified in attempting it, however deep his longing for unity might be. Pray God the time may come, but we need much thought and prayer and conference before it can be practical politics."

The Younger Man says:—"Another conference on unity! I am sick of all this talking. We talk and talk about making unity a workable proposition, and all the time we assume as a premise that it is still unworkable. Why don't we take our coats off and work together? We should then find that it does work, even now. *Solvitur laborando*. When you get to work together on a great religious venture, you soon find there are no vital differences between you at all."

*Chee Loo.**—The writer of this article has one foot in each of the above camps—and both feet and hands and all his heart in the greatest adventure in practical unity that he has ever seen or read about—Chee Loo. With the older man he agrees that it is impossible, and with the younger he says, "Why not attempt the impossible and see if it works?"

On the face of it Chee Loo is an impossible venture; no one who had not lived long upon the spot could realize more than a fraction of the difficulties that beset its birth and bringing-up. What hope of rearing such an infant with such an ill-

* The abbreviated Chinese name for the Shantung Christian University at Tsinan. It is by this name that it is generally known in China.

assorted crew of parents and god-parents, different nationalities and different denominations, divergencies far wider than anything we see at home?

How it began.—The first two societies to unite were the American Presbyterians and the English Baptists, with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, some few years later, a nervous third! One's first thought, naturally, is "Whatever drove such strangely ill-assorted fellow-travelers to seek shelter together? It must have been a heavy deluge!" It was . . . a very heavy deluge indeed—the Boxer rebellion. Before those fateful days the position had roughly been this—a number of separate missions all tackling the same great job, all of them past the pioneering days of small things, and all failing to make satisfactory advance because their individual resources were too small—and then, out of the blue, the cloud-burst of the Boxer outbreak, the mission stations in tumbled ruin, and a crowd of disconsolate refugees huddled together out of the storm in a new close fellowship enforced. The port in this storm was Chefoo on the Promontory of Shantung, and their common adversity soon produced among the survivors a crop of close friendships and new understandings of each other's point of view. One can imagine the mighty talks of those days and the great plannings born of that new vision which comes when men seek God's will in groups together. And thus it was that the adventure of Chee Loo was first conceived.

What is emerging?—It is a great thing to see visions and dream dreams in the Sunday-night intimacy of a great emotion; it is a far different thing to carry them out in the cold and critical light of a Monday-morning world. The writer still well remembers the fierce discussions that preceded the action of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in joining the scheme. Were we justified, or was it the great mistake that some people considered it? Here, indeed, is unity in the crucible of a most fiery testing. What is emerging?

A real University.—In this brief article only the swiftest glance is possible at results which would need a book to do them justice. In the first place there has emerged a real university in every sense of the word, including the finest mission medical school in China with a splendid hospital and nursing school attached. Closely adjoining the medical school is the well-wooded university campus of over 80 acres where the arts, the medical, and theological schools are quartered. Five great buildings already finished and a host of smaller ones, prominent among which is the Anglican hostel with its chapel. The

campus is dominated by a beautiful chapel of cathedral architecture and almost cathedral proportions, where far-reaching experiments in combined worship are being carried out. To name but two of Chee Loo's countless activities, there is the University Translation Bureau which is helping to give China a new medical literature, and incidentally to create the new language with which to do it; and there is the famous Extension Department, which has been described by Dr. Robert Speer as "the most effective piece of university extension work that can be found in Asia, if not in the world."

International and Interdenominational, with Students from fourteen Provinces.—The university staff is recruited from four countries, and no less than twelve denominations are taking an official part in the work. The university is now a co-educational institution, and students come to it from over seventy different middle schools scattered over no fewer than fourteen provinces of China. The travels of some of them to reach their university read like the student stories of the Middle Ages. There is no discrimination made between Christians and non-Christians as far as entrance to the university is concerned, but practically all have left the university as Christians, 70 to 80 per cent going directly into church service.

The Chee Loo Family.—And how do these incongruous elements combine? You have only to be in the place a few days, or even hours, to feel the spirit of it. Have you ever lived in a parish where the vicar was a real father of his people, where the services were "family prayers," and where a deep and true family spirit reigned everywhere? That is the spirit of Chee Loo. The affection and enthusiasm with which we talk of our fellow-workers has become something of a joke outside the university, but what would you have when they're all such perfectly splendid . . . but there!

Only last night the writer was sitting at the feet of one of the pioneers in bringing the union about. The tale of the early antagonisms and difficulties sounds to a new-comer almost like a bad fairy story—a story far too highly spiced, alas! for present publication, but one which leaves the hearer full of wonder at the overruling power of God, and the vision and grace and perseverance of the men who believed in the possibility of union, and fought it through to so triumphant an issue.

And what about the dreaded bogey of undenominationism? In the days before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel entered the union, Bishop Iliff, to whose vision and determination we owe so great a debt, was arguing the case hotly

with a prominent doubter. "Ah," said Bishop Iliff, "I begin to see where the difference between us lies. . . . I am a much better Anglican than you are!" (a gasp of interrogation). "You seem to think that the Church is so fragile a thing that it needs all manner of safeguards and protections to keep it from breaking. I have a stronger faith than that. I believe that the Church has something to learn, and something very great to give, and I am not afraid. I would have us enter the union without all these restrictions you call for." Bishop Iliff's wisdom has been amply justified.

There was a day (historical now) when we watched each other with the jaundiced eye of criticism. "What is this system the Americans are trying to foist on us?" . . . "This is a Presbyterian plot; we will have none of it." We watch each other still, but it is with eyes eager to see and learn. May the writer be allowed to give a personal illustration of what he means? Some time ago, at a meeting of the congregation for election of officers, his name was proposed for the superintendentship of the Foreign Children's Sunday-school. He got up at once and said he was a stout Anglican, as they knew, and believed in teaching children all about saints and angels and the Church's year and liturgical prayer and such-like, and he would leave the room while they decided that they would rather not press their proposal! He was immediately shouted down—"Go ahead: we are not afraid of what you will teach them. We want our children to learn anything good that you have to give them, etc., etc." It required a large measure of grace for older and far wiser folk than the writer to have said and meant such things, and he sat down with a lump in his throat wondering if he were showing as gracious a willingness to learn from them. He is now holding the children's service in the beautiful little chapel of the Anglican Hostel, and trying to pass on some of the treasures of his own inheritance; and all the parents know, and approve, and send their children.

To return to our "younger man"; is he right in condemning conferences and saying that when we work together we find there are no real differences? Alas, not yet! We need all the prayer and thought and discussion that wise and consecrated minds can bring to bear upon our problems, but ventures like Chee Loo have taught us that love and faith and hope are bigger than differences, and that when we work together we *can* work together, and in the truest unity. Our path is beset on either side with knotty problems, some thrilling, some ridiculous, but our great discovery is that they are on the *side* of the

path, not in the *centre*, and we can go ahead, problems notwithstanding.

In the last analysis, perhaps, the proof of success rests in the effect that such an adventure produces upon the lives of the individual adventurers. May the writer again be allowed to give personal testimony? Some of his friends foretold that his days as an Anglican were numbered, that he would emerge as a "betwixt-and-between," or as one of those "little sillies who are not sure what they are" described by Barrie in *Peter Pan*. He has had shocks in plenty; he has learned, sometimes with real pain, of many unsuspected shortcomings in his mother-Church; but with a clearer knowledge of her failings has come a doubling and trebling of his love and loyalty to her, and of his belief in her future. He does not wish to see China become Anglican. He wants to see her become that greater thing to which the English Church has pointed the way in the great message that came from Lambeth. In those glowing words is enshrined the vision and genius of our church to-day. Has ever a body of Christians had so great a call or so great an opportunity? Pray God we may not fail Him when it comes to putting our principles of unity into practice.

[From F. H. Mosse in *The East and the West*, London.]

The Mürren Conference on Unity

THE revival at Mürren, in the Swiss Alps, in 1923 of the conference held thirty years previously at Grindelwald was so successful that Sir Henry Lunn resumed the conference in 1924, bringing together an assembly even more representative than that of 1923. It included Anglicans, Free Churchmen, representatives of the Church of Sweden, the Lutheran Church of Germany, the Methodist Episcopal Church of America, and the Reformed Churches of Switzerland, France and Hungary, and the Eastern Orthodox Church. Among them were the Most Rev. Nathan Söderblom, D.D., Archbishop of Upsala; Professors Diessmann and Richter and Baron von Pechmann (Germany); Bishop Cannon and Dr. Atkinson (U. S. A.); Dr. Kellier and Professor Choisy (Switzerland); the Rev. H. M. d'Aubigne and Professor Paul Sabatier (France); Bishop Ravatz (Hungary); and Bishop Nicolai (Serbia). The Anglicans and Free Churchmen included Archbishop Bernard, Dublin; the Bishops of Winchester, Chelmsford, Edinburgh, Plymouth, Peterborough; the Dean of Bristol, Canons Lacey, Moore, and

Guy Rogers, Professor Carnegie Simpson, Dr. T. R. Glover, Dr. Scott Lidgett, the Rev. J. E. Rappenbury, Dr. Charles Brown, the Rev. Thomas Phillips, the Rev. Benjamin Gregory, and Mrs. George Cadbury. The committee decided that the conference this year would most effectively advance the cause of unity "by ceasing for awhile to discuss our differences, and concentrating upon the thought of our Common Evangel, that message in which we can join in one spirit and one hope of our calling, to proclaim the love of God to men as the one effective redemptive appeal to a sinning and sorrowing world." In his presidential address Sir Henry Lunn urged that an apostolate with an evangel is the supreme need of the age. The greatest of all heresies, he said, is Antinomianism (*i. e.*, rejecting the moral law on some ground of perverted Christian principle), and that is the chief danger to-day. "In the reaction from the forced discipline of military service, the whole world is passing through a period of lawlessness, and this is especially felt in the religious world. . . . Lawlessness and heresy will not be conquered by ratiocination, but by consecration and conviction." We cannot, he continued, be apostles unless we are touched by the spirit of such followers of Christ as St. Benedict, St. Francis Xavier, St. Teresa, Rutherford, Bunyan, and John and Charles Wesley, and enter into sympathy with the method of Christ's intercessory prayer. Unless they went from the conference with some definite message as the result of their own consecration there on the mountainside to God, and of their determination to enter into his spirit, they would have met in vain. An object lesson in Christian unity was afforded on the first Sunday morning of the conference, when at Holy Communion Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists, and a German Lutheran knelt at the same altar in the little English church, the Bishop of Chelmsford officiating. If this is possible at Mürren, why not elsewhere? asks the editor of the *Church of England Newspaper*.

—[From *The American Church Monthly*, New York.]

Longing for Christian Unity

[An address delivered at the Mürren Conference by the Most Rev. the Archbishop of Upsala, Sweden.]

The first and last duty of a "Fellow-worker unto the Kingdom of God" is to fill and strengthen his inner life or to cleanse and enrich his soiled and poor heart with the presence of the

Father "who, to speak with our Saviour, is in secret"—that is, who is on the inner side of existence behind our thoughts and wills, nearer to us than our own souls.

But we cannot isolate the work for our own salvation from the entire "fellow-working unto the Kingdom of God." That is an illusion cherished still to-day by many pious men and women, but contrary to the spirit of Christ and his Apostles. There is no single great or small duty in my life which is not necessary for my own salvation.

Let me mention to-day two distinct Christian duties—two urgent Christian aims. They are not foreign to each other; on the contrary, they depend largely on each other. But they are distinctly two, and must be clearly distinguished from each other.

I mean, first, our fellow-working for realizing our unity in Christ, and, secondly, our fellow-working for applying God's rule to human conditions in national and international life.

APOSTLES OF UNITY

(1) The longing for Christian unity is felt now everywhere—after the disruption in the world tragedy—more keenly than ever before. It has been advocated by the Lambeth Appeal and a hundred other sincere and corporate outbursts of the Christian conscience in all lands and in most communions. During fifteen years the same great need has been served by the Faith and Order Movement instituted by our Episcopal brethren in the United States. Its devoted and indefatigable apostle, Robert Gardiner, speaketh, although he is dead. His gentle energy and his noble life stand before our inner sight, strengthening and exhorting. But long before the creation of the Faith and Order Movement, or any other of the numerous modern strivings for Christian unity, a man followed a divine inspiration in summoning in 1892 the first Grindelwald Conference and in continuing those gatherings and taking them up again in this unrivaled cathedral, where we have come to praise God's sacred name and to listen to his voice. This cathedral is orientated, though, not West-East, but North-South. Ice-capped peaks form the walls. The deep, green valley is the central alley, leading from the entrance gate up towards the choir. Grindelwald, Wengen on the one side, and Mürren, Gimmelwald on the other, form, as it were, the rows of benches. The rushing sounds of singing water from beneath Lauterbrunnen throughout the valley and the rolling echoes of thunder constitute the many-voiced organ, and in the shining white mystery of the

Berner Oberland in the South, we imagine the altar, sometimes hidden, sometimes unveiled for awful adoration and worship.

The dear and venerable brother, who has gathered us here, and who entertains us with Christian care and more than royal hospitality, must rejoice in the Lord in seeing how Christian unity, which God made the noble passion of his life, is become in our days the recognized Christian ideal and duty as never before. The unity already exists in Christ between all true believers, who live in God. Nothing is more wonderful than that spiritual communion of Christians. You may experience an intimate fellowship with a soul that belongs to a different denomination — perhaps to a distant country with traditions very foreign to your own. But, if that blessed spiritual unity, already existing, is alleged as an excuse for refusing co-operation for Christian unity, it becomes untrue to the Master Himself, who, according to St. John xvi, did not urge only spiritual and invisible unity, but also its visible outcome, because it is said “that the world may believe that Thou didst send Me.” The spiritual unity is not visible to the world.

CHRIST'S RULE MUST BE EXTENDED

The second urgent aim for our “fellow-working unto the Kingdom of God” says that Christ's rule must be extended to national and international life. Human conditions must be Christianized, baptized, not allowed to run as heathens, ruled by the selfishness of the lower ego, in neglect of what Christ taught and did, and is to-day and forever. In other words, the incarnation of the Logos must reach and embrace also the social and economic and industrial life and international relations. Human conditions, the use of wealth and power and politics must be made sacramental. They must bear witness of God's grace and of our Christian faith.

The brotherhood of men, the breaking down of the middle wall of partition through the Cross and our stewardship of love, must be preached and confessed, not as a sentimental idea, but as a definite doctrine of the Church, and not only confessed and inculcated as clear-cut dogmas in Christ's teaching, but realized in the relationship of the groups of society and of the national units, with the help of the best experience and the keenest thought and the wisest action in economic and international life. That means the entire Copec programme.

The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, which has taken for its motto St. Paul's words “. . . Fellow-workers unto the Kingdom of God,” and which it is intended

to be held in Stockholm in August, 1925, serves both those ends, Christian unity and the application of Christ's spirit to economic and social and international relations. Our Life and Work Movement does not mix both those great undertakings, but it understands that:—(1) In contemplating together in prayer and mutual counsel our Christian duty toward the problems, which oppress and hamper our civilization to-day, it will inevitably make for church unity, and (2) that Christian unity is necessary to a certain extent, if the Church shall be able to heal those wounds of society and of our entire civilization.

“THE OBVIOUS DANGER”

You know the argument of that gentleman who refused to enter a committee to which he had been appointed. He thoroughly approved the good object of the committee, but he said, “I don't want to be a member, because Mr. Smith is on that committee, and I hate Mr. Smith and his ideas; but if I am going to co-operate with him for the betterment of labour conditions in our town, I am afraid I might learn to respect him, even to like him, and to find his ideas reasonable, which I do not want.” Such is the obvious danger of co-operation. Prejudices will fall down and a real unity will reveal itself beneath them. Does not the same, perhaps unconscious, argument prevent some Christian from heartily joining others in Christian work?

In following more closely the Lord, in penitence and trust and whole-heartedly loving service, we shall inevitably draw nearer to each other. An acute intelligence amongst the lay Churchmen in Germany has expressed his experience in these words, “Doctrine divides, but service unites.” The first half may be too pessimistic, since doctrine is intended to seal unity and make it steadfast. But the tragic history, say, for instance, of Holy Communion, the foremost act of fellowship in the Church and Congregation of Christ, testifies to the sad truth of that saying.—Let me add, in parenthesis, that I, for my part, do not at all believe in a unity arrived at by cutting down the doctrinal structure of each communion as far as it expresses more or less adequately Christian experience in the language of our poor intellect, which can never grasp and render in a system God's Truth, but can receive Himself in our hearts and lives. I do not believe in a minimizing of positive dogmas, but, on the contrary, in concrete and characteristic types of piety in church life. Our mediæval sanctuaries were too dark. It became necessary to widen their windows and gates in order to let in more light and more sun, more air. “Lift up your heads, ye

gates." Indeed, sun and daylight is needed, and fresh air must be allowed to enter into the sanctuaries of devotion. But, if you go on widening gates and windows, you will have much light and much air, but scarcely any walls. That which makes a building is not the windows but the walls. The building will lose much of its solidity. It will be open and luminous, but it will scarcely be a shelter, a refuge, a home for poor human souls any more.

Therefore, I think that Christian unity will be arrived at, not by diminishing the content of faith, but by discovering one day that our denominations constitute chapels in one and the same Church of Christ.

SERVICE UNITES

Anyhow, the second half of the sentence is true. *Service unites*. It is impossible to meet the huge miseries and injustices of our times if we continue to walk separately. We are never tired of quoting, over and over again, a father in God and a patriarch in his church, whom a painful loss has prevented to be here present. He wrote (in the preface to one of the reports of the Archbishop's Committees): "In the region of moral and social questions we desire all Christians to begin at once to act together as if they were one body, in one visible fellowship. This can be done by all alike without any injury to theological principles."

His successor, the present bishop of Winchester, has rightly written that the Copec Conference in Birmingham was in several respects the most remarkable meeting ever held in British Christendom. I would add that it was, in its domain, the most remarkable meeting ever held in the entire history of Christendom.

The Stockholm Conference in August, 1925, has been from the beginning intended to be what can be described now, after the Birmingham Conference, as a Copec for the whole of Christendom. The Copec Conference started from a unity of language, nation, traditions. That will be changed in Stockholm into a multitude of languages and nations and traditions. Will it be possible? I think it is difficult to answer that question. But there is not a bit of doubt that it is necessary. And even if a thing has been impossible, it has become accomplished in the individual moral life, as well as in history, if it has been necessary in God's purpose for the world.

THE ANARCHY THAT REIGNS

We must come out from the anarchy that reigns now in

Christendom as to the ideas about the obligation of the Church regarding the economic, social, and industrial problems. One preacher says, "In order to be a real Christian, you must be a Socialist." Another tells, with the same deep tone of conviction, that, on the contrary, a Christian must oppose Socialism, because private property is necessary for the development of character and independence. If you walk some way further down in the town and enter another church, perhaps of the same denomination, you will hear the preacher say that Christian doctrine has nothing to do at all with such problems. I wonder if the last one has ever read a book called the New Testament, where our Lord speaks much about mammon, which means property. We must get at clear ideas and leading principles for united action in those respects.

And further, the Church, as such, must endorse Christ's teaching of the Brotherhood of Nations, exemplified by Him in a way most scandalous to national feeling of his own day, when He spoke of Samaritans and Jews. If we understand that the extension of lawful order to international relations in a real Commonwealth of Nations, belongs to God's continued creation and revelation, the Church, as such, must give to that commonwealth of nations a Christian soul, otherwise it will, with all political cleverness, be a machine (that is a dead body with no soul) or it may get a devil for its soul instead of being inspired by Christ's teaching and spirit.

Time is lacking for reminding us how such a craving for united action of the Church in international and national strifes and problems has inspired many of the prophets and teachers in the Church. In his Preface to one of the Symbola of our Evangelic Church, the Articles of Schmalkaldan, Martin Luther urges that the Christian Conference asked for and needed, ought to take up the disunion of peoples and princes, and the sins and miseries of society, and thus get an object worthy of the Christian vocation, instead of occupying itself with questions of ecclesiastical toilet and such momentous things.

It has been told many times how similar indicatives were issued independently in 1916 and 1917 in Great Britain, in America, in the Scandinavian North, in Switzerland and in Hungary, in order to provoke a testimony of Christian solidarity in spite of the disruption of war; and how those similar movements burning in Christian hearts throughout the world, found each other and united in the programme for a universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. The idea was brought

before the gathering of the World Alliance near to the Hague in 1919—by the way the first time when responsible men from the belligerent camps met in friendly discourse—and those men were Evangelic Christians. Brought before that assembly, the Life and Work Movement received a hearty blessing from the World Alliance, of which it is thus a child, as it were, and with which it is anxious to keep the nearest possible relationship throughout its realization. The following year the Conference on Life and Work was constituted in 1920 at Geneva.

The Life and Work Movement acquired its constitution in four sections; the American, the British, the European, and the Orthodox one, with a common secretariat. It was decided later on—a proposal from our American brethren—that the Conference should take place in August, 1925, in Stockholm—a fulfilment as it were of Sir Henry Lunn's first plan of summoning the conference in 1892 to Norway.

VALUE OF "COPEC"

By far the most important preparation for our meeting has been accomplished by the admirable achievement of the Copec Conference. A similar meeting is to be held in the United States after due preparations. Many years of Christian deliberation, thought and experience in Germany, in France, in the North, etc., on the same problems are being summed up by commissions and in conferences held in those different countries. Those preparations are intended to be presented in the clearest possible way in reports circulated in order to be studied, before the International Committee, enlarged by experts from different countries, will meet between the 9th and the 18th of August and present, as we hope, the final result of such preparations in theses to the Conference itself, which is to gather from the 19th to the 29th of August. It will be composed of official delegates appointed by the Christian communions; but no resolution passed will be in any way binding on any communion before it has been considered authoritatively and eventually accepted.

Let me express the hope that those here present will come to our meeting as delegates from their communions, and let me offer a hearty welcome to each one who carries in his heart this sacred task, entrusted by God to his Church to-day under circumstances which cry for the leadership of Christ's spirit.

But the most essential "fellow-working unto the Kingdom of God" consists in prayer and in strengthening our own inner life.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

In Hearty Agreement With Dr. Guth's Recent Article

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY,

Dear Sir:—I am in hearty agreement with the article on denominational education by President Guth in a recent issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly*.

A. C. MCGIFFERT.

President's Room,
Union Theological Seminary,
New York City.

Wisdom in Dr. Guth's Point of View

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY,

Dear Sir:—I have just read with appreciation the article written by President W. W. Guth in *The Christian Union Quarterly*. So far as I can judge, there is great wisdom in his point of view. Personally, I have had no experience in an educational institution in which there was either denominational or sectarian control. Northwestern University is definitely affiliated with the Methodist Episcopal Church, but that church assumes no control whatsoever that could be in any way questioned. I have no fear that any Protestant church will seriously throttle the progress of educational institutions in America. If all our institutions of higher learning were controlled by the various denominations, the situation might be quite different. In my judgment, the article by Dr. Guth is quite true, and if the late controversy over fundamentalism had seriously affected progress in the sectarian colleges and not in the other colleges, I should be more afraid of denominational control.

The co-operation of the churches in promoting education is essential. If we had the choice between really godless colleges and sectarian controlled colleges, the situation would be very serious. In my judgment, the day is past for both, and we have most certainly entered into a period in which our institutions of higher learning are definitely Christian, and the distinctions are becoming less and less between the State controlled, denominationally controlled, and privately endowed institutions of higher learning.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER DILL SCOTT.

Office of the President,
Northwestern University,
Evanston, Ill.

Dissents From Dr. Guth

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY,

Dear Sir:—There has not appeared within the last few years a more ex-parte argument than that of President Guth on "Denominational Education." His evidence of the narrowness of denominational education rests on a few cases and is unjust because his induction is insufficient. He forgets the many denominational schools in which the teaching of religion is broad and in which there is no taboo upon real scientific facts.

It is a very clever effort to reduce the great denominations to sects. Every careful thinker knows that the great denominations stand for the fundamentals of religion and that through them alone Christianity is kept alive historically. Were it not for the great denominations and their schools there would be no supply of Christian leadership, either in the pulpit or pew. It has been demonstrated that churches are compelled to have their own colleges because the great institutions not controlled by the Church never furnish enough men and women to carry on the Christian work of the world.

It is also true that many corrupting intellectual influences have gone out from the non-denominational schools because there was no definite teaching of religion to furnish the motives for a real moral life. Philosophies were taught, and are being taught, that are in direct contradiction with the very foundations of Christian truth. Christian truth cannot live simply through emotion or sentiment. It has a necessary body of truth. It is the denominational schools that keep this alive for the good of civilization and our land.

It is not sufficient to claim the name Christian. The essential part is—what are the fruits? The denominational school is the outstanding school that works directly to adjust a student's faith to his growth of knowledge. It does not send forth large groups of materialists which are a curse to our country. There is a fine balance over against mere intellectualism in the spiritual influences of a denominational college. If President Guth will look at the question in a broad light he will not depreciate the denominational school, but, as a Christian, thank God for what it is doing.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN A. W. HAAS.

Office of the President,
Muhlenberg College,
Allentown, Pa.

Dr. Guth Speaks With Authority

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY,

Dear Sir:—I have just read President Guth's article in *The Christian Union Quarterly*. My "reaction" is as follows:

President Guth speaks with the authority of a trained investigator and experienced educator. He has learned full well that Christian education, by its very nature, forbids "control" by any social group, however large or small, that has any interest other than the intellectual and moral freedom of the persons in our schools, whether members of the faculty or of the student body.

In a democracy the only defensible position for any religious group is to resist the temptation to control educational processes and ideals by selfish group considerations. So-called "denominational control" will have no dangers only when members of the supporting denomination care more for Christian education than for the welfare of the group to which they belong.

President Guth's article is timely and worthy of serious consideration by all interested in Christian education in America.

Yours very truly,

MILTON G. EVANS.

President's Office,
Crozer Theological Seminary,
Chester, Pa.

The Guilt of Privately Endowed and Denominational Schools

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY,

Dear Sir:—Dr. Guth places privately endowed institutions with State institutions as over against denominational schools, in considering universal growth in religious understanding and conduct and the dynamic toward this, which might be actuated through the Church in society.

The problem of more comprehensive education through State institutions seems to me as often blocked, weakened, and rivaled by privately endowed institutions as by denominational schools. Therefore, their *raison d'être* evolves from a joint facing of two questions: (1) What are the ultimate ends in a democracy regarding general education and where is the Church's place therein? (2) Toward realization of these ends, where must the privately endowed institutions and denominational schools make a contribution?

As Christian citizens of a democracy, can we avoid facing State support of schools as ultimately the only effective agency which can take up the question of universal education, because it can (1) more easily consider the interests of the whole in setting standards—formulate a minimum standard, raise it from time to time, and protect any lowering of it by private agencies; (2) more easily maintain major claims; (3) more adequately introduce uniformity when desirable; (4) more generally stimulate additional activities?

Can we as Christian citizens, facing the struggle toward these ideal conditions as being basically the creation of a greater national sensitiveness to equality of opportunity, thereby, avoid failure caused by State enactments over the heads of local groups and the cramping uniformity and standardization which will result? The State can no more afford to serve only the interests of a particular group than the Church of Christ can. The State, as the Church, must be concerned with the total connectiveness of each individual with the whole group.

Given this Ideal Education in a democratic State, are we not faced with an enlarging experience, changing both the situation and the persons? Where are the privately endowed institutions and denominational schools? Are they not identical? Where is the Church? Is it not identical with the Kingdom of Heaven for which we pray?

At present public education does afford all types of experience for growth—inclusive of religious functioning—but the distribution is limited. A large field of religious experience is still left to the church to provide training in worship, passing on of religious heritages, and that most neglected field, getting at the national and international implications of the social ideals of Christianity. It is in meeting these problems at present that privately endowed institutions and denominational schools could have real value through providing a more understanding leadership and stimulus to public education toward seeing complete life as religious functioning.

But are not privately endowed institutions and denominational schools equally faced with the problem of adjusting themselves progressively to a democratic order, which changes for them in ratio to their success in creating its fulness of life? Cannot the accusations against progress confront them both as well as State institutions? Are they not both more or less guilty of self perpetuation at the cost of a larger good, segregation of the most fit in society, indoctrinations, and, therefore, limited understanding and lack of national progress?

Private schools were founded (1) in order to improve and experiment in education. How much of this has been consciously contributed to public education made more available to the masses? (2) To insure expert use of money for teachers, equipment, etc. How has this contributed to the opportunity of the less fortunate child? (3) To hold social position, family prestige, segregation from certain social contacts, for wider range of cultural outlook, to hide backward children, or advance superior. What contribution has this made to society as a whole? How awakened students to a sense of their own powers and their relation to a world of action? (4) That parents' individual ideas of education be given outlet. What stimulus has this been to the establishment of State laboratories and the release of the educational dreams of less economically independent teachers and parents? As Dr. Guth summed up the evils of the denominational system, so might we sum up the evils of privately endowed institutions: "Is it not a logical

consequence of the attempt to control education and drive it to the defense of any kind of—belief?" Are they not "put under the pressure of certain kinds of beliefs?"

It is true that denominational schools were founded to protect children against public school curriculum—not wholly because of religious spirit but by segregation to make sure of certain religious indoctrination—parents feeling this their duty and right? It is questionable how far this could build any national consciousness of the value of worship, give wide-spread inspiration for the acquisition of our religious heritage as stimulus for life to-day, or develop a dynamic for directing *national* life as our Christian ideals imply.

Are not both privately endowed institutions and denominational schools guilty of failing in promoting "religion as the implicit motive of education" (Coe) because of religious, economic, cultural, or social and historic cleavages?

Taking a long look—as we pray for the Kingdom of Heaven—are they seeing themselves necessarily self-exterminating as they merge into the larger life of a democratic State? Are they not equally faced with the present call of the Church's need—new purposes for interdenominational and denominational growth toward more comprehensive religious functioning? Each needs greater insight. If they will not see, both must not be allowed to go their way unmolested.

MARY E. WEISEL.

Office of the Dean,
Presbyterian Graduate
School of Religious Education,
Baltimore, Md.

In Agreement With Dr. Guth

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY,

Dear Sir:—In the main, I am in hearty agreement with the opinions expressed by President Guth in his article in a recent issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly*.

Sincerely yours,

Office of the President,
Wellesley College,
Wellesley, Mass.

ELLEN F. PENDLETON.

A Defense of the Denominational School

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY,

Dear Sir:—The first sentence of Dr. Guth's recent article in *The Quarterly* is open to criticism. "A sharp distinction should be made between

denominational education and Christian education." That all depends upon what Christian education is and what denominational education is. If "denominational" stands only for the things which cause one denomination to differ from another denomination, then the body of denominational teaching is exceedingly small, and would be sectarian. If Christian education is the body of truth contained in the Holy Scriptures, as interpreted and applied by the New Testament, then all denominations teach Christian education, and denominational schools stand for Christian education. For example: I do not know a single Presbyterian college under denominational control which gives any emphasis whatsoever to the distinctive Presbyterian denominational characteristics. In all the under-graduate courses in the Bible there is nothing sectarian, but plenty that is Christian. The literature, history, and doctrines of the Bible are not a denominational possession; hence, a Presbyterian teacher can teach the whole Bible without being denominational in any sectarian sense. All denominations are Christian, and all Christians are denominational; at least, all active Christians are denominational. The State is Christian. That is affirmed, generally, concerning the United States, and it may be said also of all Protestant and Catholic Europe. To deny that nations are Christian, and to deny that denominations are Christian, is a distinction that is so "sharp" as to be untrue.

The last paragraph of Dr. Guth's is full of erroneous assumptions:

If all the denominations could be *broad-minded* enough to free their colleges from organic connection or ecclesiastical control and regard them as proper for listing in some such category as the second one above, education in our country would surely receive a great impetus for good and a real blessing. There would then be *no rivalry* among denominations to establish and maintain institutions of learning; funds could be *honestly solicited* for real and worthy educational efforts; many colleges would achieve their well earned and much desired retirement, but others would be infused with new life; plants, equipment, and endowments *would increase* to keep pace with justified demands; *freedom* of research and teaching would be assured; teachers would be more adequately remunerated for their services and better men and women would be attracted to the teaching profession; the student would get what he is entitled to—an education *without sham* or pretence; and religion and morality, as decreed by the framers of the Act of 1787, would go hand in hand with knowledge, to the end that good government and the happiness of mankind would not be an ideal only.

The italicized words are my own work. Read each sentence and see if Dr. Guth has been fair to any denomination, whether Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Disciple, Episcopalian, or Catholic. Take the expression "broad-minded." Are denominations narrow-minded? Is there unchristian "rivalry" among denominations in their educational work? Are funds dishonestly solicited by denominations? Would "freedom" be any more "assured" than now? Is present denominational education a "sham"?

Undoubtedly, Dr. Guth has had an individual experience somewhat

different from mine. He has less optimism as to the real value of Christian denominations and the work they have done and the spirit in which they are drawing together into larger denominations. It seems to me the article, as an article, makes unfortunate criticisms on many of our denominational schools and overlooks the real Christian work that is done by them, and is unfortunately optimistic with reference to State institutions and privately operated institutions. Freedom from restraint is not an evidence that any citizen is more law abiding. It is a fallacy to say the "least governed is the best governed." Our present State and ecclesiastically operated institutions disprove this popular and erroneous view. As I read Dr. Guth's article I wondered what the country would do for ministers and missionaries and religious teachers if it were not for denominational colleges, and the Christian atmosphere and teaching which dominate them.

Yours truly,

Office of the President,
Missouri Valley College,
Marshall, Mo.

WM. H. BLACK.

Dr. King Supports Dr. Guth's Position

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY,

Dear Sir:—I am glad to say that I find myself quite in agreement with President Guth in his article.

Very sincerely yours,

Office of the President,
Oberlin College,
Oberlin, Ohio.

HENRY C. KING.

Why the Christian Church Needs Colleges

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY,

Dear Sir:—President Guth writes masterfully in a recent issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly* on the folly of "Denominational Education." The reader is "almost persuaded."

There is much, however, to be said on the other side. Public money can be used to teach everything else except religion. The subjects that are hostile to religion can be taught in tax supported institutions, but not religion itself.

To be entirely consistent, President Guth should indict the State insti-

tutions along with the denominational colleges. They are sectarian too. Any institution that is not free to teach all truth is sectarian.

So long as the State taxes its citizens to maintain institutions of higher learning, wherein religion cannot be taught on the same basis as other subjects, just so long will the churches maintain their own schools wherein all truth may be taught, including religious truth.

President Guth cannot minimize the stubborn fact that ninety per cent of the ministers of the churches continue to come out of the denominational colleges, though more than twice as many students attend other types of school as attend denominational colleges. The Disciples of Christ figure that only ten per cent of their students of college grade attend their own colleges and yet they claim that eighty per cent of their ministers come from this ten per cent.

While some denominational colleges are sectarian, the vast majority are open-minded toward all truth. It is no more fair to style them, as a class, sectarian, than it is to say that all State universities are godless or that all independent institutions are "cultural."

When the American people take a common sense view of religion and give it the same support in tax supported institutions they do to other departments of learning, I could consider the proposal to do away with denominational colleges which President Guth eloquently advocates. As matters now stand, in sheer desperation the churches have no choice but to maintain their denominational schools.

This does not hold for secondary education, because children and young people in these schools are at home, or should normally be, and can be given the religious nurture their lives must have in order to be well rounded. But colleges are far removed from most homes and present a different problem. The custom of bringing religious instruction in from the outside in State schools, while I heartily favour it, has not yet proved its ability to give the Christian atmosphere so necessary to the steadying of the conviction to give one's life to all-time Christian service. If the future proves it able to do this, the solution of our problem may be in that direction. At present we should on this point maintain the attitude of the open mind.

Sincerely,

W. A. HARPER.

President's Office,
Elon College,
Elon College, N. C.

Not Denominational, But Christian Education

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY,

Dear Sir:—I can sum up my comments on President Guth's "Denomi-

national Education" in a single sentence. I believe the world needs, not denominational, but thorough Christian education.

Sincerely,

Office of the President,
Butler College,
Indianapolis, Ind.

ROBERT J. ALEY.

Another Point of View of the Denominational College

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY,

Dear Sir:—I agree with many views of Dr. Guth on denominational education, as expressed in a recent issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly*. In our effort to make our people support our denominational colleges, we are under constant temptation to put our case too strongly and to do injustice to non-denominational institutions. We are not going to Christianize our youth unless we can Christianize those who are in State and private institutions. One of the dangers in having denominational institutions is that it tends to keep Christian people from taking proper interest in having State institutions Christian. Of course, an institution can be Christian without being denominational, and it is the duty of Christian citizens to see that their State institutions represent their Christian civilization.

It is also true that practically every constituency of a small college would be overjoyed to find its small institution made large over-night. For the American public (I am not speaking of the few, the very few thoughtful educators) put numbers as the test of the success of an institution. They cannot believe that any institution that remains small is a good institution.

Nevertheless, there is a place for the denominational college, even for the small denominational college, and there is something to be said for its continuance.

In the first place, if denominations are going to continue, they will find that a college of their own is essential to their having an educated ministry and leaders who have grown up in the denominational atmosphere. Such an atmosphere is made, not by teaching any denominational tenets, but by having the chief men in the institution members of the denomination and exerting their influence for the denomination, simply by doing their work and living their life as Christian members of the denomination. Of the denominational colleges that I know best, I am sure no one who went from one to another would know which denomination was in control by anything that is taught, and yet there would be in each case the denominational atmosphere that I speak of, which would be helpful to the students of that

denomination in strengthening their denominational life. The institution that I attended never required any student to go to Church or even to attend chapel, had no courses in the Bible and did not even have the courses of the older colleges in Evidences of Christianity, and yet we felt that the atmosphere was Christian and denominational, though not half the professors belonged to the denomination that was in control of the college.

It is worth while for any denomination to have such an institution and an appeal for money can be made for such an institution to persons who would not feel the necessity of giving to an independent institution. Of course, there is danger when the denomination can control or undertakes to control an institution by the denominational general assembly. But there is also danger, as we know, in a State institution being dictated to by the State legislature. It is well that we have institutions of both kinds. It will not often happen that the same kind of intolerance that dominates legislatures will dominate the churches. And one kind of institution is a check on the other. But as to whether an institution would best serve its purposes by changing from one kind to the other—a church institution, for example, surrendering its denominational control, would depend upon circumstances and would be for the authorities of the institution and its constituency to decide; but a college that grows large and comes to serve a larger public than it was founded to serve, is not likely to be objectionable to its public denominationally, or else it would never have grown large.

The task of giving all the people higher education is a stupendous one, one that no other nation has ever undertaken and we need all the agencies to accomplish this task that can be appealed to. If any one will take the trouble to find out how many students were graduated last year from denominational colleges and compare it with those who were graduated from State institutions, he will be surprised to find what an enormous work the denominational colleges are doing. Some years ago a writer published an article in *The Popular Science Monthly* in which he thinks he showed that 75% of all the colleges and universities in the State are "sectarian" and that these "sectarian" institutions educate twice as many of our young men and women as do the non-sectarian colleges and universities. I gathered statistics from the reports of the United States Commissioner of Education and my figures showed that the denominational colleges did not educate so large a number, but very nearly as many as the non-denominational.

One of the most statesmanlike presentations of the subject of church colleges is in a paper prepared by a member of the General Education Board of New York, a man who has given profound study to the subject of building and perpetuating civilization through education and who has had at his disposal time and means to pursue his study for many years in this country and in the Old World as well. It is largely by his advice that millions of dollars have been given to church colleges that might otherwise have been given to State and undenominational institutions. I had the pleasure of

reading his paper, and I asked to be allowed to publish it. But as it was confidential and intended only for the Board, this was not granted; but I was permitted to publish certain passages from it.

The General Education Board has been given many millions of dollars "to promote a comprehensive system of higher education in the United States." The question before the Board was whether any of this money should be given to church colleges. The author of this paper takes the position that our national system of education is simply the sum total of the systems in the States, and continues:

"State systems of colleges will have to be built up through wise cooperation with local denominational agencies. I believe that statistics disclose the fact that some eight or nine tenths of all students enrolled in the colleges and universities of the United States, be they State or denominational, were reared in the homes of the people who were actual members of Christian Churches. . . . Religion is the foster mother of education. . . . The denominational tendency is toward over-multiplication. We shall need carefully to study the numbers, the distribution of the wealth of the different denominations in each State. Oftentimes we shall have to discourage sects which have neither the numbers nor the means to support their college. We may find it necessary at times to harmonize conflicting sectional or local interests within denominations themselves. We shall need to work sympathetically. We may deplore sectarianism but the sects exist. They harness the powerful motives of religion to the educational chariot. They are the mightiest agencies possible ready made to our hands. Among the Protestant sects there is little abuse of this power. They make no test of admission to their colleges, and little check is placed on freedom of inquiry. That little is rapidly passing away. Nor is such conservatism as exists altogether unhealthy. If the sects are destined to disappear, the objector to sectarian colleges has nothing in the end to fear. Meanwhile let us see them while we have them. But they will not disappear. The sectarian spirit is indeed declining; but sectarian organizations will continue long after the convictions which originated them have been modified or laid aside. As social organizations based on community of taste and feeling in matters religious, they have a permanent root in the varieties of character and culture among men, and they will continue indefinitely. Let us therefore use them gladly and fearlessly; they are for good and not harm. . . . We know not what social paroxysms await us, and the higher agencies of education ought to be fortresses, impregnable fortresses of truth. If too great dependence on the populace for annual support is a possible weakness in our State universities, that fact becomes a powerful reason for endowing the private institutions. If the test should come, the power which will act most effectively to preserve the State institutions will be private and denominational colleges and universities amply endowed and holding and teaching truth, whatever may be the passion of the hour, and ultimately directing popular opinions into right channels. Better yet, and more probable, the private foundations everywhere numerous and free, will so enlighten and direct popular opinion at all times that there can never ensue a conflict between the democracy and its State institutions."

Very sincerely yours,

R. E. BLACKWELL.

Office of the President,
Randolph-Macon College,
Ashland, Va.

BOOK REVIEWS

PROBLEMS OF CHURCH UNITY. By Walter Lowrie, M. A., Rector of the American Church, Rome. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

This book presents, as its basis for the discussion of church unity, four principal factors: Faith—a common faith; Love—a uniting love; Prayer—a common prayer; and Order—a common ministry. As to which must first be sought after in point of time depends upon the precise character of the disunion that we hope to resolve. The differences which separate the various Protestant denominations, according to Mr. Lowrie, come chiefly under the head of Order, whereas the differences which divide Roman Catholics, Orthodox, and Anglicans have chiefly to do with Faith, and yet he pertinently raises the question whether, as a method of approach, this is not too mechanical.

He classifies faith, hope, and love as spiritual gifts, prayer as a spiritual experience, order—whether of worship or administration—as a spiritual product, and emphasizes that it is a spiritual experience which unites us: “in other words, it is an experience of the Spirit.” The fundamental communion is “the communion of the Holy Spirit,” which means “not a solitary intercourse *with* God, not at all a communion *with* the Spirit, but the communion which we have with one another in the common experience of the life-giving Spirit.” Consequently, he rightly argues, the problem of Christian reunion brings us face to face with the need of a revival of religion.

He shows that the essential idea of the Church has frequently been obscured in discussion. Luther thought it best to discard “the blind and uncertain word Church (*Kirche*).” The Puritans sought to do away with the ambiguity by distinguishing scrupulously the “meeting house” from the congregation. The New Testament provides us with no express definition of the Church, because it was too well known to need definition and was adopted as the most apt denomination for the community of Christ’s disciples. One of the chief evils of denominationalism lies in the fact that each regards itself as a separate church, claiming for itself the allegiance which is due only the universal Church of God. These denominations are as independent of one another as are the sovereign nations of the world. Over and above them there is no law—no code of inter-ecclesiastical law. Law cannot produce the concord which we seek. The Church is a spiritual society. As soon as St. Paul was known as a Christian he was recognized as a member of the Church wherever he was, whether in Jerusalem, Antioch, or in any one of the churches that he founded. He did not cease to be a member of one when he became a member of another, because he was a member of the Church universal. The editor of this journal (*The Christian Union Quarterly*, Vol. XIII, No. 3, p. 230) made an attempt at this, but

encountered criticism from many in his own communion and refusal by other communions, showing how far we are away from the essential idea of the Church, which includes all Christendom, with Christ as the head and individual believers as the body, "members each in his part."

Since the Church is a company of Christians assembled together with the Lord, our personal likings and tastes have no pertinence to the Church of God, in which God's will alone must prevail. St. Paul points out the one disposition which makes unity possible: "With all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love." He has in view the whole Church and its growth toward perfection. With a general discussion of many denominational positions, the author says: "The time may be near for scrapping, not the old confessions alone, but the whole denominational machinery," but he affirms that this must be preceded by a candid inquiry into the reasons for dissent.

He raises the question whether it was reasonable to treat the New Testament as a legal code and to expect that every question would be conclusively answered "in a summary history by St. Luke and a few occasional letters by St. Paul." He recognizes a strong presumption in favour of this proposition and thinks it strange if the documents of the first age of the Church "did not somewhere, by express statement or by implication, give us clearly to understand what are the essential notes of the true Christian." This, however, he affirms, re-opens the query as to "whether the common Protestant estimate of the sacraments really agrees with the Scriptures or is not rather deduced from the too rational conception which, under the influence of Humanism, was formed of the Apostolic age." He regards unity as practicable only on the basis of accepting the Apostolic age as normative for the Church of all times, but no one will presume to imitate all the customs of the Apostolic age, and few will insist upon excluding all practices which are clearly more modern.

He wisely affirms that it is vain to talk of Christian union if Christians cannot commonly pray together, for prayer is the central act of religion. It is a difficult thing. It is more often a sharp curb to our wishes than an expression of our wishes. As St. Augustine said, more particularly of the Lord's Prayer, "It is a purification of our desires." Because prayer is speech with God, it assumes a sense of God's presence and, therefore, awaits an answer. In this fine discussion of common prayer, which covers two chapters, he says that what is required for reunion is neither a compromise nor an abject surrender to the claims of any one denomination, but each by ordering his own ways aright.

His chapter on the Holy Communion is particularly strong, making it the purpose of attending Church on every Lord's Day, treating the celebration of the Lord's Supper as "the chief act of common worship." In this particular the Roman Catholics and the Protestant communion known as the Disciples are in agreement. We may not be sure what the earliest Church

meant by the "blessing," but we cannot doubt that it was a prayer. The theological discussions about the Eucharist are presented, with special emphasis on the order of its celebration.

While the author does not regard the problem of the Christian ministry and the form of church organization as deserving the prominence given them in the discussion about reunion, he argues that whatever authority bishops, deacons, and presbyters enjoyed in the early Church did not rest upon popular sovereignty "of the whole body," but rather as God's ministers. He says that no church to-day reproduces exactly the organization which prevailed in the Apostolic age or the age which succeeded it. However, he does not regard uniformity of organization as one of the first things to be attained, and is not inclined to assert "that the episcopate (in the diocesan or in any other form) is essential to the being of the Church," but he affirms that "the episcopate must be regarded as a *sine qua non* for the reunion of Christendom"—not because it is an ancient institution, but for pragmatic considerations, and on this ground many Protestants would be in full agreement; but from this position the Roman Catholic Church would dissent.

The closing chapter on faith and love, which includes hope, is a fine close to a very sane discussion through 328 pages of the problem of church unity. Its broad sweep through history, the Scriptures, and present day conditions; its avoidance of dogmatism, its tolerance, and its inclusion of the whole Church; its emphasis on prayer, hope and love—all these things give to it a worth that makes it one of the best contributions to Christian unity.

ASPECTS OF REUNION. By Harold H. Rowley, B. A., B. D., Late Dr. Williams' Divinity, Elmslie Memorial and Baptist Union Scholar, and Houghton Syriac Prizeman. New York: George H. Doran Company.

It is no surprise that the cynic pours his ridicule upon a faith which boldly proclaims its power to reconcile the sinner to God and to his fellow men, yet is wholly powerless to reconcile the saint to his fellow saint. There are many Christians who have come to believe that if men are truly reconciled to God in Jesus Christ, they thereby ought to be reconciled to one another. Out of this background Mr. Rowley, a modern English Baptist, argues for reconciliation on spiritual experience with sacramental forms optional and creeds secondary. He contends that union *per se* is nothing. It must be Christian. He cites two deacons sitting together at the Lord's Supper, partaking of the elements, but not on speaking terms with each other and, thereby making their worship unreal; likewise when the spirit of Christ is repudiated in the home and in business. That condition is as deplorable as divisions between the denominations. He opposes all compromises and pleads for an unprejudiced way to the Christian ideal.

Under government he makes no complaint against the idea of authority in itself, but against the assumption that all authority is derived from the past, which, he contends, vitiates the idea. He discusses episcopal, presbyterial, and congregational systems without seeing in any one of them identity of the New Testament practice, for, as he says, "The Apostolic Church was not a carefully designed organism at all." He would have added strength to this chapter had he discussed the papal system, for we cannot think of Christian unity except we think of the whole Church. He sees in the office of the bishop the value of an overseer, not being afraid of the term, and whatever government may be found for the reunited Church, "let us not be concerned that it shall have something to satisfy everybody, but that it shall be worthy to do the work that Christ shall entrust to it," whether it be "quite different from any found in the New Testament, and whose functions cannot be identified with those of any known person of the Apostolic age," or not. He contends for an order of prophets, whether they be ordained or not; likewise, in mentioning evangelists, pastors, teachers, and prophets, he contends for an order of scholars.

Of the sacraments, he dissents from infant baptism's being called baptism, preferring the term dedication or presentation,—“the term associated with our Lord's own first bringing by his parents to the feet of Him for whom He came,”—and that it should not be made compulsory, not being the *esse*, but, perhaps, the *bene esse* of Christianity. While maintaining “that a rite of baptism was ordained by Christ is arguable,” he affirms that it is likewise arguable that the baptism ordained by Christ is binding on all Christians, and cites the Friends as an instance of a group of Christians showing by their fruits a vital experience with God. He does not advocate the dropping of baptism, but says that “an outer ceremony cannot be held vital to an inner faith.” It may be of value in many ways as a symbolic expression of that inner faith and, therefore, does not make the outer ceremony compulsory for all its members. Of the Lord's Supper he says: “It is not to be something occasional and isolated, but something belonging to the very essence of the common round of life, something that should penetrate ordinary daily experience, that should speak of his dying.”

In discussing the Nicene Creed, he asks: “Why should his revelation to our generation be of less importance in the eyes of the Church of our generation than his revelation to the fourth century? If some aspects of the truth are seen in clearer light to-day, let us modify the expression of our faith in such a way as to make them known.” He hesitates on making the Apostles' Creed binding on the whole Church, but welcomes and honours theology.

He pleads for a Christian membership in the whole Church. He would have a Junior Church with probationary classes, preparing them for the duties of citizenship in the Church. In this instruction it would not be binding upon the Junior Church to accept everything that is taught, but it

would be binding to consider it, for the truest education is not that which provides one with ready made views, but that which equips one to form one's own views. The transfer from the Junior membership to full membership should take place at eighteen years of age, or possibly twenty-one. Prior to this time they are regarded in a very real sense as members of the Church under training—not in order to become Christians, but because they are Christians. Those who have made their decision to serve Christ later in life could not very well accommodate themselves to the Junior membership, but they could be in a probationary class. This plan aims to make the Church in truth the Body of Christ.

The remaining chapters deal with discipline, the church meetings, appointment of ministry, finance, and conclusion, in which he recognizes that the road to a reunited Christendom will be a long one, but it is not without hope. The book presents the point of view of a thoroughgoing Protestant. It is a strong, courageous voice for unity. Some of its positions may be questioned, especially its advocacy of excessive discipline, but there is a sincerity for a pure Church upon Christian foundations that will be recognized as the outstanding merit of the book.

CHRISTIAN WAYS OF SALVATION. Lectures delivered before Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y., on the Russell Foundation, Easter Week, 1922. By George W. Richards, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States, Lancaster, Pa. New York: Macmillan Company.

In this book a contribution is really made both to the discussion of present day problems of theology and religion and to the problem of Christian unity. Dr. Richards is both the pupil and successor of Dr. Philip Schaff and is, therefore, one from whom a contribution of this twofold significance is to be expected. His book will be welcomed and appreciated alike by those who are seeking for a better adjustment of the Evangelical faith to the thought of the present age and by those who are looking for light on the reasons and sources of the Church's divisions and for some way out of them into unity. The book is a study of the idea of salvation. This, the author conceives, is the formative principle of theological thought, determining both the nature and form of the doctrines and practices of religion and accounting for those differences which mark and divide religious bodies from each other.

The book is not a study of the question of the atonement, nor of the various methods of salvation as preached and practiced by the different religious bodies so much as it is of the ideals and principles which control the process of salvation and which determine the different ideas of salvation and the various methods of its attainment. The foremost questions raised

and discussed are: Whence does salvation come? How is it given? How is it appropriated? How is it expressed in doctrine, institutions, and deed?

The answers to these questions, the author believes, determine all the other ideals of religion and religious theory, theology, Christology, ethics, polity, and ritual. This is a somewhat different approach to the study of religious thought and practice, and a very fruitful one. It studies and interprets the constituent elements of religion with a view to the central purpose running through it all, and the purpose of religion everywhere and always is salvation of some kind or other.

There are, therefore, pre-Christian ideas and ways of salvation as well as Christian ideas and ways, since the idea of salvation of some kind is common to all religions and is co-eval with religion itself. In the first, or introductory, part of the book the author outlines the development of salvation and the way of its attainment from the ideas and efforts of early man in primitive religion seeking the amelioration of the conditions in which men live here, by the favour of the gods and the aid of supernatural powers, with little or no thought of a life after this, on through to the conception of salvation as redemption or deliverance from the present evil world and entrance into a higher world, either here or hereafter.

The main part of the book is, of course, devoted to the discussion of the Christian ideas and methods of salvation as conceived and practiced by the various church bodies and schools of Christian thought. Here again Dr. Richards is a discerning and skillful historical interpreter. In successive chapters come clear and fruitful expositions of the teaching of Christ and of the experience of salvation which men had with Him; of the thought and experience of the early Church, especially as represented in St. Paul and St. John; and of the long and varied development of the ways and means of salvation in the life of the Church—Ancient Catholic, Orthodox Catholic, Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Zwinglian, Calvinist, and Humanist; and a summing up section on Conclusions.

The author's own thesis is that salvation is first of all an experience of the heart, changing the life, and afterwards a fact to be explained, interpreted, and reduced to form and theory. Moreover, the explanation and definition of the experience is to be done for each succeeding age by those who are having the experience, and done in the terms of the age in which they live. The experience is the abiding and constant possession of all believers of all ages. The interpretations and explanations vary with the ever growing mind and thought of the centuries. This experience is a three-fold experience, answering to the threefold need of the human heart, namely, the need of providence, the need of grace, and the need of truth. Salvation is, therefore, the spiritual experience of God in Christ, who satisfies these needs by revealing a God of love who provides, a God of grace who forgives, and a God of truth who guides. The two redemption factors held in common by all the churches are,—Jesus, and the community of believers.

Christ brings us into fellowship with God, who by his Word begets faith, hope, and love in the human heart. The Church, by its doctrine, organization and life, sets forth Christ to men and thus fills them with the Spirit.

In this book the student of theology will find a clear and able exposition of the great Christian doctrines in their relation to the central theme and purpose of religion. The student of church history will find a suggestive and illuminating outline of the growth and development of Christian ideas and institutions as inspired and directed by the ever increasing and enriching conception of salvation as it grows from more to more in the growing thought of men. The preacher will find a rich and rewarding study of the great central experience and message which is to make up the content and aim of his preaching. All in all, here is a book no serious student of things fundamental can well afford to miss.

H. C. ARMSTRONG.

INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN MOVEMENTS. By Charles S. Macfarland, General Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

The method by which Christianity is to function in establishing between international relations is not by the exchange of political ambassadors, but rather by the interchange of good-will and service. This volume is the story of the various movements that have arisen in the last few years, coming together in a simple, natural, and quiet way, and giving out a viril influence of moral and spiritual power upon the nations of the world.

There is, undoubtedly, in the trend of thinking and action of these times, a movement toward the world-wide unifying of Evangelical Christianity by co-operative and federal development. There are at present federal councils in America, Great Britain, Ireland, France, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Spain, Japan, China, and Australia, and these are coming rapidly into correspondence with each other.

The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, which is to hold its final conference at Stockholm this year, was first convened at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1920. The international committee has held three meetings—at Peterboro, England, 1921; Helsingborg, Sweden, 1922; and Amsterdam, Holland, 1923. On its several commissions are representatives of Anglicans, of Protestants of America and Europe, and of the Eastern Orthodox Church.

The World Conference on Faith and Order, which had its origin at the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church at Cincinnati, 1910, is a call to all who believe in Jesus Christ as God and Saviour to discuss fully and frankly the differences among Christians. At the same time that this organization came into being the Disciples, in their General Convention at Topeka, organized their Association for the Promotion of Christian

Unity, emphasizing prayer, conference, and the distribution of Christian unity literature; likewise, at the same time, the National Council of Congregational Churches at Boston appointed a committee to confer with the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Those churches co-operating with the World Conference on Faith and Order are the Anglican, Baptist, Christian, Congregational, Czechoslovak, Disciples, Eastern Orthodox, Friends, Lutheran, Methodist, Moravian, Old Catholic, Presbyterian, Reformed, and South India United. The Roman Catholic Church has been invited, but, up to this time, it has not accepted the invitation. A preliminary conference was held at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1920, attended by representatives of seventy-eight churches in forty nations. The subject committee has proposed for discussion in small groups of members of different churches a series of questions dealing with the faith and ministry of the reunited Church, the nature of the Church, and the Christian moral ideal. It is believed that by these conferences it will be seen that many beliefs, apparently conflicting, are really complimentary and that many differences are due mainly to ignorance of one another's position. It is probable that the World Conference may be held in 1927 or a year or two thereafter.

The Central Bureau for Relief of the Evangelical Churches of Europe had its beginning in 1922, out of what is generally known as the Bethesda Conference, having met in the Bethesda Mission House in Copenhagen. This conference consisted of seventy-five officially appointed representatives of thirty-seven church bodies. Twenty-one European nations were represented as follows: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Great Britain, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Esthonia, Finland, France, Germany, Holland, Hungary, Italy, Lettland, Norway, Poland, Roumania, Serb-Croat-Slovene State, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland; also reports were presented from the Ukraine and Lithuania. In this movement we have a fundamental basis of inter-denominational and international unity.

The internationalization of foreign missions has become one of the most permanent factors in the establishing of fraternal and co-operative relationships, as seen in the International Missionary Council, representing the Evangelical Christian missionary forces of the world. The first regular meeting of this Council was held at Lake Mohonk, N. Y., 1921, and its second meeting was held at Oxford, England, 1923. By this Council, Christian leaders, divided by national and racial lines and speaking many languages, are brought into genuine co-operation and fellowship. The Committee on Co-operation in Latin America was organized in 1916. It held its first congress at Panama in that year. Its second congress is to be held at Montevideo, Uruguay, in April of this year. This committee faces great opportunities, both in unifying the Evangelical Christian interests in Latin America and in strengthening Inter-American friendships. The Bible Societies have established world relationships. Their colporteurs, likened by

President Woodrow Wilson, in his centennial address of the American Bible Society in Washington, in 1916, to shuttles going to and fro and weaving the fabric of a common society.

There are many Christian organizations for fellowship and mutual service that have a world-wide significance. Among these are (1) World's Sunday-school Association, with secretaries in Japan, Korea, China, Philippine Islands, Argentina, Brazil, India, Ceylon, Egypt, Syria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia; (2) World's Christian Endeavour Union, with Christian Endeavour societies in every country in the world where Evangelical Christianity has gone; (3) World's Student Christian Federation, organized in 1895, with five Christian Student Movements and now there are 2,600 associations or unions with a combined membership of 240,000 students and professors; (4) Salvation Army, from a local organization, has expanded with startling rapidity to be an international force with its 20,000 officers in no less than seventy-three countries; (5) Evangelical Alliance, which is strong in several countries, particularly in England; (6) International Federation of Christian Women, which has been especially effective in world organization for international peace; (7) World Brotherhood Federation, with meetings conducted largely by laymen, held a World Brotherhood Congress in London in 1919.

Many of the larger communions have formed international organizations, such as the World Alliance of the Reformed Churches Holding the Presbyterian System, the Baptist World Alliance, the Lutheran World Convention, the Ecumenical Methodist Conference, the International Congregational Council, and the Lambeth Conference.

Some national organizations have developed an international service in friendship, such as the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, with its commissions on International Justice and Good-will, on Relations with Religious Bodies in Europe, and on Relations with the Eastern Churches; likewise, the Young Men's Christian Association and the Young Women's Christian Association are foremost of the world organizations for international friendship by service.

In the organizations for international peace, the Church Peace Union, founded by Andrew Carnegie in 1914, is named first, with its trustees from Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Protestant communions. Most of its work has been done in association with organizations which are either directly its children or which it has had a part in calling into being. The World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches was organized at Constance, Germany, 1914, with representatives from many nations. Its next meeting was at The Hague, Holland, in 1919, then at St. Beatenburg, Switzerland, 1920, at Copenhagen in 1922, where were gathered two hundred and fifty delegates from twenty-five nations. The Alliance has established councils in Norway, Holland, Hungary, Japan, Italy, Finland, Germany, Belgium, Great Britain, Roumania, Sweden, Esthonia, Bulgaria, Denmark,

Switzerland, France, Greece, Spain, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Portugal, Lettland, Serb-Croat-Slovene State, Turkey, China, and the United States. Councils will eventually be organized in every country in the world.

The Committee on Interchange of Preachers and Speakers has rendered valuable service. The American Friends Service Committee has furnished an opportunity for the distribution of money for the needs of the world, first to the relief work in the devastated regions of France and, likewise, for world service, ministering to Germany, Austria, Poland, Russia, Serbia, Mexico, Syria, and Japan. The Committee on Friendly Relations among Foreign Students has done good service; also the American and Foreign Christian Union, the American Waldensian Aid Society, and the McAll Mission in France.

Such is the survey as presented by this remarkable volume, which assumes encyclopaedic value. It belongs to the library of the minister, the educator, and every one who is a student of international affairs. It has crowded into 223 pages the record of movements that will give colour to succeeding centuries. It is a good companion volume to Dr. Lynch's *Mobilising for Peace*.

SCIENCE AND LIFE. By Robert Andrews Millikan, Ph. D., Sc. D., Director of the Norman Bridge Laboratory of Physics, California Institute of Technology (Pilgrim Press). Until one disentangles Christianity from science altogether—neither committing it to an outworn science nor tying it up to a new science—he will be confused in his thinking. Dr. Mullikan shows, in these brief chapters, that there is no conflict between science and religion. The former deals with the processes of nature, while the latter deals with the spiritual aspirations of mankind. The two go hand in hand. This little volume effectively answers the charge that modern science discredits religion.

IMMORTALITY. Edited by Rev. Sir James Marchant, K. B. E., LL. D. (Putnam's). Belief in immortality ultimately rests on the truth of belief in the government of the Universe by one supreme, moral, and spiritual Being, and there is no book, in recent years, that addresses itself so satisfactorily to this thesis as this handsome volume, presenting the earliest conceptions of immortality, the Christian idea, its philosophy, its ethical basis, its relation to science, and the witness of the poets. These subjects are discussed by Sir Flinders Petrie, of the University of London; Mr. Cornford, of Cambridge; Dr. Macdonell, of Oxford; Dr. Welch, of Edinburgh; Dr. Macintyre, of the University of Sidney; Dr. Galloway, of the University of St. Andrew's; Dr. Eucken, of Germany; Canon Barnes, of Westminster; and Mr. Hewlett, with introduction by the Right Hon. Lord

Ernle. It is one of the most stimulating volumes on this subject that has appeared in recent times.

THE RELIGION OF JESUS AND THE FAITH OF PAUL. The Selly Oak Lectures, 1923 on the Communion of Jesus With God and the Communion of Paul With Christ. By Adolf Deissmann, D. Theol., D. D., Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin (Doran). This book gives a valuable and illuminating study of the most vital theme in our religion. The author conceives of the experiences of both Jesus and Paul as communion. In the case of Jesus, it is communion with God; in the case of Paul, it is communion with Christ. For Jesus religion is immediate and direct. For Paul there is a mediator, and the mediator is Christ. For both religion is inner life. "Inner life deals finally with religion; it is a living and moving in God; whether imploring Him or being overwhelmed by Him, whether divining Him or fearing Him, it is always a communion of man with his God." What was the communion of Jesus with God? This, according to the author, is the chief question. The answer is sought in a study of "The Prayer Life of Jesus as the Reflex of His Communion With God," "The Communion of Jesus With God the Father and God the Lord," "The Working Out of Communion With God in the Message of the Kingdom," and "The Dynamic Culmination of Communion With God in Jesus' Consciousness of Mission and Messiahship." The second part of the book deals in similar manner with the experience of Paul. "I hope to show that Paul's religion has to be understood by means of his experience of communion with the living, exalted Christ. What I want to answer is this question: what is the moving energy which we meet whenever we come across Paul, even in the smallest details of his letters? May I try to answer by means of a simile? As when one travels on an ocean steamer, wherever one is, by day or night, on deck or below, one notices, whether softly or more strongly, the vibration from the working of the engines, and in the end one vibrates in unison with it: so to this great religious genius communion with Christ was the constant vibrating energy of life." In these lectures Dr. Deissmann has made a contribution to the study of Jesus and Paul which is of abiding value.—H. C. A.

REALITIES AND SHAMS. By L. P. Jacks, D. D., LL. D., D. Litt., Principal of Manchester College, Oxford (Doran). In this collection of seventeen essays Principal Jacks reveals that characteristic discrimination, which has distinguished him on both sides of the Atlantic. Beginning with Matthew Arnold's definition of culture—"getting to know the best that has been said and thought"—he discusses the current events in their social relation to nations, classes, and individuals, closing with that fine word from St. Francis de Sales, when reproached by a friend for endangering

his life by the severity of his labours: "It is not necessary that I should live, but it is necessary that God's work should go on." He sets forth great ideals in clear and fascinating thought.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE RACE PROBLEM. By J. H. Oldham, M. A., Secretary of the International Missionary Council and Editor of the *International Review of Missions* (Associated Press). This book is the result of a careful study of Christianity as related to race conditions. It does not attempt to make any independent contribution to the biological and anthropological aspects of race; but, with insight and courage, it discusses the ethical aspect of race contact which constitute a grave menace to the peace of the world. The legacy of the past, the Christian view, the causes of racial antagonism, social equality, guiding principles, practical steps, and other phases of this problem, are presented in these sixteen chapters with commanding interest and serious obligation of our opportunities and possibilities. It is, without doubt, one of the most valuable and outstanding contributions to the discussion of the race problem.

EVANGELISM IN THE MODERN WORLD. Edited by Two University Men (Doran). Christianity is the religion of evangelism and no age of the world is more ready to receive a daring application of the mind and teaching of Christ to the whole field of contemporary life than this age. In the evangelist's rethinking his message, revising his method, restating his Gospel, and relating his appeal to contemporary needs and modes of thought, he will face his task with greater confidence and urge more heartily that Christ be made the Lord of life. There are ten contributors to this volume. Among these are Principal A. E. Garvie, Rev. Frederic C. Spurr, President of the National Free Council of England, and others, all being from the European side of the Atlantic. The place of evangelism, higher criticism, the new psychology, the materialistic spirit of the age, approach to the modern mind, sin in the preaching of to-day, the Cross, and the opportunity are some of the subjects of the chapters. It is a book of real worth and needs to be studied in the face of the problems and possibilities of modern evangelism.

THE CONDITIONS OF CONVERSION. By W. L. Watkinson, D. D. (Revell). This is a book of nineteen sermons, covering such topics as "God's Invisible Calvary," "A Sin of Fear," "Circumstances and Character," "The Safeguarded Life," "A Genuine Conversion," and so forth. They are clear and satisfying.

CREEDS AND LOYALTY. Essays on the History, Interpretation, and Use of the Creeds. By Seven Members of the Faculty of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts (Macmillan). The subjects dis-

cussed are "The History of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds," by Prof. Muller; "Liturgies and Creeds," by Dean Washburn; "The Scriptures and the Apostles' Creed, With Special Reference to the Birth of Christ," by Prof. Hatch; "The Virgin Birth and Belief in Christ," by Prof. Dun; "The Resurrection of the Body," by Prof. McComb; "Honesty and the Creeds," by Prof. Nash; and "The Creed as a Test of Church Membership," by Prof. Addison. Each writer is responsible only for the opinions expressed in his essay. The discussion is marked by scholarship, courage, and freedom. On the creed as a test of church membership, Dr. Addison says: "Its significance as a theological norm, as a compact body of Christian teaching, and as a symbol hallowed by centuries of tradition and devotion, remains unimpaired. . . . But let it never stand between a follower of Christ and the fellowship of his Church." That the creeds have their merit is no question, but how to modernize them is a grave question, taking them out of the phrasing of the early centuries and, in the light of modern scholarship and experience, to interpret them in the terms of to-day. This book is a worthy contribution to that end, devout in spirit and clear in thought.

THE LORD WE LOVE. Devotional Studies in the Life of Christ. By Charles R. Erdman, Professor of Practical Theology, Princeton Theological Seminary (Doran). These fourteen studies, from the nativity of Christ to his ascension, are beautiful in their simplicity and devotion. This makes the twelfth book that Dr. Erdman has produced. They grow with increasing merit. There is a healthy calm about these studies that are most salutary to the soul in its quest for living truth.

One of the most satisfying books on health is **RELIGION AND HEALTH**, by James J. Walsh, M. D., Medical Director of Fordham University School of Sociology (Little, Brown, and Company). He not only clearly shows the intimate relation between religion and health, but how the practice of religion contributes to health and how nervous and mental diseases have increased in proportion to the decline of religious belief and practice. **THE CHURCH, THE BIBLE, AND THE CREED**, by Thomas F. Gailor, Bishop of Tennessee (Morehouse), is the title of a book of five chapters on the historical outline of the Church's fundamental faith, being Lenten lectures delivered at Trinity Chapel, New York. It is a strong, orthodox presentation of these subjects, affording a comprehensive study in a very small compass. **OUR BIBLE**, being a book of 207 pages in the Christian Nurture Series (Morehouse), is one of the best books for the training of young people in Bible knowledge to be found anywhere. It is especially suited to senior high school students. In fiction **THE LOTUS THRONE OF NIRVANA**, by Walter M. Haushalter (Lucas, Columbia, Mo.), is a delightful story, well told and abounding in touches of art.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the Work of Thomas Campbell, a Presbyterian Minister, of Washington, Pa., 1809; present organization, 1910. President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences, and distribution of irenic literature—"till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for, and sermons on, Christian Unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857. President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering, and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910. President, Rev. Nehemiah Boynton; Secretary, Rev. Linley V. Gordon, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For the promotion of Christian Unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMAN'S UNION, 1898. President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Secretary, Rev. John H. Bentley, Souldern Rectory, Banbury, England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian Communions.

CONTINUATION COMMITTEE OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910. Chairman, Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent; Secretariat, P. O. Box 226, Boston, Mass., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918. Ad Interim Committee—Chairman, Rev. Joseph A. Vance, Detroit, Mich.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908. President, Dr. Robert E. Speer; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the co-operation of the various Protestant Communions in service, rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911. Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Colue Bridge House, Rickmansworth, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895. President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford; Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and co-operation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK, 1920. Chairmen, Archbishop of Upsala, Archbishop of Canterbury, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Rev. A. J. Brown; Secretary, Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For union of the Churches in common, practical work, and to insist that the principles of the Gospel be applied to the solution of contemporary social and international problems.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914. Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury; Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1; Chairman, American Council, Rev. William P. Merrill; General Secretary, Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the Churches and the avoidance of war.

WORLD'S EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE, 1846; Incorporated 1912. Chairman, Sir Andrew Wingate; Hon. Secretary, Rev. R. C. Gillie; General Secretary, Henry Martyn Gooch, 19 Russell Sqr., London, W. C. 1. To enable Christians of British and foreign nations to realize in themselves, and to manifest to others, that living and essential union which binds together all believers in the fellowship of Christ. Universal Week of prayer organized by the Alliance since 1846.

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

The Editor's Notes:

The Permanent Growth of Unity—Christian Unity in Education—Newman Smyth—Larger Maps—Unreadiness for Unity

Tolerance in Christianity FREDERICK D. KERSHNER

Reunion in India THE BISHOP OF MADRAS

The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work HENRY A. ATKINSON

Jesus Christ, The Redeemer of the World J. A. CRAMER

A Theological Background for Religious Education CARL AGEE

Our Quest for Authority HUGH LENOX HODGE

What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity

The Revolution of Christian Equality—The Human Mind's Limitation—The Spiritual Value of Co-operation—The Scandal of Being Separated at Prayers—Similarity of Hindus and Christians—Teapot Tempest in Southern Methodism on Unity—The Christian Way Toward Unity—Canadian Union as Seen by Presbyterians—Canadian Union as Seen by a Congregationalist—The Sixth Annual Ohio Protestant Pastors' Convention—The Quadrennial Meeting of the Federal Council in Atlanta

Book Reviews

Documents on Christian Unity—The Paths That Lead to God—Whither Bound in Missions, etc.

Contents of Vol. XIV

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

504 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York

Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4; 100, Princes Street, Edinburgh

CONTENTS

APRIL, 1925

VOL. XIV.

No. 4

<i>THE EDITOR'S NOTES</i>	341
<i>TOLERANCE IN CHRISTIAN- ANITY</i>FREDERICK D. KERSHNER	353
<i>REUNION IN INDIA</i>THE BISHOP OF MADRAS	359
<i>THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK</i>HENRY A. ATKINSON	369
<i>JESUS CHRIST, THE REDEEM- ER OF THE WORLD</i>J. A. CRAMER	374
<i>A THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION</i>CARL AGEE	389
<i>OUR QUEST FOR AUTHORITY</i> ...HUGH LENOX HODGE	398
<i>WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY</i>	409
<i>BOOK REVIEWS</i>	434
<i>CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIV</i>	440

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is seventy-five cents a single copy, or two dollars and fifty cents a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion contributing annually \$5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive two copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copy to some designated person or institution.

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ, and that the Unity of his disciples is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and, equally free, to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the Reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ—growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in his own words,—“By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another.”

The Christian Union Quarterly

Edited by Peter Ainslie, D. D.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

- DR. HAMILCAR ALIVISATOS,
Athens, Greece.
- BISHOP CHARLES P. ANDERSON,
Chicago, Ill.
- REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.
- BISHOP CHARLES H. BRENT,
Buffalo, N. Y.
- DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn.
- PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N. Y.
- REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.
- BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR.,
Washington, D. C.
- REV. RUSSELL CECIL, D.D.,
Richmond, Va.
- REV. S. D. CHOWN, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada.
- DR. FRANCIS E. CLARK,
Boston, Mass.
- DR. J. A. CRAMER,
Utrecht, Holland.
- PROF. DR. ADOLF DEISSMANN,
Berlin, Germany.
- ARCHBISHOP F. H. DU VERNET,
Prince Rupert, B. C.
- REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky
- DEAN H. E. W. FOSBROKE,
New York, N. Y.
- DEAN W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill.
- PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England.
- MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor.
- PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C.
- DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Shanghai, China.
- REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.
- DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England.
- PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa.
- PROF. CHARLES FOSTER KENT,
New Haven, Conn.
- BISHOP EDWIN S. LINES,
Newark, N. J.
- DR. FREDERICK LYNCH,
New York, N. Y.
- VERY REV. J. A. M'CLYMONT, D.D.,
Edinburgh, Scotland.
- PROF. SAMUEL MCCOMB,
Cambridge, Mass.
- BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL,
Pittsburgh, Pa.
- BISHOP WILLIAM F. MCDOWELL,
Washington, D. C.
- THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER,
Manchester, England.
- REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N. Y.
- DR. WILFRED MONOD,
Paris, France.
- DR. JOHN R. MOTT,
New York, N. Y.
- BISHOP HARALD OSTENFELD,
Copenhagen, Denmark.
- BISHOP EDWARD L. PARSONS,
San Francisco, Calif.
- PROF. ARTHUR S. PEAKE,
Manchester, England.
- PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa.
- PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England.
- REV. J. H. SHAKESPEARE, D.D.,
London, England.
- PASTOR DR. FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND-
SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany.
- REV. NEWMAN SMYTH, D.D.,
New Haven, Conn.
- DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N. Y.
- THE ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA,
Upsala, Sweden.
- DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J.
- REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich.
- BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio.
- BISHOP LUTHER B. WILSON,
New York, N. Y.

SO LONG AS THE DISUNION OF CHRISTENDOM IS REGARDED AS INEVITABLE, ITS "OFFENCE" MUST GO ON DELAYING THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD. UNTIL THE CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE CEASES TO ACCEPT THIS EVIL AS PAST HEALING, THE GREATEST SCANDAL IN THE CHURCH CAN NO MORE PASS THAN WAR—THE GREATEST SCANDAL IN THE WORLD. NEVERTHELESS IN BOTH CASES THE TIME IS MORE THAN RIPE FOR THE FATAL DOCTRINE OF "INEVITABILITY" TO BE UTTERLY CAST OFF, AND FOR A GREAT RESURGENCE OF THE FAITH OF CHRIST THAT GOD'S WILL CAN BE DONE UPON EARTH, AND THAT GOD RELIES ON THE MORAL SENSE AND THE FREE-WILL OF MAN TO DO IT. PROBABLY NOTHING WOULD MORE TEND TO FORWARD INTERNATIONAL UNITY THAN THE IMPULSE AND EXAMPLE OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST MAKING A GREAT AND SIMULTANEOUS MOVE IN THE SAME DIRECTION.

—WILLIAM LEIGHTON GRANE.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1925

THE EDITOR'S NOTES

The Permanent Growth of Unity

WHILE denominationalism is putting forth tremendous effort to establish itself throughout the world, there is the significant fact that Christian unity ideals are finding expression in all parts of the world as never before. It is another reminder of Newton's law of action-reaction. Sir Isaac Newton affirmed that "To every action there is opposed an equal and opposite action." It is a recognized governing principle in physics and mechanics. Why should it not, likewise, be so recognized in our common human relations of Christian brotherhood? What has been so long recognized as a governing principle in physics and mechanics may be interpreted as a parable to be applied to spiritual experience, as is true in so many other instances of the relation of the natural world to the spiritual.

The opposite reaction moves slowly, as do all things of a permanent character. Sometimes there is a restlessness in consequence that more is not being done for the unity of Christendom. It is true that more ought to be done, but there is a progress in understanding and fellowship far beyond what has ever been in the Christian world before. This progress may be checked for a time, but it is not at all likely that it will recede. At times it may appear so, but brotherhood is a living thing, checked sometimes in one direction, then finding an outlet in another direction. Unity of Christendom must come. It cannot come in a day, but each day contributes to its possibility. The law of action-reaction is undoubtedly functioning. Denominational triumphs are for a time; unity deals with eternity. The foundations of a united Christendom are in Christ. These foundations cannot be overturned. Because we cannot see afar is no reason that the law of action-reaction is not at work. Faith is

a definite element in the growth of unity—a living faith that sees beyond physical sight. These are the great spiritual possibilities that crowd the vision of those who are looking for the Kingdom of God.

Christian Unity in Education

UNTIL Christian unity functions in education, little progress will be made toward a united Christendom. Whatever service the denominational college has rendered in the past, and in many instances it has rendered valuable service, the time has now come when denominational colleges should be interdenominationalized so completely that their denominational identity will be obscured for a system of unification. To project denominational education, attempting to educate young men and young women apart from other young men and young women because of certain denominational affiliations, is not according to the principles of the new civilization whose foundations are in brotherhood expressed in terms of the international, interracial, and interdenominational. Any system of education that divides people is destructive of those higher principles that unite people. All these financial drives for the perpetuation of denominational schools are vain attempts to maintain the survival of an archaic institution. The times are ripe for the establishing of a unified Christian educational system. The suggestion of President George B. Stewart of Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y., for a national university of religion for all denominations in Washington is the idea of a statesman and far visioned men are responding cordially to it. *The Christian Work*, New York, says:

The great project proposed by President Stewart of Auburn for a university of religion at Washington took another step forward recently when a luncheon group of influential men, representing a goodly number of denominations, expressed their unanimous and hearty approval of it. It will be recalled that President Stewart submitted the plan in lieu of a denominational memorial, which the Presbyterians originally had in mind when their General Assembly appointed him head of their National Capitol Commission. The company assembled recently included Dr. Charles E.

Wood, minister of the Church of the Covenant in Washington, who presided; Jason Noble Pierce, minister of the Congregational Church in Washington attended by the President; Chancellor Clarke, of the Northern Methodists' American University at Washington; Dr. William M. Lewis, president of George Washington University; Dr. George R. Baker, secretary of the Baptist Board of Education; Bishop James Cannon, Jr., of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; Edward F. Mellon, the distinguished architect, who is now designing the buildings for Pittsburgh University, himself an Episcopalian; Dr. A. W. Harris, of the Methodist Board of Education; Drs. Covert and Robinson of the Presbyterian Board of Education, and other men of like rank. One speaker reported that a very distinguished philanthropist, who had heard of the plan, declared: "I am interested in that. When you have it ready, I shall be willing to serve on the Board of Trustees and I think I could get so-and-so and so-and-so to serve also," and he enumerated a number of men of wealth, as well as of light and leading. So greatly do men outside church institutions feel the need for religious education that, according to one of the luncheon guests, one state university is now planning to start a school of religion. The company agreed that the proposed institution at Washington ought not to be under the ecclesiastical control of the churches, but should have their united sympathy and support. Might not the churches, instead of continuing their present policy of building in competition with each other in Washington, for purely denominational glory, contribute different halls in this one university of religion? So they might nobly compete with each other in a common service. The meeting appointed a continuation committee to develop the project further.

And it will go further. There are too many minds to-day thinking in terms of a better educational system, and one of the factors in that better educational system is the unifying of the denominational schools, free from denominational interference, that the way may be found to Christian education for which the whole world is waiting.

Newman Smyth

SOME time ago we made record on these pages of the passing of a distinguished Christian unity advocate—an Episcopalian, Mr. Robert H. Gardiner, of Boston, whose prophetic service as secretary of the World Conference on Faith and Order will remain as a permanent contribution in the interest of a united Christendom. Another distinguished prophet of

unity has passed from us—Dr. Newman Smyth, of New Haven. The cause of Christian unity never had a more ardent advocate than he.

Since 1910, when there appeared to have been released in the churches a desire for closer fellowship, Dr. Smyth had been in the forefront. His long years of service as pastor, especially at Center Church, New Haven; as author, especially of *Old Faiths in New Light* and *The Passing Protestantism and the Coming Catholicism*; as a prophet of freedom in theological controversies—all these contributions from his eventful life prepared the way for his contribution to Christian unity, which was the crown of his career.

He was ever watchful for every indication of unity. It held the first place in his thought. When the Protestant Episcopal Commission on a World Conference on Faith and Order sent a deputation to Great Britain in 1913-14, Dr. Smyth was made chairman of that deputation. On landing in England, he coined a fine sentence in meeting a group of reporters. He said: "We are here to face the problems of faith and *find* them out." Heretofore it was customary to fight them out, but Dr. Smyth's phrase indicated that we were passing out of controversy into conference. At the close of the visit of the deputation, in a meeting with Anglicans, being the Archbishops' Committee, Bishop Gore arose and, at some length, paid a beautiful tribute to Dr. Smyth, especially the scope of his learning and his prophetic vision.

His contribution in behalf of catholicity found its outlet in his untiring efforts in behalf of the concordat between the Episcopalians and Congregationalists, which, while it failed to gain the support of either communion, did not fail to awaken general interest. In his last book—*A Study of Church Unity*—he has left us his ideals, discussed out of the appeal for a joint commission of chaplains in war times, the Lambeth Appeal, and the providential training of Congregationalists as peace makers.

Dr. Smyth was a fine soul—gentle, patient, keen, fearless, and far visioned. Although bearing the weight of eighty-two years, he was youthful in spirit and enthusiastic in the causes

which possessed his soul. His faith grew into remarkable ripeness and we shall remember his fellowship as among the richest experiences that pass between souls.

Larger Maps

It has been said that, on one occasion, a British prime minister said in a speech before Parliament: "Gentlemen, you must study larger maps." This needs to be said in every council of Christians, and said over and over again until all Christians come to understand that the boundary lines of Christianity include all who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour.

Through the centuries, however, it has been the policy of Christian statesmen, in conducting the affairs of the Church, to confine themselves to the study of small, provincial maps; hence the history of anathemas, exclusions, divisions, and a world-wide denominationalism. It was the Greek Church putting the Roman Church under the ban and, in turn, the Roman Church putting the Greek Church under the ban. It was the Roman Church putting the Anglican Church under the ban and the Anglicans putting the Nonconformists under the ban. It was the Roman Catholics putting Protestants under the ban and Protestants putting each other under the ban, until, all in all, there have been issued several hundred orders of excommunications, the monuments to which are seen in the several hundred divisions of Christendom. This is the result of small map studying.

It is usually claimed that such a course was necessary and we congratulate ourselves that all these divisions conformed to the laws of necessity, if not to the laws of God, when, as a matter of fact, that is not true at all. There is no law of necessity that could justify such a course, neither can any law of God be found that justifies it. The whole thing is wrong. Arguing from the biological principle of life, the first division of the Church was sin and every subsequent division has added to that sin. The life of God in the souls of mankind through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour made for brotherhood and unity. The

normal growth of the Church was brotherhood. When that brotherhood was broken Christianity became an abnormal product and it will remain so until it finds the path to unity.

We are so absorbed in the things we believe about Christ and his Church that we are constantly losing sight both of Christ and his Church. By the side of what we believe is the practical demonstration of a Roman Catholic priest and a Protestant minister walking down the street without recognizing each other and in each other's mind feeling a sense of superiority and, therefore, antagonism; or the same condition has found illustration among Protestant ministers of different communions, although less frequent than between Roman Catholics and Protestants. But these things that have to do with vital Christianity do not disturb us as much as definitions, speculations, and traditions, upon which we divide and destroy the beauty and power of brotherhood.

Our forebears, be they Greek Catholics, Roman Catholics, Anglicans, or Protestants, studied small, provincial maps and destroyed the word catholicity. Although that word appears in the dictionary and falls from the pens of many writers and is heard on the lips of distinguished speakers, nevertheless, to us of this day, it has no particular significance as a usable term. The Methodist Catholics have as much right to its use as the Roman or Greek Catholics, but neither has a right to it in applying it to one of the divisions of Christendom, for, if it is to function properly, it must include all Christians. No church is willing to do this now. Consequently, this word is held in abeyance until the dawn of a universal brotherhood; then catholicity, which we hold now as something that once was and which we still hold as something that is to be, will come forth as powerfully as the tides of the sea. Says the Rev. H. D. A. Major, in *The Modern Churchman*, London:

It seems to us that before the organic unity of Christendom can be secured, the Church's leaders will require to enlarge enormously their conception of catholicity and to revise drastically their standard of moral and spiritual values. No responsible church leader, so far as we are aware, has yet dared to unveil to a Christendom desiring organic unity the vision of a

catholic church which is ready to include all who wish sincerely to be comprehended in it, whether Quakers, Unitarians, Romanists, or Christian Scientists. Yet such a catholic church is needed if we are to have organic unity, for Christian experience has proved, and is proving, that while some Christians need dogmas, others find them detrimental to their spiritual life, and that this is equally true of sacraments and regulations. The Society of Friends, with its saintly Christian characters, is a standing testimony to Christendom that sacraments are not necessary for the development and perfection of the Christlike life; and the noble Christian personalities of many English and American Unitarians afford equally strong testimony that complete dogmatic freedom does not lead to departure from Christ.

Moreover, the demand for such a comprehensive catholic church becomes more serious when it is recognized that these facts of Christian experience are being supported by historical research into Christian origins. Historical and literary criticism seems to indicate that neither dogmas, nor sacraments, nor ecclesiastical regulations, constituted an integral part of our Lord's Gospel of the Kingdom. There was no institutional side to that Gospel. Hence the catholic church of the future with our Lord's words ringing in her ears, "Why call ye Me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?" will demand neither dogmas nor sacraments as essentials of membership, though she may value them and use them as factors in her corporate and social life. She will, however, demand no more of her members than the Church's Founder commanded, and she will plead for no less, namely, love to God and man—such a love as was manifested supremely in the life of Jesus Christ. She will substitute *amo* for *credo* in her formularies; *I love* for *I believe*; and emphasize practice rather than profession as the sign and seal of membership.

But this vision is too remote. It is a Pisgah-view. Manna, moreover, is light food, and is loathed by the souls of those who have tarried long by the flesh-pots of Egypt. The generation that has lived in Egypt must first die off and give place to a new generation disciplined under more simple and healthy conditions, who will have courage to enter the Promised Land. Only when divided Christendom, if we may make use of an illustration drawn from the Israelite prophet (*Hosea* 3:4, 5), has been deprived of its ephod and its teraphim, its sacrifices and its obelisks, its priests and its princes, which to-day it esteems as essential to its religious life, will it be able to find its long lost unity in a simpler faith, a purer worship, a less pretentious organization, and a wide-embracing love.

One is more likely to err in his attempts to exclude than in his attempts to include. It is hard to pull down a wall that our forebears have put up, but had our forebears lived in these

days they, doubtless, would have been as bold in the removal of our present walls as they were in the erection of the walls of their day. When we spread out the Christian map of the world let us observe how many we can include rather than how many we can exclude. We must begin to think in terms of all Christians if we would include the whole Church.

Unreadiness for Unity

THE incident of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., a Baptist, giving half a million dollars for the new Protestant Episcopal Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York, and, at the same time, suggesting that "quite conceivably the time will come to include among the twenty-five trustees laymen of sister churches"; and Bishop W. T. Manning's reply that "the time has not yet arrived" and "any attempt prematurely to force such an arrangement would retard the cause of unity rather than aid it," has not been without practical lessons. It was a clever suggestion of Mr. Rockefeller and for Bishop Manning to have proposed a departure from a custom of centuries' standing in the Protestant Episcopal Church would have produced a storm in his own communion.

The time has not arrived when any one of the communions of Christendom can depart from its historic customs without causing severe opposition in its own fold. We have arrived at the time when a few individuals, here and there, can make departures; but, in this instance, only a few clergymen and a few laymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church advocated the departure for the cause of unity. That few is in all communions, but, until that few has multiplied, it cannot be expected that a communion as such will depart from its historic position. The incident in question has given an opportunity to see where unity is in the thought of the communions of Christendom.

The Baptists or Presbyterians or Disciples may appoint one of another communion on their boards of trustees because it is customary among those communions to do that. It has not been customary among the Protestant Episcopalians. For a

time the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral in Washington had two Presbyterians on its board of trustees, but it provoked such criticism among Protestant Episcopalians, not being in accord with their custom, that it was abandoned in 1908.

It is a deeper question, however, than the mere appointment of a representative from a sister church on the board of trustees of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine. It is a call for the departure from the historic custom of a communion in the interest of Christian unity. Is any communion at this time willing to make that departure? The Protestant Episcopal Church is no worse than any other communion in this matter. It is a sad fact that there is a majority element in all communions that is for ever pleading for loyalty to the historic position of that communion, whether it be Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Baptist, or Disciple, while there is only a minority, and not a large minority at that, that is contending for the larger fellowship. The following words are familiar in the council chambers of all communions, which Dr. Clarence E. Macartney, moderator of the Presbyterian Church, uttered in an address at a recent meeting of the Princeton Theological Seminary Alumni:

Both the historic polity and the blood-bought doctrines of the Presbyterian Church are in danger. Christianity is never in danger, for it is the will of God for the world's redemption, and our faith standeth not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. But churches are always subject to error and declension from the truth of the Gospel. It is that danger which now confronts the Presbyterian Church.

The Form of Government of the Church declares that in perfect consistency with the principle of freedom and private judgment, Christian people have a right to associate themselves in groups or churches and to declare what the terms of admission to that church shall be, and what the qualifications of its ministers.

Change the word "Presbyterian" in Dr. Macartney's address to "Protestant Episcopal," or "Baptist," or "Disciple," and it would be recognized as an orthodox utterance in the gathering of those communions. "The historic polity and blood-bought doctrines" of all communions are being jealously guarded. The

small group of ministers and laymen in the various communions is too much in the minority to be a factor in making the departure without severe protest, if not rupture, in the communion.

This condition cannot always last, lest denominationalism will finally strangle Christianity. Every communion glories in its historic position, whatever that communion may be. Is it right? The Apostle Paul appeared to have thought differently. Christ and his brotherhood are contending for the right to the first place. But touch any one of these historic customs and there is a storm of protest. The fact is no communion in Christendom is ready for unity. There ought to be a thousand men now evangelizing the churches in the interest of Christian unity. The Protestant Episcopal Church has done about as much as any in the cause of unity, and a great deal more than most churches in this preparation, but no one of the churches has done anything in the cause of unity to boast of. It is still almost an unexplored field.

Christians are held by their historic customs as severely as the non-Christian religions are held by theirs. There is not enough spiritual power in any one of these communions to break down these barriers of custom. They stand like walls of adamant. To attempt it now would, perhaps, do more harm than good, especially in this period when a mild form of Christianity is so generally satisfactory. There must come a rise in the spiritual power of the whole Church, including every communion, before a permanent move can be made for a united Christendom.

As it is now the Christian communions are running a close parallel to the non-Christian religions, as is instanced in the present controversy on untouchability among the Hindus. Untouchability is one of the most vital questions from the orthodox Hindu point of view, which is now sweeping over India, and referred to in this number of *The Quarterly* (p. 419). Says *The Indian Social Reformer*, Bombay :

We strongly deprecate the use of intemperate language in dealing with long-standing customs and institutions, not only because it stirs up needless

antagonism, but also and chiefly because such language is as much out of place in dealing with social phenomena as it would be in dealing with natural phenomena. If a person who happens to stumble upon a stone were to inveigh against the law of gravitation, he would be only making himself ridiculous. Not less absurd is the use of the language of invective against old customs. It is an axiom in the study of institutions that they must have had their origin in some felt need of the times in which and the conditions amidst which they were first instituted. The idea of untouchability probably originated in some crude idea of sanitation. We set apart now-a-days localities for offensive trades such as slaughter-houses, tanning, and so on. The people engaged in these trades have necessarily to live in or near the same localities. In a community which set much store by the principle of heredity, their children would naturally be supposed to be tainted by their surroundings. We do not offer this as a conclusive or comprehensive explanation of the origin of the practice of regarding certain castes as untouchables, but only as a probable one for some forms at least of this sentiment. We have a sincere respect for genuinely orthodox men and women, and we have been ever anxious in our efforts to reform institutions that have survived their utility, not to impute any evil to individuals or classes. Most of what is good in us, we owe to our orthodox heritage, and Burke's plea that one should touch the wounds of the state (which is society in its political aspect) as tenderly as the wounds of one's parents, has been one of the inspiring ideas of all our great reformers like Ram Mohan Roy, Ranade, Sir Ramakrishna Bhandarkar, and Sir Narayan Chandavarkar. The same may be said of most social reformers, and we doubt if there is much in the complaint about the use of offensive language in regard to the removal of untouchability or any other reform. To say that a custom is a blot on religion is not a reflection on religion. It is, on the contrary, a tribute to religion which is all that is pure and true and beautiful. Untouchability may be an incident of Varnashrama but it has certainly no place in Sanatana Dharma which is the fundamental ethical-spiritual basis of all forms and sects of Hinduism. Mahatma Gandhi's claim to be a Varnashramite Hindu has always seemed to us to be difficult to reconcile with his espousal of this reform and of his manner of life transcending differences of caste and creed. That, however, is a small matter. We have to consider the question from the point of view of the untouchable classes. One of our old professors used to tell us of a man who defended fox-hunting on the ground that it gave pleasure to the entire hunt—horsemen, horses, and hounds. "What about the fox?" some one asked, and there was no answer.

Untouchability may appear to Christians as inconsequential as the historic customs of the various Christian communions

appear to Hindus. But whether it be untouchability or an historic custom of a Christian communion, approaches to their removal must be cautiously made. There must be an educational foundation laid first. Haste multiplies schisms. It would be a most appropriate gift if Mr. Rockefeller would establish a foundation for this education and evangelism. It is, without question, the greatest need of these times. The little work that is being done in it is of such a meager character that it is hardly felt in the Church at large—a few individual voices here and there. Mr. Andrew Carnegie had the dream for such a foundation. Had he lived it would have been his greatest gift to civilization. Mr. Rockefeller has this opportunity, making a board of trustees from all “sister churches” for a plan of educating the Christians of the world in a real understanding of each other. Bishop Manning would hail it with delight as would multitudes of Christians. This incident has opened a door for a world of opportunity.

The communions have their various boards for propagating their denominational ideas, which are the lesser things of religion. We need a foundation that would keep to the front the greater things of our common faith and, at the same time, make a way for a common understanding among Christians. The surprise is that no great soul has come forward to establish such a foundation. When it does come, as it some time will, it should be composed of free souls, definitely committed to the ideals of a closer co-operation among Christians. The essential thing of these times is that Christians shall possess such spiritual attitude of mind as will express itself in terms of genuine brotherhood both in thought and conduct. Conditions are ripe for such a campaign with groups of Christian unity educators and evangelists, going into schools, both state and denominational, into churches, religious conventions, and wherever there are listeners, declaring that the permanent unity of Christendom is essential to the spiritual growth of the world. It is the call of the hour.

PETER AINSLIE.

TOLERANCE IN CHRISTIANITY

BY FREDERICK D. KERSHNER, LL. D.

Professor of Christian Doctrine, Butler College, Indianapolis, Ind.

ONE of the most instructive incidents in the life of Jesus deals with his rebuke of his disciples for their intolerance. Certain healers, the Gospel narrative tells us, were performing their work in the name of the Teacher of Galilee and were in the way of being suppressed by the Twelve because they did not possess the proper credentials. Jesus informed his too-zealous supporters that they should look with toleration and sympathy upon every effort to proclaim his Gospel and to relieve human needs, no matter how unorthodox might be the means of healing employed. "No man," He said, "who will work a miracle in my name can lightly speak evil of Me."

We can not help wondering about the character of these heretical heralds of the new Kingdom who brought down upon themselves the anathemas of the "sons of thunder." It is possible that they were stray followers of John the Baptist who had heard something of Jesus and his work and, without any authoritative information, were putting into practice the little knowledge they had. It is, of course, possible that they were separated even more widely from the orthodox followers of the Galilean. Whatever may have been their exact status, they were obviously without proper credentials for their work. Jesus Himself does not justify their irregular and unauthorized method of presenting his message. He simply laid down the general principle that, where people are right in the main and are conscientiously trying to do their duty and to help others, we ought not to condemn them because of some deficiencies in their programme. We must tolerate our erring brethren so long as they are actually doing the work of our Master.

I.

The Church throughout the centuries has repudiated the teaching of Jesus concerning tolerance and has followed the point of view of James and John. Beginning with the Pre-Nicene period, factional disputes aroused the most intense bitterness and there was no disposition to tolerate even trivial differences of opinion. It would require a small volume to enumerate the different views and teachings which were styled heretical in those early days. Some of these heresies did, no doubt, touch upon vital matters, but others were of obviously trivial importance. People of unblemished character and sacrificial in their attitude toward life were cast out of the Christian fellowship because they differed in opinion from the majority of their brethren upon minute details of doctrine or discipline. The spirit of intolerance breathes everywhere in the denunciation of heretics in the writings of men like Tertullian and Augustine. The Athanasian Creed, with its damnatory clauses, sums up the spirit of the age. Unless one follows unquestioningly and unhesitatingly the beaten tracks of orthodoxy, his case is hopeless both in this world and in the world to come.

The spirit of intolerance grew more pronounced as the older culture of the Roman empire passed away, and the long night, which we sometimes call the Dark Ages, began. For several centuries education was scarcely known among the people at large. There were no books to read; the Greek and Latin classics were buried and unknown; and, naturally enough, the spirit of ignorance paved the way for the reign of the spirit of intolerance. The imperial idea, which demanded absolute submission on the part of the people, was dominant alike in State and in Church. Under such circumstances tolerance, on any large scale, could not be anticipated and, assuredly, did not exist.

II.

Persecution, which is always the twin sister of intolerance, became the universal habit of the Church. Any divergence of opinion from the established code was rewarded by martyrdom

on the scaffold or at the stake. No matter how kindly or gentle in deed or life the heretic might be, the sentence pronounced was the same. Naturally enough, the heretics of one age became the saints of the age following. Joan of Arc was burned with the approval of the Church of her own day and was canonized by the Church at a later day. Much the same experience fell to the lot of Savonarola and many others. The spirit of intolerance, which made martyrs of these distinguished people, maintained its hold under changing conditions throughout the century.

There were, of course, occasional champions of tolerance. In the dreary waste of the centuries the most notable of these advocates of charity was Europe's greatest scholar, Erasmus. The author of *The Praise of Folly* was one of the greatest advocates of tolerance recorded in history. Erasmus, naturally enough, received the anathemas of all parties because he refused to be a partisan. He was attacked by Catholics and Protestants alike because neither party wanted to forego the pleasure of persecuting the other. Nevertheless, Erasmus remains the one outstanding intellectual figure of his day. He had not read his Greek New Testament in vain. Had he been able to impress his attitude of tolerance upon the warring factions of his day, we would have a different world. Erasmus never wanted the Church to split. He wanted it to assume the attitude of tolerance, which was characteristic of its Founder, and to make room for widely divergent views within its fold. Sympathetic with the reformers at first, Erasmus finally turned away from them because of their intolerance. He saw, as none of them possessed the vision to see, what would be the ultimate perils and dangers of schism. He wanted freedom in the Church, but he did not want disunion and strife. The world has never done full justice to Erasmus. He was too far ahead of his age for people to understand him. His biography has been written by partisans who could not appreciate the breadth and comprehensiveness of his insight. He still belongs to the future and the future will some time appraise him at his real worth.

III.

Of course, it is utter nonsense for any one church or party to claim any special merit in the matter of tolerance. The Catholics may have burned a few more Protestants than the latter were able to burn of their religious antagonists, but the spirit of intolerance ruled in all parties alike. One would have expected the persecuted Puritans to have done better, but their history is tragically disappointing. Driven out of England by persecution, they established a new home in America where they could persecute others to their heart's content. Only a few of the more down-trodden and ignominious sects, as they were regarded at the time, stood for the spirit of tolerance. Among these were the Anabaptists, Mennonites, and Quakers. It is to the everlasting credit of these hunted and persecuted groups that they never retaliated in kind, although it must be said that they had few opportunities to practice such retaliation. The fact is that the spirit of intolerance so dominated the thought of the world that it required almost superhuman powers to rise above it. When one reads the private papers of men like Sir Thomas Moore and the Reverend Cotton Mather, men of exceptional breadth and culture, and perceives the spirit of intolerance which runs through them, he no longer marvels at the fact that persecution was the special vice of the age.

IV.

The modern world has become more tolerant because it is better educated and is better acquainted with at least this particular phase of the genius of Christianity. We no longer burn people at the stake because they do not agree with our views concerning the Trinity. We put up with a good deal from our religious neighbours without shutting the doors of Heaven upon them. It is no longer customary or practical to repeat the opening and closing section of the Athanasian Creed in the ordinary public worship. We practice Christian co-operation and fellowship with those whose doctrinal views are widely divergent from our own. And, yet, the spirit of intolerance still

lingers with us. We have no hesitancy about the use of harsh and bitter epithets in condemning what we conceive to be heretical views on the part of others. We do not burn our theological enemies at the stake, but we starve them and their children if we get a chance. No matter how much practical good these heretics may be doing, we unhesitatingly excommunicate them from our fellowship. They may be working miracles in the way of relieving human distress to an extent which we ourselves can not compass and, yet, we will have nothing to do with them. Like our forebears, who persecuted the prophets, we are quite sure that the Lord has delivered the ark into our hands and we do not propose that it shall be desecrated or defiled. It may be that we are right theologically, but, whether right or wrong, we do not possess the spirit of the Master. We can afford to be as tolerant as He was when He rebuked his disciples for their dictatorial attitude toward heterodoxy on the part of others. We need a rebirth of the spirit of tolerance.

V.

Tolerance, of course, does not mean luke-warmness or indifference. There is nothing Laodicean about it. The fact is that only the man who is thoroughly sure of his ground can afford to be tolerant. The chief cause of intolerance and persecution in religion has been the lack of assurance on the part of the persecutors that truth was actually with them. Had they been absolutely confident of their position, they would not have worried so much about suppressing those who opposed it. They assumed the attitude of intolerance because they wanted to strengthen their own weak convictions. It is only the man of absolute assurance, the man who is conscious that he is on the side of truth, who can afford to be tolerant. Tolerance is, therefore, an indication of the strongest faith rather than the reverse. Intolerance means a lack of religion rather than a superabundance of it. It was because Paul wanted to bolster up his shaking Jewish orthodoxy, after his experience at the death of Stephen, that he plunged with such blind fury into the business

of persecuting Stephen's associates. It is when we are most doubtful of our own cause that we are most vehement and intolerant in advocacy of it.

VI.

The spirit of tolerance must come back to the Church before reunion can ever be a reality. The original unity was characterized by broad-minded and patient sympathy with the views of others and, in this way alone, was harmony secured. The early Christians did not think alike nor did they all worship alike. They were bound together by their common loyalty to Jesus Christ and their common desire to serve Him and to proclaim his Gospel. Until this ideal again becomes dominant in the hearts of Christians, disunion and schism will prevail. Those who really desire Christian union, in all communions, should begin paving the way for it by assuming the attitude of tolerance. This can be done, as Jesus did it, without any sacrifice of convictions and without any compromise of truth. It cannot be done, however, without a broad-minded and catholic spirit, which is still no easy task to secure, in the face of the enormous pressure of intolerance which dominates the world.

FREDERICK D. KERSHNER.

LOVE EVER GIVES

Love ever gives—
 Forgives—outlives,
 And ever stands
 With open hands.
 And while it lives,
 It gives.
 For this is Love's prerogative—
 To give,—and give,—and give.

—*John Oxenham.*

REUNION IN INDIA

BY THE ANGLICAN BISHOP OF MADRAS, INDIA

THE reports of the negotiations for union between the Anglican and South India United Churches are to be found in various publications, e. g., *Documents on Christian Unity* (Oxford University Press) and similar summaries.

THE WAR HAS MADE MEN THINK

One good result of the World War has been the determination of thinking men to have done with shams. They have probed the foundations of the religious life and have found that there is much which needs to be set right. How was it possible that, after nineteen hundred years of Christianity, the world should be so in the grip of commercialism and ambition, of force and oppression, that a war like that should be precipitated? How was it that the Church was not able to raise an effective voice against it, or, indeed, to give any real counsel, which any of the nations desired to hear?

The answers to these questions involve a very full survey of the religious history of the West, which is quite beyond the scope of this article. But it is necessary to mention the existence of these questionings in order to get the proper background for a discussion of the present movements toward the union of churches.

A DIVIDED CHURCH CANNOT LEAD

It was at once obvious to everybody that a Church which was split into fragments could not speak with a clear voice on any subject. If the Church were reunited there would, at any rate, be a common platform from which it could speak. Again, men, when faced with realities of warfare, did not attach so much importance to labels as they did to personalities. And the man who could answer questions asked in the face of imminent death, the man who could sympathize with and understand his

fellow men, was seen to have something which was worth while. At such times men did not bother to ask what his label was, but they followed him and felt that he could help them. By a curious reaction, when it was over they began to transfer the personality of the man to his label: they began to reason that so and so was a real soldiers' padre and he was—of such a church. That church must, therefore, be good. Since, then, that church is good, why is it separate? Why is my church separate from it? And so they demanded, as never before, that these differences should be examined and, if possible, union should be arrived at.

The churches themselves, deeply grieved at their want of power as leaders of the world's thought, were also examining the question and demanding that this numbing separation should cease. And so the way was prepared for the many movements toward unity which are taking place throughout the whole of non-Roman Christendom. For Rome alone remains aloof, serenely confident that she alone has the whole secret of God's mind and that the only possible union is the submission of every other church to her terms.

THE QUESTION OF UNION IN INDIA

In India, as elsewhere in the mission field, the questions raised by the war were not new, for in the mission field the Church is always and avowedly at war. It had long been felt that, till Christians spoke with one voice, the attacks on the fortresses of paganism or non-Christian systems lost half their force. It was with that conviction that negotiations were definitely started between the Anglican Church in India and the South India United Church (Presbyterian and Congregational, English and American).

FUNDAMENTALS OF CHRISTIANITY

The course of the negotiations is open for all to read in the accounts of the findings of the three meetings of the committees which have been held. It is not my purpose to repeat them

here. I propose to consider some of the questions which have emerged. They are typical and interesting because they bring out in clear relief the questions which divide us. On the primary points there is no disagreement of statement, though there is room for varieties of interpretation. But no time was wasted in discussing whether the Bible should be laid down as the Rule of Faith; whether the Nicene creed should be used as a summary of the salient points of our belief; whether the two sacraments ordained by Christ, with his words and his elements, should be retained. All were agreed on that.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH

The fundamental point from which the negotiations started was the acceptance of the Historic Episcopate. That was agreed, provided that no theory concerning the Episcopate should be required. That is to say, the Episcopate was to be accepted as part of the organization of the Church: it was to be constitutional, which meant that the bishop was to exercise his powers in accordance with a written constitution: it was to be historic, which meant that it was to be linked (in as many ways as possible) with the Episcopate which has subsisted in the Church from the earliest times. It was no gain to accept an Episcopate which historically could be challenged as a new creation, if union was the object aimed at.

Another characteristic of the negotiations was that, within the widest limits compatible with truth, every type of worship was to be admitted in the Church. Uniformity was never the aim: unity in difference was the goal. A union which excluded the "Catholic" or the "Protestant" would be simply the creation of a fresh sect and was not to be thought of. The records of the three meetings are available for any who care to read. They have not yet been formally considered by either church, for they are incomplete. Progress is slow, for, as the details and implications of the findings already reached are worked out, ever fresh questions arise, which are necessarily answered in accordance with some underlying theory of the ministry and sacraments, and the answers have to be tested and combined.

And this is not easy, for there are fundamental views concerning them which are practically world-wide and cut into all religions. I will suggest a few of these questions, as they will show the problems which have to be faced and may account for the slowness of the negotiations.

Is the Church God's creation or man's? Of course when one puts the question in that form, the answer is pat on every one's lips: It is God's. True: the Church is the Body of Christ, created by Him unto good works. But is the Church simply the invisible communion of saints in this world and the next? Or is it a visible society on earth whose organization is ordained by God? Or, again, is it simply an association of Spirit-filled men and women who are free to gather in any groups for organizational purposes, as they think best, united only spiritually by their common possession of Christ's Spirit and their faith in Him? A good deal of theoretical support may be found for all these views in the Bible; and, on the other hand, history can point to a good deal of evidence of the harm which has befallen the Church through its being too much of an organization and too little the company of faithful believers.

And that brings us to another question: Is the Church intended by Christ to be a community of "saints" (in the popular sense), or is it to be a school of men to bring them to Christ? Till the sixteenth century there was, as a rule, only one answer to these questions. All men were to be made disciples, baptized and then taught. In the sixteenth century the other view became more prominent, and companies arose who would not admit any but perfected saints; or if they did admit them, distinguished between the Church invisible, known only to God, and the Church visible (wheat and tares), not only in the sense in which we must all admit that the Lord (alone) knoweth them that are his, but almost in an institutional sense also.

The question is not entirely theoretical, because union cannot be accomplished till we have agreed that a definite union of men and women on earth is God's plan and that that union is his own Church, his creation.

If, then, the Church, as the organized Body of Christ on earth, is God's purpose, the question of organization comes to the fore. And first in organization comes the question of the ministry. It is on that point that most discussions on union turn, and no hard and fast solution can be found which commends itself to every one. There are three points which have to be considered: guiding, teaching, and ministering of sacraments. The question of the distribution of these functions has been debated ever since the earliest beginnings of the Church. The majority of churches have now acquiesced in the combination of these three duties in one group of officers. In the Jewish Church the priest and the prophet were distinct. A priest might be a prophet: the prophet, as such, had no priestly function. In the Christian Church, as portrayed in the New Testament and in the earliest ages of the Church, the prophet was distinct from the elder and deacon. The Apostles, as missionaries and founders of the Church, exercised a control apart from their position as companions of our Lord and witnesses of his resurrection.

The Apostles died and the leadership of the churches fell to the elders or bishops. The prophets, owing to the cheapening of their vocation and unauthorized claims, died out, and the ministry crystallized into the official orders of bishop, priest, and deacon. The prophetic spirit found an outlet in the orders of hermits and monks and, later on, in the great bands of preaching brothers, who, in their turn, became institutionalized. All this is well known, but a survey of it will help to give the background of the question which must always be debated in any scheme of union; namely, What is the ministry?

The ministry must always be called of God. That is always agreed. The commission of the minister must be recognized and confirmed by the Church. That is also agreed. The recognition may range from the commission or ordination given by a bishop through all the grades of recognition, down to the willingness of a group of believers to listen to and accept the ministrations of any person so called of God. It is on this point that the difficulty occurs. For many centuries the commission of the

Church was given by the laying on of hands by a bishop and presbyters, as representatives of the Church and as themselves commissioned to ordain. From the sixteenth century the controversy has gone on as to the lawful ministers of ordination and there are now ministers whose commissions represent every variety of theory.

The experience of the mission field in India has narrowed this controversy considerably. It is now almost entirely a question of episcopal or non-episcopal ordination. The conditions of mission work require, that in the administration of young churches and in the evangelization of fresh districts there should be leaders with authority to act, and many a superintending missionary has exercised, and to-day exercises, the controlling powers of a bishop—indeed one may go further and say—of a very autocratic bishop, if need be. But, when the question of providing for the future, in which the missionary is no longer needed to control the now well established Church, comes to the front, it is seen that some provision for an orderly succession of leaders is absolutely necessary. Hence comes the willingness to accept a “constitutional episcopate.” It is born not of theory but of experience of hard fact.

The next fact which emerges is that the commission of the ministry must be based on the widest foundation possible. There is a vital necessity in a country like India, which is divided into thousands of castes that will neither intermarry nor “interdine,” that all possibility of caste churches should be eliminated. The Body of Christ cannot be represented in one small town by a Brahmin church and minister, and a Sudra church and minister, and an outcaste church and minister. The ministry must be recognized by the whole Church: its authority must not rest on a little group of caste-fellows. There cannot be three (or more) churches representing three (or more) different social grades in every village. From this fact comes the decision that the ministry and the episcopate should be as far as possible “historic,” recognized by the whole Church. The perfect state of things will be reached when every minister is a minister, in fact as well as in claim, of the Church of the whole

world. That that is impossible while Rome makes submission to her bishop a *sine qua non* of communion must not deter us from going as far as we can toward the true goal. These facts explain why the committees of the negotiating churches have reported that a union organized on the acceptance of a historic and constitutional episcopacy is advisable.

THE SACRAMENT OF UNION—AND DISUNION

But, when that has been agreed, the question has not by any means been solved. The question of the administration of the Lord's Supper, the Sacrament of Communion, at once comes to the fore. Full membership of the Church, the full worship of the Church, carries with it the right and the duty of partaking of the Lord's Supper. Conversely, discipline in extreme cases is marked by authoritative exclusion from the Lord's Supper. In the older Christian countries "excommunication" has largely disappeared. It has gone out of fashion. The habit of church-going is not so strongly developed that any person of openly scandalous life is eager to thrust himself into a Communion service. The trouble is rather to persuade respectable church-goers of the duty and privilege of partaking. But, as in the primitive Church, so in the new churches of the mission field, such discipline is both necessary and salutary. It is necessary, for, coming from a religion based on a social organization and not carrying with it moral obligations to others than fellow castemen, no one is willing to be absent from the innermost rites of his new community (I had almost written, his new caste). And so the moral obligation has to be enforced, in the last resort, by exclusion (till repentance) from the brotherhood of the Church. It is salutary, for experience shows that, in hundreds of cases, the end is attained and repentance and amendment of life do follow exclusion.

But this discipline has to be exercised wisely and justly; it cannot be left to the indiscriminate administration of any self-appointed minister. By long custom it is associated with the official ministry of the Church. In the Anglican Church it

rests finally on the bishop, advised by his assessors, clergy, and laity.

It is a great disaster that the sacrament of union has figured more largely in the history of the Church as the test of disunion than the pledge of union. We seem to have reached an *impasse* in that direction. Whether it be the question of intercommunion between two churches or groups, or the admission of individuals to this or that communion service, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper figures as the dividing factor quite as often in controversy as it emphasizes the union of Christians. Some earnest advocates of union have urged that the better road to union lies not through conference and adjustment of organization but through invitations more widely extended to Christian people to gather at the Lord's Table. The suggestion is worth consideration, but here too the different background of various groups of Christians has to be faced.

What is the Lord's Supper? It is the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. It is ordained by Christ Himself: He gives the feast. It is the showing forth of Christ's death till He come. It is not only a man-made love-feast shared by the eager members of a human brotherhood. It is much more than that.

There are as many grades of answers as there are types of mind in the world. And the sacramental and non-sacramental types of mind run through all religions. At one end of the scale is the view that a sacrament is merely an acted picture, a pious remembrance of an important event, which has no real power in it, beyond a vague appeal to sentiment. At the other end comes the view that a sacrament is a real transaction, dependent upon the accurate fulfilling of the acts prescribed and still more on the right attitude of mind. It is a perpetual reiteration (to use no stronger word) of the fact that God became man and gives Himself to men.

That there shall be room for as wide a difference as is compatible with truth, is agreed. But the question is wrapped up with the question of the minister of the sacrament. Those who find in it a solemn repetition of the breaking of the Body

of Christ in sacrament, lay stress upon the commission and recognition by the whole Church of the minister who performs these solemn acts for God and man. Those who lay more stress upon the fellowship of Christians in the feast find less importance in the fact that this or that Christian presides at the Lord's Table. These are not mere prejudices. They are deep-rooted convictions: they are the intimate life of many Christians.

Can these views be blended in one Church? All this leads up to a practical point. Let there be the widest legitimate liberty of opinion on the meaning of the sacrament. We can live together as brethren. Let there be the best provision for the needs of those who desire ministrations of this or that sort. But what is to be the position of those who feel that the efficacy of the sacrament depends on the definite commission of the minister, recognized and given in accordance with the long tradition of the Church? They cannot accept conscientiously anything which would be to them unreal. And how are we to provide for them? Some solution must be found.

NO PART OF THE CHURCH CAN STAND ALONE

And it becomes more and more evident that the reaction of a union effected in one part of Christendom reaches to its remotest limits. To India come missionaries and visitors from every church. They are associated by the ties of prayer and interest and gifts with this or that section of the Church. They naturally and rightly refuse to be cut off from the fullest communion with those who have been one with them in an association dating back perhaps for hundreds of years. What would be the relation of an episcopal church supporting one part of a United Church in South India with a non-episcopal church supporting another part of the same church? Can the missionaries returning from South India play the part of mediators in the division in England and America? They will belong, if by God's grace union is accomplished, to one Church in India, helped and recruited from churches in far off lands

which are still separate. Endless complications can be foreseen, unless union can be accomplished everywhere.

The negotiations in South India are a clarion call to the churches of Britain and America to strive earnestly for union, lest they be found to hinder the work of the Kingdom of God in India, a work for which they have striven and sacrificed so much, a work which has received the seal of God's approval in many souls brought to the light of the Gospel of Christ.

HARRY MADRAS.

A MORNING PRAYER

Another day has come;
O help me, God, I pray,
To full forget the bitter things
That happened yesterday.
And give me strength, O Lord,
Each issue so to meet,
That I may face Thee unashamed
Before the Judgment seat.
Help me to rule myself
And kindly let me live,
To all my work, to all mankind,
My very best to give.
And should, in thy great plan,
This day my labours end,
Forgive my sins, my soul receive,
For Jesus' sake, Amen.

—*Pierre Bernard Hill.*

THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK

BY HENRY A. ATKINSON, D. D.

General Secretary of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work,
New York, New York

MARTIN LUTHER said, in advocating the calling of an universal Christian conference, "such a conference ought not to occupy itself with vestments and otherwise momentous priestly and liturgical questions, but it ought to take up burning problems of quite a different nature, namely, the divisions, the wars and fights of princes and nations, and the inequality and quarrels of the different classes and groups of society; it must help against the deluge of mammonism and immorality. Should the Church be willing to take up such earnest challenges to Christ's disciples there would be no lack of material." The challenge in these words has now been accepted after more than three hundred years and the churches of the world are attempting to do the thing he outlined. There is to be held in August of this year in the city of Stockholm, Sweden, a conference representative of all of the communions of the Church of Christ, in view of the needs of the world for that adjustment and peace which comes from righteousness and truth.

The purpose of the Conference is not primarily to promote the reunion of Christendom, although the co-operation which is required to make it successful will promote this end. There will be no attempt to adjust the differences that exist between the various bodies of the Church. While delegates will assemble as Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, Anglicans, Lutherans, and members of the Eastern Orthodox Church and members of the other Reformed Churches, fundamentally they will all come as members of that great invisible Church of the Living God and as believers in the Gospel that Jesus revealed

to the world. The supreme purpose will be to discover how best Christ's message may be applied to the world's needs and how in the Christian way of life the world can find healing and rest. It is clearly understood that the Conference will not in any way affect denominational autonomy, either in organization, doctrine, or administration. No ecclesiastical body will be compromised in its distinctive position by participating. It is to be a free conference for mutual benefit; a conference only with no authority to bind any of its constituent bodies and, as far as any one knows now, it is not the intention to establish a permanent international body. Whatever continuation work is done will be determined upon by the Conference itself.

I have only recently returned from an extensive trip which carried me into practically all of the countries of Europe. In company with Dr. Herman Neander of Sweden, Archbishop Germanos of Greece, and Dr. Alexander Ramsay of England, I visited the heads of the churches of most of the countries of Europe. Everywhere we found the same confused condition of affairs, the same perplexities, the same questioning; peoples and nations are depressed by the ruin of the war and its aftermath and are in terror of more war to come. Almost hysterically all are saying, "Can religion do nothing to help?" What can the churches do in these crucial days? This was the question that the message of the Copec Conference at Birmingham sought to answer. The meeting of the French churches at St. Etienne, the German churches in their meeting at Munich, and the meeting of the Eastern Orthodox churches at Siniaia, Roumania, all raised the same issues, propounded the same question, and sought the same solution.

The nations are yearning for purer politics; for some answer to the industrial unrest and injustices which are producing chaos and confusion. Every country is menaced with lawlessness and leaders are trying to arouse the conscience of the world to a new appreciation of the dignity of law and the necessity for its enforcement. Customs vary among the nations and the problems are not identical, but the underlying evils and the bad effects growing out of them are the same in every

nation. The only adequate help in these days of need must be sought on an universal plane, for the one great truth which has come out of the war and has been stamped upon the conscience of humanity, by horror of those years of fighting and the fear of the years since the armistice, is that of the oneness of humanity. We know now that it is impossible to hurt one nation without hurting all, and so the problems, being universal, cannot be solved by individuals or nations acting alone.

In arranging for the Conference, therefore, there was set up an international committee of fifty-five members, with representatives from twenty-eight nations and about forty communions. The members of this committee were all officially appointed by the highest authorities in their various communions; therefore, the plans devised and the arrangements effected are as nearly official as can be made.

The first meeting was held in Geneva in 1920, called together by a committee appointed at a meeting of the World Alliance held at the Hague the year previous. The Conference was organized in four sections—the American, British, Continental European, and the Eastern Orthodox Church. Meetings of the International Committee have since been held in Petersburg and Birmingham, England; Zurich, Switzerland; Amsterdam, Holland, and at Helsenborg, Sweden. According to the decisions taken by the International Executive Committee, the programme will include the following chief points, which are to be considered carefully by commissions in the four sections:

- (1) The Church's Obligation in view of God's Purpose for the World,
- (2) The Church and Economic and Industrial Problems,
- (3) The Church and Social and Moral Problems,
- (4) The Church and International Relations,
- (5) The Church and Christian Education, and
- (6) Methods of Co-operative and Federative Efforts by the Christian Communions.

It was agreed that these subjects should be studied by the sections and the reports embodying the findings and the conclusions of the churches be made the basis of the discussions at the Conference in Stockholm.

Commissions have been established in all the countries represented and the reports are now practically completed. I saw the outline of two of the reports that are being prepared by the Continental Committee. Being present at Birmingham and hearing the discussions in the Copec Conference, whose reports are to be sent in by the British section as its contribution, I know how thorough they are and, in addition, I have recently gone over, with great care, the reports produced by the commissions of the American section. All these plans show an interest in the problems and confidence in the power of Christianity to contribute to their solution. The purpose of the churches to state a programme is most encouraging.

The International Executive Committee meets in June as the guest of the Bishop of Winchester at Farnham Castle and, on August 9th of this year, the entire International Committee will meet in the city of Stockholm and set to work to correlate the reports on the six subjects that have been prepared by the four sections and to prepare out of them six composite reports that will be translated into three languages—English, French, and German—and put in the hands of all the delegates of the Conference on the day of the first meeting which will be August 19th.

There will be in attendance at the Conference in Stockholm six hundred official delegates coming from all the countries of the world and, in addition, about a thousand visitors. The executive officers are now receiving the names of the appointees and in the list of those last received are the names of the five delegates who will represent the Christian churches in India, thus showing the widespread interest in the enterprise.

The Conference will be directed in its deliberations by the Executive Committee under the direction of the four joint presidents, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Patriarch of Constantinople, the Archbishop of Upsala, and Dr. Arthur Judson Brown. Inasmuch as all the delegates at Stockholm will be there as the official delegates of their individual communions, it will be literally the Visible Church deliberating on these great themes, and the results achieved and their carrying out

will be in accord with the combined wisdom of the Church through its leaders.

The Stockholm Conference promises to be a great success. One of the outstanding leaders of the Church Universal said, when the plan was first discussed: "There is a call for such a Conference, but it can succeed only if it be made a second Nicea on life and work." The Conference, from present indications, promises to fulfil this demand.

Just as the problems of the world are universal, so is the Church of Christ. While this is not exclusively a Protestant gathering, the Eastern Orthodox churches having an equal share in the arrangement, still, if it were merely the Protestant churches getting together, it would be worth the effort, for, with the development of Protestantism, there has also developed the extreme of nationalism and industrialism, both the outgrowth of the Protestant emphasis on the value of the individual.

The Stockholm Conference is a great undertaking and one which should commend itself to the interest of every right thinking individual, whether within or without the churches, who believes in the possibility of a new heaven and a new earth being created through human endeavour directed by the Spirit of Almighty God.

HENRY A. ATKINSON.

OPTIMISM

The poor plane tree, with mottled bark,
 Raises its bare twigs to the dark,
 And seems to hope, the Lord knows why,
 For stars in that unlikely sky.

—*Frank Kendon.*

JESUS CHRIST, THE REDEEMER OF THE WORLD

BY PROFESSOR DR. J. A. CRAMER

Utrecht, Holland

THE title of this article shows that we wish to remain within the sphere of religious thought. But this should not be misunderstood. I do not intend to make a definite separation between religious intuition and scientific knowledge, nor to oppose them to each other, but I only wish to indicate the sphere in which we shall treat our subject. We do not wish to make a separation. For, if we should do this, it might happen that, being believing Christians, we should know Jesus Christ to be the Redeemer of the world and, in doing so, should avoid the absoluteness of Christianity, where, as scientific men, we should not be able to deny the relative aspect of Christianity; that, as believing Christians, we should be fervent admirers of the missionary work, where, as scientific men, we should not be able to defend its good right. We cannot admit that there is any radical separation between faith and knowledge, though in this broken world it is never entirely to be avoided.

We wish to lay all stress upon the missionary device: Jesus Christ is the Redeemer of the world. This position we shall hold so high that it is safeguarded from every scientific attack. And that is why we take our position in the center of our Christian experience and, standing there as in an unconquerable fortress, we proudly open our gates for all the raw materials of scientific research.

A Christian is a born free-trader; only he is opposed to every attempt of smuggling foreign goods, bearing false stamps, in order to be sold as home-made goods.

Christianity presses its own stamp on things. We do not wish to give up something essential to our belief because of

scientific considerations. Therefore, we shall submit scientific research of religious problems to the control of Christian experience. We proclaim the necessity of science—not because we venerate science to such a degree that, at any price, we want to strike a scientific attitude, but because it would weaken our positions as Christians and spoil the holy cause of the Christian faith, if we kept apart from modern culture and modern thought. We wish to confess our Christian faith not only within the walls of a small parish church, but freely and frankly on the large stage of the world. We wish to push forward the great missionary idea that Jesus Christ is the Redeemer of the world, and to confess before all men the “absoluteness” of Christianity.

We are quite aware that the word “absoluteness” is derived from modern evolutionistic apology, which saw a relative truth in every non-Christian religion, and in the Christian religion all these relative truths brought together in an absolute form. So this word does not exactly express our opinion. Its meaning, however, is clear, if we use it in the sense of decisive revelation of God in human history.

Evolutionistic idealism does not understand the real value of history and identifies Christianity too much with philosophy—the old wrong, which can be traced as early as Hellenism, and which tried to dissolve popular religion into a philosophic system. Christianity, with all its forces, opposes every attempt of taking it away from the basis of history. From the very beginning it had to defend itself against this danger. The fact that Origen, to whom the old Christian Church owed the whole of its theology, was condemned, proves that the Church intuitively felt that it was from history that Christianity had to borrow its credentials. Christianity is truth, not in the intellectual but in the ethical sense of the word, as St. John uses it, identifying it with “life.” Jesus Christ is the revelation of God in human history. God revealed his life in the historical personality of Jesus. Christianity and history are not opposed to each other, but closely united. The old idealistic philosophy opposes Christianity to history as the invisible and unchange-

able world, with its everlasting ideal reality displaying itself to the visible world with its eventualities. But we do not share that opinion, because we believe that it is in history only that Christianity can reveal its essential being. Everybody who has taken notice of the problems of the history of religion and who knows the innumerable difficulties about the origin of Christianity, viz., about the origin of the evangelical picture of Jesus Christ, and also the difficulties brought about by the affinity of Christianity and history, wants to know the meaning of "Christ, the Redeemer of the world." For it might happen that this expression were only an edifying confession to which many people were clinging as to a rock in the midst of roaring waves of unbelief and doubt, without realizing its real significance and which they were not able to justify before the court of science.

Is Christianity the absolute religion? Is it the decisive revelation of God in human life? I do not ask whether it is the highest revelation, for, by calling it by that name, we might make the impression, falling into the old mistake of evolutionistic idealism, and of seeing in Christianity the realization of the religious idea working, as an agent and as a ferment in the non-Christian religions, until the moment it broke through at last in Christianity, thus being the revelation of God Himself in human conscience. On the other side, the expression of highest revelation might be taken in the sense of highest revelation "until now," so that in the future there remains the possibility of a still higher revelation, not to mention the question whether that higher revelation would be in the line of Christianity or not. No, I do not say the highest, but the decisive revelation in human life in the personality of Jesus Christ. This testimony is a testimony of faith. Historic research does not give us the right to call Christianity absolute. If we consider historical research only, we remain within the domain of relativeness, as all historic facts are in relation to those preceding and those following, and every one of them has to give up its place to the following, the germs of which it bears. On account of historic researches we cannot even declare that among all the other religions Christianity is the highest form of religious life

we know, because scientific research does not give us a scale of comparison.

This testimony of faith about the decisive significance of God's revelation in Jesus Christ is based on experience. If we came in contact with Him, by preaching the Gospel, and have been renewed and sanctified by the influence of his personality, we know that we have not been brought into contact with Him in the same way as we are usually brought into contact with historic personalities by historic sources, but that we have come into touch with Himself, with his living personality in the real sense of the word, so that we made the experience of a present reality.

That contact has been of such a decisive and overwhelming character, surpassing our common experience to such a degree, that we felt the presence of God and were put before the absolute demand of a holy life. On account of that experience we are convinced of the historic reality of Jesus Christ. I emphasize this assertion notwithstanding the reproach that, in doing so, I am passing from the domain of faith to that of history, a *metobasis eis allo genos*. Many ask how experience can give any certainty about the truthfulness of historic information. This objection seems decisive, but in fact it is not. Of course our experience cannot give any certainty about all the different lines by which his picture is drawn and all historical details by which his life is represented. Indeed, experience does not give us certainty about any single fact of his life. But it convinces us of the historic reality of Himself, for it is exactly by the human character of his life that Jesus makes such an overwhelming impression upon us, that is to say, just because that Divine life is represented as entering into the sphere of our human life and taking part in our human struggle and sorrow and distress, his picture has a decisive influence on our hearts. We can say that history brings us into close contact with Jesus. Christianity preaches redemption, forgiveness of sins, and reconciliation with God by the personality and the work of Jesus Christ. The world opened to us by Christianity is not a world of enlightened ideas and philosophic systems, but the domain

of our human history. But it is not history only which brings us into close contact with Jesus; it is also true that Jesus binds us to history.

He makes us understand what great advantage it is to belong to mankind whom He redeemed by sacrificing his Divine love, and among whom He is still working through the Christian churches and the Christian testimony. Wherever the Gospel of the Living Christ is preached and the Church is radiating the light of the glorified Christ by its testimony and where new life is awakened, faith, hope, and love are born, and out of the depth, caused by the consciousness of sin, rises the thanksgiving for salvation and peace. Jesus brings us back from the world of ideas to the world of history, from the clouds to the earth again.

If we gained the certainty of salvation through the depth of consciousness of sin and agree with St. Paul that nothing can part us from the love of God in Jesus Christ our Lord, we see Jesus Christ not as our own Redeemer only, but also as the Redeemer of the world. It is our own religious experience which showed us the absolute character of Christianity.

The objections raised against the universal importance of Christianity are well-known. It is considered a token of narrow-mindedness to call one's own religion the only true religion. Will not the Buddhist, the Mohammedan, the follower of Confucius, or the Jew say exactly the same thing? That explains the opposition of all those religions against our missionary propaganda. For religious life is so closely united with personal life, that fighting for the right of one's own religion becomes an act of self defense. Advocates of the mission work are often thought to be intolerant. Many ask whether every race has not got that religion which is best for it, whether it is merely by accident that the Chinese are followers of Confucius, the Indians of Buddha, and so forth. Is there no deeper cause for the fact that Northern Europe, like North America, is, for the greater part, Protestant, and Southern Europe, as well as South America, is decisively Roman Catholic? Is not the question why all Slavonic races belong to the Greek Ortho-

dox Church, worthy to be examined? Many admirers of our modern civilization consider the device—Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of the world—an unpardonable pretention and they would be right if religious consciousness were only one of the constituting elements of civilization. In that case the manifold revelations of religious life really would be a great advantage. We hear, therefore, from many sides the objection that Christian mission work is a great danger, as it destroys so many heathen civilizations and is the cause of the fact that cannibals and so forth disappear.

We could agree with this objection if the world were a museum of antiquities, a zoological or a botanical garden, or a station for agricultural experiments. Then, I should try to save from ruin the genuine cannibal as well as the gorilla and should have to consider all mission work an attempt to remove the precious plants and flowers from the botanical garden and sow apple pips instead. But, fortunately, the world is not a museum nor a botanical garden, but the arena in which mankind has to fight in its struggle for life against all sorts of powers which try to ruin it morally and materially. Wherever we look we see the same titanic struggle, everywhere we hear the cries and laments caused by the sufferings of the world. He who sees all those terrible sorrows and pains from an æsthetic point of view only, and who does not feel his heart shrink with grief, gives such an exorbitant proof of superficiality and selfishness that we need not talk with him any more. But, if we feel the suffocating problem of human life twisting itself around us as a monstrous cuttlefish, we may fight with might and main to escape from the deadly danger. However, it will be all in vain if there is not a higher power that comes to the rescue.

Jesus Christ brings us that help. As soon as He comes the suffocating and twisting relaxes and the deadly arms are cut off. Jesus Christ saves us from ruin, from sorrow, sin, and guilt. Then we see that sin is the nucleus of all suffering and that it is the love of Christ only that can save us. Then we learn that He would not have been able to save us, if his love had not been greater than all the suffering of the world. The

absoluteness of Christianity was revealed to us at the same moment of our experience of salvation. This was the cause with St. Paul, who, at the moment of his salvation, suddenly saw Jesus Christ as the Redeemer of the world and, in this way, became an apostle of the heathen, a missionary by the grace of God. We look at the world with other eyes than we did before, we love the world with a new love, and we pray our Lord for the privilege of becoming the heralds of his Divine word. We may be gratified with the results. In many regions swords have been made into plowshares, spears into sickles, and peace and order are reigning instead of battle and disorder.

Alas, nowadays, in our civilized countries exactly the contrary is to be seen. Heathenism rises among Christendom and Christianity fades away under the heavy burden of modern civilization. Really we need all our forces in order to defend our religious experience and to proclaim Jesus Christ as the Redeemer of the world. The main objection to starting from the center of our own religious experience is that we cannot go beyond the limit of our own consciousness. Our desire to help others is met with much sympathy and it is considered a token of our kind-heartedness, but, in spite of that, it is considered a proof of narrow-mindedness. Those who share that opinion draw our attention to the same desire for missionary activity of the adherents of other religions and to the results they reached. All stress is laid upon the fact that our missionary work has been very little, compared to those regions that have not yet been reached, in spite of all our efforts, and that those small results have been harmed by the barbarism, risen in the Christian world from which the missionary work has started, viz., the Great War.

Believing Christians may go their way, untroubled by these objections and they may continue their missionary work, convinced of the unconquerable power of Christianity. That point of view may be accepted. But we fear that, in this way, Christianization would take far too long, and that all sorts of misunderstanding would rise and a great many obstacles. Therefore, we have to prove the superiority of Christianity

above every other religion in such a way that everybody around us can understand us. Of course, we do not try in the least to convince unbelieving people around us by reasoning, and we do not, but, for a moment, think of the possibility of convincing heathen people of the truth of Christianity by discussing religious matters; unbelief, in its deepest nucleus, not being a matter of ignorance but of repugnance. We only speak with regard to our own Christian surroundings, among which there are so many who disapprove of every missionary effort.

It is clear that on comparing Christianity to other religions we do not derive our norm from history. There are many who wish to avoid every subjective norm and think it possible to find an objective one, without the slightest respect to their own religious experience. But they are mistaken, because they cannot leave their own subjective convictions out of consideration. A Mohammedan or a Buddhist will find an entirely different norm of comparison than a Christian. In the examination of historical phenomena we come into touch with human life, the same that beats in to our own hearts. We cannot get out of the spiritual sphere and moral conviction in which we ourselves have been educated. But, as we have the full right to use that norm, we are, at the same time, obliged to show, by scientific means, that the intellectual objections against our point of view are of no importance, so that we need not take off our Christian wedding gown at the banquet of the priests of science.

St. Paul did not object to dispute with them on the Areopagus, and the end was that Dionysius, the Areopagite, was won. a result not to be underrated. And, therefore, we have to show that Christianity, compared to other religions, has a much deeper conception of religious life, of the being of God, of the human soul, and of the place one has to occupy in this world in relation to his expectations of the future life. In no religion is God such a single, spiritual, normal being opposed to the world and the soul. Christianity rejects every attempt at identifying the world or the soul with God. It stands absolutely on the side of theism and condemns all pantheism. God is the creator of the world, which is separated from Him, entirely sub-

jected to Him, and under his influence. But, more than any other religion, Christianity separates the soul from the world, yea, brings it into conflict with it. And that conflict is of an ethical character, for the cause of that opposition is not material, but it is sin, which is the cause of that conflict.

Man, in his struggle against sin, has to conquer his spiritual possession. He is not what he should be. He has to fight for it. Therefore, he has to obey the will of God, who in no respect may be identified with nature. This, however, is impossible for him, unless he is saved by God.

Law-religions preach obedience to God's will, but ascribe to every man the strength to conquer sin by his own endeavours. Christianity proclaims salvation not by teaching, as non-Christian religions do, that man has to lose himself in the substance of God, but by teaching that he has to believe in the love of God, who saved the world by an act of Divine mercy. Faith brings us into close union with God and by that union we are purified and cleansed from sin and guilt and so we become fellow workers for the realization of his kingdom and the building of that everlasting sanctuary in which we may live with Him as free personalities. Christianity does not urge us to deny the world, notwithstanding the decisive contrast between the world and God, but it sees in this world the matter in which man has to give shape to the thoughts of God, and in which he has to develop his own personality.

Not by sublime solitude but by earnest labour man has to fulfil his duty, and has to show by moulding the matter that he discerns. No religion awakens human energy to such a degree as Christianity does, to which history bears evidence on every page. As Christians, believing in Jesus Christ as the Redeemer of the world, we ask for the support of science, of philosophy, philology, archeology, ethnology, psychology, and history. We do not judge other religions roughly or haughtily, but we try to discover the congenial truths, our Christian experience enabling us to discern what, in other religions, has real value; but it will always prove impossible to erect the Christian building upon heathen basis, because the fundamental

truth of Christianity contradicts the heathen spirit absolutely. The Christian religion does not preach development of religious consciousness, but demands confession of sin and conversion, and thus causes a complete revolt in the human mind, heathen as well as Christian. So, we cannot be saved by the forces of our own energy but only by the regenerating grace of God. When Christianity, however, penetrates into the world and summons the world for Jesus Christ, it loses its best vital forces. Christianity is not at fault here, but its adherents are.

Civilization never can be the aim of Christianity, for the aim of Christianity is man himself and the realization of the Kingdom of God by means of civilization. Civilization procures to Christianity the material for the great structure that outgrows every temporary culture. As soon as a generation gets so fond of its own culture that it considers it to be the aim of life and restricts itself to this, so that it loses sight of eternity and forsakes its Divine vocation, Christianity becomes dull and fades away like a tree that gets no sun. Cultured men are always apt to do what Israel intended to do on its way to Canaan, while it rested near the waters of Elim and preferred to stay there under the palm trees. But it had to leave the oasis and to get out into the desert. We never may enjoy the advantage of civilization, forgetting that life is a pilgrimage to eternity. That is what Jesus is speaking of when He warns us not to gain but to lose our lives. If we shut ourselves up within the limit of our civilization and forget that Christianity is the force compelling us to strive for good higher than this world is able to give with all its wealth, Christianity fades away and culture decays. We have made that experience in the old regions in Egypt and in Asia-Minor, and we have asked ourselves in terror whether we, in our time, are not living on the verge of ruin, because the salt became tasteless.

We have to proclaim Jesus Christ as the Redeemer of the world with all our strength and to procure to the world the salt, which alone can save it from decay. The more Christianity penetrates into the hearts of the different nations, the more it reveals their riches and multiformity. Christianity is opposed

to every attempt of effacing all individual differences. We make the same experience about the different nations and individual man. It is the very individual character of every nation which is so clearly represented by Christianity. Christianity hates all monotony; it creates the greatest differences. The individual character of a nation shows itself most clearly when that nation is converted to Christianity. Christianity is far too rich to confine itself to one nation, or to limit itself to one race, far too alive to shape all nations into one single form. It respects the personality of everybody, neither kills it, nor moulds it as if it were some dead material, but awakens and purifies and sanctifies it and makes it grow by the love of God. It tries to realize itself in every religion and, in that way, it shows its inward riches in all spheres of life. With Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of the world, we mean that Christianity needs the whole world to develop all its power and riches and glory and reviving force. Even now we see many divergences. We know the difference in form between the old Greek and the Latin Christian Church, in our days the difference between the Oriental and Western Christianity; and we are quite aware how German Christianity differs from English and French. If we do not keep this in mind, we will be disappointed in all our endeavours toward bringing the churches together into one single dogmatic and disciplinary body. This is clearly proved by the history of the old church. The more those differences increase, the more Christianity unfolds its Divine depth and the sacred and awful mystery. Whereas Christianity forms man individually, the intercourse with true Christians enriches us spiritually. So the missionary work, which promotes the intercourse between the various nations and which enables them to understand each other, enriches the Christian Church as no other work is able to do.

Now we have still to answer this question: What is the meaning of history if we proclaim Christianity to be the absolute religion? Does it not seem as if we were fixing an immovable point in history and also stopping all historical development? That question would give us much trouble if we were

standing on the standpoint of old idealistic evolutionistic idealism. For if, after a long preceding development, the religious idea had broken out in Christianity, history would not be able to add anything to the absolute religious truth. That cannot be said about "life." It is inherent to spiritual life that it wants history to develop its fulness. On the standpoint of evolutionistic idealism the highest revelation of the religious idea can only manifest itself in the end of history. We do not deny historical development, but we take it in the sense of Galatians 4, where St. Paul says that God sent his Son in the fulness of time. The revelation in Jesus Christ had its historic preparation in Israel and the civilized world around, but not as the mere result of that preceding development. The revelation in Jesus Christ is surely bound to temporal and local conditions, but is not to be explained from those conditions. We know that this may be said of every human being, for nobody is to be explained from his surroundings only, and every human soul has something absolutely inexplicable and original. But, though no historic appearance can be deduced without any reference to what preceded, this is least of all the case with the Christian religion.

Jesus Christ, in whom God revealed Himself, is the most wonderful revelation of eternal life in human history and an inexplicable wonder. That life, revealed in Jesus Christ, tries to penetrate into every earthly form of life in East and West, North and South, and to manifest its energy. That is why we call Jesus Christ the Redeemer of the world. But we are mistaken if we think that, by religious development, mankind will become one great brotherhood living in mutual peace and love. Humanistic ideals and evolutionistic dreams bring disappointment only and Christianity itself indicates a quite different direction, namely, the wonderful realization of the Kingdom of God which surpasses all visible reality. My Kingdom, says Jesus Christ, is not of this world. This utterance forbids us to consider Jesus to be the Redeemer of the world in a humanistic or revolutionistic way. Christianity speaks of struggle, of opposition, of animosity between the kingdom of the world and the Kingdom of God and draws a line of demarcation from Gol-

gotha throughout the world unto the day of judgment, when all resistance will be conquered and the Kingdom of God will get its full realization. The meaning of history, therefore, is to plant the roots of Christianity into the life of this world so that the fruits of the Kingdom of Heaven may ripen. It is by its missionary work and its struggle against unbelief and sin, all those powers that try to frustrate God's purpose, that the Christian Church has to become conscious of its own riches. The meaning of history is the development of the Divine life revealed in Jesus Christ and active in the Christian Church. St. Paul speaks of the growth of the Body of Christ into a perfect man.

But now there is another difficulty to be considered. It seems as if the large world with its millions and millions of inhabitants only exists in order to enable the relatively small Church of Christ to develop and to maintain itself by the power of God, whilst that large world itself would fall a prey to eternal condemnation. Thus, we should return to the old medieval Christian opinion about history which considered the Christian Church a holy island amidst the roaring sea of paganism and sin. In that case the expression that Jesus Christ is the Redeemer of the world would get the opposite meaning and indicate that Jesus was the deemer of the world, so that only a very small part of it would be saved, whilst the greater part of mankind would be condemned forever. This is by no means what we want to express.

But then the question rises: What is the meaning of history? To answer this question we have to come to the point, and to realize for ourselves, what we mean by a testimony of faith. It means to us a testimony of that inner conviction that is not derived from historic researches but from our own experience only, that in the end Jesus Christ will become the ruler of all mankind. We believe that the eternal forces of the Gospel will conquer all resistance and that, at last, the light will drive away all darkness. We trust that everything done by the Christian Church in Jesus' name will have its eternal consequence and will bring forth its eternal fruit for all mankind. The preach-

ing of the Gospel, although it is temporally withstood and rejected by the majority of mankind, cannot have been in vain, but every word spoken in the name of Jesus Christ must bear its blessed fruit. We have to do our daily work honestly and carefully in order to realize, in the generation among which we are living, eternal thoughts of God, to express in our life the Divine purposes of God with the world.

Everything true and beautiful and blissful in this earthly life bears in it the germ of eternal development and strives after its full realization when Christ will come back on the clouds of heaven. Being Christians we have to sow the seed of God's eternal thoughts in the evil of this temporary life and to co-operate with all who try to raise this world unto the height of God's purposes. We have to show our Christian faith in this life and to apply the evangelical principles of truth and righteousness and love. But so we have to leave all the rest to God Himself, for the leaven of the Kingdom of God will have its irresistible effect through all mankind into eternity. The activity of the Christian Church will manifest its blessed influence in all directions. Origen saw the universe in a vertical line, all good descending from God, the Father, the source of life and light. From Him descended the redeeming force that would restore all that was fallen from Him, so that at last every dissonance would disappear out of the harmony of the universe and God would be all in all. We are in some way Origenists, not in the vertical but in the horizontal line. Origen left the domain of history and out of Christianity he made a philosophical system. As to us, we want to remain in history. We see mankind, to which we ourselves are belonging, as one immense body, with Jesus Christ, the Son of Man, as the center of it. Seeing history in the light of his Incarnation, we learn that all events before and after God's revelation in Christ belong to one marvelous Divine scheme of which we now can only see a small part. The history of the world becomes the manifestation of God's eternal purpose as to the salvation of man. By calling Jesus Christ the Redeemer of the world we make our earth the spiritual center of the universe. Jesus Christ the

Redeemer of the world means the same as Jesus Christ the King of Heaven, crowned with glory and sitting at the right hand of God. The absoluteness of Christianity signifies the decisive victory of life and the eternal salvation of mankind.

J. A. CRAMER.

“OUR FATHER”

“Our Father”—so it was One prayed

Long ago—

In Galilee—

And by this deathless “Our” He made

The least among us unafraid,

Serene and glad, with lifted head

And faith that smiles because He said,

Long ago—

In Galilee—

“Our Father.”

He did not say “MY Father”—thus

Inferring something less for us—

Himself a Son of God, and we

“Unredeemed humanity.”

He did not say “Their Father”—so

Allowing us, mere sons, to know

That He, as high as star from sod

Above us, must be very God.

“Our Father”—this the deathless prayer

Long ago—

In Galilee—

Of Him, our Brother, holy, rare;

And all God’s children, everywhere,

Shall claim their heritage and say

“Our Father”—as He taught one day

Long ago—

In Galilee—

“Our Father.”

—Grace Allen.

A THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

BY REV. CARL AGEE

Minister of the First Christian Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

THE most distinguishing characteristic of the modern Church is its method of propagating the Kingdom. Practically within a generation the method has changed from that of the traditional evangelism to that of religious education, and religious education requires the support of a different type of theology than that required by evangelism.

Whatever may be our criticism of the evangelistic method of church work, it certainly had a passion and a conviction that is not so common to-day, and one of the chief reasons for the violent reactions against the modern point of view is that it is charged with being of the head rather than of the heart. The opposition to modern science may be partially accounted for on the grounds that it produces an academic attitude toward life rather than an emotional attitude. We are admonished to love God with our minds, but we must not forget that we are also commanded to love Him with all our hearts.

Religion is fundamentally an emotional experience and, if our methods get us no further than certain intellectual attitudes, no matter how correct they may be, we are miserably failing.

We have not proceeded far enough with the method of religious education in our churches to make any very intelligent criticisms, and it may be for the best that we have not until we have established our foundations.

Our colleges offer a better basis for criticism on this point than do the churches, because their work of religious education has been more thoroughly done. What type of Christians are our best colleges producing, and what is the effect often of a seminary course upon an enthusiastic young preacher? These

results have often been too tragically evident to need repetition. It is not the contention here that young people lose their faith, but that they too often lose their ardour. It is altogether probable that the development of the "open mind" and the "suspended judgment" has been overdone. The great need that is too often conspicuously absent in the average college graduate is conviction. A young lady who graduated from one of America's best colleges last year, and who through the entire four years kept in vital touch with the work of her church, is considered by her friends as a kind of "religious sport." The average pastor finds that no matter how modern is the thinking and programme of his church, one of his greatest problems is to quicken and enlist the activity of college graduates.

It is taken for granted that the average Christian college, in making intellectual and religious adjustments, is promoting religious education at its best. We hope soon to see the day when the churches shall have developed their educational programmes to the point where there will be no cleavage whatever between the training received in the Church and that received in the high schools and colleges, but even when this is done our problem will only be made more acute, unless we provide the conviction that is so obviously needed.

The Church has gained a great deal in the transition of its methods from evangelism to that of religious education, but it has also lost something that is vital, which is caused by getting the cart before the horse in appropriating the method before adopting the principle. It is recognized by all that the method of religious education is incompatible with the traditional theology. There is a constant clashing at every point and, yet, we have done no more than try to patch up the old theology as it is broken down by our pragmatic procedure. The most consistent people in Christendom are the Primitive Baptists, who declare that religious education is the work of the devil. Their theological conceptions of the nature of God and the nature of man will not permit them to interfere with God's work by meddling with religious education nor even with evangelism. If God wants a man saved He will do it!

Furthermore, it is significant that up to within the past quarter of a century theological interest centered around conversion. The first books on the psychology of religion, particularly those of James and Starbuck, were critical laboratory studies of the phenomenon of conversion.

Under the older theology the experience of Paul was the norm and the programme of the Church was directed toward producing a similar experience. In our day, the experiences of Timothy and Jesus are considered the normal ones, but our theology does not support this view with the same vigour and enthusiasm as the old. We have been dragging our theology along behind our methods when it should be the prophet's voice pointing the way.

Religious education has received its sanctions from the field of psychology rather than that of theology and this has resulted in a certain academic attitude which is characterized by a decided lack of conviction. This conviction will never be realized until we have a theology that is thorough-going and consistent and one that undergirds our programme of religious education. The greatest problem of the modern Church lies in the fact that its method has been revolutionized without a corresponding revolution of its principles. Most of our religious educationists take the position that these principles are fundamentally psychological. They have ignored the theological implications, thus making the primary task of the Church an academic procedure rather than a religious one.

There have been a few attempts on the part of the leaders in religious education to deal with this problem, but, as yet, there has been no thorough-going treatment of it. The pioneer in the field was Horace Bushnell and his book on *Christian Nurture* marks an epoch in American theology. Another significant contribution has been made by Professor George Albert Coe, but his work has been coloured more by psychological than by theological interests. Professor Rauschenbusch was the prophet in the field that is providing a thorough-going theology for a social Gospel. Our greatest need to-day is for a great prophet to re-

write our theology from the standpoint of religious education as the fundamental method of propagating the Kingdom.

The limits of this article make it impossible to state the doctrines involved, even in outline. Only a few examples will be suggested.

For example, the whole problem of the nature of religion is involved. If religion is something that one "gets" in an ecstatic conversion experience, as the traditional evangelistic method presupposes, then the only purpose of religious education is to create the conditions where that experience will be realized. If, however, we believe with William Adams Brown that we no longer conceive of the Divine nature of men as an endowment imparted once for all, but as a capacity to be developed, then let us rethink our conceptions of God and man and the nature of the universe in the light of this.

Professor Coe says, "Religious nature is an expression of the immediate presence of God in every human mind." Phillips Brooks says, "Religion is the life of God in the soul of man." The great question for us is whether this Divine life can be developed by educational methods, and the religious world is all but agreed that this is true.

Now, let us write a theology that demands that this shall be done. If we can undergird our modern programme of religious education with a "Thus saith the Lord," it will be saved from its present insipid character. We need a school of prophets who can go out with the passion of a Martin Luther or a John Wesley, proclaiming that the method of religious education is the will of God.

The clearest example of inconsistency that one can well imagine is for a church with a fundamentalist theology to attempt to do its work by the methods of religious education, and, yet, it is this effort to mix oil and water that has caused a great deal of the consternation in the Church. The reaction of modern methods against the old theology has destroyed one citadel after another until the remains constitute a rather thin theological gruel. Our general attitude in this progressive conflict has been

largely defensive and negative, and we are left without the conviction that comes from a positive offensive.

The results of religious education may be satisfactory from the educational point of view, but it is certain that, from the religious point of view, there is much to be desired. It is also evident that whatever is done here must be done by the ministers and theologians, for the religious educators are inclined to ignore the theological aspects of the problem and depend wholly upon psychology, which never gets us beyond the stage of luke-warmness. We need the fervour and passion that comes from a consciousness of doing the will of God, and, unless we can give our work this Divine sanction, we may well be concerned about its consequences. We must be able to say that our God demands that his work shall be done by educational methods rather than by the sporadic, cataclysmic methods of traditional evangelism. And if we make this assertion, it means that we must support it with a consistent statement that involves every theological concept.

This means a discriminating conception of God, which is not a composite of all those in the Old Testament and the New, but that given us by Jesus in his teaching and experience. If God is thought of as an arbitrary monarch, "adopting some to the hope of life and adjudging others to eternal death," as John Calvin states it, or if God has no immediate intercourse with the affairs of this world, except in the miraculous where law and order break down, it is obvious that religious education is ruled out. Our modern programme presupposes that God is dependable and that He co-operates in carrying out the laws of growth and development. If God overrules the freedom of his children and resorts to force and coercion, then, again, there is no place for religious development. If God's chief purpose is his own selfish glory, and his people are serfs and slaves, the difficulty is readily seen: but, if God's highest purpose is the enrichment of the life of his people, a real incentive is given to religious education. These suggestions should be sufficient to convince us that our pagan God must give way to a Christian God, if we are to justify our programme by an appeal to his will.

Also the traditional conception of the origin of man creates serious problems for religious education. The special creationist theory, that God created man perfect in the beginning and that his nature was subsequently corrupted, reflects both upon the wisdom of God and upon the dependableness of the nature of man. If God has created man so that his natural tendency is toward degeneration, surely education will fail. If man is prone to do evil and, if the image of the invisible God has been blotted out by the sin of the race, there is not much of a nucleus for the developing process of religious education. His only hope is in the despotic power of a capricious God.

On the other hand, the mechanistic explanation of the origin and nature of man is equally fatal. If, for instance, man can be explained on the basis of heredity and environment, or the synthesis of material forces, he is largely beyond the control or influence of the educator. From this view, man is as rigidly fated as from the view of the strictest Calvinism. If religious education has any vital significance, man must be free in his moral and spiritual nature.

The view that gives the most rational explanation of the origin and nature of man and, at the same time, has the greatest significance for religious education, is the evolutionary theory. This relates man very definitely to the laws and nature of the universe in which he lives. It relates him to the lower animals in such a way as to throw a flood of light upon many of the problems of his physical nature, which traditionally were explained on the basis of original moral perversion.

The evolutionary view does not eliminate God from the creative process, as some believe, but demands a God who is in his world, actively engaged in his great creative task. He is present and active at every variation and is seeking to improve the stock as much as the limitations of heredity and environment will allow. It will be observed that the cutting edge of God's activity in the life of man is in the realm of man's free choice. Blood will tell, so will environment, but both of these together do not tell the whole story. The most significant moment in creation was when man emerged into self conscious-

ness from that lower state of which he had been a part. This emergence was not sudden or absolute and the evolutionist feels that the process is still going on and will continue until the free spirit is the master of the body in which it dwells, and until it co-operates with God in controlling the universe. It is toward this end and for this purpose that religious education labours with a consciousness that God by this method has thus far created man so that he responds naturally to moral and spiritual stimulation. It works with the conviction that all the uncontrolled forces of the world cannot thwart the processes of moral development. It believes that man is created in the image of God and endowed with all the potential attributes of his nature and that its task is to help to develop those attributes to their fullest capacities.

The Christian evolutionist feels that the purpose of the Creator is to bring man to the fullness of his stature so that he will be like God, and the possibility of this is the inspiring hope of those concerned with religious education. One of man's distinguishing characteristics is that he is an intellectual animal. He thinks and then decides. It is the province of religious education to provide him with right materials to aid him in thinking and to moralize his decisions. The chief difference between God and man is that of attainment. God is, and man is becoming. This gives meaning to the fatherhood of God. It can be readily seen that these considerations are largely theological and must not be ignored.

The traditional conception of the origin and nature of sin positively prevents a consistent programme of religious education. As stated by F. R. Tennant, this traditional doctrine is as follows:—

The theory refers the prevalence of sin to a fall from pristine condition of innocence or integrity at the beginning of human history. One consequence of this moral catastrophe was the corruption of our nature in suchwise that every individual finds himself from birth onward in an abnormal state, a state described as inconsistent with the concept of man foreign to the Creator's intention, a state, therefore, displeasing to God or sinful and also guilty and deserving of punishment.

This corruption of human nature has generally been represented since

Augustine as consisting in a diminution of the freedom of the will and in an acquired ingrained bias or inclination to evil, and the universal appearance or sinfulness in the lives of men is ascribed to its hereditary transmission by means of natural generation.

It will be readily seen that this picture is rather a dark one from those interested in religious education, but this is the picture that comes from a rigid literal interpretation of the Genesis story. Hence, we see that we are immediately led into the necessity of reinterpreting the Scripture. There is no use for us to try to reconcile evolution with the Genesis story of creation. We might as well frankly say that, in the early chapters of the Bible, we have a body of folk-lore that reflects the religious ideas of a primitive people. This will lead us into a restudy of all Scripture on the basis of its literary form. External theories of inspiration will be abandoned and we will study the literature just as it is. The Bible is not a book of science or law or history, but it is a book of life that reflects the current ideas of the time in which it was written.

Referring again back to the problem of the nature of man and the nature of sin, we are brought face to face with the problem of conversion and the doctrine of conversion must be restudied in the light of religious education. From this standpoint, radical conversion is an exceptional and abnormal experience. In a social order, where the ideals of moral development prevail, the necessity for the older type of conversion will not be present. Where such great stress is laid upon the vividness and extreme importance of dated conversions, religious education is bound to suffer. An over-emphasis upon conversion as an isolated Christian experience has determined the thought and activity and even the building of the Church until comparatively recent years. Nothing has hindered the progress of the Kingdom more than the insistence upon a uniform type of conversion experience. The term "salvation" has taken on a new significance. The bargain-counter idea of exchanging faith, repentance, confession, and baptism for salvation will not endure in an atmosphere of religious education. The operation of the Holy Spirit has an entirely new significance under the impact of

religious education. If the outpouring of the Holy Spirit is arbitrary and conditioned upon ecstatic states of mind, it has no significance for this method; but, if the Holy Spirit is dependable and operates according to conditions which may be created by education, the difference will be readily seen.

The conception of immortality also requires to be restudied from the standpoint of religious development. If we believe that we begin our life in the future world where we leave off in this world, there is a tremendous incentive for spiritual development. A materialistic heaven of golden streets and pearly gates and jasper walls has small significance for one who thinks in terms of spiritual value. A hell of physical fire and brimstone has small meaning to those who decline to believe that the spirit is combustible.

Under the influence of religious education, interest in Jesus Christ has shifted from the elements of the miraculous and unusual and unreproducible to those spiritual qualities that are the priceless heritage of every man. To incorporate the spirit and purpose and ideals of Christ in human life and human relationships is the task of the modern Church. These theological views have been worked out for the most part, but their tremendous significance for religious education has been overlooked.

The cause of Christian union has been well served by the great advances made in the field of religious education. The outstanding leaders in this field have all but lost their denominational consciousness. The best principles and methods are the common possessions of all. When there is sufficient courage to adopt a thorough-going and consistent theological background for religious education, there will come a renewed conviction and enthusiasm and the cause of Christian union will be greatly strengthened.

CARL AGEE.

OUR QUEST FOR AUTHORITY

BY HUGH LENOX HODGE, D.D.

Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, Md.

THERE is an increasing demand for reality, which is imperative and must be met in terms of present day thought. The quest for reality has been a long quest for authority, that which we and our ancestors, back to the beginning of time, have attempted, often in vain. We admit the question is not ended or settled. It never was more active and insistent. Perhaps, it is because the authority has been sought largely in externals, in things, in organizations, in persons, in powers and signs, in books, for us principally in the Bible. And even the authority of these has been propped up by physical things, often only theoretical, as dogmas, creeds of the churches, theory of verbal inerrancy of the Bible, or infallibility of the churches or even of the clergy, insistence of known authorship of the various books and even the homogeneity of the books of the Bible; whereas, we all know and profess the belief that Christianity is of the Spirit and centers in the Person of Christ and not in the Bible or Church or ordained clergy.

Perhaps the illusiveness of the quest is partly due to the fear of what might be, if our outward props gave way—Fear that the decisions of the Church or old interpretations of the Bible giving way would leave us without authority. The things that we have clung to, or that our fathers have, serve us no longer. We ask, what next? What will happen? What is left? And we cling tenaciously to the past and yet our quest is unsatisfied, our quest is still on.

The Holy Spirit is not static but dynamic, growing, given to all flesh, poured out not alone upon disciples but upon men. Can we regard the Spirit infallible in his work on writers of the Old Testament or the New Testament and regard Him fal-

libile in men of to-day? Not without a stretch of imagination, to say the least. Now, where does the fallibility or the infallibility of the Spirit's working end? The quest is still on.

I. The foundation of our faith concerns us all deeply. We want realities, the basic, the truly fundamental, that which cannot be gainsaid or argued out of court. That which, exposed to severe storms of doubts, and great floods of people, crowds, majority votes, will not be shaken but stand. That is the desire of every man. This Jesus unquestionably came for and spake unto. He appealed to wise, eager spirits who wished to be established. He warned against a faith in the sayings of the scribes, in things of the past or even of things written and handed down in his day. They rushed to Him as to a great teacher and asked for facts. Now Jesus' way of teaching was and is personal experience, and in his mind personal experience of Himself. For the real thing that men want is not truth in the abstract, but a personal touch with it, a doing of it. He ends his Sermon on the Mount with considering men as "wise" who come to Him, hear his words, and "do them," and this He likened to a man who "dugged and went deep" and "laid foundation on a rock" for the building of his character. We want to note that the "rock" (which is a metaphor for that which cannot be shaken) is Jesus Christ Himself.

We can picture everything that man has made as passing, even the passing of man's mind, or well formed decisions. The changing of our creeds, of our faiths, are historical facts we all know, but what lasts is Jesus' teaching; that is never superseded. Our interpretations and applications change; they cannot be fundamental, but his sayings no storms can shake. They are more prevalent to-day and more potent than ever before.

Jesus speaks of the "wise" and "foolish," and they are pictured not as good and bad. A man is not bad and an enemy of the Bible because he differs from the others in interpretation and application, but only when he fails to obey is he bad. That is, when he fails to do what is commanded or when the grip of Jesus, who says these things, is not felt and impelling to action therewith. He becomes bad, unrighteous, because the

authority of the person of Christ is not within him. Jesus sought no other authority than to be in men and to work through them.

Of course what Jesus taught is open to personal interpretation and the question of authority is still open. What did Jesus mean by his sayings? is a question that is always rife. He was never autocratic, dogmatic, never argumentative, least of all doctrinal. He formulated none. He left that to men of every age as each feels within himself the realities of his revelation. He demanded of none to accept what He said because He said it. In speaking against traditionalism and literalists He simply said, "But I say unto you," and left it there to be accepted not as a dictum but as a practice for each to work out, not on the grounds that He was inspired, sent from God, or is God. All that, because authority in man is by experience and companionship. The spirit, under all of it, was, Does God in this form appeal to you? This is the point of all his teaching and his doing.

Pre-eminently the revelation that Jesus gave of Himself was his relationship to God—not to God as an absolute monarch, but to God as Father. That fatherhood is pictured as quickening, as drawing, and as wise. It is always of the tenderest things that can be attributed to a father. He pictured God as caring for the hairs of our head, and God in the most loving possible phrases of solicitude for every man's welfare. It is as if again He said, Does this appeal to you, cause you to hear and to believe in Me? This is at the center of his saying, "Call no man rabbi nor father nor master." These terms in the mouth of any Jew of Jesus' day meant autocracy. The power of a "rabbi" was the power of a leader over the crowd, imposing his will and his beliefs. The "father" stands at the head of his family and the elder son, on the death of the father, succeeding as the autocrat of the family, lords it even over his own mother. His word is law not to be questioned. "Master" was the term of the slave overseer. These were all autocratic terms in Judaism, and Jesus repudiated the thought that his followers should be led by any such authority. It is the prohibition of allowing

mere man to dictate a faith rather than the appeal made within man by the picture of God as Father.

II. The quest for authority has been sought in the Bible, but, if we keep clearly before us the authority of the purpose of Christ, we find that He did not place the fountain of reality in any book at hand or to be made. His actual complaint was, "Ye search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they that testify of Me. And ye will not come unto Me, that ye might have life." He is the fountain, the way, the truth, and the life uniquely. *Christianity is the religion of a person and not of a book.* It came into existence and continued for one hundred years without the New Testament, which was not yet in being. What He said concerning the Old Testament was frequently in way of criticism and with additions, and even contradictions, as we see in many phrases of the Gospels. If it is claimed that the Scriptures are inspired and breathed in by the breath of God, and God could not breathe a lie, and, therefore, the Bible is infallible, we are certainly on the wrong quest. The theory of inspiration and the theory of its infallibility (and there are many theories) do not, even on this, rest on the infallibility of God, but on the meaning of the Greek word "inspired" and on the human theory of the action and intention of the Spirit, on the writers. It also depends on what writings are rightly included in what we now call the Bible. We still insist upon asking, Was the Bible inspired to give us science, or God; to give us history, or God's relationship to human development; to give us dogma, or thoughts of God for us to formulate (as one must for himself)?

"Why do we claim the sinless conception of Christ, whom no living man has seen," is asked by a recent writer. Not because original manuscripts, which no living man has seen, say so, and that these manuscripts are declared infallible by men of our day, and past days; but it is because the story of Christ, as we have it, asserts its indisputable authority over our own lives and we say, "I believe" and "I know" by personal experience.

III. Again, we think too readily that our quest is intellectual and interpretative, but the compelling power is moral. What intellect of any age settles anything for succeeding ages? Take science. If the first pages of Genesis are ancient science, it is certainly not the science of 1925. What changes more rapidly in these last few decades than the findings of science? And unless we are prepared to say that the intellectual mind is a totally different thing from the scientific mind, then we must argue that in religious matters mind does not settle things, merely as mind, but only by experience. That is how science grows and religious concepts also. After all, what is more personal than religion and necessarily influenced by deeper knowledge of all things in God's whole universe, of course science included? It is truly said that orthodoxy is a matter of votes always, yes of votes and not necessarily of facts. Votes of councils since A. D. 325, votes of policy, of politics, of fear, and even of the strength of armies, as in the days of Charles of Germany and in the contests against the reformers, and these votes rather than truth. It is even evident (if you will allow me to say so) in the perverted method of packing our General Assembly and electing our Moderator for the purpose of turning votes for "orthodoxy." Hear this from the Southern Presbyterian Assembly in May, 1922, declaring as a church, without debate, that it did not believe in evolution. It stated: "The church remains at this time sincerely convinced that the Scriptures, as truly and authoritatively expounded in our Confession of Faith, teach that Adam and Eve were created body and soul by immediate acts of Almighty Power, thereby preserving a perfect race unity, and that Adam's body was directly fashioned by Almighty God, without any natural parentage of any kind, out of matter previously created from nothing, and that any doctrine at any variance therewith is a dangerous error, inasmuch as, in the method of interpreting Scripture it must demand and in the consequences which by fair implication it will involve, it will lead to denials of doctrine fundamental to faith." One is apt to ask very seriously without debating the theory whether this body is any more competent to decide upon this question than

the school boards of the west who voted against the teaching of evolution in the schools. For it is a question of facts, not of votes and not of religion. It reminds one of Kipling's story of the "Village That Voted The Earth Was Flat," which was once supposed to be the Biblical view, and may have been, for it certainly was of our forefathers. Even if it was the Biblical view, it was proved to be untrue by science at a later age. The Menonites, in their annual conference, lately passed a series of resolutions on its own authority, that bobbed hair for women is a violation of Scripture and women with bobbed hair will be received as members only as they promised to let their hair grow. "When Sisters young or old violate the Scriptures by having their hair shorn they shall be dealt with as transgressors and not held as communicant members until they are brought to repentance."

Now this "authority" we may laugh at. It does not affect us. It appeals to those only as authority who are ready to do it in their own practice. Others will ignore it, perhaps laugh at it, as we do. Votes cannot make a thing true or untrue, though they can make it orthodox by "authority," when one wishes to recognize it as such, but to none other. Each church has rejected all council-authority of other bodies, and even its own bodies, and recognized them as fallible. Our Westminster Confession of Faith distinctly states that "all councils and assemblies are liable to mistakes." Christ recognized the authority of the Old Testament Church but with reservations: "The scribes sit on Moses' seat: all things therefore whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe: but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not" (Matt. 23:2, 3; with Matt. 15:1-14). The matter of practice works toward making "authority" infinitely more than mere words do. Christ rejected their practice and tradition and law and their interpretation because all were outward details, "omitting the weightier matters," which were all moral rather than intellectual and had to do with the expression of the moral will, doing the will of God. This was the concern of Christ and this is the actual authority which men really

recognize. Authority is that which actually compels a man to do.

Is it not remarkable in a spiritual and moral religion, such as ours, that believers should strive after physical proofs, founded on theory only, to maintain its authority, such as the character of original manuscripts, inerrant verbal dictation, immediate creation, validity of ordination? These are physical explanations of "How" concerning the great mysteries of our faith. They might all go and yet Christ be unshaken and duty to Christ remain inviolate. The moral authority is what counts.

In asking what the authority of Moses was there is but one answer. It is not that he said that he was sent by God or that he made any claims. It is the growing consciousness that he spake as God to them, and they listened to him only so long as or so far as they felt the impelling of God in them through what Moses was and said. The authority of Peter and John, when they were called "bold" in Jerusalem by their persecutors and yet won, with the other apostles, over five thousand men in a single day in that city, was not a mechanical nor automatic sort nor was it their apostolic office. It was the impression made on the moral concepts of those who knew them to be "men of Jesus." Paul's authority was challenged in Jerusalem, Galatia, and in Corinth by sternly bigoted, traditional Judaizers. His credentials were his converts—"living letters of commendation"—and his life, namely, what he denounces as evil, and what he upholds as truth. He defends his apostleship not on the physical laying on of hands but as a minister of Christ above them all (I Cor. 11:16-33; 12:1-13; 4:1-6). Christ's authority was not a claim and not a demonstration. They asked for proofs, for signs, for "one to rise from the dead." "If ye believe not my words neither will ye believe that one rose from the dead." He refused signs, for the authority needed is not outward demonstration of power. You have proof and do not see it, because you refuse the inward witness and seek only the outward. Even the disciples cry, "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us" (John 14:8), and the answer is, "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me? Believe Me

that I am in the Father and the Father in Me: or else believe Me for the very works' sake." The answer that they seek for authority is throwing them back upon themselves in their personal relations with Him. The inward witness is the grip on thinking men.

Surface authority or position, power, reputation, and so forth, and majorities are most precarious and shakable—all shifting sand. When does a man say he knows and becomes immovable, unshakable? He says it sometimes by insanity, or inanity, or by mere stubbornness or pure laziness; but, setting this aside, all our interpretations may be shaken, all our traditions may pass away, all translations of the Scriptures be superseded, but our God and our personal experience of God cannot pass away and we say, "We know," "not because of thy saying: for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ" (John 4).

IV. Now, again, the quest for authority is not outward, but the witness of Christ within, and this is to be reached, as Jesus said in the Sermon on the Mount, by digging and going deep. That is individual research for rock foundation and immovableness. Jesus was asked many plain questions about his authority—where He got it, if He were the Christ, what right He had to command in the temple. What was his answer? In every case He turns them back on themselves to think. Thus is the astonishing contrast with the scribes' authority who boasted of themselves when questioned, and of their erudition and quoting the law as supporting their opinions or bigotry (as the case might be). For example, what authority had Christ to chase out the money changers from the temple? His answer is not an evasion. "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (John 2:19). The temple was forty-six years in building. It was indubitably an answer which did concern his right in chasing out the robbers, but not based on the authority the scribes looked for. It is the temple of his body (of which He spoke), and when He was raised from the dead they remembered that He spoke this and they believed the Scriptures and the word which Jesus spoke, and such had right in the temple.

That was the record. Jesus made them think for themselves and find the interpretation of his right to cleanse the temple many days later by his resurrected body as Lord. They had to dig deep into his sayings and find their answer by experience and not in a surface literal manner. Or take another—the famous question, “Who is He that gave Thee this authority?” (Luke 20:2). That is as to his infallibility, and his answer given is not an evasion but is educative. They ought to know by experience. “The baptism of John from heaven or from men?” One that drew the populace, as the testimony of John and his baptism did was indubitably from heaven. They had seen thousands repentant because of their belief in the truth that he spake and this was sufficient guarantee for them also to repent and believe. Again, the people they knew well enough did not admit it to be of men and they feared to say it was “of men,” and they were silenced or convinced, which? Yet it was authority to all who heeded Him. Or another illustration, John 10:24, “Why hold us in suspense, if Christ, tell us plainly,” and his answer, “If I told you, ye would not believe; the works that I do in my Father’s name bear witness of Me, but ye believe Me not because ye are not of my sheep.” It is on the principle that spiritual things are spiritually, inwardly, personally discerned.

One wonders why, in these days, authority is sought for anywhere else concerning our spiritual religion. One asks, Why seek religious truth differently from all other knowledge and as intelligent men? Do we study science, selling, or banking, or politics till we know by experience? Yes, we study books, we go to school and college. But a graduate of a normal school, however well taught, seeking a place as a teacher, finds it exceedingly difficult to get a school because the first question asked is, “Have you any experience?” We all know that no book is sufficient, no saying of others, but only what we know, because “I have done it.” It is an experimental conviction which is the authority for any of us. In ordinary life and in matters of the soul how can it be outward or by count or by majorities or by book, however sacred and exalted that may

even be. Jesus counseled and cultivated "asking," "seeking," and "knocking," and these persistently and continuously, till they "find," and "have," and it "be opened unto them." Because deep things, and they are foundation things, which we call "authority" (and this is the quest for authority) never come to any of us till wanted badly enough to be earnestly inquired for and done—worked out in practice or a willingness to do so, at least.

Protestants protest against dwarfing or crushing the mind into a mould by outside authority, whatever it may assume to be. It is against ecclesiastical authority as such, whether it be Roman Catholic or General Assembly. It is a protest for the right to think in every age, to be free to worship according to individual conscience, to search for what is true, until individually satisfied, and let others do the same. It claims that conscience, and tradition, and custom might be and are open to mistakes and need constant cultivation and growth. It is not to be static. "What think ye of Christ?" is the question—what *ye* think. The doctrine of the Trinity was not given or formulated by Christ, but it is what in the early Church (which was eminently a thinking Church), in the course of its experience, came to formulate as true; and only so is it true. It is not a matter of logic nor of argument but just experience—"I know." So the atonement was formulated and this is why there is more than one theory of it. But there is no question as to fact. Jesus provoked all to think it out and through, till his personality stands out, not as a belief about Him, but a belief in Him as leading toward God and the goal of our quest for reality. Our own conviction is the authority worth having. This basic truth is found by weighing, and it involves more than the intellect. It is the whole moral being and by it growth. This is its value, as seed, as leaven, and progress, the bursting of wine skins, "the kingdom in which the violent take it by force," and by reaching toward a standard we never actually attain in this life. Christ is the truth. The Spirit reveals Christ. Christian religious authority is actually the impelling of the Spirit of Christ in his followers—to do the thing which He says, and we are still

doing—practicing—failing—gaining on the whole, but the goal—the supreme expression—is still ahead. “When we see Him we shall know Him, for we shall see Him as He is and ever was and ever shall be.”

HUGH LENOX HODGE.

TRUTH

Let there be many windows in your soul.
That all the glory of the universe
May beautify it. Not the narrow pane
Of one poor creed can catch the radiant rays
That shine from countless sources. Tear away
The blinds of superstition; let the light
Pour through fair windows broad as truth itself
And high as God.

Why should the spirit peer
Through some priest-curtained orifice, and grope
Along dim corridors of doubt, when all
The splendour from unfathomed seas of space
Might bathe it with their golden seas of love?
Sweep up the debris of decaying faiths,
Sweep down the cobwebs of worn-out beliefs,
And throw your soul wide open to the light
Of Reason and of Knowledge. Tune your ear
To all the wordless music of the stars,
And to the voice of nature, and your heart
Shall turn to truth and goodness, as the plant
Turns to the sun. A thousand unseen hands
Reach down to help you from their peace-crowned heights,
And all the forces of the firmament
Shall fortify your strength. Be not afraid
To thrust aside half truths and grasp the whole.

—*Ella Wheeler Wilcox.*

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

The Revolution of Christian Equality

THE equality of all Christians before God, including equality of membership, equality at the Lord's Supper, and equality in the pulpit, is a principle that must triumph in the minds of all Christians, if spirituality is to grow and brotherhood become a reality. Civilization has advanced by breaking down national isolations. One may go further and say, with Friedrich Naumann, that "history teaches that the general progress of civilization can be realized only by breaking the national liberty of small peoples."

Take, for example, any one of the small nations of the world which might take the position of saying, "We shall refuse entrance to all people other than our own nationality. We shall live as we please, irrespective of the nations that surround us." One such nation taking that attitude would hinder the general progress of civilization. When one or more Christian denominations take a similar attitude toward other denominations it hinders the general growth of spirituality, it lowers the standard of Christianity, and delays the coming of the Kingdom of God.

Our barriers of episcopacy, creed, baptism, or what not, are purely incidental by the side of the great principle of the equality of all Christians before God. If one wishes, he may have all these and more, so he practices the brotherhood of Christian equality. If, on the other hand, holding to any one of these, isolates him from other Christians, especially if there creeps into his thinking that, because he has done thus and so, he is better than other Christians, that thing which he has done becomes a hindrance to the will of God rather than a help, even though the Scriptures or the church councils may be cited for its authority. Many of the laws of Moses were altogether proper for observance in the time of Jesus, but there was scarcely anything against which Jesus more severely leveled his denunciation than the formalism into which those laws had passed. That which was intended to be a factor in spirituality had become an unspiritual element.

It is precisely so in this day with the principles on which our Christian denominations rest. Whether they be Roman

Catholic or Protestant, the motive for projecting them was good. Its purpose was to express truth and love. In passing out of an experience into a form it made denial of the great principles which are to guide Christianity into a united and spiritual brotherhood. Hence we are contending to-day with a form of truth that has largely become untruth, and a form of love that has largely become unlove, for anything that tends to separate the followers of Christ into non-co-operative camps is a false principle, irrespective as to how it is labeled.

These are the days of Christian revolution—a term from which some are inclined to shy off, but which was a popular term in America in 1776. Our forbears were the revolutionists in those days. Out of the American Revolution came the Declaration of Independence, proclaiming as a self-evident truth that all men are created equal—perhaps somewhat beyond what they meant, for they were thinking more of their equality with the British king and their British kinsmen beyond the Atlantic, rather than the slave's equality with the master, for most of them were slaveholders. But a great principle had been proclaimed. A few years later, out of the French Revolution, came the Declaration of the Rights of Man, affirming that all men are free and equal in respect of their rights. It was a great step forward and shook the foundations of European civilization.

The Church has had its Reformation, setting up one of the greatest landmarks in history. Both Roman Catholicism and Protestantism have been benefited thereby. But, with all the upheavals of the Reformation, equality was an untouched principle. The Declaration of Independence had not come. The Declaration of the Rights of Man had not passed the National Assembly of France. Men were thinking in the terms of freedom rather than equality; consequently Christian denominations built up their distinctive peculiarities as nations were building up their nationalism, which always differentiated, and sometimes isolated, them from others.

In this new day, with its new vocabulary, new idealism, and new hope, there must come a Christian revolution—not violent, like the American or French Revolutions, which had to do with politics; but as gently as flowing tides and blooming flowers. It must come with such force that the present inequalities of Christendom shall be wiped out. Let the episcopal bodies hold to the episcopacy, for it is an ancient and useful form of church government. Let those bodies that hold to baptism by immersion still practice what they believe, for there is a beautiful

idealism in the symbol. Let those creedal bodies hold to their creeds, if they want to, for they are the expression of an ancient faith. But let them abandon sectarianizing any one of these things for which they stand. They sectarianize when they make that practice exclusively their own and forbid others into their fellowship who do not accept it as they do. Let them no longer say, "Unless you accept this, we cannot accept you, hence we close to you our membership privilege, our Lord's Supper privilege, our pulpit privilege."

We must face the unchristian attitude of all these inequalities. We must not be afraid to think our way through these networks of prejudices. Few men could be found who would affirm that man's relation with God is dependent upon a certain form of the episcopacy, or a certain form of baptism, or a certain creed. Christianity deals not so much in what as in whom. The Living Christ in the living soul is the ideal for which we all strive. The evidence that both of two men have the Living Christ is in their brotherly attitudes toward each other. Only this can conquer the world.

Loyalty to Jesus is not in forms, but in experience. To break away from Christian formalism, which takes us to the rocks of inequality, we must find in our hearts the declaration of the equality of all Christians before God, if we are to promote interdenominational understanding and harmony. The Christian revolution of the equality of all Christians before God means the releasing of our new powers in the souls of the disciples of Jesus that shall hasten the coming of the Kingdom of God.

[From Peter Ainslie in *The Christian Work*, New York.]

The Human Mind's Limitation

THE profession of a creed is a poor substitute for the living faith of the New Testament; and a baptismal certificate to start with and priestly absolution on your death-bed are anything but a clear title to the fruition of eternal life as there understood. Yet, I ask, are there not thousands of professing Christians who are content with this? Can we then say that religiously we have emerged from the Dark Ages? In fact, though we have had one religious reformation, many earnest men of our time have felt or are feeling that there is a crying need of another and one more thorough. I can now refer only to very few. Even John Morley discussing religious conformity spoke of "some prophet to come who should unite sublime depth

of feeling and lofty purity of life with strong intellectual grasp"; but whose gospel, he thought, could "hardly be other than an expansion, a development, a re-adaptation of all the moral and spiritual truth that lay hidden under the worn-out forms." Again, F. H. Bradley, acclaimed, till his lamented death a few weeks ago, as the *doyen* of British philosophy, has said: "There is a need, and there is even a certain demand, for a new religion. We want a creed to recognize and justify in due proportion all human interests, and at the same time to supply the intellect with what it can hold with confidence. Whether we shall get this new religion, and if so, how, whether by modification of what exists or in some other way, I am unable," he says, "to surmise." And a brave thinker still among us [Dean Inge] has said: "The future will show whether civilization, as we know it, can be mended or must be ended. The times seem ripe for a new birth of religion and spiritual life, which may remould society as no less potent force would have the strength to do." But what is wanted, I think, is not a new religion. "Let the human mind expand as much as it will," Goethe has somewhere said, "beyond the grandeur and moral elevation of Christianity, as it sparkles and shines in the Gospels, beyond that, the human mind will not advance." I would say, need not advance; agreeing here with Martineau, "that Christianity, understood as the personal religion of Jesus Christ, stands clear of all perishable elements, and realizing the true relation between man and God." But, speaking as one who may be regarded as an outsider, I am amazed at the growing disparity between that Christianity and the Christendom of to-day. This seems to me, I confess, too much like salt that has lost its savour, or leaven that has no longer the power to raise. I can see no hope of amendment without more earnest courage and more intellectual honesty than the leaders of religious thought in our day far too often display. "The Christian religion," as Harnack has truly said, "is a sublime and simple thing; it means one thing and one thing only: eternal life in the midst of time, by the strength and under the eyes of God." But nowadays it appears bedecked "with gold, silver, and costly stones," the venal offerings of the worldly wise, or fenced in by "wood, hay, and stubble," the erections of centuries of misguided dogmatism and superstition. By such various accretions its own inherent simplicity, sublimity, and power are eclipsed till now large numbers, instead of being attracted to it, are either indifferent or perplexed; and some are even re-

pelled. Yet never, I believe, has a Christlike life failed to attract the unsophisticated and open-minded. This is the light the world still wants; and there is no substitute for it, be it dogma or hierarchy or state patronage. More than twenty years ago I ventured to say in a society consisting of bishops and statesmen, philosophers and men of science: "In so far as he lets his light shine and men see his good works, the religious man affords practical evidence of the worth of his faith. With enough of such light the survival of faith would be sure." And before writing this paper I came across a letter in the *Times* of 13th September, 1924, from which I cannot forbear to quote. "We cannot too often remind ourselves," the writer says, "that the force by which Christianity is most surely propagated is an individual life. When we have seen with our own eyes the loveliness of but one life guided by Christian values, we know what is meant by 'the beauty and winsomeness of Christ.'" This is the practical outcome of all I have now been trying to say.

[From Prof. James Ward in *The Hibbert Journal*, London.]

The Spiritual Value of Co-operation

IN order to base what I have to say on the eternal truth of God, let me begin by quoting what St. John says in his first epistle. First of all, we have the message: "God is light and in Him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with Him and walk in darkness, we lie and do not tell the truth."

What it is to walk in darkness is told us in another place in the same epistle: "He that saith he is in the light and hateth his brother, is in the darkness even until now . . . and walketh in darkness and knoweth not whither he goeth."

But, "if we walk in the light as He is in the light," two things follow.

1. The first is, we have fellowship one with another.

There can be no such thing as full and genuine fellowship with God if we have not fellowship one with another. And "hereby know we that we have passed from death unto life because we love one another." That is only a partial and impure loyalty to any cause which does not involve and spontaneously long for fellowship and co-operation with other devotees of the same cause. Self-love has somewhere taken the place of love of the cause; be it art or love of country or of the Kingdom of God.

Or else, the cause is too narrowly interpreted, as it is when one's ideal is individual salvation instead of the Kingdom and righteousness of God or the promotion of one's own denomination.

And it is just when we try to live as we pray—for the coming of the Kingdom of God—that the real practical meaning of fellowship comes to light. I raise no controversial question concerning matters purely ecclesiastical when I say that the Church of Christ should strive; or, if you like, the disciples of Christ together should strive for the doing of the will of the Father on earth as it is in heaven.

“If we walk in the light as He is in the light we have fellowship one with another.” That is the first consequence.

2. But there is another consequence: “the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin.”

Again, I have no desire to tread on anybody's theological or religious toes. Nor do I raise any question concerning the salvation of those individuals who assure us that the blood of Jesus Christ has already cleansed them personally from all sin. I only desire to point out that our Lord, in the night in which He was betrayed, took a cup of wine and, giving it to his disciples to drink, spoke of it as the blood of the covenant, the blood which was shed for the remission of sins. You may put any interpretation you think true on one aspect of these much controverted words. There is another aspect of them which, it seems to me, does not admit of controversy; and that is that somehow or other the remission of sins is more than a purely individual matter; that there is some connection between forgiveness and fellowship; fellowship with one another in Christ.

And this idea receives corroboration from the words of the beloved disciple, who was there and closest to the heart of the Master and has preserved for us some spiritual lessons connected with that awful and blessed night, not given by the synoptics.

One is: “That ye should love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also should love one another.” And the other is that, “If we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another,” and (then) “the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.”

Mayhap the isolated individual believer cannot be cleansed from all sin so long as he keeps to himself. And did not the Master say also: “Where two or three are gathered together in my name (two being the smallest number of persons that can gather), there am I in the midst of them”?

Man is not only an individual; he is also a social being. Even on the natural plane, a man cannot be himself by himself; and a good man who is not a good citizen is a contradiction in terms.

A child who lives to himself finds certain adjustment necessary when he goes out to play with other children. There are certain faults of egotism and narrowness that cannot be cured, and there are certain virtues, such as team play and regard for the rights and feelings of others that cannot be acquired, except in fellowship and playing the game together.

The man who lives to himself and thinks by himself becomes peculiar; not quite normal; what we call a "crank."

And does not all this hold true in spiritual matters? Can a man be a full-orbed Christian in isolation? My own observation is that many Christians become worse than they were before conversion, in some respects; more difficult to get along with; more certain of their own infallibility. It is a relief to get away from their presence and associate for a while with just an ordinary, good-natured sinner—if you know what I mean.

Now apply this to the Church as a whole. The development of normal, well-rounded, full-orbed Christians requires their association together, not merely to pray and sing hymns together on Sundays, but to go out and work together the rest of the week for the Kingdom of God in the world, for getting "righteousness, peace and joy in the Spirit" into all human relationships.

It is the realization of that which created and sustains this organization of the Federal Council of the Churches.

If any one denomination, Methodist or Episcopalian, thinks itself capable of bringing in the Kingdom all by itself, all it has to do is to try it, to learn its mistake.

Of course, no denomination thinks itself big enough for that task. The trouble lies elsewhere; in a false or inadequate conception and vision of what the Church is in the world for.

If the Church is here only to provide safe transit for certain individuals from this world to another—to be what someone has called "a post-mortem emigration society"—that is one thing. There is then no basic reason why Christians should form themselves into groups unless they want to. The Church has nothing to do with their salvation. But the moment we realize that the Church of the living God is in the world to put over the Kingdom of God, the absurdity of sheer individualism or of isolated and independent denominationalism, each sufficient to itself, becomes apparent.

I am not discussing the question whether there ought to be any denominations. I am only saying that no denomination is or can be in a healthy and wholesome condition that does not work for the Kingdom outside in the world; bringing not merely individuals to God in Christ, but society itself to the standards of Christ.

In the present divided state of Christendom, two things seem possible and necessary: one is the work of this or some similar association; the other is that in every community Christians should get together to apply the principles of Christ to the secular as well as religious life of the community and of the world.

The specific spiritual benefits that come to the workers from such association may be briefly summed up in some way as this: Gain in breadth of sympathy and a broader grasp of truth from many angles; learning how, first, to put up with one another, then to understand and appreciate one another, and finally to love one another. In a word, such co-laborers with God come gradually and more and more into a realization of what fellowship in the Kingdom means; not fellowship in one denomination; not even fellowship in the Church of God itself; but fellowship and co-operation in the Kingdom of God, in the *Basileia*, which is greater than the Church, the *Ecclesia*, and for which the Church exists.

[From Dr. C. B. Wilmer, University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., in an address before the Quadrennial Meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, Atlanta, Ga., 1924.]

The Scandal of Being Separated at Prayers

It is plain that we do not all agree as to the way in which Sacramental doctrine should be presented by an Evangelical and Catholic teacher; but we are agreed, I think, as to the value of Sacraments in the Christian life. Edward Irving once said that men are generally right in what they affirm about religion, and wrong in what they deny. That is very true in relation to the Sacraments. A sincere man speaks out of a real personal experience when he says that the Sacraments have refreshed his soul; and all genuine experience is worth weighing. If one says—and it may be said wistfully and reverently—that the Sacraments have not, so far, helped him, he does not thereby deny that they may have helped others. No—we are

right in what we affirm, from our own experience, about the grace of God; but we are wrong if we deny the validity of another's experience, superstitious and irrational as we may deem it to be.

Closely connected with doctrinal differences as to the *rationale* of the Sacraments are the differences of belief which exist among us as to the significance and importance of an ordained ministry. But they are, of course, vitally important in the consideration of the larger problem of reunion. None of us, I am sure, thinks that even if we could achieve a federation of all Protestant churches, we should have reached the reunion of Christendom; for the Roman Church and the Eastern Churches minister the Gospel to many millions of our fellow Christians in the Name of our common Lord. In our ideal of the reunion of Christendom these great churches are embraced, and the question of Holy Orders is fundamental in our dealings with them. That question cannot be ignored, and some distance has been traveled in the attempt to get agreement about it by the Appeal of the Lambeth Conference of 1922 and the Reply of the Free Churches. We must be patient, and we shall the better restrain our natural impatience, if we bear in mind the magnitude of the enterprise upon which we are engaged. The reunion of Christendom is little likely to be accomplished, in its larger sense, for centuries; but we must move toward it, wherever and however we can.

If we are to move in the right direction, we must sometimes pause and look back. St. Paul thought of Christians as One Body, organized in God's fashion so that each member had his appropriate function. There were divisions in the Body even in his time, but he always conceived of its unity as a unity of organization. Perhaps that is the ultimate purpose of God for the Church—that it should be One, not only in discipleship, in fellowship, in faith, but One in the complex organization of its service for the world. But we must not forget the Johannine ideal of unity, which the Fourth Gospel ascribes in sacred words to our Lord Himself. It is not inconsistent with the Pauline ideal, but it is quite different. "I pray . . . that they all may be One, as Thou Father art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be One in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me" (John 17:21). The unity is to be visible, for the world is to recognize it, and recognizing it is to be drawn to discipleship. But there is nothing said about an organic unity, such as that which St. Paul has in his mind. The

unity is in the region of spirit, "as Thou art in Me and I in Thee," where biological analogies will not serve. And yet it is a visible unity; wherein does the unity appear? St. John leaves us in no doubt: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, so do ye also love one another (that is, with a love that will pour itself out in sacrifice). In this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, that ye love one another" (John 13:34, 35). The proof to the world of the common discipleship of Christians, to be convincing, must be something at once deeper and more obvious than unity of organization; it is the *κοινωνία* of the Christian society, inspired by love. The Lambeth Appeal defines the Catholic Church thus: "We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward visible and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognized officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world wide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church."

I daresay—indeed, I think—we could all say that. But this ideal cannot be realized all at once, and it is well to begin in our endeavour to realize it by that which is most practicable and likely to be effective in our own generation. Unity of discipleship—thank God—we have, whether we confess it publicly or no. Unity of service: that we can have at once in larger measure than in the past. Unity of worship: perhaps we ought to think more about this. For the real scandal of Christendom is that we are separated at our prayers in the highest act of worship. The Sacrament of unity is dividing us. I know that ecclesiastical tradition, on the one hand and the other, suggests that unity of faith must precede unity of worship. I cannot communicate at a Roman altar, even though there be no other altar within 50 miles, because I cannot accept the Creed of Pope Pius IV. And there has been such a thing, I believe, in other quarters, as fencing the tables, so as to exclude heretics as well as evil livers. That has been the assumption, in the history of the Church. "You must believe all that I believe, if you are to come to the Lord's Table with me." And yet, I find when I go to Holy Communion that the only public confession of faith I have to make is the Nicene Creed, which is common to Roman, Anglican, and Free Churchman. I think we shall have to consider this matter very gravely, if we are to get on with a reuniting of Christendom by beginning among ourselves; but I know how great the hazards

are. Perhaps we must pray about it more in our several churches, before we are permitted to pray together at his altars for the healing of Christ. But when unity of worship and unity of faith have come to us, we shall not, perhaps, have so great difficulty in reaching toward a unity of organization.

[From the Most Rev. the Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, in *The Review of the Churches*, London.]

Similarity of Hindus and Christians

“SAVE the Hindue religion : Down with Mr. Gandhi and his anti-untouchability campaign” was in effect the cry raised at a meeting of orthodox Hindus, held on Sunday afternoon in the rooms of the Native Piece-goods Merchants’ Association, Mulji Jetha Market, Bombay. The meeting was convened by about 75 signatories headed by Mr. Manmohandas Ramji, a prominent millowner, and Messrs. Devidas Madhavji Thackersey, Sunderdas Narayandas, Dayalji Moolji, Kanji Khatao, Moolji Haridas, Lalji Naranji, Chaturbhuj Devkaran, Cooverji Pitamber, Dr. Popat Prabhuram and Yeshwant Vishnu Nene. Admission to the meeting was restricted to those who carried a so-called invitation, that is a printed handbill convening the meeting. Gandhi caps were scrupulously kept out. Orthodox Hindus with a large element of Shastris, Pandits and religious preachers predominated in the meeting, but a small number of disguised Gandhi-ites contrived to get in.

Mr. Manmohandas Ramji occupied the chair. Beginning with the chairman’s opening speech, Mr. Gandhi came in for very hard knocks at the hands of every speaker with reference to his (Mr. Gandhi’s) “heresies” about the removal of untouchability, and it was vehemently declared that the Hindu religion was in danger of extinction at the hands of Mr. Gandhi. Up-roarious scenes took place whenever a follower of Mr. Gandhi tried to raise his voice of dissent against such views, and the dissenters were silenced because the dominant party in the meeting threatened to forcibly eject such dissenters.

Before the chairman opened the proceedings, a message of sympathy was read from the Shankaracharya of Sharada Pith. Mr. Manmohandas Ramji, the chairman, first explained that it was a preliminary meeting convened for the purpose of ascertaining the truth about the aspersions alleged to have been made by Mr. Gandhi against the Hindu religion and priesthood at the Belgaum Congress whilst speaking on untouchability and to

consider what steps should be taken to check the evil effects of such aspersions. Proceeding Mr. Ramji, in the course of a long speech in Gujarati, said every one was entitled to his opinions, whether in social, religious or political matters, but he had no right to foist his opinion on ignorant and credulous people and to mislead them by saying that swaraj was impossible without the removal of untouchability. It was their business to see that the ignorant people were not deceived by such heretic utterances like those of Mr. Gandhi. For his own part, said the speaker, he would rather lay down his life to defend his religion than have swaraj. Mr. Gandhi's logic about removal of untouchability was fallacious. There was no such thing as real equality on the face of the earth. Even in England a rigid caste system prevailed and the higher castes did not mix with the lower castes. The Hindu law givers had created the caste system on the same principle on which the modern medical men advised the segregation of persons suffering from infectious diseases. The untouchables were segregated because of their filthy habits and customs. How many of those who preached the removal of untouchability on the platform invite scavengers and sweepers to dinner in their homes?

The next speaker was Mr. Naranji Purshottam Sanghavi. In solemn tones and apparent grief he quoted passages from Mr. Gandhi's "Nava Jivan," wherein he had said not only was untouchability satanic, but he went to the length of saying that if Hindu scriptures were found to support untouchability, he (Mr. Gandhi) would be ashamed to call himself a Hindu. The speaker held up these quotations from Mr. Gandhi to ridicule, and a large part of the audience seemed so much scandalized that it shouted its strong disapproval of Mr. Gandhi's "heresies."

Continuing, the speaker said if Mr. Gandhi had made such scandalous declarations publicly in any other country he would be torn to pieces by the mob. His declarations were meekly tolerated in India because the Hindus had become cowards and did nothing to defend their religion. Now the time had come when they should give up their cowardice and lynch Mr. Gandhi when he made such statements publicly.

At the last statement of the speaker, there was an uproar from both his supporters and opponents. The chairman could not restore order for some time. Then turning to the speaker, he said: "You have evidently, in the heat of the moment, said something which you did not mean? What you meant to say

was that you were willing to lay down your life for your religion and not that Mr. Gandhi should be lynched?"

The speaker agreed that that was the correct interpretation of what he said. He was then allowed to conclude his speech.

Several other speakers addressed the meeting in the same strain as the two foregoing, and occasionally there was an uproar. Finally, a resolution was passed appointing a committee to investigate the alleged aspersions of Mr. Gandhi against the Hindu religion and to recommend what steps should be taken to counteract those aspersions.

[From *The Times of India* in *The Indian Social Reformer*, Bombay, India.]

Teapot Tempest in Southern Methodism on Unity

OPPOSITION to the unification of the Northern and Southern Methodist Churches was held to be considerably strengthened among the Methodists of the North Alabama Conference recently, after a resolution pledging co-operation and support to the organization of the forces throughout our church, with Bishop Warren A. Candler, as chairman, under the name, "An Association to Preserve the Methodist Episcopal Church, South," by defeating the pending plan of unification, was adopted at a mass meeting of several hundred members at the Tutwiler Hotel, Birmingham.

More than a dozen leaders of the North Alabama Conference voiced their objections to unification and were heartily applauded when they declared that the measure "was already defeated" so far as the North Alabama Conference is concerned. Every available seat was taken in the assembly and many stood throughout the meeting, which was presided over by Dr. W. E. Morris. Dr. Ira Hawkins, presiding elder of the Huntsville district, led the assembly in prayer.

After listening to prominent speakers for two hours, the assembly adopted resolutions pledging full co-operation with and support to Rev. M. E. Lazenby, editor of *The Alabama Christian Advocate*, and a resolution by which the body made permanent or confirmed its temporary officers.

The meeting was called by more than 1,200 ministers and laymen of the Southern Methodist Church in the bounds of the North Alabama Conference. The "organization to preserve the M. E. Church, South, as a definite religious denomination, as a working force in God's Kingdom," sponsored the meeting. Speakers of the evening were presiding elders, pastors, church

officials, educators, judges, lawyers, business men and bankers.

The plan of unification now confronting Northern and Southern Methodism was taken up in detail.

The "nameless" church provided for in the plan was discussed. Rev. H. M. Stevenson, in discussing this part of the plan, said:

"Even the friends of unification speak of the plan as a federation, co-operation, but name this child! They don't know its name! They don't know what its name will be! Neither do we! But there is one thing that they know, and that we all know—that is that the name of the united church will certainly not be the Methodist Episcopal Church, South."

Mr. Miller declared that the plan is unbusinesslike and stated that, since all the valuable property of the M. E. Church, South, is vested in boards of trustees of the church, it would be foolish to think of a non-existing thing holding titles to property. He said that the danger of the plan lay in its many uncertainties.

The question of "overlapping territory" was discussed by several speakers.

Mr. Comer said that, if the Northern church desired a real unity that would prevent overlapping, that church should practice that doctrine by having all their congregations in the South join the M. E. Church, South.

Mr. Miller had also said that nothing in the plan would guarantee the Northern Methodist congregations of Birmingham or of the South to join the M. E. Church, South.

Special notice was given to the consideration of the Negro question.

Dr. Henry, who is a graduate of two or more Northern universities, stated that the Northern church, like the Northern people, had gone farther with their factional bitterness than has the South.

He stated that it was not a matter of prejudice, but a matter of history that the Northern people refused to recognize the ability of the schools of the South, the educators of the South, or the ability of Southern people. He expressed the sentiment of the North as recognizing "all virtue to be north of the Ohio river." He said: "Now since we are nothing, let's rise up and show them that they don't need us."

The speaker also quoted Booker T. Washington and other Negro leaders as authority for the argument that the Negroes chose to be in one church and have the white people stay in

another church. Dr. Henry then said: "Now if the Negro doesn't want to go to church with me, I am sure I don't want to go to church with him."

Dr. Scott said: "They say we are prejudiced when we mention the Negro question. They have pitched this tune. They have taken into the back alley 364,000 Southern Negroes."

He then mentioned two regular Negro bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church (North), and read from the proposed "plan" where it provides that all bishops of the two churches shall, on adoption of the plan, be bishops of the whole church without further action.

"If you can vote for the plan now pending without voting for two Negroes to be bishops with full legal power in your church, then I am a hobgoblin," Dr. Scott said.

He also showed that the plan from the beginning has never been unanimously satisfactory, even from the commission which adopted it at the beginning.

Dr. Scott denied the legality of the called session of the general conference which met at Chattanooga last year, and said: "If the Southern Methodists had been selecting their delegates to decide this question, the personnel of that general conference would have been different."

Dr. Scott was loudly applauded.

Dr. Henry said that the Roman Catholic Church is a final argument in unification. He also used the Unitarian Church as an example. He said that, since the days of John the Baptist, the advance of Kingdom work has not been based on "unification" of denominations, but upon "multiplication" of denominations. He mentioned the three leading Protestant churches, showing that they are denominations with several branches or divisions.

Prominent officials from almost every district of the North Alabama Conference expressed the belief that each district would send lay delegates to the annual conference who are opposed to unification. They believe the plan is sure to be defeated. Several leading churches of the Birmingham and Bessemer districts have elected delegates to coming district conferences who are opposed to the plan.

Letters and telegrams were read from leading churchmen from over the connection stating that the sentiment against unification is strong generally.

C. H. Ohme, conference lay leader, said that, from present conservative estimation, at least 90 per cent. of the laity of the North Alabama Conference opposes the plan.

Judge R. L. Blanton, of Jasper, Judge Hammett, of Talladega, and several prominent laymen from nearly every town and city of north Alabama stated that they opposed the plan and that their respective congregations were, in most cases, almost or totally unanimous against the plan.

There are approximately 7,500 clerical delegates and 2,500 lay delegates in the various annual conferences of Southern Methodism. If the plan pending is adopted, it will require 7,500 of those possible 10,000 votes, or three-fourths of all the members of the several annual conferences.

The annual conferences of Southern Methodism will vote upon the plan during 1925.

[From Rev. J. A. Gann, Pastor Methodist Church, Millpot, Ala., in the *Birmingham News*.]

We are told that Judge John S. Candler, in commenting on Bishop Candler's declaration that the plan of unification is already defeated, said it was quite remarkable that men would come such a long distance and at such expense to sit up with a corpse.—*Editor*.

The Christian Way Toward Unity

THE search for peace is as old as the human heart and as wide as the human race. It is to be had, both Godward and manward, only through the agency of the whole Christian Church. No one doubts that if we are to have peace in the world of practical politics it must come through good-will and understanding between nations, bred by conference and stabilized by co-operative action. The same holds good in the realm of religion. The group formations into which the Christian world is broken must reach after mutual understanding and that unity which will eventually declare itself in the process of sympathetic fellowship. Bold and patient—above all, patient—experiment is necessary if we are going to get anywhere in this matter. It is the day of sowing, not of reaping, so that we have no business to be discouraged when a golden harvest fails to appear in the springtime of endeavour.

Is it not so that there are entirely too many receipts for unity and too few concerted inquiries as to the Christian way toward unity? Experience has clearly demonstrated that unity cannot be reached by way of controversy, and therefore the World Conference on Faith and Order, as its name implies, has consistently stood for the way of conference as the Christian way.

This fact forestalls all possibility of postulating fixed conclusions. This is the very kernel of the World Conference—both its real strength and its apparent weakness. We are deliberately adopting the method of research. Religion quite as much as science depends upon research for its very life. What is seemingly abstruse and detached is often the precursor of a revolution in practical affairs. There is no connection at first sight between Franklin's kite and a modern trolley. Similarly a superficial view of the World Conference on Faith and Order cannot find any relationship between colloquies on belief and organization and the Church unified and inspired to deal effectively with the problems of human society. The connection is equally real in both.

This is the background of the story of the World Conference on Faith and Order. It was not a detached movement but it lighted its torch at the brilliant flame of the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910. From the very first it was a co-operative project. Simultaneously three communions conceived it—Congregationalists, Disciples of Christ, and Episcopalians.

The ten years following were taken up with securing the attention of Christendom and enlisting active support. Commissions were appointed, conferences held, and European countries visited. As soon after the close of the War as possible a Preliminary Conference was held in Geneva attended by representatives of seventy autonomous churches from forty nations. This gathering marked the beginning of a new stage in our progress. The true meaning and value of conference began to dawn on the minds of men. Conference gradually revealed itself to be not a meeting for controversy where each person endeavours to establish his own position, but an opportunity for eliciting from others the convictions which hold them, in order to establish sympathetic understanding among people of different minds. The value of the World Conference, when it eventually meets, will depend upon loyalty to this conception of conference and its widespread employment among Christians of different communions in the interim. Let it be noted that in this mode of approach we are but using the same method now extensively employed in every department of life where earnest men are seeking to solve the industrial, social, and racial problems of their day.

Every communion has what is distinctive in belief and organization. Its special problems are different in character or emphasis from its neighbour's problems. It is quite clear that if a World Conference is to be successful it must be based on a

survey of the entire field. Churches which have creeds and those which have not, Churches which have long-established order and those which have not, occupy precisely the same plane in conference and merit the same respect and consideration. Mutual understanding—and it is a far cry to any such goal—is the next step toward unity. We must gird ourselves promptly to this end, for the date of the World Conference is set for two years hence (1927), subject only to the confirmation of the Continuation Committee.

The preparation for the World Conference on Faith and Order is conference and conference and conference—local conference, regional conference, every kind of conference which will help Christians of different communions to understand one another. This is no call for new organization but for the use of the organization we already have. It does call, however, for the use of intelligence, considerateness, and perseverance. The problem before us is—What are the things which divide us? What are the things that unite? We must reach a point where in common we can formulate the answer to the satisfaction of all.

Side by side with this study there must continue that co-operation in practical affairs which in itself is a unifying activity. The one is a unity of head and heart, the other of the hand.

There is a goal so bathed in light as to be obscured by the blaze of glory which reveals it. Is not the unity of the Christian Church a goal of this sort? My whole conception of ideals was coloured for life when I was a small boy, by an engraving of Turner's *Celestial City* which formed the frontispiece of *Pilgrim's Progress*, and which still awakens mystic longings when I turn to it. It suggests more power and peace and beauty than it actually conveys. When I think of the Babel which the Christian Church has become, I would falter were it not that I see, beyond and above it, the Heavenly Jerusalem coming down from God, clothed in that dazzling glory which, however much it baffles, allures and comforts and inspires.

[From Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent, D. D., Buffalo, N. Y.]

Canadian Union as Seen by Presbyterians

OF the 1,630 ministers in the Canadian Presbyterian Church, 1,307 will enter the United Church of Canada, the union of the dominion's Presbyterian, Congregational, and

Methodist denominations. This number represents 80.1 per cent of the church ministry. Ministers who have decided definitely not to enter the union number 197, or 12 per cent. The remaining 126 ministers have reported themselves undecided. These figures represent the result of a questionnaire circulated in each of the seventy-seven presbyteries and are announced by Presbyterian Church headquarters. It is understood that many of the 126 are in favour of the union but availed themselves of the voluntary nature of the questionnaire and withheld a definite statement for the time being. Ministers have no voice in the voting of congregations, which began December 22 and continued into January.

Three days before the congregational voting began advocates of the union held a stirring meeting in Metropolitan church, Toronto, and similar gatherings were held in twelve local Presbyterian churches, with a uniform order of service, in order to rally opponents of the union. At each "dissenting" meeting it was stated that arrangements are being completed for the early functioning of opponents of the union under the present name of the Continuing Presbyterian Church. For missionary and extension needs, it was reported, many large subscriptions have been received. One of these totals \$25,000, according to the report, and there are two of \$10,000 each.

Each gathering also heard a statement from "the Women's Missionary Society of the Continuing Presbyterian Church," promising that the society will carry on work after the union. The society's statement contains this paragraph: "While in all government—provincial and dominion—women are expressing their opinions by their vote on all public questions, it has remained for the Presbyterian Church, through its union committee, to ignore the women of our church, giving to a work which vitally concerns them the scant attention of one short paragraph." Attention is drawn to the fact that the church courts which decided on the union have no women in their membership.

Two meetings typical of discussions being carried on in Canada were two simultaneous but independent gatherings recently held at Toronto. In Century Baptist church members of King Road Presbyterian church opposed to entering the union were addressed by Dr. N. H. McGillivray of Orillia, who asked: "If Presbyterianism as a system of worship ever was right, isn't it right still? And if it is right still, why should we desire to change?" In St. John's church Dr. J. H. Sedgewick

of Hamilton stated that Presbyterianism is a system of polity and government by presbyteries, a system which, by terms of the union, will not be changed. Voting non-concurrence in the union, according to Dr. Sedgewick, is striking at the heart of the Presbyterian system. Announced secessionists, in his opinion, have no great principle on which to base their breaking away from the church of their fathers—now going into the United Church; yet all past secessions from the Presbyterian Church have been glorified by some great principle.

[From *The Continent*, New York.]

Canadian Union as Seen by A Congregationalist

CHURCH union continues to lumber along its way to its goal on June 10, 1925. Interest in it in Canada has no doubt been deadened by the deplorable squabble in Presbyterianism. It has got down to a squabble, hot, bitter, and, in some things, unscrupulous. The ecclesiastical spirit is certainly not commending itself to the country, and organized religion is suffering grievous harm from the distressing controversy. With all good will to find it, it is difficult to see what common principle, except a dislike, holds the anti-unionists together. The "Wee Frees" in Scotland stood firmly together on obscurantism. The "rebel synods" of Canada contain theologically-obscurantists and progressives, ecclesiastically-reactionaries and liberals, socially-well-to-do and poor, although in some districts chiefly the well-to-do. There is not a little drum-beating over the Westminster Confession, although, how some of the anti-leaders with their history of teaching behind them, can do it, puzzles many. It is certainly a newly-found zeal. Presbyterianism is the plea of others, although the chief complaint has been that, in seeking union, the Assembly did not practice Congregationalism.

The present position is: three historic churches have voted for union, the Federal Act is passed, five Provincial Acts have also been passed; British Columbia, Ontario, Quebec, and Prince Edward Island Legislatures will be asked to pass similar Acts this session. The four Western Provinces are for union. In the Maritime Provinces, there is a greater division of opinion, but they, too, are strongly for union. The battle rages in Ontario and Quebec, chiefly in the Presbyteries of Toronto, Hamilton, and Montreal. Montreal is the high seat of opposition. The latest returns show that in the ministry there

is a great swing towards the United Church. During the next four weeks Presbyterian churches in great numbers will be voting concurrence or non-concurrence. Estimates indicate that if the anti-unionists reach 250 ministers and part congregations—a small section of a great church—they will have rallied well. Meanwhile, preparations are being pushed on for a great national event in Toronto on June 10 this year, when the three churches will begin their united life in one great, far-distributed stream—dominion and world-wide—of service and blessing in the name of Christ. May it yet be that in spite of controversy unnecessarily bitter and of a cleavage hard on any Christian ground to understand, a new day will dawn for the church in Canada—the herald of church unions in other lands, so that Christ's Church may be more equal to her great task of saving the world.

[From Principal D. L. Ritchie in *The Congregationalist*, Boston.]

The Sixth Annual Ohio Protestant Pastors' Convention

EIGHT hundred and thirty-nine ministers from all sections of Ohio, representing practically every Protestant denomination in the state, assembled at the sixth annual Ohio Pastors' Convention in Columbus, for a three-day meeting recently. That means that one in every eight of the ministers of the state was on hand. The topics discussed ranged from the child labour amendment and international relations to evangelism through co-operative visiting and week-day religious instruction. The convention adopted a resolution urging the United States to adhere to the World Court, to submit justiciable disputes to an international tribunal, to support the outlawry of war, participate in a conference on the reduction of armaments, and sweeten relations with Japan. The conference learned that in forty-five cities and towns thirty thousand Ohio children now receive week-day religious instruction. It approved a plan for all the churches to unite in a visitation of all the homes in the state, to bring the message of the Church to every household. But nothing that it did may prove more significant than its adoption of a code of ethics covering the relations between different congregations in the same community. The code condemns any attempt on the part of one church to win members from another, either through individual efforts or by undue emphasis on large Sunday evening services. It urges the churches to do things together and to hold union services frequently. These

Ohio pastors' conferences are getting the Protestant ministers of the state acquainted with each other. The people we know are the people we love. The other states should follow Ohio's example. *Verbum sap.*

[From *The Christian Work*, New York.]

The Quadrennial Meeting of the Federal Council in Atlanta

ONE hesitates to use superlatives, but undoubtedly the Atlanta meeting was the best in the history of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. One was bound to feel in Atlanta that at last the Council had found itself, that it stood upon solid ground, that the great experiment in Christian unity was no longer an experiment but a "going concern." The official reports of the Council's service during the last quadrennium were prefaced by this significant statement:

The Council owes its existence to the fact that there is already a genuine spiritual unity among the evangelical churches. The Council grows in strength just in proportion to the growth of the spirit of mutual understanding and the recognition of common tasks among the churches.

This leads to action.

And to act together effectively the churches must have some common agency . . . through which to manifest to the world this unity of spirit. It was the recognition of this truth that led twenty-eight denominations, sixteen years ago, to create the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, in order to manifest the essential oneness of the Christian churches of America in Jesus Christ as their Divine Lord and Saviour.

The report continues:

By joining hand with hand in common tasks we come to a larger mutual understanding and greater confidence in one another and are thereby prepared for the further programmes of co-operation that lie ahead.

The greatest significance of the Federal Council is in its spiritual vision and unity, its "diversity of gifts but one spirit," its exaltation of Christ; and from this spiritual dynamic come the practical results of co-operation in seeking to follow Christ to the end that all departments of life may be Christianized. However far in the future organic union may be for the great Protestant churches of America, unity of spirit and unity of action have come already through the Federal Council. At last united Protestantism has become articulate; it can point with

proper pride to a record of worthy achievement; it goes forward with a programme involving all the relationships of life.

As you have faith in your own church and its Divine Master, have faith in the brotherhood of churches as the greater Christian army, of which your church is a part, and over which the Lord of All is in command.

The Federal Council has found itself, not as another organization, but as the same old churches we have known, inspired by a new vision, sharing that vision, and co-operating in the tasks that challenge Christian conscience and Christian work.

The Federal Council is fortunate in its leaders. Statesmanship, spiritual power, social vision, wisdom, and tact are characteristic of them to a remarkable degree. Chief among outstanding Council personalities in Atlanta were Dr. Robert E. Speer, the retiring president, and Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, the new president. Dr. Speer was superb as a presiding officer at the opening sessions, and his straightforward attitude toward all issues, his brotherliness, and his spiritual earnestness gave inspiration and momentum to all that followed. And then came Dr. Cadman—dignified but not too formal, warm-hearted and witty, kind, tactful, but businesslike. The programme moved expeditiously under him, and every one and every cause was treated with sympathy, understanding, and consideration.

Other personalities who were prominent and noteworthy in the leadership of the Council were the efficient general secretaries, Drs. C. S. Macfarland and S. M. Cavert, and recording secretary, Rev. R. D. Lord.

The seven days' programme was filled with vital, constructive speeches and discussions. The general theme was, "The Church in the World," under which purpose and methods of Christianizing all relationships in life were presented. Special prominence was given to evangelism, local co-operation, race relations, international relations, and peace. The two greatest addresses were the Sunday afternoon Auditorium address by Dr. Speer on "Christ, the One Hope of the World," and the Council Sermon by Dr. Cadman on "The Light of the World."

High points in the Council included those made in the addresses of M. M. Davies, giving a Methodist layman's testimony of his awakening and life devotion to interdenominational leadership and service with the Atlanta Christian Council; a group of addresses on race relations by white and coloured speakers, including Dr. Alexander D. Haynes, Dr. Ashby Jones,

Bishop Clement, Dr. John Hope, and Bishop Reese; the evangelistic service of Bishop McDowell; the social service message of Bishop McConnell; the challenging appeal for the rural church by Rev. Warren H. Wilson, Presbyterian (North); the message to America of mingled appreciation and regret from Rev. K. Tsumashima of Japan; the friendly message from the German Federation of Evangelical Churches by Prof. Julius H. Richter of the University of Berlin; Sir Willoughby Dickinson's peace address, representing England; Prof. James T. Shotwell's address on outlawing war; William J. Bryan's eloquent peace address; the fine peace addresses by Governor William E. Sweet of Colorado and Judge Florence E. Allen of Ohio, and the presentation of the chaplaincy work by Chief Chaplains Axton and Scott. The reading of the letter to the Council from Cyrus E. Woods, former ambassador to Japan, strongly deploring the Japanese exclusion act as an "international disaster" to American diplomacy in the Far East, to American business, and to religion, produced a profound impression.

The Council adopted strong and constructive pronouncements and resolutions on vital issues. Hardly less important was the way in which the members treated each other, the spirit of Christian brotherhood which prevailed. One could not identify the members of the different denominations, so freely and happily did the members mingle socially and vote together. No colour line appeared in the Council. The coloured members were scattered through the assembly and suffered no embarrassment or discrimination. In the race relations discussions the Southern white speakers made as strong declarations for Christian brotherhood, justice, and opportunity as did the coloured speakers. The Japanese, the German, and Rabbi Isaac Markenson, who brought fraternal greetings from the Central Conference of Jewish Rabbis, were all received with Christian cordiality.

The Council handled some highly controversial subjects, but so wisely that strong, advanced action was taken without anything like a fight. The nearest approach to excitement was over the subjects of war and the chaplains. Dr. Morrison of *The Christian Century* introduced and prepared to push resolutions intended to disapprove the service of ministers as army chaplains. It appeared in the reports and statements made regarding the status and work of the chaplains, that a needed ministry of ever-increasing value is carried on by the chaplains, that their status is steadily being raised and that the govern-

ment regulations relieve the chaplains of duties formerly required of them so that they are free to devote their time entirely to pastoral ministry. The entire subject of military chaplaincies was referred to a special committee of twelve, to be appointed by the Administrative Committee of the Council and to report a year later.

On the subject of war the pronouncement adopted declared that the church should continue the crusade for a "warless world," for membership in the World Court by the United States, for co-operation by the United States in enacting international laws for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes, for the outlawing of war, for mutual disarmament, for "full, open, and friendly relations between the United States and the League of Nations without commitments which would involve us in the local politics of European or other nations."

It was recommended that the relations between Japan and the United States be studied, the action taken by Congress in excluding Japanese immigration was deplored, and it was declared, "Let American Christians urge such change in the law as will put Japan on the quota basis, which was recommended by Secretary Hughes last year and supported by Ambassador Woods in his letter to the Federal Council."

The international pronouncements were adopted with only one negative vote.

The finances of the Federal Council have been faithfully handled heretofore by Alfred R. Kimball as treasurer. He is now succeeded by Dr. Frank H. Mann, recently of the American Bible Society. The total budget of the Council has risen to about \$260,000 a year, and \$291,500 will be required in 1925. The money is well spent apparently and the Council needs and deserves the liberal support of all the churches to help carry on its big and varied programme of service.

The legal status of the Council has been strengthened and broadened by a special act of incorporation passed by the Legislature of New York. The necessary reorganization was accomplished under the competent leadership of Dr. Alfred W. Anthony.

The Council enrollment in Atlanta included a total of 380 members and officials and guests, 36 being Congregationalists. There were 189 voting members.

[From Rolfe Cobleigh in *The Congregationalist*, Boston.]

BOOK REVIEWS

DOCUMENTS ON CHRISTIAN UNITY 1920-4. Edited by G. K. A. Bell, Dean of Canterbury. New York and London: Oxford University Press.

The issuing of the Lambeth Appeal by the Anglican bishops in 1920 brought an awakening interest in Christian unity around the world and this volume is largely the collection of responses to that Appeal, with the addition of encyclical letters from Rome and Constantinople, the work of the World Conference on Faith and Order and other unity movements, apart from the results of the Appeal, that have taken place in various parts of the world. Actual schemes of union have gone forward in Canada, Scotland, Australia, India, United States, and elsewhere. The results of conferences and the various proposals for reunion are presented in the ninety documents, which are contained in the 382 pages of this valuable volume. In addition to documents on Christian unity, the appendix contains several important documents relative to social, international, and missionary purpose, such as the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches, the International Missionary Council, the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, and the Mürren Conference.

Beginning with the Lambeth Appeal, which was published in *The Christian Union Quarterly*, and interpreted in a most illuminating article at that time by the Rt. Rev. Ethelbert Talbot, presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, the document creating the World Conference on Faith and Order is published along with questions for preliminary discussion by local groups, with a list of the various churches co-operating in all parts of the world.

While the Pope did not formally reply to the Appeal (his secretary of state only acknowledging receipt), nevertheless, two years later in his encyclical letter, and in the year following, in his encyclical letter, he gives considerable space to reunion, especially emphasizing loyalty to the Roman Pontiff—"On him, as the successor of Peter, falls in perpetual succession that utterance of Christ—"On this rock will I build my Church"; and he, ever fulfilling that vicarious office, which was bestowed upon Peter, ceases not to stablish his brethren, when need arises, and to feed both the lambs and the sheep of the Lord's flock (*gregis*)."

The encyclical letter from the Patriarchate of Constantinople, "unto all the churches of Christ wheresoever they be," is based upon a quotation from the first epistle of Peter (1:22)—"See that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently." The Patriarch advocates closer intercourse with other churches and mutual understanding. He sees in the League of Nations, "which has now been effected with good omen," an example of unity among Christians as being both feasible and timely, beginning with the removal of distrust and friction between the various churches.

The concordat between Eastern Orthodox, Old Catholics, and Anglican Churches proposed a basis for future negotiations looking toward the restoration of corporate unity and intercommunion. It proposed the acceptance with common mind of the traditional and œcumenically received Faith, Ministry, and Sacramental Order of the historic Catholic Church and declared the acceptance of the sacramental acts of each other, and that they are true and valid, proposing that intercommunion is desirable and authorized. However, on proceeding into negotiations, it was discovered that the question of Baptism, Confirmation, and other questions would have to remain for a time still in the field of negotiations. A document presenting special terms of intercommunion suggested between the Church of England, including the churches in communion with her, and the Eastern Orthodox Church opens another angle of approach between these churches. This covers thirteen statements with an appendix and other documents bearing on it.

The entrance of the Protestant responses, like that of the others, shows where Protestantism stands and is no more discouraging than the Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, or Old Catholic positions. None of the great divisions is disposed to give up anything and, consequently, no one is in a position to give anything for the unity of Christendom. The outstanding contributions of these documents is that they are expressed in more polite and civil language than Christians were accustomed to use in reference to each other a hundred or four hundred or eight hundred years ago, and that of itself indicates progress.

The report from the Committee of the Free Churches of England, including Baptists, Congregationalists, Wesleyans, Methodists, Presbyterians, Primitive Methodists, United Methodists, and Moravians, was published in *The Christian Union Quarterly* at the time of its appearance. Its answer classifies itself under three heads: (1) The recognition of churches, that is to say, that the churches of Protestant communions are just as much churches of Christ as those with the episcopal form; (2) Episcopal ordination, to which the report pledged an open mind, at the same time asking that the signers of the report would not be expected to regard any one form of polity as the exclusive channel of grace; and (3) Spiritual freedom of the churches, which means that "the Church must be free in matters of religious faith and moral duty to learn of and to obey the Lord, who is still living and present in her midst." In addition to this report the Protestant communions of England took separate action, generally concurring in the report. The Society of Free Catholics, which includes Anglicans and Nonconformists, both in England and elsewhere, affirmed in their report the hope that the basis of the Lambeth Appeal would be accepted "as provisionally an adequate basis for discussion and negotiation."

The Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland started negotiations for unity among themselves as far back as 1908, and

there has been steady progress for the union of these two Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, expressed in very interesting documents. On the appearance of the Lambeth Appeal both churches responded sympathetically. The Church of Sweden received the Lambeth Appeal "with deep and sincere satisfaction." While the Church of England and the Church of Sweden have intercommunion privileges, the latter church does not attach "decisive weight either to the doctrine of the ministry in general or to what is usually called the apostolic succession of bishops and the questions thereby implied." Continuing, the report says: "No particular organization of the Church and of its ministry is instituted *iure divino*, not even the order and discipline and state of things recorded in the New Testament, because the Holy Scriptures, the *norma normans* of the faith of the Church, are no law, but vindicate for the New Covenant the great principle of Christian freedom, unweariedly asserted by St. Paul against every form of legal religion, and applied with fresh strength and clearness by Luther, but instituted by our Saviour Himself, as, for instance, when in taking farewell of his disciples, He did not regulate their future work by *a priori* rules and institutions, but directed them to the guidance of the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost."

While the formal answer to the Lambeth Appeal must, as far as the churches holding the Presbyterian system are concerned, rest with the supreme courts of those churches, nevertheless the General Council of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches throughout the World holding the Presbyterian System welcomed the earnestness of the purpose and "earnestly commended this whole matter to the interest and prayers of believing people." In the response made by the Alliance of Missionary Societies in Kenya Colony, East Africa, it urged that, in all future ordinations of African ministers, the various churches accepting the basis of the Alliance should be represented by those authorized to ordain in the various churches, so that all African ministers so ordained would be fully recognized as ministers in all the churches concerned; likewise a member of one branch of the Church should become a member of another branch "without a special religious ceremony being required."

The United States furnishes two interesting instances—the first being an agreement of the affiliation of the Hungarian Reformed Church with the Protestant Episcopal Church, which worked, and, second, the concordat between Protestant Episcopalians and Congregationalists, which did not work.

Australia furnished an instance of strong resolutions, adopted by the reunion conference between representatives of the Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches in Australia. This was followed by other conferences there. The United Church of Canada, composed of Presbyterians, Methodists, and Congregationalists, is presented at some

length. Its steps will serve not only as a guide to attaining the United Church of Canada but as a guide to Christians in other countries who are seeking the way of unity. The Lambeth Appeal received consideration in these conferences. From China and South India have come voices of commendation for the Lambeth Appeal.

While the Appeal may not have done all that its advocates expected of it, it has rendered great service in its world-wide message. It must not be overlooked that any appeal for Christian unity can make little progress in a world where all communions think they are absolutely right. The value of these documents is to reveal where the churches are in this day. So long as they all stay where they are there will never be unity. Some general changes must come and the churches must face the folly of their unbrotherly attitudes and cocksure interpretations.

If it be said that all these churches are carnal, no one of these communions would like it; but, as a matter of fact, that is the present condition of all the churches of Christendom. Paul said that when schism started; he would say it more vehemently now. Dean Bell may not follow us in our conclusions, but he would have added to the strength of his fine editorial work had he included one of Phillips Brooks' lectures on "Tolerance," or, to come in the period 1920-24, if not written by the Dean himself, some great appeal on the necessity of a spiritual Church, if there would be a united Church. All in all, it is a valuable book, apparently discouraging because of the unwillingness of the various churches to move from where they started, but it is a hopeful volume, indicating that there can be found Christians around the world who are seriously considering the necessity of a united Christendom. It may be said that, in most instances, the signers of these historic documents are beyond where the documents are. Disunity is abnormal, while unity is the normal condition of mankind. The documents of this book reveal such an interest in unity as the divided Church could never muster before. It is a great thing to be made aware of where we are. Facts like these challenge thought, purpose, and hope. Dean Bell has made a worth while contribution in collecting such valuable documents on Christian unity, and many will be helped thereby.

THE PATHS THAT LEAD TO GOD. A New Survey of the Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief. By Wilbur Fisk Tillett, Dean Emeritus of the Theological Faculty and Professor of Christian Doctrine in Vanderbilt University. New York: George H. Doran Company.

This is a commanding volume of 581 pages. Both the subject and the name of the author arrest attention. It is almost encyclopedic in its facts and wide range of thought as it presents the many paths that lead to God. Some of these are "Through Nature to God," "Through Science to God,"

"Through Man to God," "Through Philosophy to God," "Through Reason to God," "Through the Bible to God," "Through Christ to God," "Through the Church to God," "Through the Creeds to God," "Through Doubt to Faith," "Through Experience to God," and "Through Suffering and Death to God," besides other chapters discussing "Man's Search for God," "Religion and Religions as Related to God," "Evolution and God," "The Progressive Revelation of God in the Scriptures," and other chapters equally as important and interesting.

There is no one of these paths in which Dr. Tillett walks but that he carries with him a large following of thinkers, not only ministers and laymen, but especially young men and young women who love to study. It is in no sense a technical work, but the author's thoughts move with delightful grace in his interpretation of the modern man's outlook on the paths that lead to God. Dr. Tillett says that it is written not "for the learned, but for learners," nevertheless both the learned and the learners will read these pages with satisfaction and profit in their enrichment of the evidences of our common faith.

WHITHER BOUND IN MISSIONS. By Daniel Johnson Fleming, Ph. D. Published by the Council of Christian Associations, New York.

Dr. Fleming has given us a study of the missionary task in the light of the changing conditions of to-day which is of first rate importance. They are conditions which call for earnest thought and courageous action, and Dr. Fleming has dealt with them in a constructive and illuminating fashion. Very naturally the rising tide of democracy and the awakening of nationalism throughout the "missionary world" is having its effect on the problem of missions, with the result that the center of gravity is changing from the temporary "foreign missions" to the permanent indigenous Church. Also humanity is being reunified and the interpenetrations of East and West are building new fellowships, richer, more beautiful, and more fruitful than anything the world has yet seen. The new word in missions, therefore, is mutuality. Each learning from the other, and helping to stimulate the other, and all working together for the achievement of the great common goals of a great common life.

This, of course, brings us face to face with the problem of a divided Church, of church division, denominationalism, and sectarianism. A divided Church does not fit in with the vision of a united world. Denominationalism is obsolete. Sectarian ecclesiasticism bent on the perpetuation of divisions created long ago for reasons which have no connection with the religious life and experience of these new Christians, and which really have little connection with modern religious experience anywhere, is more and more seen to be a hindrance to the Kingdom of God. Nothing is more important

than this. Shall missions carry over and plant our Western divisions and sectarianisms in the new life of the older worlds, or can and shall we rise above and go beyond all these denominational and sectarian predilections and help to build a united Church on the mission field? Already in some countries sectarianism is taking root and the evil is getting a hold. In most countries, happily, the spirit and tendency are in the opposite direction, toward co-operation and unity.

These great questions and others equally important and interesting are presented and discussed with splendid courage and ability in this excellent book. [H. C. A.]

CHRIST TRIUMPHANT. By A. Maude Royden, author of *Sex and Common Sense*, *Political Christianity*, etc. (Putnam's). Miss Royden always speaks with confidence. In this volume of eleven chapters she discusses power and pain as interpreted by the Cross with her usual force and clearness. She lifts the shadow of gloom that too frequently lies in our religious thinking and makes very real that the Kingdom of Heaven is on this side of the tomb. Her five chapters on the interpretation of the Cross are particularly illuminating. The whole book rings with confidence and hope in its appeal for social justice.

THE WORD AND THE WORK. By G. A. Studdert Kennedy, M. A., M.C., Rector of S. Edmund King and Martyr, Lombard St. Chaplain to H. M. The King (Longmans). Mr. Kennedy is one of the greatest voices that came out of the World War. He has the attitude of a prophet. In this little book of 86 pages he has crowded a burning appeal to make people think, or, to use his own phrase, to cause "a pain in the mind." He faces world conditions with remarkable insight and fearlessness, and leaves an answer that goes echoing through the conscience. It is refreshing to find a voice so steady and confident in God amid the blindness of men. These seven Lenten sermons center around the Word, as spoken of by John, and emphasize the work which is to be done. It is a book for the times.

SOCIAL STRUGGLES IN ANTIQUITY. By M. Beer (Small, Maynard & Co.). This is a lucid study of the social development of the ancient world, culminating in the appearance of Jesus Christ. It is one of the most valuable books that has appeared on the study of the clash of the social classes, especially in that early period of economic development.

The Christian Union Quarterly

**INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND
INTERNATIONAL**

Volume XIV

JULY, 1924, TO APRIL, 1925

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Adventure in Good-Will, An—Rev. Homer W. Carpenter.....	256
Agee, Rev. Carl. A Theological Background for Religious Education	389
Ainslie, D. D., Rev. Peter. The Editor's Notes—	
A Scientific Study of Theological Schools.....	118
Christian Unity in Education.....	342
Division a Denial of Christian Idealism.....	8
Is There Equality Among Christians?.....	229
Larger Maps	345
Newman Smyth.....	343
Seriously Facing Divisions.....	10
Spiritual Leadership.....	117
Spiritual Life.....	123
The Method of Conference.....	6
The Passing of Robert H. Gardiner.....	11
The Permanent Growth of Unity.....	341
The Reality of Discord.....	5
Theological and Racial Equality	230
Toward Equality.....	231
Unreadiness for Unity.....	348
Ainslie, D. D., Rev. Peter. The Revolution of Christian Equality....	409
Aley, Robert J. Not Denominational But Christian Education.....	320
Allen, Grace. "Our Father".....	388
American Church Monthly, The, New York. An Irish Bishop on Anglican Reunion	80
American Church Monthly, The, New York. The Mürren Conference on Unity	305
Another Point of View of the Denominational College—R. E. Blackwell	321
Archbishop of Upsala. Longing for Christian Unity.....	306
Aspects of Christian Unity in Near East Relief—Rev. John Ralph Voris	273
Atkinson, D. D., Henry A. The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work.....	369
Ave Maria, The, Notre Dame, Ind. The Roman Catholic Church on Unity	81
Balance of Values for Christian Unity, The—Rev. John B. Cowden..	180
Barton, Rev. William E. The Springfield Declaration of the Congrega- tionalists on Unity	206
Bishop of Madras, The Anglican. Reunion in India.....	359
Black, William H. A Defense of the Denominational School.....	317
Blackwell, R. E. Another Point of View of the Denominational Col- lege	321
Blanden, Charles G. Prayer.....	244
Blunck, Rev. A. C. Protestant Union a Possibility.....	210

	PAGE
Brent, D. D., Rt. Rev. Charles H. Robert Hallowell Gardiner.....	193
Brent, D. D., Rt. Rev. Charles H. The Christian Way Toward Unity.	424
Brown, Ralph W. The Present Status of Unity in the East.....	101
Burns, Prof. G. Frank. The Church of To-morrow.....	190
Calkins, Rev. Raymond. A United Church Required.....	299
Canadian Union as Seen by a Congregationalist—Principal D. L. Ritchie	428
Canadian Union as Seen by Presbyterians—The Continent, New York	426
Cannon, Jr., Bishop James. The Unification of American Methodism	165
Carpenter, Rev. Homer W. An Adventure in Good-Will.....	256
Cartwright, F. W. Whence Come Denominations?.....	293
Catholic and Slav Orthodox Unionistic Congress, The—Matthew Spinka, Ph. D.	267
Cecil, Lord Hugh. Is Reordination the Only Obstacle to Reunion?..	80
Chinese Recorder, The, Shanghai. Denominational Christianity in China	217
Christian Union in the Seminary Curriculum—Frederick D. Kershner, LL. D.	161
Christian Unity—A Survey—W. Robinson, M. A., B. Sc.....	35
Christian Unity—W. I. T. Hoover, Ph. D., LL. D.....	52
Christian Unity in Education—The Editor's Notes—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D.....	342
Christian Way Toward Unity, The—Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent, D. D..	424
Christian Work, The, New York. A World Association of Churches.	84
Christian Work, The, New York. The Sixth Annual Ohio Protestant Pastors' Convention	429
Church of To-morrow, The—Prof. G. Frank Burns.....	190
Church Union in Canada—Joseph Ernest McAfee.....	85
Church Union in Canada—R. P. Mackay, D. D.....	143
Churchman, The, New York. Release Bishop Roots.....	204
Churchman, The, New York. Unity Along Spiritual Lines.....	83
Clark, Thomas Curtis. The Journey.....	164
Clark, Thomas Curtis. Revelation.....	289
Cobleigh, Rolfe. The Quadrennial Meeting of the Federal Council in Atlanta	430
Continent, The, New York. Canadian Union as Seen by Presbyterians	426
Continent, The, New York. Date Set for Canadian Union.....	218
Continent, The, New York. Union at a Standstill in Scotland.....	209
Continent, The, New York. What Kind of Union?.....	97
Cooney, Blanche Taylor. O Teach Me How to Pray.....	40
Cowden, Rev. John B. The Balance of Values for Christian Unity..	180
Cramer, Prof. Dr. J. A. Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of the World....	374
Cross of Christ and the Reconciliation of the Nations, The—Dr. Adolf Deissmann	213
Date Set for Canadian Union—The Continent, New York.....	218
Davis, Ph. D., Jerome. Loyalty to Christ.....	245
Defense of the Denominational School, A—William H. Black.....	317

	PAGE
Deissmann, Dr. Adolf. The Cross of Christ and the Reconciliation of the Nations.....	213
Denny, Bishop Collins. Some Objections to the Proposed Plan of Methodist Unification.....	174
Denominational Christianity in China—The Chinese Recorder, Shanghai	217
Denominational Competition in Home Mission Fields—The Herald of Gospel Liberty, Dayton.....	293
Denominational Education—William Wesley Guth, Ph. D., LL. D.....	12
Discussion of Doctrinal Differences, The—Dr. H. T. Hodgkin.....	94
Dissents From Dr. Guth—John A. W. Haas.....	314
Distinctive Ideals of the Life of Jesus, The—George W. Richards, D. D., LL. D.....	233
Division a Denial of Christian Idealism—The Editor's Notes—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D.	8
Dr. Guth Speaks With Authority—Milton G. Evans.....	314
Dr. King Supports Dr. Guth's Position—Henry C. King.....	319
Eastern Church and Reunion, The—C. H. Palmer.....	200
Ede, Very Rev. W. Moore. The Way of Hope.....	91
Evans, Milton G. Dr. Guth Speaks With Authority.....	314
Federal Unity of the Churches — Fifteen Years of Progress — Rev Charles S. Macfarland.....	130
Fellowship for Christian Unity—Rev. A. W. Gottschall.....	104
Gann, Rev. J. A. Teapot Tempest in Southern Methodism on Unity.	421
George Calixtus—Matthew Spinka, Ph. D.....	67
Gottschall, Rev. A. W. Fellowship for Christian Unity.....	104
Guardian, The, London. Unity and Truth.....	290
Guilt of Privately Endowed and Denominational Schools, The. Mary E. Weisel.....	315
Guth, Ph. D., LL. D., William Wesley. Denominational Education..	12
Haas, John A. W. Dissents From Dr. Guth.....	314
Harper, W. A. Why the Christian Church Needs Colleges.....	319
Herald of Gospel Liberty, The, Dayton. Denominational Competition in Home Mission Fields.....	293
Hill, Pierre Bernard. A Morning Prayer.....	368
Hodge, D. D., Hugh Lenox. Our Quest for Authority.....	398
Hodgkin, Dr. H. T. The Discussion of Doctrinal Differences.....	94
Hoover, Ph. D., LL. D., W. I. T. Christian Unity.....	52
Hope of Christian Unity, The—Rev. L. W. McCreary.....	58
How to Realize "ut unum sint"—Bishop Harald Ostenfeld.....	264
Human Mind's Limitation, The—Prof. James Ward.....	411
In Agreement With Dr. Guth—Ellen F. Pendleton.....	317
In Christ—John Oxenham	173
In Hearty Agreement With Dr. Guth's Recent Article—A. C. McGiffert	313

	PAGE
Intellectual and Social Forces Working for Reunion—Prof. Vernon Stauffer	198
Irish Bishop on Anglican Reunion, An—The American Church Monthly, New York.....	80
Is Reordination the Only Obstacle to Reunion?—Lord Hugh Cecil....	80
Is There Equality Among Christians?—The Editor's Notes—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D.....	229
Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of the World—Prof. Dr. J. A. Cramer...	374
John Ruskin's "The Construction of Sheepfolds"—Dean W. J. Lhamon	154
Journey, The—Thomas Curtis Clark.....	164
Kendon, Frank. Optimism	373
Kershner, LL. D., Frederick D. Christian Union in the Seminary Curriculum	161
Kershner, LL. D., Frederick D. The Unanswered Prayer of Our Lord.	26
Kershner, LL. D., Frederick D. Tolerance in Christianity.....	353
King, Henry C. Dr. King Supports Dr. Guth's Position.....	319
Kramer, Ph. D., D. D., Frederick F. Religion and the Christian Church	41
Larger Maps—The Editor's Notes—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D.....	345
Letters to the Editor.....	101, 313
Lhamon, Dean W. J. John Ruskin's "The Construction of Sheepfolds"	154
Lines, Bishop Edwin S. The Reasons for Broken Unity Exist No Longer	99
Longing for Christian Unity—The Most Rev. Archbishop of Upsala.	306
Love Ever Gives—John Oxenham.....	358
Loyalty to Christ—Jerome Davis, Ph. D.....	245
Macfarland, Rev. Charles S. Federal Unity of the Churches—Fifteen Years of Progress	130
Mackay, D. D., R. P. Church Union in Canada.....	143
Major, Principal H. D. A. Modernists and Traditionalists as Factors in Christian Unity	195
McAfee, Joseph Ernest. Church Union in Canada.....	85
McCreary, Rev. L. W. The Hope of Christian Unity.....	58
McGifert, A. C. In Hearty Agreement With Dr. Guth's Recent Article	313
Messenger, J. E. The Problem of Unity.....	300
Method of Conference, The—The Editor's Notes—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D D.....	6
Modernists and Traditionalists as Factors in Christian Unity—Principal H. D. A. Major.....	195
Morning Prayer, A—Pierre Bernard Hill.....	368
Mosse, F. H. Unity in the Crucible.....	301
Mürren Conference on Unity, The—The American Church Monthly, New York	305
Newman Smyth—The Editor's Notes—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D.....	343
Newton, Rev. Joseph Fort. The Will to Fellowship.....	90

	PAGE
Norris, Rt. Rev. Frank L. Union Congregations in China.....	202
Not Denominational But Christian Education—Robert J. Aley.....	320
Optimism—Frank Kendon.....	373
Ostenfeld, Bishop Harald. How to Realize “ut unum sint”.....	264
O Teach Me How to Pray—Blanch Taylor Cooney.....	40
“Our Father”—Grace Allen.....	388
Our Quest for Authority—Hugh Lenox Hodge, D. D.....	398
Oxenham, John. In Christ.....	173
Oxenham, John. Love Ever Gives.....	358
Oxenham, John. The Secret Place.....	266
Palmer, C. H. The Eastern Church and Reunion.....	200
Passing of Robert H. Gardiner, The—The Editor’s Notes—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D.....	11
Pendleton, Ellen F. In Agreement With Dr. Guth.....	317
Permanent Growth of Unity, The—The Editor’s Notes—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D.....	341
Prayer—Charles G. Blanden.....	244
Prayer—Henry van Dyke.....	192
Present Status of Unity in the East, The—Ralph W. Brown.....	101
Problem of Unity, The—J. E. Messenger.....	300
Protestant Federation in Czecho-Slovakia—Dr. F. Zilka.....	207
Protestant Union a Possibility—Rev. A. C. Blunck.....	210
Provost of Trinity College, The Most Rev. the, Dublin. The Scandal of Being Separated at Prayers.....	416
Quadrennial Meeting of the Federal Council in Atlanta, The—Rolfe Cobleigh.....	430
Reality of Discord, The—The Editor’s Notes—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D.	5
Reasons for Broken Unity Exist No Longer, The—Bishop Edwin S. Lines.....	99
Release Bishop Roots—The Churchman, New York.....	204
Religion and the Christian Church—Frederick F. Kramer, Ph. D., D. D.	41
Reunion in India—The Anglican Bishop of Madras, India.....	359
Revelation—Thomas Curtis Clark.....	289
Revolution of Christian Equality, The—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D.....	409
Richards, D. D., LL. D., George W. The Distinctive Ideals of the Life of Jesus.....	233
Ritchie, Principal D. L. Canadian Union as Seen by a Congre- gationalist.....	428
Robert Hallowell Gardiner—Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent, D. D.....	193
Robinson, M. A., B. Sc., W. Christian Unity—A Survey.....	35
Roman Catholic Church on Unity, The—The Ave Maria, Notre Dame, Ind.	81
Scandal of Being Separated at Prayers, The—The Most Rev. the Provost of Trinity College, Dublin.....	416
Scientific Study of Theological Schools, A—The Editor’s Notes—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D.....	118

	PAGE
Scott, Walter Dill. Wisdom in Dr. Guth's Point of View.....	313
Secret Place, The—John Oxenham.....	266
Seriously Facing Divisions—The Editor's Notes—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D.....	10
Similarity of Hindus and Christians—The Times of India.....	419
Sixth Annual Ohio Protestant Pastors' Convention, The—The Chris- tian Work, New York.....	429
Some Objections to the Proposed Plan of Methodist Unification— Bishop Collins Denny.....	174
Spinka, Ph. D., Matthew. George Calixtus.....	67
Spinka, Ph. D., Matthew. The Catholic and Slav Orthodox Union- istic Congress.....	267
Spiritual Leadership—The Editor's Notes—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D.	117
Spiritual Life—The Editor's Notes—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D.....	123
Spiritual Value of Co-operation, The—Dr. C. B. Wilmer.....	413
Springfield Declaration of the Congregationalists on Unity, The—Rev. William E. Barton.....	206
Stauffer, Prof. Vernon. Intellectual and Social Forces Working for Reunion	198
Teapot Tempest in Southern Methodism on Unity—Rev. J. A. Gann..	421
Theological and Racial Equality — The Editor's Notes — Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D.....	230
Theological Background for Religious Education, A—Rev. Carl Agee.	389
Times of India, The. Similarity of Hindus and Christians.....	419
Tolerance in Christianity—Frederick D. Kershner, LL. D.....	353
Toward Equality—The Editor's Notes—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D....	231
Truth—Ella Wheeler Wilcox.....	408
Unanswered Prayer of Our Lord, The—Frederick D. Kershner, LL. D	26
Unification of American Methodism, The—Bishop James Cannon, Jr..	165
Union at a Standstill in Scotland—The Continent, New York.....	209
Union Congregations in China—Rt. Rev. Frank L. Norris.....	202
United Church Required, A—Rev. Raymond Calkins.....	299
Unity Along Spiritual Lines—The Churchman, New York.....	83
Unity and Truth—The Guardian, London.....	290
Unity in the Crucible—F. H. Mosse.....	301
Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, The—Henry A. Atkinson, D. D.	369
Unreadiness for Unity—The Editor's Notes—Rev. Peter Ainslie, D. D.	348
Van Dyke, Henry. Prayer	192
Voris, Rev. John Ralph. Aspects of Christian Unity in Near East Relief	273
Ward, Prof. James. The Human Mind's Limitation.....	411
Way of Hope, The—Very Rev. W. Moore Ede.....	91
Weisel, Mary E. The Guilt of Privately Endowed and Denominational Schools	315
What Kind of Union?—The Continent, New York.....	97

	PAGE
What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity....80, 193, 290,	409
Whence Come Denominations?—F. W. Cartwright.....	293
Why the Christian Church Needs Colleges—W. A. Harper.....	319
Wilcox, Ella Wheeler. Truth.....	408
Will to Fellowship, The—Rev. Joseph Fort Newton.....	90
Wilmer, Dr. C. B. The Spiritual Value of Co-operation.....	413
Wisdom in Dr. Guth's Point of View—Walter Dill Scott.....	313
World Association of Churches, A—The Christian Work, New York..	84
 Zilka, Dr. F. Protestant Federation in Czecho-Slovakia.....	 207

BOOKS REVIEWED

Acute and Chronic Unbelief. Its Cause, Consequence, and Cure— Wyckoff	112
Aspects of Reunion—Rowley.....	326
Building of the American Nation—Butler.....	109
Catholic and Protestant Elements in Christianity—Quick.....	106
Christ Triumphant—Royden.....	439
Christian Doctrine of Health, The. A Handbook on the Relation of Bodily to Spiritual and Moral Health—Dougall.....	112
Christian Ways of Salvation—Richards.....	328
Christianity and the Race Problem—Oldham.....	335
Church Principles—Simpson.....	219
Church, the Bible, and the Creed, The—Gailor.....	336
Clash of Colour, The. A Study in the Problem of Race—Mathews...	108
Conditions of Conversion, The—Watkinson.....	335
Creeds and Loyalty. Essays on the History, Interpretation, and Use of the Creeds—Muller, Washburn, Hatch, Dun, McComb, Nash, and Addison	335
Disciples, The. An Interpretation—Abbott.....	223
Documents on Christian Unity 1920-4—Bell.....	434
Evangelism in the Modern World—Edited by two University Men....	335
Faith and Health—Brown.....	224
God of the Early Christians, The—McGiffert.....	222
Gospel of Luke, The. An Exposition—Erdman.....	111
Immortality—Marchant	333
International Christian Movements—Macfarland.....	330
Life of Jesus—Renan.....	110
Lord We Love, The. Devotional Studies in the Life of Christ— Erdman	336
Lost Radiance of the Christian Religion, The—Jacks.....	111
Mahatma Gandhi—Rolland.....	109
Marcus Aurelius—Sedgwick.....	110
Mobilising for Peace—Lynch.....	112

	PAGE
One Generation to Another—Kirk.....	220
One Man's Religion—Quillen.....	111
Our Bible (Christian Nurture Series).....	336
Paths That Lead to God, The. A New Survey of the Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief—Tillett.....	437
Personal Religion and the Life of Devotion—Inge.....	220
Physical Training of Public Speakers—Sommer.....	112
Prayer as a Force—Royden.....	223
Problems of Church Unity—Lowrie.....	324
Realities and Shams—Jacks.....	334
Religion and Health—Walsh.....	336
Religion and Morality—Anderson.....	221
Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, The—Diessmann.....	334
Religionisms and Christianity—Hoover.....	223
Science and Life—Millikan.....	333
Social Life and the Crowd—Tayler.....	224
Social Struggles in Antiquity—Beer.....	439
Suburbs of Christianity—Stockman.....	110
Teaching Pastor, The—Bitting.....	108
Tolerance—Brooks.....	220
Twelve Tests of Character—Fosdick.....	111
Way of Jesus, The —Hodgkin.....	221
Whither Bound in Missions—Fleming.....	438
Will Protestantism Be Overthrown?—Dowding.....	111
Word and the Work, The—Kennedy.....	439
Why I Believe in Religion—Brown.....	110

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the Work of Thomas Campbell, a Presbyterian Minister, of Washington, Pa., 1809; present organization, 1910. President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences, and distribution of irenic literature—"till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for, and sermons on, Christian Unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857. President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican Communion.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering, and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910. President, Rev. Nehemiah Boynton; Secretary, Rev. Linley V. Gordon, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For the promotion of Christian Unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMAN'S UNION, 1898. President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Secretary, Rev. John H. Bentley, Souldern Rectory, Banbury, England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian Communion.

CONTINUATION COMMITTEE OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910. Chairman, Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent; Secretariat, P. O. Box 226, Boston, Mass., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918. Ad Interim Committee—Chairman, Rev. Joseph A. Vance, Detroit, Mich.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908. President, Dr. Robert E. Speer; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the co-operation of the various Protestant Communion in service, rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911. Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Bryn Melyn, Harrow Weald, Middlesex. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895. President, Mrs. George Cadbury, Manor House, Northfield, Birmingham. Secretary, Rev. Thomas Nightingale, Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, E. C. 4, London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and co-operation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK, 1920. Chairmen, Archbishop of Upsala, Archbishop of Canterbury, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Rev. A. J. Brown; Secretary, Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For union of the Churches in common, practical work, and to insist that the principles of the Gospel be applied to the solution of contemporary social and international problems.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914. Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury; Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1; Chairman, American Council, Rev. William P. Merrill; General Secretary, Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the Churches and the avoidance of war.

WORLD'S EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE, 1846; Incorporated 1912. Chairman, Sir Andrew Wingate; General Secretary, Henry Martyn Gooch, 19 Russell Sqr., London, W. C. 1. To enable Christians of British and foreign nations to realize in themselves, and to manifest to others, that living and essential union which binds together all believers in the fellowship of Christ. Universal Week of prayer organized by the Alliance since 1846.



CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
1924-1925

DATE	ISSUED TO

