


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:

Is Christianity a Unifying Force?—Denominational Journals—Nicæa and Stockholm---325 and 1925—Abandoning Denominational Names

The Function of Christian Doctrine W. E. GARRISON

The Psychology of Opinion CHARLES A. S. DWIGHT

Christian Union — What is the Goal? J. F. TAINTOR

Church Union in Canada HUGH L. KEENLEYSIDE

Interchurch Government. An Essay on the Advantages of Federation as Exemplified by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America CLARENCE R. ATHEARN

What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity

The Consummation of Church Union in Canada—Canada Makes Church History—The United Church of Canada and Religious Education—The Roman Catholics and Malines—The Church Unity Octave—Bishop W. T. Manning on Christian Unity—Unity Features South American Congress at Montevideo—Unite in Religious Music

Book Reviews

The Faith of Modernism—Christianity and Modernism—The Foreign Student in America—My Duel With the Vatican—Why the Church? 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

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

CONTENTS

JULY, 1925

VOL. XV.

No. 1

THE EDITOR'S NOTES.....	5
THE FUNCTION OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.....W. E. GARRISON	14
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF OPINION.....CHARLES A. S. DWIGHT	29
CHRISTIAN UNION—WHAT IS THE GOAL?.....J. F. TAINTOR	34
CHURCH UNION IN CANADA..HUGH L. KEENLEYSIDE	40
INTERCHURCH GOVERNMENT. <i>An essay on the Advantages of Federation as Ex- emplified by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.</i> CLARENCE R. ATHEARN	46
WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY	79
BOOK REVIEWS	107

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 EDWIN S. LINES,
Newark, N. J. |
| BISHOP CHARLES P. ANDERSON,
Chicago, Ill. | DR. FREDERICK LYNCH,
New York, N. Y. |
| REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. | VERY REV. J. A. M'CLYMONT, D.D.,
Edinburgh, Scotland. |
| BISHOP CHARLES H. BRENT,
Buffalo, N. Y. | PROF. SAMUEL MCCOMB,
Cambridge, Mass. |
| DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn. | BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL,
Pittsburgh, Pa. |
| PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N. Y. | BISHOP WILLIAM F. MCDOWELL,
Washington, D. C. |
| REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass. | THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER,
Manchester, England. |
| BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR.,
Washington, D. C. | REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. |
| REV. RUSSELL CECIL, D.D.,
Richmond, Va. | DR. WILFRED MONOD,
Paris, France. |
| 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. |
| REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky | PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa. |
| DEAN H. E. W. FOSBROKE,
New York, N. Y. | PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England. |
| DEAN W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill. | REV. J. H. SHAKESPEARE, D.D.,
London, England. |
| PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England. | PASTOR DR. FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND-
SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany. |
| MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor. | DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N. Y. |
| PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C. | THE ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA,
Upsala, Sweden. |
| DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Shanghai, China. | DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J. |
| REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. | REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich. |
| DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England. | BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio. |
| PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa. | BISHOP LUTHER B. WILSON,
New York, N. Y. |

BROTHERS, FOR THE SAKE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, I BEG OF YOU ALL TO DROP THESE PARTY-CRIES. THERE MUST BE NO CLIQUES AMONG YOU; YOU MUST REGAIN YOUR COMMON TEMPER AND ATTITUDE. FOR CHLOE'S PEOPLE INFORM ME THAT YOU ARE QUARRELING. BY "QUARRELING" I MEAN THAT EACH OF YOU HAS HIS PARTY-CRY, "I BELONG TO PAUL," "AND I TO APOLLOS," "AND I TO CEPHAS," "AND I TO CHRIST." HAS CHRIST BEEN PARCELED OUT? WAS IT PAUL WHO WAS CRUCIFIED FOR YOU? WAS IT IN PAUL'S NAME THAT YOU WERE BAPTIZED? . . . YOU ARE STILL WORDLY. FOR WITH JEALOUSY AND QUARRELS IN YOUR MIDST, ARE YOU NOT WORDLY, ARE YOU NOT BEHAVING LIKE ORDINARY MEN? WHEN ONE CRIES, "I BELONG TO PAUL," AND ANOTHER, "I BELONG TO APOLLOS," WHAT ARE YOU BUT MEN OF THE WORLD?

—I COR. 1:10-14; 3:3-5
—*Moffatt's Translation.*

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

JULY, 1925

THE EDITOR'S NOTES

Is Christianity a Unifying Force?

THERE has never been a period in history when the human mind has been so profoundly interested in those forces that have to do with unification as now. Whether discussing political, social, or economic problems, no two words have bulked so largely in our thinking as co-operation and unification—if not the very use of these words, certainly the ideas which they convey. No strategy can remove them nor abuse browbeat them. They are here to stay.

Sixteen hundred years ago Constantine called the Council of Nicæa. Aside from the metaphysical issue that was sweeping through the Church, Constantine must have conceived of Christianity as a unifying force and, perhaps, thought to use it as a factor in the unification of his crumbling empire. He had conquered his enemies by force of arms, but his empire was not united. That he needed a unifying force was no question, but the question, perhaps, was—Could Christianity serve as such a force? If this was his motive, there naturally arise many questions of criticism, which need not be discussed here. Christianity has held together crumbling homes. Is it big enough to hold together a crumbling empire or, still greater, a crumbling world? Even so late as 1860 it was too weak to hold together the United States of America, and Christian men resorted to war and pinned the nation together with bayonets.

The Council of Nicæa revealed the weakness of Christianity not only by not functioning in unifying the empire, but by bursting forth in such a storm of controversy over metaphysical questions as to divide its own household. That same weakness exists to-day, and hence the strength of denominationalism. The Church took the World War far more seriously than it has ever taken the unity of its own household.

If one studies the spirit and words of Jesus he is led to conclude that Christianity is the greatest unifying force in the world. On the other hand, when one studies the history of Christianity, he is impressed with the brittleness of its bonds. It will break over the definition of a word and stay broken, or over a political issue and likewise remain broken, although the issue may long ago have been settled politically. Have men understood Jesus? Or have the records of Jesus in the New Testament been doctored by idealists? Is Christianity really what the world needs, or are we to look for the birth of a new religion? Who of us is willing to be Christian?

Christianity is now facing its severest test. It is painfully lagging behind in co-operation and unification. It must function to these ends or it will be severely judged by the oncoming generations. There is no reason why all the denominations co-operating in the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America should not be definitely united into one Protestant church except for the party-cries and party-spirit, which were regarded as poison in the apostolic church and, therefore, must be so regarded in the modern church. With the unity of Protestantism assured, the next step will have to do with the other great branches of Christendom—Anglican, Eastern Orthodox, and Roman Catholic. A divided Church is weak. Multiply its division into two hundred, as may be read in the United States census reports, and the Church is pretty nearly at the limit of its weakness. The Christianity of the world to-day could hardly be weaker than it is. It has great buildings, makes great party-reports, and blows loud trumpets, but it is a weak institution—weak spiritually and morally, weak as a factor in co-operation and unification. This ought not to be. It was not the purpose of its Founder. Men have run away with it and its divisions are now a plague to mankind.

The strength of Christianity lies in its unity. Here is really the greatest issue of all history—the need of a united religion in order to be a force for a united brotherhood of the world. The old party-plan has not helped to that end. Is Christianity a unifying force? It has been thought so by many. The world is waiting for Christians to prove it. The most pathetic scene

in the world to-day is the different denominationalists going up to our two hundred different places of worship on Sunday, some of us going because our forebears went, others of us going because we want God and any place of worship would suit us, and still others of us going because we believe that we are the sole guardians of the truth, believing that the one hundred and ninety-nine other denominations are in grave error. These are the party wall builders; we strut with pride; we stand aloof; we pray, but for our party; we work, but for our party; we are pious, but it is party-piety. This Sunday morning scene is not according to the will of God, however great the crowd, however fine the sermon, or however beautiful the worship. Is there no conscience among us whereby we may break the bars of these prison houses and be free? Could we but find the truth we would love the whole Church. How can it be done?

But we love the term "Baptist," or "Methodist," or "Roman Catholic," or "Episcopalian," or "Disciple," or "Presbyterian," or "Christian" as a party use, and so on. The Church delights in advertising its weakness—go down the streets of a great city or stop at a village cross-road and all these churches are shouting, "We are divided." The marvel is that there appears to be no sense of shame. Is there no cross in sight in the midst of all this shame? If the Apostle Paul wrote to the Church at Corinth as he did, how would he have written to us who, with pride, call ourselves "Episcopalians," "Presbyterians," "Disciples," "Baptists," "Roman Catholics," "Methodists," "Christians," and so forth? This is what he wrote the Corinthians:

Brothers, for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ I beg of you all to drop these party-cries. There must be no cliques among you; you must regain your common temper and attitude. For Chloe's people inform me that you are quarreling. By "quarreling" I mean that each of you has his party-cry, "I belong to Paul," "And I to Apollos," "And I to Cephas," "And I to Christ." Has Christ been parceled out? Was it Paul who was crucified for you? Was it in Paul's name that you were baptized? . . . You are still worldly. For with jealousy and quarrels in your midst, are you not worldly, are you not behaving like ordinary men? When one cries, "I belong to Paul," and another, "I belong to Apollos," what are you but men of the world? (I Cor. 1:10-14; 3:3-5—Moffatt's Translation.)

Stern words! It is by no means sure that, if the Apostle Paul returned to the flesh and hurled at us these burning words, we would any more heed him than would the five brothers of Dives had Lazarus returned in the flesh with his appeal of repentance. That appears to have been the judgment of Jesus relative to the attitude of the five brothers and, by inference, we would say it is his mind now regarding us. We know better than we are living. The Church is divided. It must be united by Christians. Who of us is willing to venture toward the proof that Christianity is a unifying force? It is costly, but it must be worth all the cost that will come to him who tries.

Denominational Journals

ONE of the factors in perpetuating denominationalism is the denominational journal. These are of all grades from extreme bigotry to liberal attitudes. In the regular reading of the former group a man's religion is sure to be seriously damaged; in the regular reading of the latter group one may be able to take care of his soul; in the regular reading of those which fall in between these extremes one is forever at a disadvantage because of the narrowness of denominational news and denominational outlook. One who confines his reading to his denominational journal takes a most unfair risk with himself. No one can constantly and exclusively read his denominational journal without seriously involving his soul's fellowship with the whole Church of God.

The denominational journal is a part of the propaganda of the party-policy. It is a call for loyalty to the denomination and, therefore, for the perpetuation of division in the Church of God. If all the members of the denominations are going to be forever loyal to their denominations, unity of the Church is an impossibility. Has the time not come when Christ can be lifted above all denominations so that loyalty will be to Him rather than to any party in Christendom?

When the three denominations in Canada united last month there was no further need of the three denominational journals that had been factors in maintaining denominational loyalty.

The Presbyterian Witness, *The Christian Guardian* (Methodist), and *The Canadian Congregationalist* ceased publication to make way for *The New Outlook*, which is the new journal of the United Church of Canada. In the removal of these party-organs and the incoming of the new journal, the United Church of Canada has taken a long step toward permanent unity. More important than the signing of the agreement is the removal of these party-organs for the one united organ. The union movement in Canada stands out as the most unique instance of unity in modern times. Canada is ahead of the rest of the world in this venture and every step that has been taken indicates sane statesmanship.

The denominational journal is unfair. It has got to be unfair. That is a distinct feature of its business. If it reports on the work of the Church in India, its report is the account of that denomination's work in India, or in Boston or in New York, or in Baltimore, as though God had no saints except those of that party in that country or in that city. Indeed, that party may be a small factor in the Christian work of that community; but, in the reading of the denominational journal's report, that party looms to a fictitious place either for boasting for what has been done or for a call for funds to put it in the lead of the other parties. The one thing kept in mind is "This is our church"—a phrase that betrays the memory of the days of excommunication.

An interdenominational journal offers healthy reading, especially when it touches the whole Church without reservations. Such a journal helps the soul to find its way to fellowship with the whole Church. It is a work that needs to be done. It is a work that must be done. If the Christian mind is to think in terms of unity, it must not be disturbed by such hindrances to united thought as is given by denominational journals. In thinking we begin to find our way to fellowship. The mind needs helps, not hindrances, to that end. The denominational journal is a decided hindrance. The interdenominational journal is a decided help.

Nicæa and Stockholm—325 and 1925

SIXTEEN HUNDRED years ago the Council of Nicæa was held, dealing with theological questions. Next month the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work will be held at Stockholm, Sweden, dealing with ethical problems. Sixteen hundred years separate the two. What the Church was then and what it is now furnishes interesting observation. The Stockholm Conference does not promise to have about it the spectacular element that surrounded the Council of Nicæa. The outstanding personality there will be his Grace the Archbishop of Upsala, who has successfully led the movement for this conference with skill and promise. All branches of the Church will be represented except the Roman Catholic Church. It is regretted that they declined representation, but its delegates, from the Eastern Orthodox, Anglican, and Protestant communions, from all parts of the world, will discuss freely the problems of Christian ethics rather than Christian theology. It will, therefore, be freer and more likely to make definite advance. The findings of these committees that have been at work for months and the return of the delegates to their homes in all parts of the world ought to be a great influence for the unifying of Christianity.

Is the modern Christian mind adapted to unity? It has been trained so long to denominationalism that one cannot help but raise the question as to the place of denominational schools in present day education and why we hesitate to unify our educational systems in America and Europe, when there are already movements on foot, and in many instances successfully operating, for the unifying of the Christian educational systems of the non-Christian lands. It is another indication of the weakness of Christianity in America and Europe. Its timidity reveals that weakness.

When it comes to the question of the superiority of certain parties in the Church—be they the Roman Catholic party, the Anglican party, or the multitudinous Protestant parties—no one of these has anything to boast of and the sooner we courageously face this question the better for Christianity and the

world. Emerson says: "The true test of civilization is—not the census, not the size of the cities, not the crops—no, but the kind of men the country turns out." The test may be applied to five parties here in the city where this journal is published—here are five men, one being a Roman Catholic, one an Episcopalian, one a Methodist, one a Presbyterian, and one a Baptist. The world sees no difference in them and there is no difference in them so far as their religion is concerned. In fact, in a business transaction their religion does not figure at all. They might as well not belong to any church so far as the world's confidence in them is concerned. Party-strife has put so much emphasis on what they should believe that how they should live has had secondary consideration, and so secondary that to say a man is a member of any one of the parties of Christendom is no particular recommendation of his honour and integrity, so far as the world is concerned. A party-church cannot produce the highest type of manhood. A philosophy that attempts to claim it is morally unsound. Hence the world will never be unified through the force of Christianity until all parties are willing to come to the standard of Christ, who affirmed that the true test of Christianity is in the kind of characters it turns out. A church at variance with itself cannot produce the best results in anything, particularly in human character. It remains to be proved whether Christianity is a unifying force or not. Church history has certainly not proved it. The words of Jesus for the unity of his flock are like Scripture passages on the tomb stones in graveyards. Is Christianity strong enough to write these Scripture passages upon the tablets of the human heart? Until then spiritual progress is balked.

Abandoning Denominational Names

WHEN Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick suggested dropping the name "Baptist" from the new church they are expecting to build in the neighbourhood of Columbia University, New York, although retain affiliation with the Baptist denomination, it raised a protest among the Baptists, as would be expected in any denomination, but the willingness of the Park Avenue

Baptist Church to do this indicated the ripeness for the growth of this idea. There are other congregations equally ready to follow and will follow, if it can be done without friction, for why burden the Church with these cumbersome denominational names?

It is sometimes maintained that these names must never be abolished because they stood for great principles and have come up through glorious histories. But these names are nothing in comparison with Christ and the principles for which He stands. The action of the Park Avenue Baptist Church is evidence of the world's judgment to that end. These denominational names appeal to the denominationally minded. Beyond that they have no influence. There is a tendency in many quarters to minimize them, if not to get away from them entirely. This feeling is so general that it would be quite impossible to check it, although strong efforts are being put forth here and there to do so.

Whatever these names stood for once, they do not stand for the same thing now. They are largely worn out labels that can be conveniently dropped almost any time and anywhere with only a passing comment. To the world at large they mean little or nothing. Read the list—"Baptist," "Christian" used denominationally, "Congregationalist," "Disciple" used denominationally, "Episcopalian," "Lutheran," "Methodist," "Presbyterian," "Roman Catholic," and a hundred and ninety-one others of similar character. Each one of these stands for a party and in not a single instance does the use of any one of these terms include the whole Church, not even such Scriptural terms as "Disciple," "Christian," "Church of Christ," and "Church of God." In their party limitations these beautiful Scriptural terms have been sectarianized as severely as the other names mentioned in this list. Dr. Fosdick is right in venturing to get away from labels that are worldly and that savour of worldly pride.

There is no reason for carrying these denominational names over into this day and handing them down to the oncoming generations. Believers in the non-Christian nations do not care for them and they fit poorly those in the so-called Christian nations who are seeking for fellowship with all who love

our Lord Jesus Christ. The time must come when they will be abandoned as we abandon other hindrances to the unity of the Church of Christ. In the apostolic plan there were things to be put off and things to be put on. Anything that savours of partyism in the Church is to be discarded. Back of all names is the attitude of the party-spirit and the party-cry. These are the unspiritual things. They savour of the world and belong to worldly practices.

The Church has a task and that task certainly is not to perpetuate party-cries and party-spirit. It is just the opposite. It has to do with co-operation, unification, fellowship, brotherhood, the limitations of which include the whole Church. One may dissent, saying he will not fellowship with this denomination or that because, to him, they represent certain errors. But does this one remove the error by isolating himself? Never. That policy has done more to establish error than any other. We are all in the Church, for it is the Lord, not man, who adds to the Church. Our policy must include all, and error will die quicker in the atmosphere of kindness and fellowship and brotherhood and love than in the atmosphere of the opposites of these. This is the teaching of Jesus. Are we strong enough to follow Him? So long as we are "Baptists," "Disciples," "Episcopalians," and so forth, we are still diligent in keeping open the running sore of division and proclaiming a divided Church, to a world that cannot be won to Christ except by a united Church, in which all denominational names are sunk before Him, who must some day be proclaimed by the whole world as King of kings and Lord of lords. To Him be glory forever. Amen.

PETER AINSLIE.

THE FUNCTION OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

BY W. E. GARRISON, PH.D.

Dean of the Disciples Divinity House of the University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.

THERE are two extreme and opposing views with reference to the function and value of doctrine in religion, and specifically in the Christian religion. The first of these is that correct doctrine is of the essence of Christianity, that the discovery and doctrinal statement of truth is the worthiest occupation of the thoughtful Christian, that the preservation and transmission of pure and permanent doctrine is the highest function of the Church, and that the acceptance of sound doctrine by the individual is both an indispensable test of his fitness for admission to the Church and a means to his attainment of all the Christian virtues and graces. The second is that all doctrinal statements are obscurations of essential Christianity, irrelevant to the purposes of Jesus, and hindrances to the accomplishment of his programme; that only conduct counts; that the true Christian should not only refrain from forcing his doctrines upon others, but should, if possible, refrain from having any.

There are, likewise, two views of the nature and origin of doctrine: First, that it is a body of knowledge of Divine things, given directly by revelation in the Scriptures, classified and arranged by man of course but positive, permanent, inflexible, and unmistakable; second, that it is a formulation by men of essential Christian attitudes and practical convictions in accordance with what current terminology calls the "thought-forms" and "social patterns" of successive periods, and, therefore, both admitting and requiring restatement from time to time as these thought-forms and social patterns change with enlarging knowledge and changing experience.

This article defends the thesis that the second of these definitions of the nature of doctrine is the true one; and that doctrine so defined—as the changing human formulation of attitudes which have permanent validity—is inevitable, is safe, and is useful.

The first of each of these pairs of definitions—that is, that doctrine is Divine in its origin and is of the essence of Christianity—represents, in the main, the classic attitude of Protestantism and, in large part also, of Catholicism. The second century saw the rise of the conception of “the faith” as something to be stated in propositions, believed, kept, and transmitted unchanged; as something that could be measured, tested, and guarded by a “rule of faith” reduced to propositional form. The development of the Old Catholic Church was, in part, a dramatization of the meaning which was put into Paul’s words, “The things which thou hast heard from me among many witnesses the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others”—on the assumption that the “things” referred to meant doctrines. The insistence upon episcopal succession grew up largely out of a consciousness of the need of an unbroken series of responsible teachers to transmit the faith and an authoritative tribunal to determine the doctrines which constituted it. This development was the more natural at a time when not only was the New Testament canon not clearly defined, but even the very idea of a canon of authoritative Christian Scriptures was still in process of formation. The first ecumenical council had for its chief task the formulation of a set of doctrines which should be considered normative for all Christians. So successful was this formulation—framed though it was under imperial pressure and amid the turmoil of political, sectional, and personal animosities—and so deeply was the idea impressed upon the Church that the preservation of these doctrines was essential to its very life, that even to this day there are those who soberly and hopefully propose the Nicene Creed as the doctrinal basis for the reunion of Christendom. The pseudo-Athanasian Creed, with the menace of its damnatory “*Quicumque vult*” standing at its beginning and repeated in the middle and again at the end, registered, in the

most uncompromising terms, the conviction that, to the end of time, no man could be saved without believing these doctrines formulated in the fourth and fifth centuries. Here, then, we have an affirmation of the permanent validity of certain particular doctrines as the essence of Christianity.

Protestantism revised the doctrines of the Church and swept away some that had accumulated between the fourth century and the sixteenth, but if it made any change in the estimate of the place of doctrine in Christianity, it was to lay even greater emphasis upon it. With the laying aside of the idea of the absolute authority of the Church—acceptance of which might be considered as establishing a presumption of the right attitude even of a person who neither knew nor cared anything about doctrine—and with the abandonment of the most striking religious practices, such as auricular confession, penance, and the veneration of saints and shrines—performance of which furnished at least *prima facie* evidence in favour of an individual's correctness from the standpoint of the Church—there was renewed insistence upon doctrinal precision as the criterion of true religion. The fine-spun theological pronouncements of the Protestant theologians of the sixteenth century, and the bitter doctrinal controversies, especially within Lutheranism and between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, afford adequate and tragic evidence of this. Melancthon's son-in-law spent years in prison on the charge of Crypto-Calvinism, while his ten children, the grandchildren of the great reformer, lived in beggary and semi-starvation. Such was the intensity of the Protestant spirit of "*Quicumque vult.*"

Luther's theory—which was held also by most of his successors—that "the meaning of Scripture is plain," sounds innocent and obvious, but was a root of much bitterness. One might almost say that it is the root of all the bitterness that has marred the peace of Protestantism. To Luther, the meaning of "*Hoc est meum corpus*" was so plain that Zwingli's differing interpretation of it seemed to him nothing less than the deliberate rejection of the clear word of God. And so with all the hair-splitting theologies of the latter half of the sixteenth century—as to the ubiquity of Christ's risen body, as to whether

his "descent into Hell" was part of his humiliation or part of his triumph, and the like. These were not conceived as matters of speculation, but as doctrines plainly declared by the infallible Word of God, and, therefore, essential elements of the Christian religion. It is true that these fantastic extremes did not long trouble the peace of the Church, but they troubled it desperately while they lasted; and even after these particular items of controversy had passed into the museum of theological curiosities, there remained a vast body of controversial theology the propositions of which, pro and con, were held as revealed truth.

That correct doctrine is permanent and essential; that Holy Scripture is an infallible, final, and authoritative source of doctrine; and that the meaning of Scripture is plain—these are the three legs of the tripod of Protestant denomination-ism, a system of sects practicing mutual exclusiveness because each believed its particular doctrines to be essential, Divine, and obvious.

The movement of the Disciples of Christ was a revolt against this whole system of insistence upon doctrine and was the proposal of a new criterion of Christianity. The new criterion was: Loyalty to Christ. It was recognized that the whole elaborate system of Protestant orthodoxy, whether true or not, was not a mere systematic arrangement of materials which were given with unmistakable clearness by revelation, but was the product of the operation of the human mind interpreting the statements of Scripture and speculating upon their implications. The variety of these interpretations and speculations had produced a diversity of doctrines, and the insistence upon these doctrines as fundamentals of Christianity had led to the disastrous division of the Church into warring sects. It had become perfectly evident that the meaning of Scripture is not unmistakably plain as regards the whole body of doctrine which might be derived from it. There would have been no novelty in a proposal to return to the Scriptures as a source from which to derive doctrine, for that is what every Protestant sect had undertaken and professed to do, and the more confident they were that their doctrines represented the exact teaching of

Scripture, the more uncompromising was their hostility to each other. The one doctrine upon which there was most unanimous agreement was the doctrine that the Scriptures are an authoritative source of doctrine. But there was a factor of novelty, as well as of restoration, in the proposal to interpret discipleship in terms of loyalty, not in terms of orthodoxy. The original position of the leaders of this movement was not an affirmation of the intellect in propositions, but an affirmation of the affections engaged by the personality of Jesus, and an affirmation of the will setting itself to his way of life. And the spirit and temper of the movement was defined by the fact that the whole enterprise was conceived in the interest of the reunion of Christendom. It was thus clearly and sharply differentiated, on the one hand, from the numerous futile efforts to secure doctrinal agreement during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and, on the other hand, from the attempts, such as the Old Scotch Independents and the Scotch Baptists in the eighteenth century to "restore primitive Christianity," especially with reference to the organization, ordinances, and worship of the Church and without much attention either to union or to those doctrines which had engaged the major energies of Protestant theologians.

It was indeed a notable achievement for Thomas and Alexander Campbell in the first quarter of the nineteenth century to work their way to a realization that even the most respectable doctrines of Protestant orthodoxy—doctrines most of which they personally believed to be true—were not given in unmistakable terms by Divine revelation but were the products of human interpretation and speculation. It was not until almost three-quarters of a century later that Harnack, in his *History of Dogma*, set forth, with scholarly elaboration of detail, the essential facts in the natural history of Christian doctrine: how original Christian loyalties and attitudes are given an intellectual embodiment in doctrines framed by men in accordance with the philosophical concepts and thought-forms of the age; how the makers and inheritors of these doctrines lose sight of their human origin and ascribe to them Divine sanctions; and how the doctrines, now certified as divinely certain and indispensable, because divinely given, are codified into

creeds and exalted to the position of authoritative dogmas of the Church and criteria for Christian fellowship. Some such understanding of the origin and nature of dogma was more or less consciously implicit in the Campbells' rejection of "man-made creeds." They did not set out to correct the creeds because they were wrong, but to eliminate them as tests of fellowship, because, right or wrong, they were formulations created by human intelligence and were not the simple and original core of the Christian religion. It is this fact that justifies the assertion that what they proposed was not a reformation but a restoration.

As the Campbells and their associates gradually came to form a relatively distinct religious group, characteristic doctrines naturally arose—as doctrines always will where men are having an experience of religion and are thinking about it; and because those who were drawn to the new movement were, in the main, men of a common type of mind with a common intellectual and cultural background, there was a considerable degree of agreement in these doctrines. Warned by the experience of the earlier generations of Protestantism, they deliberately avoided some of the more troublesome questions of theology, such as the Trinity, predestination, and the exact nature of the atonement—upon which it appeared that the words of Scripture were not clear enough to lead all scholarly and devout men to the same conclusion—and focused their attention upon a narrower range of doctrines of a more practical nature, such as the steps in conversion, the terms of church membership, and the organization and ordinances of the Church.

The principle of the secondary and derivative position of doctrine, deeply and essentially implicit as it was in the movement of the Disciples, was but imperfectly grasped even by the leaders of the movement, and was still less understood by the second and the third generations. The development of an actual doctrinal content, commonly known as "our position" or "our plea," while it was inevitable from the standpoint of successful propaganda, tended to conceal and confuse the deeper issues. There was more than a mere tendency to revert to the traditional Protestant attitude, which said: Our doctrines are

right and yours are wrong, because ours are the plain teachings of the Word of God, while yours, in so far as they differ from ours, are an erroneous interpretation and human speculation. The very narrowing of the field of doctrinal interest operated to intensify the conviction of rightness within that field. The common Protestant presupposition of the inerrant authority of Scripture was not only taken for granted but gained new strength with reference to the New Testament by disentangling it from the Old by the distinction between the dispensations; and since the more subtle and mysterious doctrines, such as original sin, the relation of the persons in the Trinity, and the process of the atonement, were passed over in favour of more practical and concrete matters, such as the plan of salvation and the ordinances and organization of the Church, it became easy to believe that at least within these narrower limits the meaning of Scripture was plain and unmistakable. (And to this day we occasionally hear statements, such as one made at the Congress three years ago, to the effect that "Scripture, since it is a revelation, does not need to be interpreted.")

So the history of doctrine among the Disciples has illustrated within a restricted field, and subject to some important limitations, the general formula which the doctrinal history of the Church, as a whole, throughout the centuries has followed: First, a personal loyalty to Christ and certain distinctive Christian principles and attitudes; second, the assumption of certain presuppositions and concepts commonly current at the time and place (in this case the presuppositions included the substantial inerrancy of the original text of the Scriptures and the permanently normative character of the faith and practice of the apostolic church); third, the development of specific doctrines which give concrete and formulated expression of loyalties, principles, and attitudes; fourth, the conviction that, however human may be the origin of the doctrines professed by other bodies, our doctrines have all the certainty and authority of Divine revelation; fifth, the insistence upon these doctrines as criteria of Christian fellowship, or, if not always that, as criteria of soundness in the faith and good standing in the ministry.

The important limitations which have been suggested were three-fold: First, as has already been stated, the field of doctrinal interest has been relatively narrow and has excluded many obviously speculative matters which have afforded occasion for endless wrangling in times past. Second, the practice of requiring as a condition of membership only what we have believed that the apostles required, has still further narrowed the area of insistence, because it has seemed to us quite evident that they did not require right thinking upon very many topics,—for example, if a man believes in Christ, confesses his faith by Peter's formula, repents of his sins and is immersed, he could not by any possibility be refused membership in the Church on the ground that he did not believe in a plurality of elders or in the independence of the local church or in the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper. These latter items are, in a general way, part of our position, but are not conditions of membership. Third, we have had neither the ecclesiastical machinery nor the disposition to place the seal of official authority upon any scheme of doctrine—not even upon the scheme which has been most commonly held among us. For instance, the system of doctrine set forth in Campbell's "Christian System," Walter Scott's "The Gospel Restored," and Miligan's "Scheme of Redemption," was at one time so generally held that any preacher not in agreement with it was looked at askance, and is so still in some quarters. But the absence of tribunals for the enforcement of doctrinal uniformity has always left the way open for variation and restatement, even though it might be at considerable personal hazard for the one who should attempt it.

In the use of the liberty thus provided, limited as it has been by the inertia of popular ignorance, the dictatorship of conservative editors, and the economic pressure of conservative churches, there has been no small readjustment in religious thinking among the Disciples during the past seventy-five years. The extent of this progress, which really means a change in the doctrinal formulation of our fundamental religious attitudes, may be easily appreciated from the consideration of the following statement recently issued by a man of some prominence,

every item of which, with one exception, represents a doctrine almost unanimously held among us in the middle of the nineteenth century, and no item of which, in the sense in which it is intended, commands any general acceptance among us now:

I believe the Bible to be the inspired Word of God, true in its statements of facts, authoritative in its commands and that it is our only and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. I believe that in the Church of Christ the worship is prescribed inclusively and exclusively, that we are told what to do in our worship and that these are the things we must do and that we may not change them either by addition, subtraction, or substitution. I do not believe that instrumental music is any part of the ordained worship of God, or that it is permissible to use it as worship. I believe that humanly organized missionary societies lead to ecclesiasticism and human authority in religion and that their use is not a help but a hinderence to the progress of the truth. I believe that destructive criticism and evolution are trying to overthrow Christianity and that instrumental music and humanly organized missionary societies are seeking to corrupt it.

The divisive tendency of doctrine conceived as directly and inerrantly given by Divine authority, is evident from the further statement of the same writer who says: "I have reached a point where I desire to be associated with those *only* who are content to work and worship as the New Testament directs"—that is, as he thinks the New Testament directs. This is precisely the basis upon which all Protestant divisions have occurred—the desire to be associated *only* with those who work and worship and believe as one thinks the New Testament directs.

The Disciples of Christ need a new return to first principles in two particulars: First, they need a new evaluation of the whole category of doctrine and a rediscovery of the principle which was, dimly perhaps but really, in the minds of our earliest leaders, that doctrines—even our own doctrines—are not unchangeable and infallible statements given by the inspiration of God, but are human formulations of those characteristic religious attitudes which are the heart and soul of Christianity. Thinking men will formulate their convictions in terms of doctrine, employing the best knowledge and the current thought-forms of their time. The only safety against in-

tolerance and division lies in understanding what the mind is doing when it makes doctrines. Second, in the exercise of the freedom which will come with a clearer recognition of this old principle, that doctrines are made by men and not given by God, they need to go forward to new statements of Christian conviction and attitudes in terms consistent with the present state of knowledge and the present forms of thought. Such re-statement will often involve a shift of emphasis or the giving of prominence to a fresh point of view, rather than the denial of an old doctrine. As an example, consider the following words:

We are required to recognize the kingly rule of Christ, our Lord and Redeemer, the King of kings and Lord of lords; our only law-giver, our great high priest, and the mighty Sovereign of heaven, the only authoritative emissary from the courts of glory, who must reign till He hath all enemies under his feet.

There is nothing in this statement that needs to be denied. It represents real truth. And yet, while it is a statement of a recent writer, it represents Jesus Christ in the terms of a type of despotism which has passed from the earth. Men will not give their highest loyalty to any being who is described exclusively in terms of tyranny. It is futile to ask men who have been trained in the school of democracy and taught the virtues of citizenship to give their heart's allegiance to one who is best described as a mighty sovereign trampling down his enemies. There is evident need for a doctrine of Christ which shall not be in terms either of the metaphysics of the Chalcedonian Christology or of this picture of oriental despotism, and which will give a fresh emphasis to some of the words of Jesus Himself which have not been adequately recognized by the makers of these doctrines.

The conflict between Fundamentalism and Modernism is not a conflict between two systems of doctrine. It is the antithesis between the idea of a rigid theology, immutable, unquestionable, and not susceptible of compromise because unmistakably and infallibly given to men by God, and the idea of a flexible theology, conscious that it is a construct of man, trying to embody God-given principles of permanent validity in

forms which must be modified from time to time to keep them true to the best knowledge that God has allowed man to acquire in related fields and to the developing experience of Christian living. At this point the Disciples in their terminology have always been Modernists; that is to say, they have always spoken of theology as "man-made" in terms that did not assert that its doctrines were necessarily wrong, but that, being of human construction, they could not be considered basic to the Christian religion.

It may seem to some that there is great danger in allowing men to formulate their own doctrines, and that safety lies only in the conception that doctrine is given directly by God. On the contrary, there is nothing so dangerous as the assumption of infallibility. The *Year Book of the Churches* contains statistical and historical information about the 195 sub-divisions which make up the religious forces of the United States: 184 of these are in some sense Christian. Each one of these, of course, is *right*, in the view of its own adherents. As nearly as I can estimate, about 167 of the 184 are not only right, but are *infallibly right*, because their doctrine, discipline, and policy are the plain and simple teaching of the infallible Word of God which, because it is the infallible Word of God, does not need to be interpreted. Many individual members of the other 14 are also infallibly right on the same grounds, though their entire groups may not conceive of their positions in those terms.

As one glances over the doctrines and histories of these infallible but divergent sects—many of which seem to all but their own adherents not only erroneous but weird, uncouth, and fantastic—one is impressed afresh with the perils of authoritarianism. We hear a good deal of the dangers of free thought. If you once begin the critical process, how do you know where to stop? But if one may judge from such a record as this, the most ardent devotees of a system of infallible authoritarianism have never known where to stop. There has been positively no limit to the bewildering vagaries of the faith of those who put no trust in the human intellect and earnestly seek only to follow the teaching of plain and indisputable revelation. And these vagaries have included not only wonderful and (to most men)

incredible doctrines, but systems of morality destructive of all ordinary morality, religious attitudes which have made men entirely indifferent to the welfare of mankind, and sometimes hopes and impulses which caused the little band of God's true Chosen People to plan to seize the sword and exterminate all the rest of the human race.

These horrible programmes, and others less extreme, have been possible because men had come to believe that there is something in the nature of religion which makes it impious to think about it and to try to understand it, or because, in trying to think about it and doing so clumsily and inaccurately, they ascribed to the product of their own careless thinking the sanctity and infallibility of a clear Divine revelation.

The saving sanity of any man's religion lies in what he does not know about it with infallible certainty. True, the life of religion is in its great enduring certainties. So does life in every phase grow out of its certainties—in the home, in business, in the state. Both peace in the heart and promotional vigour are the product of conviction. But peace among men, kindness and charity, modesty and deference, are the fine flower—I will not say of our ignorance—but of the admittedly limited and provisional character of our knowledge. The certainties of life are set in a wide margin of uncertainty. The bright light of knowledge has about it a broad penumbra of things which we are only in process of finding out. And these certainties, such as they are, are achieved—not given. They are the product of struggles in experience and thought. If men would cease to hold God responsible for this widely diverse variety of divinely authenticated human opinions, they might differ as widely, but their attitude toward the product of their own thought, and their attitude toward each other would be different.

But if doctrines are in some real sense man-made, why have them at all? Why not sweep away the whole structure, and preserve only those fundamental religious attitudes of which they are said to be the imperfect expression? There is to-day a certain popular impatience with doctrines. Almost no one defends dogma under that name, and even doctrine appears to

have a connotation on the one hand of dusty dryness, and on the other of uncertainty and instability and superfluity. Does it really cumber the ground? Shall we cut it down and cast it into the fire? It might be sufficient to answer that men make doctrines because they must. If a man thinks about anything, he must think about his religion, if he has any religion to think about. The result is doctrine. It is more likely to be good doctrine if he thinks about it consciously and deliberately and willingly, than if he cherishes the illusion that he is not thinking about it at all, and that there is some special virtue in not thinking about it. Creeds are codifications of some men's doctrinal thinking, used to hamper other men's doctrinal thinking. Away with them! More often than not, they have been used as instruments of exclusion, to keep some Christian men from associating with other Christian men. As walls of separation, they are an abomination. Down with them! But doctrine is the expression of man's intelligence, dealing with the theme of man's highest interest. Up with it, and on with it!

Doctrine is not only inevitable; it is safe, and it is useful. It is safe, if its true nature is recognized, as the formulation of religious attitudes in terms of human thought and knowledge and not as an infallible utterance of perfect Divine wisdom. The martyr-fires have never been lighted in defense of doctrines understood to be human formulations. The gates of the Church have never been locked and barred to keep out opinions divergent from the opinions of the majority, when they have been recognized as opinions. Ecclesiastical exclusiveness has always been to keep out those who deny God's truth. Men will go far in the defense of their reasoned convictions or their tested opinions, recognized as such, but they have never gone to the lengths of intolerance, persecution, or division. It is safe to have doctrines.

Doctrine is more than inevitable and safe; it is useful. It is useful—as St. Paul said that every inspired Scripture is useful—for teaching, for reproof and correction, for instruction in righteousness. These are practical aims. They look to the better understanding of the meaning of life and the implications of fundamental Christian convictions, and the translation of

them into individual and social righteousness. For example, Scripture does not give us a completed doctrine of temperance. Men had gradually to make one. It gives no finished doctrine of human freedom in practical terms. Men had to make one before slavery could be done away, and men are still making the doctrines by which economic liberty shall be affirmed. It gives us no adequate doctrine on the subject of peace and war. The fundamental Christian attitudes must be embodied in a developed Christian doctrine of international relations.

Doctrine is not only not divisive, but is essentially unifying. It develops by the integration of the accumulating mass of human knowledge. By virtue of the very fact that it is a formulation in terms of current thought-forms and categories and on the basis of common experience, the making of doctrine is a social achievement. It is the work of man but not of *a* man. It involves a specific recognition of the interdependence of Christian people, both contemporaneously and historically. So with the abrogation of authoritative dogma religion does not tend to degenerate into sheer individualism. Christianity is the actual stream of the group-life of those who have tried to follow Jesus. Their experience has value for those who come after them, and their adventures and achievements in religious thinking are a part of their total experience. New formulations will, therefore, be most adequate if they grow gradually out of the old ones and if they conserve the values that have been attained. Orthodoxy is the type of religious thinking which commands the assent of the group and ministers to its needs. Sometimes it outlives its usefulness, and while retaining the label of orthodoxy becomes in fact heterodoxy. Then there is need of a new orthodoxy which shall do for the present age what the old orthodoxy did for its time. Every such period of transition and every such new effort in religious thinking should be entered upon courageously, seriously, humbly, and devoutly. Life is brutalized and emptied by flippant rejection of the instruments of the past, even as it is hampered and embarrassed by a too slavish devotion to them. He who does not from time to time take some old instrument out of his stock of working tools, will get his work-bench so cluttered up with

articles of only antiquarian interest that he cannot well do the work of to-day. But he who clears away the no longer usable tools of the past with a light and unholy joy, and with no more sentiment or reverence than if he were tossing old shoes and empty cans out of the cellar, is not a man who can be trusted to choose or make new things to put in place of the old. It must be done with reverence. Some old doctrines have been Bastilles for the imprisonment of the human spirit. They should be torn down. More of them have been shrines, and about them still lingers the sweet savour of the prayers of the saints. Perhaps they are not our shrines, and woe to us if we have not other shrines which serve us better. But to desecrate the old shrines with ribaldry and mirth, to prove ourselves with pride upon the superiority of our symbols and formulations when we break the jeweled windows and empty the niches in the sanctuaries of our fathers we can no longer use, is to disqualify ourselves for worship even at our own altars.

Let us go forward to new and more adequate formulations. We cannot serve God by blind adherence to the doctrines of our fathers, which cannot mean to us what they meant to them. If we are to be their worthy sons, we must be as free as they were, and as true as they were to the best that we know. Let us go forward courageously and reverently.

W. E. GARRISON.

IRONY

To climb a thousand mountains seeking joy,
Then find her in the valley, at your call;
To delve in stubborn mines in search of wealth,
Then find it, bared, within a garden wall.

—*Thomas Curtis Clark.*

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF OPINION

BY CHARLES A. S. DWIGHT, PH. D.

Head of the Department of Education, Keuka College, Keuka Park, N. Y.

An oft-quoted adage tells us that "thought divides." It does seem so. Since language was invented—or grew up—the conflict of opinion has gone on. The battle of ideas is incessant, and now, in these days of multiplied means of communication, it has become a regular rapid-fire of charge and counter-charge, criticism and rejoinder, dogmatisms and radicalisms. This, however, is no new fight; the verbal weapons may be different, and modern controversialists do not wear the armour of Saul, but the issues go back to the Milesian philosophers of Greece, or shade off into the vague traditions of India and China. Moses was learned in all the learning of the Egyptians—a very ancient and respectable curriculum. The world did not have to wait until we came into it before it knew anything. The lineage of language is long—and so of thought.

This conflict of opinion has not been wholly a disadvantage. Ideas are structural, and readily become ideals. It is important what a man believes, for no man will be better than his creed. Systems and symbols have their place; the great debates (as between Idealism and Nominalism in the Middle Ages, or Calvinism and Arminianism) have served an educative purpose, as wit-sharpeners, and stand no doubt for certain ideas which, whether they like it or not, continue to coerce the minds of men. We are quite willing to acknowledge also that even when faith has passed into the phase of fanaticism it has served as a glowing model of devotion, putting to shame the petty trifling, or the shallow cynicism, of the multitude. It is not the debates but the hates which we regret; not controversy but acrimonious controversy which is to be deprecated.

It is time now that the world learned how to differ amiably, even on important questions, how to allow for views of

great questions taken from different angles, and how to compensate what is lacking in one man's creed by citations from his brother's scheme of faith. The former ages may be forgiven for their intolerance which grew out of their intensity, but we must learn how to be intense without being narrow, and how to believe profoundly without discrediting the convictions of others. Our duty is to be patient with one another, remembering that at times the Lord may tell this saint in a whisper something that another believer will only learn from that saint's lips. Every prophet has a right to his own vision, and it takes all kinds of seers to complete the circle of a perfect prophecy. Spurgeon used to remark, apropos of the unfortunate differences and narrownesses of some (otherwise) good men: "It seems to me very strange that some brethren, who think so much of what the Spirit has revealed to them, should think so little of what He has revealed to other men." And this general line of remark applies not only to theology and philosophy but also to science, politics, and civic reform.

The question may now be raised as to the psychology of all this. *Why* do men differ so widely and constantly in their ideas, and policies growing out of those ideas? Is it all a chance variation, or are there underlying and persistent causes that account for these outgrowths of fanaticism, bigotry, and unbrotherliness? "There is a reason—in fact, there are several reasons. Without attempting a detailed psychological analysis, we may call attention to the following considerations:

1. Men are not, as an insightful thinker has pointed out, divided so much by their opinions as by their "elemental passions." They often *think*, we may add, that they act from a reason, whereas the only reason is that they act—by which we mean that the fundamental urge to action is something that lies back in their habit-history, or an emotional complex, or a characteristic temperament, or a "set" of prejudice, or a fanatical residual left over from some delirious dreaming, or other disintegrating state, and only after they act according to this primary urge do they stop to find or frame a plausible pretext for such a deed or policy. In many cases too no reason would be stated by such individuals, were it not in deference to con-

vention, and to justify their acts before the eyes of their fellow men, to whose judgment even fanatics are somewhat sensitive. So wars start up because men *want* to fight—and, after the die has actually been cast, all sorts of reasons for fighting are conjured up and given general publicity; so interdenominational feuds, unhappily too many in the past (we hope that they are in the past), have been born, in numerous instances, of deep-seated antipathies, or racial residues of hate, or divergent economic interests, or variant temperaments, or dissimilarities in tastes—and even a difference of tastes in jokes, Mark Twain said, is dangerous!

2. Akin to the above is the motivation which comes out of the “subconscious,” or “unconscious,” if we prefer that word—or some would say, the co-conscious. While the category of the “subconscious” is being employed by many writers to-day as a kind of abysm into which to throw all states or moods or actions not readily describable by accepted psychological formulæ, it does seem to serve the useful purpose, as a term, of calling attention to the fact that many, perhaps the most, of our experiences tend to slide into the background of our life, sinking below the level of consciousness, no longer recognized, perhaps never, as such, distinctly recalled to thought, but still there, that is, in our mental life, and conditioning, all unknown, our conscious experience, and our overt actions. Some of these are like undigested morsels in the stomach, creating a kind of temperamental dyspepsia, and accounting for a good deal of the sour and acid feeling entertained toward associates, especially when they attend another church. Our prejudices, then, are subterranean more than they are superficial; we are urged from below more than drawn from above; we are the slaves of our own past rather than the free makers of an untrammelled future; we are narrow because we never have been broad, and we hate our brother because we have never learned to love him. (We do not love him, too, because we do not know him. It is in a word the down-deep things that motivate our life; our tongues speak trippingly a long lot of explanations or “arguments” or excuses, but we speak as we do because we *are* what we are.

3. Furthermore, there is even a more subtle line of analy-

sis which leads to a consideration of the instinct (if there be a distinct instinct to be called by that name) of self-esteem, which may be a subtype of the undeniable interest of self-preservation. Even after all that we have said of the emotional phases and the subconscious motivation of life is admitted, it remains a wonder to many of us why numbers of men (we can all mention many cases) do so tenaciously cling to views they have advanced in theology, philosophy, science, or politics. What good does it to them to be so obstinate? Why are they not more docile and suggestible? Why not more willing to learn from their fellow men? Why not more reasonable, say, as to the relations of science and religion? Why so determined to uphold, at all hazards, a school, a platform, a method, or any other proposition? The answer seems to be afforded by this consideration—*thought never divides unless the thinkers are divided*. The variation is vital more than verbal; it is a battle of dynamisms, not just statuses. The personal equation here counts most strongly. For what is a man's opinion? It is he himself. Why does he not evince a willingness to give it up, or to modify it? Because having once adopted it (or inherited it out of his family line or being motivated by it subconsciously), it appears to him to be a part of himself; he has so thoroughly identified himself with it that a denial of it on the part of another man becomes an affront to his own dignity. Thus a subtle pride of opinion comes in which issues in a mood of obstinacy. So we have any number of fallacies, obscurantisms, and heresies perpetuated because each has a human sponsor, to whose heart this or that fad is dear, and who will not give it up because he does not want to deny himself. In plainer English, this means that such a man (and his name is legion) will not admit that he has made a mistake—or that his ancestors have—in taking up a position originally from which he cannot now (so long as he is *that kind* of a man) be pried out with a crowbar. Of course this is a false and unlovely attitude, and all such extreme individualists ought to remember that, as one has said, for a man to admit that he has made a mistake is only to claim that he is wiser to-day than he was yesterday.

We do not, indeed, assert that all differences among religi-

ous people are due to pride of opinion, or a subtle self-esteem, leading them to assume that they, more than others, are intelligent, and have better thought things out. We do suspect, however, that a large number of these controversies, which so sadly impede the progress of the Kingdom (there is only one) are simply impudent idiosyncrasies of egotistical individuals, and are not due to any real interest in "the truth," or in "progressive civilization." For this reason we have to-day, in the ecclesiastical as well as political realms, a condition which is describable not as a conflict of ideas but of ignorances. What then is the cure? A profounder study of psychology and anthropology, history, and the Bible itself, showing us out of what kind of a soil spring the weeds of ignorant dogmatism, narrow intolerance, and denominational misunderstanding, and with all that a plentiful supply of the regenerative grace of Jesus Christ, breeding a new type of mental and moral man, rendering men not less thoughtful when they think, not less ardent as they believe, but always as ready to locate the next-coming revelation in the word of their brother as in their own closed-circuit of self-esteem.

CHARLES A. S. DWIGHT.

When I survey the wondrous cross
On which the Prince of Glory died,
My richest gain I count but loss,
And pour contempt on all my pride.

Were the whole realm of nature mine,
That were a present far too small;
Love so amazing, so Divine,
Demands my soul, my life, my all.

—Isaac Watts.

CHRISTIAN UNION—WHAT IS THE GOAL?

BY REV. J. F. TAINTOR

Formerly Head of the Department of English Literature,
Ripon College, Ripon, Wisconsin

IN a recent number of *The Quarterly*, "The Younger Man" says, "Why don't we take our coats off and work together?" It is most desirable to work vigorously and to work in harmony as he urges us to do, but what shall we work for? What is our goal? What do we mean when we talk about Christian unity? I have read a good deal on the subject and I have never yet found any one to tell me exactly what the goal is. We beat about the bush, we do not face the real issue, we do not state definitely what the thing is that we so much desire.

Surely the goal is not uniformity. If the trees of the forest were all one kind of tree, how much of beauty the forest would lose. Yet there is a sort of root harmony, or unity, that allows the oak to express itself in its own way; that permits the maple to reveal a different type of life, and to make autumn glorious with its colour; that places no hindrance before the elm, but says, "Spread your branches outward, after the fashion of all elms." All these are still parts of the forest. It is this sort of root harmony that we are seeking, something that will make no effort to rob the individual tree of its inherent rights.

Is our goal then the abolishing of denominational lines, the throwing down of every distinctive feature of Presbyterianism and of every peculiarity of the Methodist Episcopal or of the Baptist Church? If we mean that, as we do not, it is only because, unconsciously, but really we believe that the church resulting from such discarding denominations, will be the church of our own particular sort. In the utmost frankness and fairness let it be said that the Roman Catholic Church has no other conception of union than that which absorbs all others into the

one "true church," that is, into the Church of Rome. Anything else for the great majority of Catholic leaders is unthinkable. This is not said as a criticism, but as a statement of fact.

This, however, is precisely the thing that the denominations will not do and, in any real union, ought not to do. The solution of our problem is not to be found in the attempt to gather all the smaller denominations under the sheltering wing of some one larger denomination.

Shall we, then, work for absolute accord in doctrine, for creedal unity? The writer of these lines once made a tour among a certain group of churches, in company with representatives of other churches. The Catholic priest was with us, though apparently a little uncertain of his ground. It was his daily explanation, when speaking of our unity, that we were all agreed on the ten commandments. Surely that sort of unity, even if broader, would not warrant any of us in abandoning our own form of Christian life. Agreement upon a creed would not make union.

Is our goal federation? That is tangible, definite. We might all work for it with our "coats off." But we have something of that sort now. Many of those who desire union are not willing to go into it. As far as it goes it is desirable; but it is not the final goal.

I have nothing new to suggest. I wish merely to state baldly, openly, the thing which, as it seems to me, we all see but will not look at. It will not commend itself to the vast majority, but, at any rate, no harm can come from putting one's foot in to the very center of the bush, instead of beating around it.

What, then, is our goal? Assuming always, as we must, Christian character on the part of the churches, the goal is this: That spiritual state of the Christian Church, in which every branch of the Church, from papal Rome to the Holy Rollers, is recognized as on the same footing as every other branch. The Adventists are as really "the Church" as is the Church of Rome. There is no more authority coming down from apostolic days upon the Church of England than there is upon the Salvation Army. This is the goal: A recognition by all that every Chris-

tian church is "the true Church." Nothing less than this will secure unity. For this we may work vigorously if we will.

I do not expect those who represent the supposedly true Church to agree to this. But it is necessary to face this fact before we go very far on the way toward real unity. This is the invisible, unrecognized specter that stands behind all our discussions, behind all high strung theories about the Church. It is a specter that will not down until we clothe it with flesh and breathe into it the breath of life. It is here, and here only, that we find the root harmony of the forest, that recognizes each tree as a part of the forest—each denomination as a part of the "true Church."

I always rejoice when I see two churches in a small community join together for Christian service. Usually my joy is short lived, but the thing looks in the right direction. I rejoice too, when two denominations attempt to reconcile their differences and unite in the Lord's service. But such things have little bearing on the essential problem of unity. I have often watched with pleasure two drops of rain on the window glass start downward on separate courses, gradually approach each other, and finally blend. Yet it is only the great mother earth that can take all the rain drops and unify them in soil, river, lake, or ocean. The blending of two churches means, relatively, no more than the blending of the two raindrops.

If my readers have followed me thus far, either with approval or with disapproval, some of them may be willing to go on and note some of the conclusions which follow upon the conception of Christian unity as I have presented it.

It follows, first, that we must look upon one another—all of us—as, in the sight of God, standing on a common level, having equal rights and equal privileges. We "make no more giants"; we "elevate the race at once." All the gorgeous paraphernalia of the papal regalia, all the many coloured uniforms that precede, that bear aloft, that follow the Pope on ecclesiastical occasions, desirable and delightful though they may be in themselves, cannot, so far as Divine recognition is concerned, lift him above the level of the newly but truly converted man in South Africa.

A second conclusion follows. So far as denominations are concerned, "all service ranks the same with God." All—the Roman Church, the Greek Church, the English Church, the Lutheran Church, the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church, and all other churches—are "the Church." All hold their place in the world by the authority of Christ; and for that authority they must go back of Rome, back of Peter, back of Paul, to the ever living and present Christ.

May I use a concrete illustration? A Congregational minister, and I happen to be one, says to the humblest member of his congregation: "I make no claim for myself that I do not make for you. I am, by your request, your leader, but you are in every Christian way my equal. Your rights and privileges, before God, are the same as mine. We are all kings and priests to God."

Then, that same minister turns his face toward the ecclesiastical pomp and splendour that surround the papal throne, and humbly, yet with a fine consciousness of his own dignity, he says to the man who sits upon that throne: "That which is yours before God, is mine also. Are you in the apostolic line? I also trace my lineage back even further, back to the Lord Christ Himself. Are you of the true Church? I also. Are you the vicar of Christ? I also act as his substitute, his representative. There is nothing Divine that you claim for yourself, that I cannot claim for myself, and, therefore, for all the Christian people among whom I dwell."

In plain language, if anything plainer is needed, this means that a Baptist Church, in its Divine dignity, is the equal of Rome; that a Baptist minister is as truly in the line of apostolic succession as the Pope himself.

This may sound like the ravings of a madman to those who are accustomed to cherish highly ecclesiastical dignity, but if we are ever to have Christian unity, to this very thing we must come. In all humility we will sit at the feet of pope, of priest, of minister and learn; but in the dignity of our Divine birthright, we will not bow down to any man who says: "Because of these fine trappings, because of a mythical historic link, I am holier than thou." We will not accept a place of inferiority where

God has made us equal. It is no more difficult for an episcopally ordained clergyman to recognize the apostolic ordination of a Presbyterian minister than it is for a Presbyterian minister to bow to the episcopally ordained as his superior. As long as our authority before God is not recognized as equal to any other, to talk about church unity is as idle as talking in one's sleep.

Another conclusion that follows from our conception of the goal is this: There must be perfect freedom in the expression of the religious denominational life. By this conception no branch of the Church departs from its creed, from its ritual, from its ecclesiastical forms, from its own way of expressing its life. It asks simply for the root freedom of the forest, for a life of happy union, blended with variety.

As an individual I am happiest when I can express my own religious life in the way to which I have been accustomed, cold and severe as that way may be. I am as the tree that does not care to be like its more majestic neighbour. But I am as well pleased that my Methodist friends should express their religious life in the Methodist way, and the Catholic in the Catholic way. I do not want them to be as I am. It would spoil a good Methodist to express his life in my way.

I say, therefore, to all "We be brethren." We are children of one Father. We know no high and no low before God. We are all equal in his sight—equal not in intellect or ability, but equal as a father's sons are equal before him. This makes for union. For this we may all work without doing despite to our own or to others. Only—

Another conclusion follows upon our definition. It is this: The very thing which, as I am saying, makes for union really makes for war. "I came not to send peace, but a sword." So the Lord Himself said, and, therefore, I make no apology for the fact that this conception of union makes war, unrelenting war, upon the notion that any one church is any more than any other, the true Church. It means war upon the idea that any Christian minister, for some supposed material connection with the Apostles, through the laying on of hands—sometimes of unclean hands—is any more a minister before God than the man who ignores an imaginary chain and traces his spiritual an-

cestry through righteousness back to Christ. We may as well recognize the fact that there will be no Christian union, while one branch of the Church says to another branch of the Church: "I am holier than thou. I have nearer access to God." That is not true, and some day the truth will prevail.

J. F. TAINTOR.

LIGHT

How beautiful is light!
 Light as it dawns and deepens into day,
 Light, tender, wistful as it dies away;
 Light of the moon appearing through the trees,
 Peacefully resting on the restless seas:
 Light in the clouds of grandeur and of dread;
 After long voyages, home-shore lights ahead:
 Lamp-light that streams through open cottage door,
 Telling of joy and rest when toil is o'er:
 Firelight within (while storms without we hear),
 Shining on books beloved and friends long dear;
 When dark the night descends across the plain,
 Lights of a village twinkling through the rain;
 Starlight that, silent, whispers of God's throne;
 Light of the eyes in love that meet our own:
 Glow of church-windows in a scene snow-white
 While songs of worship ring out in the night.
 Sunlight that softly seeks the hallowed place
 Where sinners pray for God's forgiving grace.

O Thou, the true and everlasting Light,
 Who art the source of all things pure and bright,
 These lesser rays on earthly paths that shine
 Speak of the cloudless sunlight—Love Divine!
 Father of Lights, by Spirit and by Word,
 Lighten our darkness, we beseech Thee, Lord!

—*Maud Frazer Jackson.*

CHURCH UNION IN CANADA

BY HUGH L. KEENLEYSIDE, PH.D.

Professor of Social History, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

THE history of religion has been characterized by the operation of centrifugal forces. In every religious era, however, there have been efforts put forth—usually in vain, it is true—to promote unity and establish tolerance. The unification of the swarming sectaries of the Roman Empire under papal control was the most successful of Christian attempts at unification, but even this unity was incomplete, as the revolts of the Waldensians, Hussites, Lollards, and many other groups attest. Since Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin substituted the doctrine of justification by faith for the ideal of papal supremacy, the western world has witnessed the birth of a multitude of independent sects, and the number of these bodies has been further augmented by the development of the modern nationalistic State.

Even in the midst of this triumph of particularism, however, the struggle for unity among the Christian churches continues. The difficulty of achieving success in this struggle is not, as is too generally stated, due alone to the jealous bigotry of those with a vested interest in the existing state of disunion. It is also due in part to the disapproval of those who thoughtfully and sincerely believe that union, even among the Protestant denominations, would mean a stultifying of progress, a period of intellectual stagnation. Whether or not this fear is justified no one is, as yet, in a position to decide, and it is this fact that adds a real social interest to the contemporary projects of church unity.

It is probable that the modern worship of "efficiency" has done more than any other single factor to promote interest in consolidation. The spectacle of competing churches and duplication of building and missionary activities is a painful one to

the practical churchman of this generation. The desire for efficient organization is not, however, the only explanation of this new movement. It has become more generally realized during recent years that minor differences of doctrine have caused major infractions of the spiritual association that should unite the followers of Christ. Church union is one method that has been adopted to end this disharmony. Whether or not it is the correct way can only be decided after trial. And it is this fact that gives the present experiment in Canada its chief interest and value.

Europe has experienced the widest expression of this desire for unity. That continent has even seen an attempt at *rapprochement* between the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches. Although productive of no formal agreement and denounced by the orthodox of each church, the conferences at Malines were quietly supported by tolerant opinion. In England the Lambeth Conference of the Anglican Church went so far as to consider, and in principle approve, the unification of Roman, English, and Eastern communions. Various other proposals, on a smaller scale, are under discussion or in process of realization.

In Australia an attempt to consolidate certain Protestant denominations, although it has temporarily failed, is continuing with an apparent assurance of eventual success.

In the United States the first important results of this movement will probably be found in the reuniting of the two major branches of Methodism, and it seems likely that this will be followed by further additions.* In this country, of course, the controversy between fundamentalism and modernism is still raging, and this will tend to delay any wide-spread projects of unification.

Canada is the scene of the first completed and important project of church union. By examining the present situation and following future developments in the Dominion, it may be possible to judge of the value of these new attempts at the formal expression of Christian brotherhood. It may soon be possible to tell whether union tends to strengthen the conserva-

* Several branches of the Lutheran Church have already united, and the movement is rapidly spreading.

tive or the liberal elements in the churches involved; whether its effect is to weaken or strengthen the church bureaucracy; and whether widening the bonds of denominational brotherhood will tend to increase or decrease the emphasis now being placed on the social significance of the life of Christ.

It is important to understand the situation in Canada that the future development of the experiment may be followed more intelligently.

The union consists of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches, and the way is left open for the entrance of other denominations. The three churches have a total membership (including adherents) of approximately 2,500,000, which is 30 per cent of the Canadian population. This total is composed of 1,400,000 Presbyterians, 1,150,000 Methodists, and 35,000 Congregationalists.*

The movement for union in the Dominion started between 1899 and 1903 in an attempt "*to prevent any unseemly rivalry and any waste of men and means*" in the Home Mission fields of western Canada. The Presbyterian Church took the initial step, but in 1902 the Methodists suggested an organic union of the three participating churches. A joint committee was formed and the Anglicans and Baptists were invited to participate. The former made a "cordial and brotherly" answer, but have so far taken no further action. The Baptists, the backbone of Canadian fundamentalism, made a declaration of the "distinctive principles" of their church, and refused to consider union. This refusal was probably an excellent thing for the United Church, as it made unnecessary the compromise with the ultra-conservative Baptist dogma, which would otherwise have been inevitable. It would also have interfered with the social programme which the Methodist Church has developed, and which it hopes to extend under the auspices of the United Church.

A Basis of Union was approved by the joint committee in 1908, and it was accepted by all the churches. The minority in

* For purposes of comparison the following totals for other churches may be given:

Roman Catholics.....	3,380,000	Greek Catholics	170,000
Anglicans	1,400,000	Jews	125,000
Baptists.....	420,000	Mennonites	58,000
Lutherans.....	287,000		

the Presbyterian Church was so powerful, however, that it succeeded in blocking action. Another committee was appointed to revise the Basis, and the following years were devoted to propaganda among the disapproving Presbyterians. (It is to be noted that in all churches the leadership was more thoroughly in favour of union than was the rank and file. This is creditable because in many cases it meant the loss of important church offices.)

The revised Basis of Union was reported by the committee in 1915, and in 1916 the Presbyterians agreed to join by action of the second assembly after the close of the war. This declaration stirred up the irreconcilables to such an extent that the General Assembly of 1917 had to request that all propaganda on both sides be dropped until the end of the war, and that "a spirit of prayer be cultivated." The Assembly of 1921 voted to join the union.

By 1921, then, the three denominations were ready to coalesce. It was still necessary, however, to get a bill through Parliament incorporating the new church and legalizing the transfer to it of the properties now held by the separate bodies. Furthermore, the opposition within the Presbyterian Church was still vigorous, although in numbers it was not of vital importance. This opposition, however, threatened to block the enabling act in its progress through the House of Commons, but public opinion shortly forced Parliament to legislate in accordance with the desire of the churches. The act, as it finally passed, provided for the withdrawal from the union of any congregation which voted to that effect, and permitted such congregations to take with them their church properties. There have been practically no withdrawals among Methodist or Congregational bodies, and up to the present only 375 Presbyterian churches have declared their independence, and 1169 have voted for union. The conservative province of Ontario is responsible for the great majority of withdrawals—the record of the city of Toronto being especially hostile to union.

The General Council is the ruling body of the United Church, and consists of equal numbers (150) of lay and clerical members of the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches, 40 of the

Congregationalists and 10 representatives of the union churches of the west. (These union churches were founded in communities too poor to support the different denominations, and they are merely reuniting with their parent bodies.) The organization of the new church is practically identical with that of the Presbyterian Church. The Basis of Union also provides for ministerial training, and consolidation of missions, publishing houses, colleges, and benevolent funds.

The religious record of Canada in modern times has been characterized by a rather broad tolerance. Although the larger churches have been divided into liberal and conservative elements, there has never been any serious attempt made by either group to drive the other out of the Church, as has so frequently happened in the United States.* There is modernism and fundamentalism, but little intolerance. In preparing the doctrinal statement of the new church it was, then, necessary to provide for the inclusion of both liberals and conservatives. This was done by adopting a conservative creedal statement, but by requiring only a general adherence to it.

The cardinal points of this creed are belief in the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ, salvation by Faith, the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the resurrection, "eternal punishment," and life eternal. There is the usual attempt to reconcile the existence of sin and the omnipotence of God. The doctrines of free will, the virgin birth, and original sin are restated. The new church recognizes "as a part, more or less pure, of the universal brotherhood, every particular church throughout the world which professes this faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him. . . ." Apparently the United Church is still firm in its belief that only eternal punishment is in store for all non-believers in the Divinity of Christ. Good works are recognized, but only in conjunction with faith. So much for the conservatives.

Those who are struggling to liberalize and "modernize" the Church are provided for by the statement that ministers (and presumably, communicants) of the United Church are required

* This statement, unfortunately, is not altogether true of the Canadian Baptists.

to be only "*in essential agreement*" with the doctrines outlined. Or, as elsewhere stated, they must accept this (doctrinal statement) "*as in substance agreeable* to the teachings of the Holy Scripture." These clauses provide for the slight differences in the dogma of the uniting churches as well as allowing a width of personal interpretation which will provide a foothold for the many liberals in each denomination.

This, then, is the situation as it stands. Only the future can prove or demonstrate its value. This Canadian experiment is likely to have a place of real importance in the history of the Christian Church.

HUGH L. KEENLEYSIDE.

THE UNITED CHURCH

In clear, calm splendour of his rapture-hour
Christ saw his Church all glorious as one—
A robe without a seam— both finely spun,
And woven fair—the Spirit's wealthy dower
To clothe the Bride with winsome grace and power,
That so her Word with winged feet might run
To every struggling soul; to men undone,
That they might know He is their rock and tower.

And this young land had seen the vision fair
Of Christ's loved Bride so clothed to win the world;
And now hath found the will and way to dare
That Christless flags of schism shall be furled,
And churches march, a great triumphant host,
With Christ as Lord, and with no other boast.

—D. L. Ritchie.

INTERCHURCH GOVERNMENT

AN ESSAY ON THE ADVANTAGES OF FEDERATION AS EXEMPLIFIED
BY THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF
CHRIST IN AMERICA

BY CLARENCE R. ATHEARN

Research Associate, Boston University School of Religious Education and
Social Service, Boston, Mass.

I. *Federation is necessary if Protestantism is to survive its two great antagonists, Paganism and Catholicism.* The "crisis of the churches" is a phrase with which the conflict against paganism has made us familiar. A leading national journal of religion recently asked this question of a group of the most influential social students in the American Church: *After nineteen hundred years has Christianity seriously modified the pagan character of human society?*

"Their answer," says the editor of this journal, "is an amazing revelation. In a series of articles they declare with surprising unanimity that the industry, the economics, the politics, our nationalist conceptions and practices, and the international relations of our so-called Christian civilization are *based upon and shot through and through with utterly pagan implications.* A society dominated by Christian men is found to be governed by rules which are non-Christian, anti-Christian, flagrantly pagan." This statement has been borne out by so many facts, drawn from the social, economic, political, and even educational and religious life of the nation, that it cannot be relegated to the limbo of flamboyant utterances of excitable fanatics.

Many books recently issued on this subject agree that the churches are facing a crisis. Among them are such suggestive titles as the following: *The Church and the New World Order, Preaching Against Paganism, The Church at the Crossroads, The Church in the Furnace, The Outlook for Religion, The*

Church and the Hour, The Reconstruction of Religion, The Reconstruction of the Church, Can We Still Be Christians?, Shall We Stand By the Church?, Why Not Face the Facts?, The New Horizon of State and Church, The Challenge of the Present Crisis, etc., etc.

A few of these authors content themselves with urging that the Church must provide the spiritual foundations of social reconstruction, but most of them find necessary some form of reorganization of the Church itself before it can adequately cope with present day problems, or stay the rising tide of the pagan demoralization of democracy. Among the latter are such men as President Faunce, Dean Brown, Arthur E. Holt, Graham Taylor, W. E. Orchard, L. P. Jacks, Professor J. M. Mecklin, Professor C. A. Ellwood, Paul M. Strayer, Bishop McConnell, Charles S. Macfarland, Paul Vogt, Samuel S. Batten, George B. Cutten, H. Rashdall, William Boyle, Charles D. Williams, Albert P. Fitch, Peter Ainslie, Joseph H. Odell, William T. Ellis, A. O. Lovejoy, W. A. Brown, William Robinson, Daniel Lamont, Frank Crane, Lyman Abbott, John R. Mott, and John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

If spiritual force is to conquer paganism it must be properly directed. This is the conclusion of Mr. Rockefeller. "The Church must have a new birth and be reorganized to meet this marvelous opportunity and great human need. This is the right, logical, and natural solution of the problem. It must be realized; and the responsibility therefor rests upon each member of the Christian Church."

Recent developments in England and America are reminding us of the real issues between Protestantism and Catholicism. Questions of doctrine and ritual are not so alarming or irritating as those of polity and administration. Under the plea of toleration Catholicism is sweeping the country. With a membership five times as great as the largest Protestant body, its rate of growth since 1890 surpasses that of any other church. To aid this advance several methods have been used. First: The emphasis on religious toleration has diverted attention from the irreconcilable contrast between the autocratic Church and the democratic State. Second: There is the well-known

expression of a pseudo-patriotism (or, if sincere, logically inconsistent), which professes loyalty to our country and forefathers (Columbus and Charles Carroll), making, at the same time, mental reservation that the spiritual is above the temporal power. Third: The promotion of the parochial school system challenges the right of the State to educate for democracy; for this system the Catholic Church is now preparing to contend with the State before the Supreme Court of the land. Fourth: A new philosophic movement known as Neo-scholasticism is gaining headway in this country; this movement attempts to reconcile Catholic theology and natural science, and to present a religious philosophy which will appeal to the educated classes of America. All this, apart from the influence and prestige which the Catholic Church has gained in political life, makes it evident that this church is preparing to enroll two-thirds, rather than only one-third of America's religious citizens under its banners.

When it is remembered that fifty-six per cent of the population belongs to no church whatever, it becomes certain that no single Protestant sect alone can hope to hold its own against either Catholicism or Paganism. If church people are not to be ruled by the Devil or the Pope, they must unite to rule themselves through some form of interchurch federation.

II. *Federation is the most promising method of Christian union.* Doctrine and polity have been the Scylla and Charybdis which have prevented efforts at church union from reaching the haven of peace. Historically, now one and now the other, has been uppermost as a cause of controversy. They are closely related and often confused; sometimes doctrine has been used as a camouflage to defeat an opponent when the real issue was purely political. The relative importance of these aspects of the problem in our own time may be ascertained by considering the relationship of the doctrinal, ethical, and political aspects of church life. This relationship is much that of the relation of thought, feeling, and will in the life of an individual. One's conduct and disposition are largely formed before a systematic intellectual view of life is built up, and yet by taking thought we are often brought to modify our habits of conduct. The

Church seeks to present a Way of Life by means of the worship of a Divine personality. Her doctrines and creeds are an attempt to give a convenient intellectual expression as to what this best life means. Hence, creeds and beliefs of the past are so closely associated with moral values that any attempt to recast these forms into new intellectual moulds is met as a violation of the sacred. Yet, as we grasp truth not alone by the intellect but by the whole life, it would seem that philosophical disputation was important only as it does involve moral values. Why quarrel over the logical expression or intellectual foundation of beliefs, when it is admitted that at bottom they all represent a similar religious experience and all issue in a righteous life? Realizing that the demands of logic must be met, yet, since we are not entirely intellectual beings, is it not reasonable to suppose that the logic of their lives would outstrip complete doctrinal statements of the experience involved? Jesus did not ask that his disciples master a complete philosophical system or accept an infallible systematic theology before they could proceed to follow Him. He tested Peter's belief in Him and love of Him by the command "Feed my sheep." Creedal discussion, without reference to its moral significance, appears as barren as scholastic speculation. So long as there is this agreement as to moral outcomes, the situation in our present day as to Christian union is one involving not so much doctrinal as ethical consideration. Neither differences in ideas nor differences in emotions can separate the followers of Christ, unless they be such as to lead away from Christ's ethical teachings. Here again it appears that Church union is a matter of co-operation in the preservation and increase of moral values.

But co-operation demands organization and organization is a political matter. All political systems have ethical needs as their origin and purpose. The State exists to conserve moral life; the Church exists to increase moral values by spiritualizing the life of the people. The common realization of similar ethical standards demands a unified organization. This organization must be flexible enough to allow for the variety of opinions of speculative pioneers, for the varieties of mystical experience, and for those whose preferential insight, whose

spiritual desires, demand a higher and more advanced ethical standard.

In emphasizing the political aspect, the importance of efforts at doctrinal reconciliation, to find the universal truth which underlies our universal religious experience, is not to be underestimated. As Dr. James Cooper once said, "The truth will bring peace, the truth as it is in Jesus, stated, apprehended, grasped with intense realization of the duties it imposes." We must also recognize the value and necessity for the stability of any political organization, of a large body of common knowledge, sentiments, ideals, and loyalties, especially common loyalty to a Divine Saviour. These fundamental loyalties, however, will be more surely secured and more widely disseminated by means of a united rather than a divided Church.

Efforts at practical co-operation have produced more permanent and beneficial results than many conferences on doctrinal reconciliation. As a matter of fact, very often the doctrines on which these bodies fail to come to an agreement are those most intimately related to the polity and administration of the Church. For all these reasons the contention is that the solution of the problem of organization for church union will not be doctrinal in nature but ethical and political. In spite of their various rational categories of explanation, and their contradictory ideational labels, the churches are largely one in spiritual experience and moral purpose. A common ethical purpose must find its expression through a common political mechanism. The churches must find some large political plan through which their united spiritual energies may be concentrated on their common task. Social amelioration depends upon the political reorganization of the Church. But just as the former is a matter of social science, so the latter is primarily a matter of political science, and not a matter of doctrinal adjustment. The Church of the future must be a temple spacious enough for all the winds of doctrine to blow through, each breathing its own distinctive music and bearing its own indispensable message to the spirit.

In a progressive civilization there must always be doctrinal and ethical differences, but these may best be adjudicated

if they all exist under a common political system which is flexible enough to adjust itself to the demands of progress. It is because the Federal Council of Churches provides such a system that it offers the most promising avenue toward Christian union.

III. *Federation is the most practical method of inter-church administration.* That the demands of life outgrow the bounds of doctrinal definitions is nowhere more evident than in the number of co-operative organizations which have been formed by the churches to meet the life needs of a new age. In a powerful passage Bishop McConnell says that any serious cherishing of traditional and divisive peculiarities must be abandoned in the face of the great tasks which only a united Church can accomplish. He outlines "three great campaigns which call for the united effort of all the churches, none of them requiring any surrender by the churches of any denominational loyalty: the conflict with the forces of physical might, conflict with the forces arising from control of the material goods of this world, the conflict with a public opinion at times the expression of animal and mob instincts. These three constitute a veritable triune anti-Christ, whose overthrow will require all the power of the Church." He goes on to emphasize the necessity of co-operative effort in religious education, evangelism, and missions. (*Living Together*, p. 81.) In the effort to meet the great evils pointed out above the churches have organized co-operative commissions, bureaus, or associations more or less permanent and powerful. In fact, the Bishop's outline of the problems to be met, makes a good classification of the organizations which have been formed to meet the need; namely, those dealing with war, with social injustice, with the dissemination of general religious information to influence public opinion; and further, with the more specific tasks of the Church, missions, evangelism, and religious education.

The Year Book of the Churches lists ninety-five such inter-church administrative bureaus. Reviewing briefly the powers and duties of these bureaus, it may be said that they serve as a clearing house for the exchange of views on projects of common interest, with the ultimate object of united action. They dis-

tribute information, conduct conferences, and submit recommendations. Their function is purely advisory in every case. The power of such agencies is limited in two ways: (1) Their financial resources are reduced to the lowest possible point and the means of collecting funds restricted. (2) The churches have been unwilling to bind themselves in advance to follow the recommendations of such co-operative bodies. Interdenominational organization rests at present on what may be called the level of immediate consent. No interchurch body has any degree of authoritative jurisdiction whatever.

One reason for the retarded development of these organizations may be that they have been regarded as temporary devices to meet passing emergencies. Because they have come into being to meet special exigencies, there is a great deal of overlapping and duplication of function among these different bureaus. Many undertake a number of activities. Some have lost their usefulness. There is much waste of energy, much duplication of effort.

In the midst of all this working at cross purposes, the Federal Council offers an opportunity for the simplification and systematization of organization. In the place of unco-ordinated, incidental, inefficient, wasteful, and temporary effort, it offers opportunity for continued, co-ordinated, systematic, efficient, economic, and permanent co-operation.

The Federal Council is the most comprehensive of all the interchurch administrative bureaus. The scope of its work is shown by the following list of its activities:

1. *Permanent Commissions*

Commission on Interchurch Federations

“ “ Evangelism

“ “ the Church and Social Service

“ “ “ “ “ Country Life

National Temperance Society and Commission on Temperance

Commission on Christian Education

“ “ International Justice and Good-will

“ “ Relations with the Orient

2. *Permanent and Special Committees*

Committee on Foreign Missions

“ “ Home Missions

Home Missions Council (Co-operating Body)

Washington Committee

General War-time Commission of the Churches

General Committee on Army and Navy Chaplains

Committee on Family Life and Religious Rest Day

“ “ Negro Churches

3. *Committees for Special Causes*

Committee for Christian Relief in France and Belgium

“ on Christian Work in the Canal Zone

“ “ Religious Conditions in Russia

“ “ African Affairs

IV. *Federation has been justified by its results.* The few years since the organization of the Federal Council in 1908 have been packed full of remarkable accomplishments. Thirty denominations have signified their general assent to the principle of federation, and are now co-operating through twenty commissions, which are working upon important interchurch programmes. City federations have been organized in more than fifty major municipalities. Organizations in such cities as Chicago, St. Louis, Harrisburg, Paterson, Detroit, Rochester, Milwaukee, Pittsburgh, Atlanta, Cleveland, Toledo, Norfolk, Buffalo, Indianapolis, Wichita, Kansas City, Dayton, Duluth, Cincinnati, Boston, Seattle, Sacramento, San Francisco, and New York, all testify by their achievements to the value of this work. State Councils of Churches have been formed in Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Ohio, California, New York, Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, South Dakota, and New Jersey. State and city Councils promote co-operation in such matters as evangelism, social welfare work, law enforcement, improvement of race relations, religious publicity, supervision of recreation and amusements, preservation of the Sabbath Day, creating public opinion as to world peace and industrial

relations, conducting union religious services, and promoting Christian unity.

There is space but for a brief reference to the work of the various commissions of the Federal Council. The Commission on Social Service has been active in organizing conferences between employers, pastors, and employees. Its statements with reference to child labour, and the coal and railway strikes have had the power of a united Church behind them. The Commission on Evangelism has organized the Protestant churches for a common expression of religious feeling in a Fellowship of Prayer during the Lenten season, and has conducted in a number of cities evangelistic campaigns noted for their power and the permanence of their results. In harmony with its function as an interchurch administrative bureau, the Federal Council has undertaken the task of distributing information, and creating public opinion on all matters of common concern to the churches. Each of its commissions has issued several volumes pertaining to its work. A department of publicity has had remarkable success and encouragement from publishers, in presenting the common causes and interests of the churches through the public press. No single denomination could alone obtain such publicity for any cause, however righteous. One result of this united action is seen in the Council's efforts toward Christian internationalism, 12,500,000 letters urging reduction of armament having been received by the Advisory Committee of the Washington Conference, as a direct result of the activity of the Federal Council of Churches. Interest in world peace has not been confined to pious advice. Appeals for Russian and Japanese relief met with greater response because they came from a united Church. Measures have been taken for the relief of the clergy in the war-stricken lands of Germany, Belgium, and France, as well as in Russia. Sympathetic relations have been established with the Greek Church. European Protestant churches, urged by the example and influence of the Federal Council, now have a more united organization than ever before in history. The Council for European Protestantism is international as well as interchurch. The universal world church, which has made such a powerful appeal under an imperial or-

ganization, now promises to come into being under more democratic auspices.

The results of federal church co-operation have proved its value, from the smallest country community to world organization. Such co-operation offers opportunity for the practice of the Christian virtues and religious ideals, which the ministers of the churches have been so sincerely preaching, in the local community as well as in national and international affairs. The final pragmatic justification of church federation may be expressed in the words of President Wilson when he urged a similar co-operation in order that "the brotherhood of mankind may no longer be a fair and empty phrase," but "may be given a structure of force and reality."

V. *The problems of federation can only be solved by participation, never by isolation.* First, there is the problem of the jurisdiction which is to be given to co-operative bodies. As to whether interdenominational bureaus shall be granted enlarged jurisdiction or their powers be constantly delimited, there are divergent attitudes among church people. While popular opinion is growing in favour of union, denominational leaders have been rightly cautious of too rapid advance. In local and national Councils two points of view have appeared. On the one side are those whose chief concern is community betterment, on the other, those whose chief interest is in preserving sectarian loyalties. Similar divergent attitudes appear in the co-operative committees. Certain members, laymen in diplomacy, are interested in their work on its technical side—surveys, statistical work, methods of evangelism, research and publication, administrative technique. The denominational diplomats, on the other hand, are constantly fussing about church sovereignty, denominational independence, and sectarian interests. The former have in mind the positive achievement of results in the field of action of the co-operative commission; the latter, the negative aim of protecting and defending denominational interests. So far as sectarian sovereignty and independence are real considerations in this day and generation and in the special fields where these bureaus operate, the denominational diplomats can only be praised for guarding the holiest of holies and

the experts only regarded as dangerously indifferent to the greater things of life. So far as this assumption is unsound, however, the reverse is true. It is unquestionably true that interchurch unions have arisen to supply the moral, social, and religious needs of men, and not to be subservient to the political ambitions of the denominations.

But interchurch organizations cannot continue to supply these larger religious needs, so long as they are hampered by lack of power. They are not given adequate power; the situations in which they are placed are beyond their control, and limitation to advisory powers insisted on, because the churches do not see any necessity for acting otherwise. The necessity is present, latent in the situation but it is not recognized. If it is not soon recognized interdenominational relations will grow worse instead of better; conditions will become more chaotic; suspicions now rife will grow in bitterness; demoralization will ensue. The fight against paganism will be lost. The responsibility lies with denominational leaders to recognize the need and its solution. The churches will delegate authority to administrative bureaus only when convinced of its necessity. That they have not done so in the past is due to the absence of this conviction, which in turn is due to the weakness of the case made out by the advocates of interchurch organization, who have talked much of the beauties of doctrinal peace, but little of the substantial economies and political advantages of interdenominational government. The cause of the deficiencies of the Federal Council and other interchurch administrative bodies is largely the weakness of support given by those denominational leaders in the best position to support them. The chief weakness of the federation movement lies in the fact that delegates to city, state, and national Federal Councils are mere "unofficial observers" without power to act. The remedy lies not in isolation but in participation.

Second, there is the problem of denominational sovereignty, and the rights of small denominations. Interchurch federation does not involve the surrender of denominational sovereignty any more than the Federal Union demands the surrender of the sovereignty of the states. This question, which was long

ago debated in the columns of the *Federalist*, has been revived by the League of Nations controversy. States were formerly so jealous of their independent sovereignty that each imagined it might still persist if, like the Ireland of Bishop Berkeley's imagination, it were "surrounded by a wall of brass sixty cubits high." The pressure of circumstances, however, has given rise to various modifications of this doctrine. To speak of a "divided sovereignty" seems illogical, yet it seems to offer a convenient description of co-operative national endeavour. The juristic theory of interstate federation, however, offers a more adequate explanation of this real social phenomenon. Just as individuals do not speak of giving up their independence when they sign a contract, or form a partnership, neither do states abandon their sovereignty when they ratify a constitution. States exercise their free will in binding themselves to the terms of a constitution, making provision for changing circumstances by the possibility of amendments. The location of executive power in specific matters may be definitely stated in the constitution. The modern tendency is toward centralization. The more recent constitutions provide either that the central government shall have jurisdiction over all matters not specifically granted to the states (as in Canada); or that central and state governments hold "concurrent jurisdiction" over all matters not specifically reserved to either (as in the German Republic). The Federal Council of Churches is at present only a "weak confederation." With proper constitutional provisions there is no danger of loss of denominational sovereignty.

The principle of federation, on the other hand, is one which is particularly adapted to preserving the rights of small denominations. Self-determination and equality are rights which are more likely to survive and receive justice in a democratic federation than in imperial competition. The fears of the small denominations that they will be overwhelmed in the councils of co-operative movements by larger sects are not justified in view of the provisions which the Federal Council makes for just representation. Any action of the Council must be approved by a majority of the denominations voting as denominations. To insist upon the unanimity rule would be to destroy all possibility

of action, and adopt a course now generally repudiated by writers on interstate relations. On the other hand, the various sects are represented according to their numbers by a form of proportional representation, which recognizes equality of capacities as well as equality of rights, and the equality of the individuals in the churches, as well as the equality of denominations.

A third problem is that of securing lay representation. It has been charged that the Federal Council is an ecclesiastical organization, making little provision for the co-operation of laymen. It is held that the Council is not a popular organization drawing its power from the people, but an ecclesiastical organization representing vested sectarian interests. Approximately 85% of the members of the Council and 76 of the 96 members of the Executive Committee are either ministers or professional church workers. Of course, expert leadership is necessary but, nevertheless, in the Constitution of the Council specific provision is made for lay participation. The literature of the Federal Council contains such sympathetic statements as the following:

The federation programme offers unlimited possibilities for the utilization of the strength of the lay membership of the churches. This makes the Council more truly representative of the whole Church and so better able to do the whole duty of the churches.

If there is any seeming lack of interest among laymen it is due to the difficulty of extending the principles of democracy to church government, but is not inherent in the principle of federation itself. The solution of this problem also lies not in isolation but in participation.

VI. *Federation is the best method by which to oppose autocracy in church government.* Hugo Grotius, in his *Law of War and Peace*, used both the inductive and deductive methods in arriving at his conclusions. What he could not establish by observing the practices of nations he sought to deduce from recognized ethical principles. In harmony with that method of approach, the first statements of this paper have dealt with the practical results of federation; the following considerations will

relate to the place of federation among other principles of government.

In international affairs there have been two policies contending for supremacy. The theory of imperialism is that all nations should submerge their separate individualities in one great empire. This was the theory for which the Holy Roman Empire stood, for which Germany fought in the World War, for which the Catholic Church contends to-day. The other theory is that of a Federation of co-equal powers, in which the right of self-determination of small communities, and small nations, shall be safeguarded.

The imperialistic theory, when applied to church government, shows two tendencies. At first the movement results in the elimination of small sects and the strengthening of the larger denominations. Imperialism is here seen working toward the establishment (by absorption or exclusion), of one all powerful denomination, the ideal of the Catholic Church. The second tendency, which appears later, is that of division. Here we have the cause of the multiplication of sects. It is to find freedom to worship God and govern themselves in their own way, that new sects are formed. There would be no necessity of forming a new sect were the requisite freedom found in the old denomination. But it is not there, imperialism does not provide for it.

When three or four strong imperialistic denominational organizations have succeeded in their drive to dominate church and religious affairs, there is sure to be another Reformation, a re-alignment of the interests within each denomination who are discontented because autocracy has fettered the right to self-expression and self-government. A form of interdenominational comity is needed, founded not on the imperialistic theory that one denomination is to absorb all the rest, but upon the Federation theory, which will give as much power to the central authority as the United States government, and yet preserve the right of self-determination of small communities and small denominations.

VII. *Federation provides a safeguard against excessive cosmopolitanism in church government.* Cosmopolitanism may

be defined as a theory of government which holds that certain common interests, economic, intellectual, religious, bind citizens together so closely that they will and should finally prove powerful enough to break down all national and state loyalties. It is spiritual unity based on common ideals. It is intranational or supernational, and, if completely developed, would supersede internationalism entirely. The organization of citizens of different nations, on the basis of a central idea, would ultimately issue in the dissolution of national ties, and the establishment of a central authority entirely independent of national states.

A man without a denomination might well be described in the same words as Edward Everett Hale's *Man Without a Country*. Yet the power of cosmopolitanism to produce in ever increasing numbers people who are perfectly at home in every sectarian country, is not to be denied. The evidences of its work in wiping out distinctions and producing like-mindedness in religious and social ideals, are on every hand. There are many forces tending toward producing like-mindedness and unity among the church people of all our communities.

These may be summed up as:

- (1) The relentless pressure of socializing processes.
- (2) The growing sentiment of Christian co-operation and union.

Attempts have been made by the sects to control these socializing processes in their own interests. But such steps must ever be ineffective. Consider how futile and ridiculous it would be for each of the 280 Protestant sects to try to enforce the regulations and restrictions as to marriage which the Catholic Church insists upon. Sectarian loyalty has often prompted migrations of large groups to a frontier country in order to preserve distinctive customs of dress and toilette (e. g., footwashing). But there is no longer any geographical frontier—the radio would reach them with insistent heresies even at the North Pole. The modern frontier is one of social and moral enlightenment; if freedom for individuality is to be found, it is not by running away, but by challenging the governmental conditions of modern life. If cosmopolitanism must come, let it be democratic and not imperial.

Imperial cosmopolitanism will destroy denominational

loyalties. Democratic cosmopolitanism—and federation—will preserve denominational loyalties. It has been charged as a defeat against the Catholic Church that a narrow parochialism (loyalty to priest and parish church) too often passes into indifference or controvergence of true local secular citizenship. It does this in proportion as the doctrine of imperial cosmopolitanism is preached and practiced. But it is just this same doctrine which is preached and practiced by loyal Protestant sectarians. Denominational leaders plead for loyalty not to the *local community* but to the *universal communion*. This is exactly what the Catholic priest pleads for; the name of such a doctrine is Imperial Cosmopolitanism. The peril for our civilization lies precisely here: that this neo-medieval religious cosmopolitanism is at present tending to proceed in substantial and dominant isolation from the old geographical or regional units. The *communions* are threatening to divide and destroy the *communities*. It has been pointed out that the ideal of imperial cosmopolitanism is a World State in which the centralized authority is exercised directly upon local governments without the intermediation of separate divisions of power. In this way it would wipe out not only racial, but also national and territorial divisions. Imperial cosmopolitanism provides for unity, but not for variety of opinion and cultures. It is cosmopolitanism, not democracy properly understood, which holds the “menace of mediocrity.” The necessity of cultural cosmopolitanism, the dissemination of common knowledge and ideals must be admitted. But the unity of opinion it engenders is not by itself an adequate principle upon which a government can be established. Government must be of such a nature as to provide both for unity and also variety of culture; for cosmopolitanism, but also for individualism; for a world loyalty, but also for national loyalties; for devotion to a universal Church, but also for denomination and community integrity. This is the form of government which federation will furnish. Denominational integrity and community integrity both stand or fall by the same arguments. Federation will preserve them both from a disintegrating cosmopolitanism.

VIII. *Federation provides for community integrity.* The general name for those theories that emphasize the importance of locality—of native place—in the development of a governmental system, is Regionalism. Its point of view may be stated in two terse sentences:

a. No political design for the common weal of all, or any part or section or class of mankind, can hope for enduring success that long ignores the permanence and priority of the geographical units (home, civic, regional, national, state) over any other kind of grouping whatsoever.

b. No political design for the common weal of all, or any part or class, can hope for enduring success if it is based upon these geographical units only. (Branford, *Science of Government*.)

Cosmopolitanism emphasizes the fact that men are united by universal ideals; regionalism calls attention to the fact that men live in space and time, and must recognize the necessity of spacial relationships. By over-stressing the universal, the cosmopolitan becomes a man without a particular country. For the sake of an abstract idea he forgets the necessity of local experience and co-operation and neglects the just interests of his own family, locality, nation, and race.

Regionalism seeks to re-emphasize the need of particular local experience, without which any universal co-operation becomes an empty name. To have a true social cosmos we must have a richly ordered series of co-operant, concrete, individual, living units; not an empty, abstractly-sentimental generalization. A true cosmopolitan must first be a devoted member of the family, then a good citizen in the life of the neighbourhood, town, region, state, or nation—an ardent patriot.

There are two schools of political thought in the Church to-day, one of which insists on the priority of sectarian divisions. Just as there are two schools in the secular State, one of which insists on the priority of party and class interests. The other point of view in both Church and State recognizes the necessity for differences of interest, but it insists that proper emphasis be given, in the solving of political problems, to what may be broadly called geographical conceptions or categories. Regionalism draws its argument from many fields of thought. As to

the preservation of community consciousness, it points out that sociologists are generally agreed in insisting that, next to the family, the neighbourhood is the necessary basis of sound associational life. This principle also is of large moral significance. Its underlying meaning is that of the ethical importance of the organized community and the moral claims of the latter upon the devotion of its members. Arguments are also drawn from the fields of psychology, philosophy, and religion. Disregard of larger community obligations can only result in the unethical Pharisaism which Jesus anathematized in his immortal classic on human neighbourliness. Neighbourhood duties and relationships are necessary to particularize, to give point and reality to the universal precepts of an ethical religion. Denominationalism emptied of home and citizenship, of patriotism and race, would be as vague, unsatisfying, and unfruitful a religious belief or condition as the monistic pantheism of the Orient. (cf. *Sectarianism and the Caste System*.)

The psychological basis of these categories lies in the common objects, interests, knowledge, traditions, and ideals,—inescapable mental and geographical horizons shared by all,—which give each community and nation its own distinction and uniqueness. The local community has a certain inalienable authority over all its members, an authority not possessed by separate groups or societies in the community. This is due to the fact that the individuals who compose the community are unified selves, sharing the life necessities of the same locality or social situation. Just as the State unifies moral interests by providing a common clearing-house for their adjustment, so a religion which ramifies into all the nooks and corners of the moral life, and sets standards for all social relations, cannot depend upon a divided institution to unify its moral claims upon individuals. A moral religion must be a community religion. Religion cannot escape, therefore, any more than the State from the necessity of being community centered.

If the principle of regionalism is not recognized by the churches there is sure to be religious reaction or revolution. Unless the denominations can learn to make reasonable sacrifices with a view to co-operation by geographical units then

unrest and dissatisfaction will surely arise. For, if, instead of co-operant evolution, church life continues in unregulated competition, the result will be sectarian strife of the intensest degree, followed by a religious revolution. It is easily seen that the sectarian battle will be won by the strongest church. This church will be one which has an imperial policy, for unconnected congregational churches cannot stand the prestige of a powerfully united autocratic church. Within this new imperialistic church demands for freedom can no longer be met by a migration to new geographical frontiers; we will be as circumscribed as Europe in Luther's time; the only way to liberty of conscience then will be by a new Reformation, new twentieth century religious wars. Such a possibility is not a fantastic dream if the present policy of sectarian competition, in disregard of popular local needs, is continued. The new frontier of freedom is the geographical and religious integrity of the local community.

The trend toward community unity in political, educational, and social life will not be without a powerful effect on religious institutions. When social welfare and educational agencies, though representing many diverse theories of society and education, can unite in a single administrative body, their effectiveness will put the churches on the defensive to justify their separate existence. A unified social welfare agency, a single public school system, must find their counterpart in a unified church administration for the *whole* community. Independent community action in church life through the free and unbiased combination of Christian citizens, extending through all levels from the local neighbourhood, to state and nation, is the democratic slogan suggested by the demands of the principle of Regionalism.

IX. *Federation provides for denominational integrity.* Different theories of government differ as to the place to be given to large group or small group activities. Both have their advantages and their disadvantages. The small group becomes responsible for the individual from birth to his entrance into society, implanting fundamental attitudes and loyalties. The small group presides over the birth of new ideas, giving them

form, substance, and power. The small group stands sponsor for the birth of the spiritual life; the church becomes responsible for the nurture of the reborn soul. Though the members of a church, like other small groups, are tolerant of one another's faults, they are not indifferent to them. Other small groups may offer a temporary companionship for misery, a temporary forgiveness for mistakes, but the Church is a group of sinners *being saved*.

Small groups have their disadvantages. The swing of the pendulum carries them from a loose Bohemianism to a narrow bigotry. Some small groups become too tolerant, too free; others, often because of opposition, grow a hard shell as a protection from environment and become narrow, strict, rigid, and exclusive of new ideas and new life. The small sects are usually the most intense in their devotion to particular individualistic ideals; they have retained their identity because of intense loyalties. But at the present time they are in a dilemma. On the one hand, they are in danger of destruction by reason of cosmopolitan and social forces, and desertion of their youth to denominations with more community prestige; and, on the other hand, they dare not attempt to counter the influence of the large bodies by themselves centralizing, or joining any co-operative effort for fear the co-operative association will be dominated by the imperialistic denominations. They prefer to risk being pounced on by the lion in the local communities, to putting their head into the lion's jaws, as most co-operative agreements appear to them. The following table shows the situation in the Federal Council.

Distribution of Small Sects in United States and Federal Council (1916)

<i>Membership</i>		
Over 100,000	35	21
50,000-100,000	10	2
25,000- 50,000	16	1
10,000- 25,000	18	3
5,000- 10,000	22	2
1,000- 5,000	82	1
Under 1,000	42	0
	TOTAL 225—100%	TOTAL 30—13.3%

The small sects must be convinced that federation movements are not merely another form of imperial competition but in reality mean democratic co-operation.

The advantages of the union of autonomous small groups into a larger federation are that all such social co-operation increases the quantity and quality of knowledge; and provides the possibility of better judgments about the true values of life. Language arose because of the need for social intercommunication. Our level of intelligence as well as our moral standards, not to mention economic well-being and happiness, is lowered—all these developments are retarded by those who obstruct the larger social unification, intercommunication, and co-operation—international and interdenominational. On the character of diplomacy depends not only bread but brains. The empirical field of the State, and the visible organization of the invisible Church, must both be as universal as possible—must include all living souls.

Recognition of denominational integrity is the only way to avoid the disadvantages of centralization. Loyalty to a large group tends to belittle personal, private, and small-group obligations. The emperor demands total loyalty. The emphasis on universality overlooks the necessity of particularized, empirical, and local demonstrations of the moral ideal. Large group enthusiasm becomes thin, unreal, and other-worldly. Extreme cosmopolitanism undermines denominational loyalties and national patriotism.

The numerical size of constituent bodies in secular or religious federal governments is an administrative problem to be worked out in practice. It is possible for a denomination to be too small to provide men and resources necessary for an independent experiment in religious grouping; and it may also be possible that a denomination may become too large to maintain the specific loyalties, distinguishing characteristics, and representative administration necessary in a democratic, as contrasted with an imperial or cosmopolitan, union. The average population of the 48 states in the Federal Union is 2,193,188; the largest ten million, the smallest seventy-seven thousand. Of 138 Protestant sects the average membership is

205,475; the largest five million, the smallest one thousand. 54 per cent of the sects have a membership of less than 10,000.

In the seventeenth century an Italian philosopher, Giovanni Vico, defined a nation as "a natural society of men who by unity of territory, origin, customs, and language are drawn into a community of life and of conscience." Denominations are, also, communities of life and of conscience, but the marks of denominationalism must be distinguished from those of nationality. The works of denominationalism may be summarized as follows:

1. *Beliefs, creeds, doctrines.* Common theological ideas expressed in a typical language which is familiar to all.

2. *Distinguishing rituals or forms of worship.* Typical emotional responses; recognition of the sacraments; use of vestments, and general emphasis on the objective or subjective aspects of worship.

3. *Search for a characteristic religious experience.* A denomination believes in, and seeks to demonstrate the value of a particular variety of religious experience. Some emphasize the mystical, others the ascetic, others the social or practical aspects of religion. Some search for signs of original sin, others for an inward light; some search for evidences of election and others for a manifestation of grace. The cultivation of all varieties of religious experience and expression is necessary to enrich the religious, moral, and cultural life of a State.

4. *Characteristic social life.* It is natural that characteristic forms of doctrine, worship, and religious experience should issue in a characteristic social life. There are differences in amusements countenanced; in dress adopted; in moral approvals or disapprovals given to forms of association and to social, political, and industrial ideals. Although these social marks have been largely destroyed by the influences of our cosmopolitan life, denominations are still to some slight extent characterized by distinguishing social as well as religious customs.

5. *History and Polity.* A common history, loyalty to great leaders of the past, the habit of political co-operation, all bind a denomination together. Each denomination is conducting a governmental as well as a religious experiment. The recognition of denominational integrity gives opportunity for the practice of self-government not found if local or denominational autonomy is denied.

Democratic administration realizes that co-operative activities can be efficient only as individual initiative is recognized. In our modern times we are in danger of over-stressing authority, social efficiency, centralization, to the exclusion of liberty, personal salvation, and the infinite worth of the individual soul. We must not forget that it is the latter principle which has motivated a great part of Christian history. Far in advance of his time, John Milton recognized that both authority and liberty, both individual rights and social duties, both tolerance and co-operation, were needed to form a successful ecclesiastical organization. In his work on *A Free Commonwealth*, speaking of spiritual liberty in the State, John Milton said:—

Where there is much to learn there of necessity will be much arguing, much writing, many opinions; for opinion is knowledge in the making. . . . A little generous prudence, a little forbearance of one another, and some grain of charity might win all these diligences to join and unite into one general and brotherly search after truth. . . .

While the temple of the Lord was building who could not consider that there must be many schisms, many dissections, made in the quarry and in the timber ere the house of God can be built. And when every stone is laid artfully together, it cannot be united into a continuity, it can but be contiguous in this world. Neither can every piece of the building be of one form; nay, rather the perfection consists in this, that out of many moderate varieties and brotherly dissimilitudes that are not vastly disproportional, arises the goodly and the graceful symmetry that commends the whole pile and structure.

Let us, therefore, when great reformation is expected, be more considerate builders, more wise in spiritual architecture.

A denomination is a group of people whose common character is sufficiently marked to enable them to act together in

carrying out a practical experiment in Christian living and worship, and sufficiently distinct from other such groups that any surrender of denominational peculiarities or integrity would lower the worth of the experiment.

An empire is inimical to the formation of small governmental groups within the body politic. A democracy encourages the formation of such groups because from them it draws its strength; they are the sources of new life and culture—social, political, religious. Federation is a democratic principle.

X. *Federation is in harmony with the principles and practices of democracy.* A democratic federation draws its power from both the states and the people, and exercises it for the benefit of both the states and the people. These seemingly paradoxical attributes of the federal form were fully discussed in the early years of the American Union and are now generally accepted. In harmony with these principles the Federal Council of Churches recognizes both denominational and community integrity. Statements from the Council reports should make this clear.

The co-operative movement must not only have the *working fellowship of the national church bodies* but must be able to move out across all the country through state, county, city, and village.

A state Council or Federation is an autonomous body having no organic relation with the Federal Council or with the city or county councils of the state.

As a matter of fact, the whole co-operative programme, which the *churches* are carrying on *through* the Federal Council depends largely for its success on the movement for local federation.

Every local community, moreover, has its own special problems which demand the co-operation of its own churches for their solution, and which cannot be met in any way by a national organization with headquarters in New York.

With regard to denominational autonomy we find the following:

In the original Plan of Federation the autonomy of the constituent bodies is wisely safeguarded. No action by the Federal Council, even though taken, as all its important actions have been taken, by the unanimous vote

of the officially constituted delegates of the constituent bodies, can, by the terms of its constitution, be legally imposed upon those constituent bodies. Such action, by the terms of the constitution, goes back to the constituent bodies in the form of a recommendation for their action or ratification, which may either be assumed or definitely expressed.

The Council may not consider itself primarily as an independent entity, but rather as a common ground upon which the constituent bodies through their official delegates come together for co-operation.

The Federal Council having recognized denominational autonomy, it remains for the denominations to recognize community integrity.

The formation of federations, local and national, will form an avenue for the extension of the principles of democracy to church government. Progress here cannot be rapid even though greatly needed. National denominational conventions are notably non-representative of the *whole* church population. The national conventions of the large denominations are so far removed from direct contact with all the members, that it might be said with much assurance of the truth, that a very great proportion of the church members are not even aware that there is such a thing as a national convention or general assembly of their church. Ultimate decisions and definite responsibility for measures of officers are so far removed from the power of the average church member that he is not much interested in the subject. What is needed is some system which will place responsibility definitely and directly on larger and larger numbers of the church electorate. But it may be argued that expert leadership is necessary and that the general public know nothing about the larger work of the church. This is true, but it is just as true that expert leadership can never thrive when the public are kept in ignorance and powerlessness. In secular affairs, the same argument, the general incapacity of the people to select leaders or judge measures, has been used to oppose the referendum, to maintain politicians and office-seekers in places which should be filled by statesmen, and in general to bolster up the weakening cause of privilege and autocracy. The same condition maintains in religious affairs. For every religious leader who may be called truly a statesman, there are dozens of

politicians, office-seekers, and sectarian grafters. Like the secular politicians, who are interested in principles merely as campaign issues, so the religious politician will revive a forgotten theological doctrine, if he thinks that by so doing he will be able to trap an opponent. The church convention system, like the political party convention system, readily lends itself to machine control. Statesmen in the Church will find themselves continually out-manuevered by the politicians until there is an intelligent and powerful public opinion to which to appeal. A history of denominational bodies from the early years of their organization in this country, will show the continual leavening of democratic influences. Is it too much to expect that further progress will see the invention or adoption of methods designed to bring the immediate control of national and international religious organizations within the direct power of larger and larger numbers of the electorate? Devices for this purpose may be taken over from the field of secular political science and adapted to the particular and peculiar needs and nature of democratic religious organization. The suggestion that the *elect* have been given the Divine right of election of their rulers is surely in harmony with Calvinistic political doctrine. Why not be consistent in life as well as logic and proceed to bring the Church up to the democratic level the State has now attained, due to the impact of the Reformation? Luther aimed his Reformation at the Church, but, because of the political winds blowing at the time, it hit the State. Hence, the work that Luther and Calvin began, and laid the foundation for in their gospels of truth, remains to be completed, namely, the Reformation of the Church.

The crisis which has come in the life of the churches of the present day is due to the fact that the State is becoming Christianized faster than the Church is becoming democratized. In the endeavour to introduce and develop Christian democracy in the State, the Church has neglected to bring her own practices up to the ideals of her own preaching. The result is that the Church as an institution appears, like many of her ministers, as a moral poser, giving pious advice to parishioners whose civic quality and community democracy already transcend that

found in the organization of the Church itself. The secretary of the Federal Council pictures the warring nations of the world, and both capital and labour saying to the churches: "When we see the score of churches in the community joining in effective co-operative action, thinking not of building up their own organizations but only of most fully serving the community, then your word will come to us with power and not till then."

This democratic reformation in church government is contingent upon three general lines of advance, namely—

(1) The invention or adoption of electoral and referendum devices, based on sound political science, which will bring control more directly into the hands of all the people.

(2) The religious education of all church members in all matters pertaining to church affairs to such an extent that they will be capable and willing to exercise the power entrusted to them. Theological illiteracy and spiritual illiteracy must be removed before church democracy will be possible or practicable.

(3) The formation of a dependable religious public opinion demands union of effort through local, state, and national federations of churches.

Federation is in harmony with the principles of democracy. Democracy is in harmony with moral and religious ideals.

Some would hold that morality is the product of socialization, that "we will never be entirely Christianized until we are thoroughly democratized." Others believe that democracy is the result of an objective moral ideal sought and served as a permanent reality by a changing society; that the stability of democracy depends upon the free devotion of all the people, governed and governors, to an independent and universal moral object. The enduring fame of Washington, Lincoln, and Wilson is due to their consecration to this ideal. That democracy could not endure without the cultivation and dissemination of religious principles was the conviction of Washington. Lincoln was concerned not that God should be on his side, but that he should be on God's side. "Mr. Wilson stood with more clearness and distinction than any other man of our time for the moral idea of the nation." (Rev. George A. Gordon.)

Democracy has always looked to Christianity for support. Two correlative principles brought out in the Reformation controversies of the sixteenth century gave impetus to the democratic movement; namely, the priesthood of all believers, and the right of private judgment. These principles rest upon the universal ideals of Christianity, which have stimulated the development of democracy, the infinite value of the human soul, and the brotherhood of man. From the religious point of view every vote is a prophetic responsibility. "Democracy without religion," it has been said, "is neither a true nor a secure principle of social structure. The individual who finds and worships God stands at the source of the community and its welfare." "Where is the spirit of the Lord, there is Liberty!" In view of this inherent harmony between religion and democracy, the organization of the Christian Church can never rightly or consistently be other than democratic.

Our understanding of the real meaning of democracy will modify our sympathies with it as a principle of church government. The positivistic philosophers identify democracy and religion and regard it as a great social experiment to be justified by its works. The idealist, on the other hand, placing religion above all social values, finds in democracy a "beloved community" in time, the manifestation of an eternal Absolute. One who is looking for arguments for or against democracy may, therefore, take his choice between genetic or formal logic, between a creative society or a created society, between prudential or providential morality, between social religion or revealed religion. Or a synthetic view may be evolved to reconcile the seeming contradictions. Dogmatically stated no such synthetic view, which takes into account all the facts of experience and explains them in a coherent manner, can be arrived at short of metaphysics. The foundations of democracy rest on metaphysical theory. Politics deals with metaphysical beings; the word "self" is a theological term. The permanence of law and rights demands a universal ethical theory. The permanence and universality of law depend upon the permanence and universality of reality. The foundation of rights is morality; and the guarantee of morality is given only by philosophy and religion. An

authoritative philosopher has said, "When we speak of the rights of man and the duties of man, the respect we accord them is measured by our belief that they belong to man as a metaphysical entity, a ward of the universe." Because democracy is a comprehensive metaphysical theory, it reconciles the contradictions of political experience. The conflicting demands of freedom and authority, unity and plurality, permanence and change have been the hidden forces in many a stubborn problem of church administration.

Democracy reconciles the demands of freedom and authority in so far as they can be reconciled. Under a despotism slaves are never completely governed by others so long as their moral will remains unbroken. Yet in a democracy the citizens are never completely self-governing so long as the functions of government are delegated to others. "The moment there is a master," says Rousseau, "there is no longer a sovereign." But in obeying this the sovereign or general will, the people in a democracy are only carrying out the terms of a self-imposed contract, and hence attaining their true freedom. The sovereign will is identified with the moral will, and though a man is forced to be free, he gains the moral liberty which renders him master of himself. It is the impulse to appetite which is slavery, and obedience to self-prescribed law which brings liberty.

A majority may sometimes be as tyrannical as a king, but constitutional guarantees of free speech and free assembly, and the right to amend the constitution, give the minority liberty to make converts to new ideas. If freedom to promote and discuss ideas is unrestricted they should gain power in proportion to their worth.

Rousseau's optimistic picture of the sovereign will as moral calls attention to the fact that both freedom and authority in a democracy rest on moral ideas. One will be truly free in that society which reflects back to him his ideals of value. The highest freedom is moral freedom, yet the perfect will must subject itself to the government of the highest law. The moral ideal is the ultimate object of obedience of both ruler and ruled. Most forms of government recognize the place of Divine authority in the state, but only a democracy stakes its life on the

presence of the Divine will in all the people. That the people have the power of discerning this ideal and the moral courage to obey it, is the faith of democracy. Faith that this moral ideal has the power of the universe behind it is necessary to sustain one's faith in democracy. A changing or fluctuating ideal having no permanent or independent objectivity means the undermining of democracy's foundations. In this connection the statement has been made that "there is nothing in the world of men or nature as we naturally see it, that can justly claim a complete allegiance. The salvation of a soul requires a Divine intervention." Does not the salvation of the Church require the recognition of Divine intervention, also, in the person of a Divine Saviour, and in his immanent presence in the souls of men? From these two sources the Church derives its authority.

In regard to the problem of unity and plurality, those who have been most interested in advocating sectarian aims adopt the point of view of the pluralist. The pluralist tends to emphasize individual and small group interests and liberty. He is impressed with the irreconcilable differences among the members of society. Though he has a general prejudice against viewing life as a whole through metaphysical glasses, he generally ends up by trying to interpret all of life in terms of one of the aspects of life and in trying to organize a church or a state on the basis of one of the elements of human association. Men have many interests and not one only; but the theory of the pluralist lacks a unifying element.

The absolutist emphasizes large group interests and the place of authority. Individual differences are passed over as of small significance. The tendency of this theory is to regard moral distinctions and individual political responsibilities as inconsequential. Akin to the pantheism of the East, in which the individual finds his freedom in absorption in the All, this theory proposes a democracy of insignificance. Both Church and State are given too exalted a place when they are identified with the World Spirit, and true freedom is held to consist in obedience to all their mandates. Both Church and State owe an obedience to a transcendent moral order; only in proportion to

the completeness and sincerity of this obedience do they have a right to demand allegiance from individuals.

"Unity in diversity and diversity in unity," said Merle D'Aubigne, "is a law of nature, and also of the Church. Without unity religion cannot be of God, without diversity it cannot be the religion of man. In religion we must neither leave out God nor man."

The democratic theory proposes a synthesis of these two views. The democratic form is flexible enough to comprise both interests under its ægis. In a democracy loyalty to a small group becomes a way of expressing loyalty to a large group. This is because a democracy can use all the products of the small group; the democratic spirit is hospitable to the new ideas and new life springing from small group relations. Unity and plurality in society can only be conceived coherently in terms of the relationships of separate souls to one another and to the individual center of the universe.

"Rebirth" and "fulfilment of the law" suggest the problem of change and permanence in the individual and in society. Salvation demands the continuous reintegration of the self to make a place in personal life for new meanings and new values. Rebirth implies both permanence and change in the individual. Consequent on the presence of these two elements there are two kinds of participation open to a citizen in a democracy. Conversion, rebirth, creativity being due to contact with a permanent ideal, change itself demands participation in the vision of perfection. A second kind of participation more often referred to is participation in the life of a changing society. It is important for democracy to recognize participation in the permanent ideals as well as in the changing activities of life.

On the other hand, the non-metaphysical view of the democracy emphasizes change as valuable for its own sake. This is especially true of instrumentalist and pragmatic theories. This view is a popular one, but it is not a credit to democracy. It is akin to the individualism which has reduced democracy to a "mere name standing for nothing unitary and real." Such a wholesale rejection of permanent principles opens the way for the charge that "a democracy may be defined as a crowd which

has imbibed delight in change for its own sake." Democracy as a metaphysical theory and democracy without metaphysical theory makes all the difference between a *dynamic democracy* and a *dissipated democracy*!

Democracy as a metaphysical theory has a place for both permanence and change. They may be regarded as due to the immanent presence of a purposeful God in the lives of individuals. Professor Hocking rests the case for permanence upon the constant purpose of a loving Mind: "What we call laws are no stable principles of nature: they are experimental adjustments made by a mind which has a care both for the value of the whole and for the interest of every dot in the pattern, and with the ceaseless vigilance and continuity of thought of an inventor, follows experiment with experiment forever."

Democracy, therefore, need hold no terrors for those interested in the preservation of permanent principles. A democratic Church will provide the opportunity for the development of new personalities in a new society but it will also preserve the irreplaceable heritage of the past.

Democracy regards the Church as the permanent empirical representative of a universal society. As such the Church provides a permanent guarantee for democracy, — a permanent foundation in the consistent nature and constant purposes of Reality itself. Being permanent in time the democratic Church provides the equipment for self-knowledge and self-development, for a concrete immortality, for a kingdom on earth as well as in heaven. And, being transcendent, as well as immanent, beyond and above, as well as in, society, it can provide a permanent moral ideal in the pursuit and realization of which the soul starts on its road toward eternal life.

It is the Church which gives permanence and more than local and temporary meaning to men's religious experiences. There are some religious events of the past which will never be repeated and which the Church as an institution has preserved. The Bible of Civilization can never replace the Word of God. Science can never write another Decalogue. No higher Revelation will be given than the Christian Revelation. Democracy does not challenge the authority of the Church on these points.

A united, democratically federated Church would provide the stable framework to safeguard and protect the religious experience and achievements of men. Besides making provision for a continuous and progressive development, the democratic Church would prevent our religious life from being a perpetual recurrence of ancient mistakes, and give significance and value to our individual thoughts and performances. A democratic federation would then not look upon change as destruction, but as fulfilment. And it would provide also the conditions for permanence, in the case of the message of Revelation, the significant religious experiences of the race, and all valuable religious institutions. A democratic federation of churches would thus serve to prevent the other institutions of our changing democracy from going to pieces like the house upon the sand. Such a united democratic Church thus seems to come in answer to the age-long prayer of mankind, "Establish Thou the work of our hands upon us; yea, the work of our hands establish Thou it."

CLARENCE R. ATHEARN.

MANY VOICES---ONE LORD

From the near city comes the clang of bells;
Their hundred jarring, diverse tones combine
In one faint, misty harmony, as fine
As the soft note yon winter robins swells.
What if to Thee, in thine infinity,
These multiform and many coloured creeds
Seem but the robe man wraps, as maskers weeds,
Round the one living truth Thou gavest him—Thee?
What if these varied forms, that worship prove,
Being heart-worship, reach thy perfect ear,
But as a monotone, complete and clear
Of which the music is, through Christ's name, Love?
Forever rising, in sublime increase,
To Glory in the Highest—on earth, peace.

—H. C. R.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

The Consummation of Church Union in Canada

"WE cannot foresee to what this movement may grow or how far-reaching may be its influence," says the *New Outlook*, the organ of the United Church of Canada into which the former denominational organs have merged, in discussing the consummation of union between Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists in Canada. "The eyes of the Christian world," the article continues, "are now upon the churches of Canada, watching with sympathetic interest, the issue of her great venture of faith." But whatever that issue may be in the destiny, power, and influence of the United Church, it were well worth twenty-five years of effort to achieve so notable a triumph as marked the opening day of the new church, and the service in which were laid its beginning and consecration.

It had been planned originally to have the new church ushered in with a spectacular procession in which the representatives of the three denominations who were to constitute the first Council of the United Church should march from their respective denominational gatherings to a point where they should meet, and Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregationalist should march abreast to Massey Hall, the largest hall in Toronto, where the new Council should convene. These plans were wisely abandoned, as we understand, for two reasons. It was found that a far larger number wished to be present at the inaugural service than Massey Hall, with its 4,500 seats, could accommodate; and it was also felt that in view of the continued opposition to union of a fairly large element in the Presbyterian Church it was unwise to surround with needless parade or any suggestion of vain-glory a course that was being taken from solemn conviction and with deep regret that it should have occasioned cleavage. The conviction arose that it was a time, not for celebrating an outward triumph, but for self-abasement and heart-searching, a launching of the new church in a service of pure devotion, of Christian fellowship in communion, and a hallowing of the United Church in dedication to God.

Hence it was that the inaugural service was arranged at the Arena, a vast, unadorned structure, devoted chiefly to sports, capable of seating in its great elliptical interior about 8,000 people. Here, it was planned that the 328 Commissioners to

Facts Concerning the United Church of Canada

According to returns officially made to the General Council of the United Church, the numerical strength of the new church is as follows:

Churches and preaching stations.....	8,806
Members.....	692,838
Ministers.....	3,819
Missionaries.....	648

Statistics of bodies forming the union are as follows:

Churches—Congregational, 174; Methodist, 4,797; Presbyterian, 4,509, less 674 non-concurring churches, 3,835.

Membership—Congregational, 12,220; Methodist, 414,047; Presbyterian, 266,111.

Ministers entering United Church—Congregational, 85; Methodist, 2,085; Presbyterian, 2,037, less non-concurring, approximately, 368, 1,669.

Missionaries entering United Church—Congregational, 24; Methodist, 310; Presbyterian, 314.

The entire Methodist Church of Canada has entered into the United Church.

All Congregational churches have entered the United Church, except a few small congregations.

The non-concurring element is made up almost wholly of members of the former Presbyterian Church in Canada, and represents, apparently, about one-quarter to one-third of that body. Eighty per cent. of the Presbyterian ministers and ninety-five per cent. of Presbyterian foreign missionaries have gone with the majority into the union.

A few days before the consummation of union, the Methodists completed their Methodist National Campaign for the raising of \$4,000,000. Up to June 9 there had been paid in full \$4,202,900.

Presbyterians at the General Assembly prior to the consummation of union reported the largest budget revenue in the history of the church.

the Council of the United Church should meet on the morning of June 10 in a service of worship, culminating in the Holy Communion, in which the great company present should share. So strictly was the solemnity of this service safeguarded that the official photographers were not even permitted to take a picture of the gathering. Amplifiers had been installed to make those who led the service heard in every part of the building,

and a great choir, with a band or orchestra, concealed from view, led in the congregational singing.

THE COUNCIL IN THE ARENA, 325 A. D. AND 1925 A. D.

Some one recalled the fact that the Council of Nicæa, 1600 years ago, had met likewise in an Arena. May it not be that the modern Council in the Arena shall become as notable for the Church? The Council of Nicæa represented the triumph of orthodoxy, but it represented likewise the failure of love and brotherhood and of Christian catholicity. It emphasized doctrine above life, and the triumph of a party above the common quest of truth. It helped to lay the way for future controversies and misunderstandings, the bitterness of which, whatever the facts at issue, had been strongly at variance with the spirit of Jesus. The new Council in the Arena lays stress upon fellowship in variety of Christian thought and experience, upon mutual love in the name of a common Lord, and upon a common devotion to the tasks of service and redemption. It is a new note in the Church.

There were a hundred chances for this inaugural service to go astray. A single false, or jarring, note and the occasion and all that it symbolized might have been ruined. A strident note of personal ambition, or undue consciousness of self, in the voice or manner of any individual leader; the slightest suggestion of the dominance of Methodist, or Presbyterian, or Congregationalist; and twenty-five years of aspiration might have been in vain. But there was no jarring note. The service was a triumph of pure spirituality, and in this it bore profound witness to the spirit in which these Canadian Christians have sought, and attained, unity. The spirit of Pentecost seemed present, in all but the strange and abnormal manifestations of the ancient day. A deep sense of order pervaded the gathering, and the intense emotions of the hour were partly subdued in a sense of awe, and partly found expression in the depth and richness of the service, beautifully designed to express common praise and prayer.

Except for the brief pre-communion address by Dr. S. P. Rose there was no addition to, or departure from, the carefully prepared and printed order of service. All speeches were reserved for later in the day. The Inaugural Service was itself essentially an expression of unity, both as a unified whole in conception and structure, and in the catholicity symbolized in its contents. The contribution of each participating church to

the new United Church could hardly have been better expressed, and these contributions with the element common to all were in a setting that emphasized the heritage of the Church, historic and universal. It was an inspiration to see in this and in later meetings how former Methodists joined heartily in singing the Psalms while former Presbyterians joined former Methodists and Congregationalists with equal fervour in the hymns of John Wesley and Isaac Watts and Philip Doddridge.

THE WHOLE CHURCH REPRESENTED

The Inaugural Service began with a hymn from the Anglican communion, S. J. Stone's *The Church's One Foundation* during the singing of which the three streams of delegates of the three uniting churches, meeting at the entrance to the auditorium, mingled in procession to their appointed places. After the minister's plea, *O Lord, open Thou our lips*, and the people's response, *And our mouth shall shew forth Thy praise*, all joined in the singing of the 100th Psalm to the tune *Old Hundredth*. Then came the *Invocation*, *General Confession*, and the *Lord's Prayer*, followed by the singing to *Winchester Old* of Charles Wesley's hymn, *O for a thousand tongues to sing*.

After concerted recital of Psalm 118:1-4, 19-26, the choir led in the Chant, *Te Deum Laudamus*. John 17:1, 2, 6, 17-23 was read, and then, all reverently bowing down, the ministers appointed read, respectively, the Prayers, of *Thanksgiving and Self-Consecration* (by Rothe, abridged, from *The Book of Common Order*), *For the Unity and Prosperity of the Church*, *For all Peoples*, and *For Our Country* (the last three all specially composed for the occasion) ending in a prayer of general intercession.

Then followed *The Hallowing of Church Union*, in which after liturgical responses by minister and congregation the Presbyterian Moderator, the Chairman of the Congregational Union, the Methodist General Superintendent, and the Chairman of the General Council of Local Union Churches, each expressed the spiritual contribution of his communion to the United Church. As this portion of the service was unique in church annals and ritual, the full text, as follows, will be of special interest:

THE HALLOWING OF CHURCH UNION (All reverently standing)

Minister officiating: To the glory of God the Father, who has called us by his grace; and of his Son Jesus Christ, who

loved us and gave Himself for us; and of the Holy Spirit, who illumines and sanctifies us:

All: This Church of Christ is consecrate.

Minister: For the worship of God in praise and prayer; for the preaching of the everlasting Gospel; for the administration of the Holy Sacraments:

All: This Church of Christ is consecrate.

Minister: For the edifying of the body of Christ; for the evangelizing of the world; for the promotion of righteousness and good will:

All: This Church of Christ is consecrate.

Minister: In the unity of the faith; in the bonds of Christian brotherhood; and in charity to all:

All: This Church of Christ is consecrate.

Minister: Having part among the brethren in the inheritance of Apostles and Prophets, Fathers and Teachers, Martyrs and Evangelists:

All: We give thanks unto the Father who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.

Presbyterian Moderator: According to the grace given unto our fathers, as witnesses to the Apostolic Gospel and standard-bearers of the Church commissioned to make disciples of all nations, more especially in the manifestation of the Spirit in vigilance for Christ's Kirk and Covenant, in care for the spread of education and devotion to sacred learning, receive ye our inheritance among them that are sanctified.

All: We glory in the grace given unto us in this goodly heritage.

Congregational Union Chairman: According to the grace given unto our fathers, as witnesses to the Apostolic Gospel and standard-bearers of the Church commissioned to make disciples of all nations, more especially in the manifestation of the Spirit in the liberty of prophesying, the love of spiritual freedom and the enforcement of civic justice, receive ye our inheritance among them that are sanctified.

All: We glory in the grace given unto us in this goodly heritage.

Methodist General Superintendent: According to the grace given unto our fathers, as witnesses to the Apostolic Gospel and standard-bearers of the Church commissioned to make disciples of all nations, more especially in the manifestation of the Spirit in evangelical zeal and human redemption, the testimony of spiritual experience, and the ministry of sacred song, receive ye our inheritance among them that are sanctified.

All: We glory in the grace given unto us in this goodly heritage.

Chairman of the General Council of Local Union Churches: According to the grace given unto our fathers, as witnesses to the Apostolic Gospel and standard-bearers of the Church commissioned to make disciples of all nations, more especially in the manifestation of the Spirit in the furtherance of community-life within the Kingdom of God, and of the principle, in things essential unity, and in things secondary liberty, receive ye our inheritance among them that are sanctified.

All: We glory in the grace given unto us in this goodly heritage.

After *The Commemoration of the Faithful* (all reverently standing), and the admonition of the minister to "keep and search for the commandments of the Lord our God," the hallowing of church union found its culmination in the following declaration by all:

All: We now, the people of this Church of Christ, compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, grateful for our heritage, mindful of the sacrifice of the fathers whose work is not made perfect without us, do dedicate ourselves, as heirs together of such precious gifts, unto the service of Almighty God in his kingdom among men.

Then, following the ascription of praise by all in concert came the Declaration of the authority for church union in the enactments of the governing bodies of the uniting churches, the signing of the Basis of Union by the official heads of these churches, and the declaration that the United Church had been formally established.

Immediately following this Declaration the officiating minister led in this prayer, constituting the General Council of the United Church:

Minister officiating: O God Almighty, Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who loved the Church and gave Himself for it; Thou who on the day of Pentecost didst shed the Holy Spirit upon the Church waiting for the promise of the Father; we wait before Thee with one heart, that the same Lord Jesus may be made known in the midst of us, our only King and Head, and the same Holy Spirit, breathing upon us, may dispense among us his manifold gifts of grace and truth. Confirm, we beseech Thee, with the witness and unction of thy Spirit the union of thy people now consummated in this feast of fellowship and love. As Thou hast made us one in body, grant that our hearts may be melted and flow together into a

living unity, that we together may join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten.

More especially, as we who are duly appointed delegates of the churches thus made one do solemnly with prayer and thanksgiving, in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ the only Head of the Church, now constitute the General Council of the United Church of Canada, let thy Holy Spirit seal this act and sanctify this chief court of thy Church. O Blessed and Abiding Spirit, endue this Council and all its members and all the congregation of the Lord with heavenly wisdom; enlighten them with true knowledge of thy Word; inspire them with pure zeal for thy glory; rule their hearts in all things; and so order all their doings that unity and peace shall prevail, that truth and righteousness shall flow from them, and that by their endeavours all thy ministers and churches shall be refreshed and established, thy Gospel everywhere purely preached and truly followed, thy Kingdom among men extended and strengthened, and the whole body of thy people grow up into Him who is Head over all things to the Church, Jesus Christ. Hear the prayers and the praises we severally offer unto Thee in silent devotion. . . . (*Here let there be a short pause for Silent Prayer*) . . . Bless all the high solemnities and the quickening promise of this beginning of days and years. And let great grace be upon all who love the Lord Jesus Christ: for his sake.

All members of the General Council: Amen.

Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire,
And lighten with celestial fire;
Thou the anointing Spirit art,
Who dost thy sevenfold gifts impart.

The American Presbyterian Church of Montreal was then formally received into the United Church, for the first time severing its official connection with Presbyterianism on this side of the line.

COMMUNION THE FIRST EXPRESSION

The first act of the United Church as thus constituted was to partake of Holy Communion. So carefully had the details of this service been prepared that the vast congregation of nearly 8,000 persons was served in a quiet and orderly way, and in almost as short a time as is occupied by the service in any local church. The pre-communion hymn was Philip Doddridge's *O God of Bethel, by Whose Hand*, and following the

Communion Sermon, the congregation sang Isaac Watt's *When I Survey the Wondrous Cross*. After the partaking of the elements and prayer by the minister the service was brought to a close by the singing of Montgomery's hymn, *O Spirit of the Living God*. A glory filled the place as eight thousand voices sang the closing stanza:

*Baptize the nations; far and nigh
The triumphs of the cross record;
The Name of Jesus glorify,
Till every kindred call Him Lord.*

Following the Benediction a hush fell upon the great gathering before the people went their way into the world outside. Friend greeted friend. There was an impression of subdued ecstasy, a sense of awe and wonder, a note of triumph in all that the day had brought. In some such spirit the disciples must have come down from the Mount of Transfiguration, or gone to their tasks following the walk to Emmaus.

The afternoon session dragged somewhat while the members of the Council were signing the roll, but after this formality the pent-up feeling of the gathering found expression in applause as Principal Ritchie for the Congregationalists, Principal Mackinnon for the Presbyterians, and Dr. James Endicott for the Methodists spoke of the significance of the union and of the contribution of each participating body. If the United Church realizes the ideals set forth by these three leaders there will be within its walls the freedom and fervour of a spiritual unity, and not merely the uniformity of a great organization.

RELATION TO WORLD-WIDE BODIES

The evening service was devoted to the hearing of fraternal delegates from overseas, the fraternal greetings from this side of the water being reserved for the following evening. Principal Gandier, of Knox College, Toronto, welcomed the fraternal delegates, and indicated the status of the New United Church in relation to the world-wide churches of the respective denominational orders represented in the union. It is the intention that the entire United Church shall assume the same relationship to Presbyterian churches elsewhere that the Presbyterian Church in Canada formerly held, and that the same shall be true in relation to world-wide Methodism and world-wide Congregationalism.

This purpose of the United Church has already been approved by international and world-wide organizations of Presbyterianism and Methodism, and there can be no doubt of the attitude of Congregationalists. Over night we have, therefore, become intrinsically related to a million and a half United Church members and adherents where formerly our fraternal relationships were with barely 30,000 Canadian Congregationalists.

Dr. T. Wardle Stafford, presenting the greetings of the Wesleyan Methodists of Great Britain and Ireland, declared, "Methodists the wide world over are content to lose the name for the sake of the Kingdom. Methodism this day has lost the name in Canada but the soul of Methodism goes on." Dr. W. M. MacGregor, delegate from the United Free Church of Scotland, referred to his wide experience of union movements. He struck a broad note in relation to doctrinal standards and the nature of the assent to be given to them. "No creed," he declared, "ever kept a church orthodox." Dr. Archibald Main, of the Church of Scotland, referred to the unfortunate misunderstandings and controversies which had made Presbyterians and Congregationalists historic enemies over ecclesiastical polity. He described the Canadian movement as "unique in church history." "You are pioneers in ecclesiasticism," he told the Council. He referred to what Wesley had done for the kindling of evangelical piety. The real test of the Church, he declared, was whether it sounded the evangelical note as the supreme note in its ministry. "You need have no fear," he concluded, "if your church stands that test."

The Rev. J. W. G. Ward, who recently came from England to the pastorate of Emmanuel Congregational Church, Montreal, was commissioned to speak for the Congregational Union of England and Wales, and for the Congregationalists of Australia and New Zealand. It was after ten o'clock when Dr. Ward rose to speak, and the audience had had a feast of wisdom, exhortation, and eloquence, but Dr. Ward proved equal to the occasion. In glowing words he interpreted the history and significance of Congregational independency and its contribution to religious life and liberty. He moved the great audience to spontaneous applause and struck a climax in a remarkable meeting.

THE SECOND DAY

The writer had to return to Boston and was unable to attend the further sessions of the Council, which moved from the Arena to the Metropolitan Church, following the opening day.

Toronto papers refer appreciatively to the address of Dr. C. C. Morrison, Editor of *The Christian Century* on the second day. He is reported as saying:

I am convinced that you, in this United Church of Canada, are dealing with the destiny of Christendom. It is a joy unspeakable to me that I have been privileged to share with you in this great historic hour that seems pregnant with destiny.

Surveying the movement from the United States viewpoint, he said that he had entertained grave doubts as to its success, for after the war "ecclesiastical carpenters were going about mending their sectarian fences that had been broken down by the unifying processes of the war."

I could not believe that union would survive that reactionary movement [he said]. But here I find, instead of going backward, as we have tended to go back in the United States, you are going forward with such a stride, such courage, conviction, and substantial progress as would have been unthinkable even to us in the days before the war did its serious and sinister work to the cause of union.

Dr. Charles F. Carter, of Hartford, Conn., was present on behalf of the National Council to convey the greetings of the Congregationalists of the United States.

Dr. Charles E. Burton had already sent a congratulatory message which appears in *The New Outlook*, issued on the day of the inauguration. In the course of this Dr. Burton says:

You need not be told that the entire Christian world is watching with keen interest what we may hardly call an experiment but rather an experience in your great Dominion, in which you are setting an example to the Protestant world and furnishing a stimulus to the divided churches of Christendom to set their eyes on their one Lord and unitedly to exercise themselves in the one cause of establishing his Kingdom.

May you find in this new relationship an enrichment of the Christian life of each member of the three communions, an increase in the power of these combined churches, and a new revelation of the meaning of the Gospel, not for yourselves alone, but for all the world.

JOURNALISM'S ACHIEVEMENT

Special reference ought to be made to the first issue of *The New Outlook*, continuing the *Christian Guardian* (established 1829), *The Presbyterian Witness* (established 1848), and *The Canadian Congregationalist* (established 1854), as the official organ of the United Church. The editorial details and organization of the new paper are not yet settled, but the editorial forces of the three bodies combined to produce in this number

issued on the first day of the United Church not only a triumph of journalism and typography, but a rich and competent portrayal of the event in its historic setting, present significance and spiritual possibilities. Journalism could hardly have produced a more creditable achievement or one more fitting the occasion. Here, too, as in the opening service of the United Church all has been conceived in magnanimity of spirit and high purpose. The editorial pen has been touched with fine consecration.

We do not know just what part Dr. Creighton of the *Christian Guardian* may have had in the preparation of this first issue of *The New Outlook*, but undoubtedly it has been large. Special tribute, however, must be paid to the way in which Dr. Creighton has conducted the *Guardian* during these trying years, and especially during recent months. In the course of Presbyterian controversies over union many harsh and unkind references to Methodists have been made by anti-unionists. This has been a discreditable episode in Canadian religious life, but Methodism in its official leaders and in its official organ has splendidly maintained its temper and its high calling. It is in no small measure due to Dr. Creighton's fine editorial advocacy of union, alike in positive utterance and in restraint, that Methodism goes solidly into the United Church with lofty faith and high enthusiasm.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

So the United Church of Canada begins its course. *The New Outlook* fittingly hails it with Longfellow's word in *The Building of the Ship*:

Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
 Humanity with all its fears,
 With all the hopes of future years,
 Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
 We know what Master laid thy keel,
 What Workman wrought thy ribs of steel,
 Who made each mast, and sail, and rope,
 What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
 In what a forge and what a heat,
 Were shaped the anchors of thy hope!

* * * *

Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
 Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
 Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
 Are all with thee—are all with thee!

If we may adopt that figure it may be said that it would be folly to suppose that the ship of the new church will have only smooth sailing and pleasant waters. There will be shoals, and perilous rocks, and turbulent seas, but there is no reason why the staunch craft should not conquer every peril. Certain real menaces lie ahead. There will be the menace with which large organization besets spiritual life; there will be the danger that the new church may be more distinctively national than Christian; there will be the danger that programmes of reform supplant, rather than express, the church's mission of redemption; and there will be the danger that formalism and narrowness of vision may nullify or minimize the emphasis upon liberty that must become evident in any church that would serve the future.

Our hope and prayer is that none of these dangers may weaken or destroy the efficacy and significance of a profoundly valuable movement. In some respects the letter of the constitution of the United Church lacks the emphasis upon spiritual freedom and the note of prophecy that marked the spirit of the gathering and of the utterances upon the opening day. Will the new church be a church of the letter, or of the spirit? In its answer to this question will be revealed its destiny, in failure or in spiritual triumph. Our Canadian brethren have subjected themselves to a severe test. They have set for themselves a high and difficult way. God give them grace, and courage, and wisdom, and vision, to follow it! God grant that in these days of narrow distrust, of sectarian and racial prejudice, of exclusiveness and aloofness, that this kindling of hearts in the Dominion may be a flame that shall never be put out, and that it may spread into a conflagration until all who name the Name of Christ may be welded by love and understanding into the unity of obedience to his highest word, *A new commandment I give unto you that ye love one another!*

[From Rev. William E. Gilroy, D. D., Editor of *The Congregationalist*, Boston, Mass.]

Canada Makes Church History

PUT down a new monumental date in ecclesiastical history—Wednesday, June 10, 1925. On that day took place the first large scale achievement of organic union of separate denominational families since the Protestant Reformation. Nearly 10,000 congregations of Christians scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific throughout the Dominion of Canada, passed in a

single day from the status of units in the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational denominations to the status of units in the United Church of Canada. They took with them all the spiritual wealth of their separate traditions and ideals and experience, but left behind, empty and obsolete, their denominational organizations and names. As a legal entity the Presbyterian Church in Canada is no more. As a legal entity the Methodist Church in Canada is no more. As a legal entity the Congregational Church in Canada is no more. Their members have moved out of the constricting and competing sectarian institutions which came down from ancient history and have moved into a new home which they have established by a common ecclesiastical agreement, confirmed by the law of the state and by the sacramental celebration of the holy Communion. All over Canada on June 10 meetings were held in local communities by the churches participating in this union, but it was in the city of Toronto that the official act of ushering in the new dispensation took place. The full meaning of the event cannot be interpreted at the present close range, nor in a single attempt. Its many-sided significance will appear in the unfolding of the new church's life and it will be the object of continued study and exposition for months and perhaps years to come.

That the post-war reaction did not overwhelm the union impulse in Canada as it did in the United States is cause for rejoicing and fresh taking of heart on the part of those Christians everywhere who still inwardly yearn and hope for the fulfilment of Jesus' prayer for the unity of his followers. We on the American side of the line have watched the movement toward unity in Canada as it made each successive turn of the road with emotions strongly tinged with skepticism. The thing was too good to be true. We felt as if it were a kind of drama being enacted, whose unreality would surely be disclosed before the goal could be attained. It was incredible that great, proud denominations could be persuaded to abandon their very existence and allow the free spirit of God to lead their peoples into the construction of a new ecclesiastical order on the level of the real problems and tasks of modern life.

But Americans did not know Canada. They did not know the breadth of intelligence in the Canadian churches. They did not know how poignantly the scandal and waste and inefficiency of the denominational system, especially in the vast new provinces of the west, pressed upon the conscience of Canadian churchmen. They did not know how much more free the ecclesi-

astical spirit is in Canada than in America. And more important than all, American doubters were not aware of the depth and sweep of the spirit of nationalism in Canada, which has loosened the roots of institutional habit and quickened into life an ardour for independent, realistic approaches to all social and public concerns. It was our American unawareness of these freshening forces moving through Canada's life that explains our incredulity toward the reports that have come to us from time to time of a new milestone of progress reached by the movement for church unity.

But June 10 leaves no doubt of the utter and genuine reality of the movement. The curtain has been rung down on the old, so far as these three denominations are concerned. A new stage has been set; a fresh scene greets the eye; the play itself is from this point on to be different. One of the most amazing facts in the new Canadian church situation is the complacency with which the venerable and most loyal leaders of the erstwhile denominations seem to regard the passing of their denominations. There is hardly a plaintive or wistful expression in any one's speech. On the contrary, there are signs of relief, of emancipation, of escape from futility and hollowness into reality and fruitfulness. Hope reigns in all hearts. The ardour of a great adventure is the ruling passion throughout the uniting churches. The people and their leaders are not daunted by the lack of precedent—they rejoice in that lack, for they can act freely in the light of actual conditions without looking backward to an authority that does not fit into the facts of the new situation.

This is one point at which the spirit of the new nationalism shows itself. It is a spirit of independent construction, proceeding on the conscious recognition that the social life of the nation is *sui generis*, and that religion and every other human interest has both the right and the duty of confronting its task with original insight and a free hand. Canadians speak often of their "great *young* country." They are conscious of their youth, of their vast room, and of the limitless possibilities of the future. Why, they ask in more or less conscious self-justification, should we uncritically take our religious institutions from other hands? Why not make them with our own? They proceed to examine the religious institutions which have been bequeathed to them. They find them—these denominational organizations—costly, inhibitive of one another's usefulness, artificial, preserving distinctions that no longer distinguish, keeping alive ancient controversies that would never be heard

of to-day were they not so richly and proudly embalmed in these venerable institutions. And even though nothing worse could be found, they surely find that these denominations are irrelevant to the essential tasks of the Christian gospel. But can anything worse be said of an institution labeled Christian than that it is irrelevant to its Christian task? So these churches of Canada have reasoned, and they have made up their minds through a process of more than twenty years of discussion and conference and reflection and prayer; and they have taken their stand out in the open air of their free, young country determined to construct *a Church of Christ for Canada*.

All this may sound as if the Canadian movement is without anchor, as if it had launched forth upon its high adventure without due concern for its harbour or in the course that leads thither. Although such daring faith would not be wholly without precedent either in western civilization or in holy Scripture, the Canadian churches have not been called upon to exercise it. The movement is essentially and basically conservative. It is not led by hot-heads but by the most sturdy and best-balanced men of the nation—lay, clerical, and scholarly. Moreover the doctrinal basis upon which the new church stands is conservative. It consists essentially of a rewriting of the substance of the historic creeds, omitting altogether the harsh and in large part the irrelevant portions. This confessional structure of the new church is soundly evangelical. No radical departure is contemplated in the ecclesiastical organization. An ingenious dove-tailing of the three types of organization represented by the uniting groups has been worked out, but it must not be imagined that the form of organization is determined by any artificial and childish desire to have all the characteristic features of the three churches reproduced in a new ecclesiastical mosaic. The new church takes its form from the new conditions, and merely selects from the abandoned denominational structures whatever materials it can actually use.

And, more reassuring than all else, there is in the new church a profound passion for a genuine spiritual life. No one can doubt that the moving consideration at the root of the union has all along been the sense that the conventional piety of the divided churches has reached a stage of arrested development. Where this piety is not tinctured with hypocrisy it is not unlikely to show itself impotent to meet the life tests of to-day. A freer air for the spiritual life is necessary. A closer gearing in of the machinery of religion with the mechanism of the secular life, so that there may be a true spiritual control of

the social organism, has been with varying degrees of clearness felt by Canada's Christian leaders. This is reflected in the name taken by the new church. It is a public name—not one derived from esoteric ecclesiological accidents. "The United Church of Canada"—it sounds free! It suggests the highway of life, not a sequestered path. It implies a purpose to meet mankind in those burly, gross, and common relationships where, after all, men actually live, rather than merely on the level of some highly specialized refinement. This means that the way is open to utilize the vast volumes of spiritual life and power which now exist outside all the churches, and which the churches are too nice in their habits and self-conception and doctrines to use. What specific qualities their spiritual life will ultimately take on no one may safely predict, but without doubt the contribution of Canada's new church to the life of the spirit will be no less than its contribution to ecclesiastical organization. The whole Christian world will watch with prayer and hope as the new church unfolds its powers.

[From *The Christian Century*, Chicago.]

The United Church of Canada and Religious Education

THE first effect of the union of the churches in Canada on Religious Education will be disturbance of present organizations, most of which have been doing good work. That will mean both loss and gain. There will be loss, because some of the co-operations that have been fruitful, are clearly to come to an end. Union has been achieved, not without division—in the Presbyterian Church, serious, and, in the extent and bitterness of it, unexpected division; and that, with other causes active, will, for a time at least, interfere with hearty fellowships in work that have meant much to education. Proof of that can be seen in the results of the Union Movement on the Religious Education Association of Canada. In some places it is threatened with disruption.

But there cannot but be gain also. The great united church, unless she is to be an unnatural mother, will, with a new zeal, set herself to the high task of the religious training of her own young people. There are those who have resolved that that must be her chief home-work. It is certainly the most urgent. An intelligent educational evangelism that will teach youth how to live and what to live for, in loyalty to Christ, must command the conscience and strength of the united church. And,

no doubt, time with its healing hand, and more speedily than some think, will bring together sundered brethren. Protestant churches simply cannot afford to remain segregated with the claims of the child and in it the vocal future calling for the united best they can give. The follies of Fundamentalism versus Modernism may, for the present, also accentuate differences, but these too will pass away. In spite of a stormy dawn and looming clouds, the sun must reach noonday and the fruits of union be gathered.

In regard to theological colleges there will also be disturbance, but in the near future there will also be unions. The colleges of the churches entering the United Church of Canada will in different parts of the country be brought together into stronger colleges. Movements are on foot to do that. Of course, the anti-unionists will set up colleges of their own, but where geography makes it possible, they will surely work together with others.

What the effect of the union will be on such a promising scheme as the one Divinity Hall at Montreal has yet to be seen. There are both fears and hopes. As one who believes intensely in the free air of interdenominational co-opération, one hopes that even with three colleges making one powerful united college, co-operation with the Anglicans and the anti-unionist Presbyterians will continue to be possible and increasingly fruitful. Anything else would be a regrettable retreat.

The union of the churches will give to the colleges of the United Church a golden chance of raising the educational standard for the ministry. In that church for a decade there will be no lack of ministers and the rich young life of the church seeking preparation for the ministry can be carefully chosen and thoroughly trained.

It is perhaps to be regretted that nearly twenty-five years ago when the Basis of Union was drawn up, standards of ministerial training were determined. But to meet the great changes in the world since, these can also be changed. The ideal that must be pursued and reached is an Arts degree and three years in a theological college with the standards of a postgraduate school. That will inevitably raise the whole standard of ministerial training in Canada; and that will be one of the greatest services that the United Church can render to the country and to the Kingdom of God in the world. In this, as in other lands, one of the strategic points from which to advance is an efficient Christian ministry. Let the United Church set the example *of a learned and godly ministry* equal to the needs of to-day

and the claims of the immediate future, and all the other Protestant churches must follow if they are to live vigorously alongside of her. In every way the challenge comes to her to do it, and she must not fail to achieve.

In country districts especially the union of local churches should help greatly in this effort. A minister will get a man's work to do. Unnecessary travel by horse or motor car consuming time and strength will be cut off, and a better chance given to a minister to be a student. Economic strain should also be easier and the minister put in a position to buy some new books. The great gain, however, will be that in a large number of cases the ministers will be taken off the road and will get a chance to study.

But the great change must be worked from the churches through the colleges. The latter by loyalty to one another, by larger staffs and a better equipment, and above all by a high ideal and sound methods in seeking to reach it, must, educationally at least, make the average ministry something like the present best, and keep out of its ranks every man who as teacher and student is not likely to be efficient. The Christian religion must get a new chance by being reasonably presented and effectively taught. Perhaps then it may be more abundantly lived.

[From Principal D. L. Ritchie in *Christian Education*, New York.]

The Roman Catholics and Malines

WHEN the Archbishop of Canterbury first announced that the "conversations" at Malines had taken place, much criticism arose, and much of it from Roman Catholics. A statement appeared in *The Times* that the Vatican had no cognizance of the "conversations," and when inquiries were made as to the foundation for this statement it was said to come from the Cardinal Secretary of State himself. Some naturally thought, therefore, that the Archbishop's claim to have obtained official cognizance from the Holy See was due to a misapprehension.

As a matter of fact, the statement in *The Times* came from a quite irresponsible person in the English College at Rome, and was utterly false. The Archbishop might have been at liberty at once to quote the Pope's own message if it had not been so much stronger than anything his Grace had said himself. A week or two later, Cardinal Mercier himself published it in a pastoral. The words of the message were that the Pope

approves and encourages the "conversations" with all his heart, and gives them his blessing.

Now to Roman Catholics the Pope is not merely infallible when he defines a dogma concerning faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church. He is defined by the dogma of the Council of Florence, which met before the Reformation and was attended by bishops from the Orthodox Church, to be the Vicar of Christ and the successor of St. Peter, who was given authority to teach and govern the Universal Church. If, therefore, a Roman Catholic knows that the Pope in his government of the church approves, encourages, and blesses a certain work of that church, he can hardly help believing that the work is in its essence according to the Divine Will.

A zealous English Roman Catholic, therefore, who hears of the Pope's approval of the "conversations" and thinks the Pope wrong is in a very curious position. He is trying to win England to an obedience which he himself refuses to give. That is a very piquant sort of propaganda, and shows, as indeed the attitude of some Roman Catholics in the war showed, that papal authority is not in practice quite such an onerous fetter as its precise definitions suggest.

If, however, hostility to Malines were the attitude of English Roman Catholics generally, as many in the Church of England have not unnaturally been tempted to believe, it would hardly encourage members of the Church of England to pray for the success of the "conversations" at Malines or other means of reunion with the Holy See. Published utterances have deepened this discouragement. It is the object of this article to show how much reason there is for good courage. The majority of English Roman Catholics have only to hear the Pope's words to accept what he approves. Even before hearing of them, the Archbishop of Liverpool, one of the most important men in the Roman Catholic hierarchy, had said that it was all to the good that the "conversations" should take place, and take place on a foreign soil where the atmosphere was easier.

Englishmen as a whole, in and out of the fold of Rome, admire Cardinal Mercier enough to recognize that as Primate of Belgium he knows his business. Cardinal Bourne published at Easter a pastoral on reunion, in which he said:

Our attitude is and must be one of intense sympathy . . . it is to us a matter of rejoicing that members of the Establishment, to whatever school of thought they belong, should learn from representative Roman Catholics, whether they be in France, in Belgium, or here at home, or in any other country, a more complete understanding of what the Roman Catholic Church really teaches. Such contact, with the help and guidance of the Holy Spirit,

must be productive of good, even though no actual result may be immediately obtained. . . . Our part is to remove obstacles from the path of all seekers after truth, and never to lose heart or to be discouraged. If our efforts seem to be fruitless or unheeded . . . at last, in his own way and in his own time, his clearly declared purpose will be fulfilled, and "there shall be one fold and one Shepherd."

But the fact remains that some English Roman Catholic writers have made, and have not retracted, hostile criticism of the "conversations." We need not be embittered, discouraged, or surprised if that is so. They maintain a tradition which endured through centuries of persecution. They are, many of them, influenced by the tradition of a hostile people, the Irish: and they have as a community made great sacrifices to maintain and speak what they are bound to regard as official Christianity, to which they are passionately attached. It is not unnatural if they emphasize the uncompromising side of their faith rather than its charity, its tolerance, and its sympathy with human nature.

But such writers do not represent the majority of English Roman Catholics any more than they represent their ecclesiastical authorities. The present writer has been in intimate touch with some of those present at the "conversations." He has read the notices in the press on the Continent as well as in Great Britain. He has spoken to many of his co-religionists in England. He knows exactly what has taken place. He has sought in personal intercourse the opinions of exalted ecclesiastics. He is in a position to state that when the "conversations" begin again they will be the object of the most sympathetic hopes from all parts of the Roman Catholic world, and that the only real danger would be that members of the Church of England might not pray for or support their representatives at Malines. The extraordinary sympathy, kindness, and encouragement which he has himself received from innumerable Anglican friends as well as from the highest authorities of their communion, and the fact that every Anglican bishop but one approves the "conversations," persuade him against fearing the danger he mentions and give him faith that at the proper time it will be overcome.

[From R. E. Gordon George, Roman Catholic, in *The Christian Work*, New York.]

The Church Unity Octave

SECURE in the unity which the Divine Founder provided for his Church, Catholics should have a deep charity for all

those sincere Christians whose souls are sick of sectarian divisions, whose hearts yearn for that unity for which Christ prayed:

I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them whom Thou hast given Me: because they are thine: and all my things are thine and thine are mine; and I am glorified in them. And now I am not in the world, and these are in the world, and I come to Thee. Holy Father, keep them in thy name whom Thou hast given Me; that they may be one as We also are. . . . As Thou hast sent Me into the world, I also have sent them into the world. . . . And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in Me; that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, 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 xvii).

Our separated brethren sometimes say that the Church is comprised of all who are united to Jesus Christ in faith and love; who these are and how many God alone knows; that the Church for which Christ prayed is, therefore, this invisible Church. Catholic theology also includes all such in the soul of the Church even though separated inculpably from its visible body.

But that unity for which Christ prayed is a visible unity; it was to be a unity so strikingly visible that it would convince the world of Christ's Divine mission: "That they all may be one, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me."

To the Catholic the words of Christ in the Gospels are so clear that sometimes it is hard to understand and believe that non-Catholic Christians can be in good faith. The Acts of the Apostles make it evident that the Twelve understood their mission to be just as Catholics conceive it to-day. But we fail in Christian charity if we judge them without taking into account the formative influences of traditional Protestant teaching. Newman was deeply religious, was always immersed in religious thought and study; yet for nearly half his long life of ninety years he remained outside the Catholic Church. And Newman is but one of thousands who have taken the better part of a lifetime to find their way back to the church of their forefathers.

In this annual appeal to our readers to join heart and soul in the Church Unity Octave of prayer, we have before quoted the Rev. Dr. Edmund Middleton's remarkable book *Unity and Rome* [which was reviewed in *The Christian Union Quarterly*]. It may serve our purpose to quote it again. Dr. Middleton, who is a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, writes:

In a certain and very real sense it is a sin for the followers of Christ to live in disunity, although we believe that Almighty God, in his mercy and understanding of human frailty, pardons the misguided actions, which

proceed from invincible ignorance. Opinions which shaped themselves, and self-confidence which assumed unwarranted authority in the heat and strife of the Reformation struggle, have now had abundant opportunity to test themselves in the light of experience and practical results. As men look backward, aided by the perspective of several centuries, misgivings are beginning to arise in many quarters. Under God this growing doubt and dissatisfaction with church conditions are turning the thoughts of men toward unity—its desirability, nay, its necessity. . . .

Lovers of unity see in the movement now under way the finger of God. They think of the Spirit of God brooding over the waters at Creation—bringing order out of chaos. Another chaos has invaded the world—this time the Christian world—seeking to rend the Church against which Christ has promised the gates of hell shall never prevail. Once more the Spirit of God—this time in his Divine capacity as the Spirit of Truth—is brooding over the waters, enlightening men's understanding, recalling to their minds the will of Christ, showing them the evil results of going contrary to that will, holding out before them the blessings of unity.

Of course Catholics know that the gates of hell have not prevailed, will never prevail against the Church; that Christ's promise could not fail; to Catholics the very suggestion seems to savour of blasphemy. But of the sincerity of the author quoted we have not a doubt in the world, and the very fact that he longs with his whole soul for unity, yet remains outside the Catholic Church, should teach us charity, and the sympathy that comes only from charity.

It is only with charity, a deep, Christ-like charity, that we can enter into the true spirit of the Church Unity Octave. Our humility, too, should be profound. If Catholics never gave scandal would not the way to unity be clearer and easier for many earnest souls who are groping their way back to the One Fold under One Shepherd?

It can hardly fail to help us to prepare our souls for the prayer of the Church Unity Octave to recall the fact that this week of prayer owes its origin to a group of earnest and fervently pious non-Catholic (Episcopal) clergymen. Under the motto "That they all may be One" they published a little magazine, *The Lamp*, through which they zealously sought to enlist others in a crusade of prayer for a reunited Christian Church. Eventually they became Catholics and priests; and now, known as the Fathers of the Atonement, they add to their prayers the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass; and still all their prayers, all their Masses, all their lives are devoted to the one object: "That they all may be One."

The most beautiful form that the beautiful virtue of Christian charity can take is prayer for others. And that is the particular exercise of charity that is urgently requested of us during the Church Unity Octave. Prayer is a wonderful privilege, a wonderful power.

In the economy of God's providence He allows, He compels us to depend on one another. In the communion of saints it is given us to help souls, hungry and thirsty for the truth. In so far as the spiritual is above the material charity in the spiritual order is above that in the material. "Inasmuch as ye did it to these my least brethren ye did it unto Me."

It may serve many to reprint from the Ordo the prayers prescribed for the Dioceses of Toronto and London to be said publicly in all the churches with a resident pastor.

Five decades of the rosary will be recited for the intention of the Octave and then the following:

Antiphon: That they all may be one, as Thou, Father in Me and I in Thee; that they may also be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.

Verse: I say unto thee that thou art Peter.

Response: And upon this rock I will build my Church.

Let us pray: O Lord Jesus Christ, who saidst unto thine Apostles, My peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you; regard not our sins, but the faith of thy Church, and grant unto her that peace and unity which are agreeable to thy will; who liveth and reigneth God forever and ever. Amen.

O God of unity and peace, grant, we beseech Thee, in the holy name of Jesus, that we who are of many races and tongues, may be united in heart and mind in all that pertains to the advancement of religion and the best interests of our country, through the same Christ, our Lord. Amen.

[From *The Catholic Record*, London, Canada.]

Bishop W. T. Manning on Christian Unity

SPEAKING recently at the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City, on the subject of Christian unity, Bishop Manning said in part:

Men to-day are not hostile to religion, but the message of Christ seems to them confused and uncertain. Amid the controversies of the churches they cannot hear the great central message of the Church. The fact which they see clearly is that, however the divisions may be accounted for, they conflict with the Church's own teaching, and contradict her own principles. They know that whatever else the Church of Christ stands for, it must, if it truly represents Him, stand for harmony, not for discord; for peace, not for dissension; for fellowship, not for separation and division.

A disunited Church cannot give the full message of Christ to the world. How can the world accept the Gospel of fellowship from an organization which is at variance with itself? What consistency is there in an appeal for a united world issued by a divided Church? That the consequences of

our present divisions are most serious is all too clear. But the hopeful feature of the situation is that Christians everywhere are realizing this. Never, I believe, since the divisions in the Church of Christ took place, has the need of reunion been felt as deeply as it is now.

A new spirit of fellowship is showing itself. Misconceptions are being removed. Mutual respect is taking the place of suspicion and misunderstanding.

Scholarship is at work; and under its impartial searchlight, some of the old difficulties wear a changed aspect. There is a new freedom, a new interchange of thought, a new readiness to compare ideas and to consider opposing views among scholars and leaders in all communions. Roman Catholics and Protestants, Anglicans and Nonconformists, are found sympathetically and open-mindedly studying each other's religious life and teaching.

I believe the time has come for a new synthesis of the deep religious values represented by all Christian communions, both Catholic and Protestant. I believe that a deeper study of these values will show that they are not as antagonistic as they may appear on the surface, but that in great degree they are complementary to each other.

We need a synthesis of the Truth for which St. Patrick's Cathedral, the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, the Russian Cathedral of St. Nicholas, and the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, all stand.

What we need to-day is a new manifestation of the spirit of brotherhood which shall draw us into fellowship not only with our fellow Christians of all names, but with men of all races and of all faiths, realizing that we are all children of one Father and are all created in his Image and Likeness.

What we need now is a Christianity larger, nobler, truer than any that we have yet attained, a Christianity larger, not because it has surrendered its faith in Christ's Gospel, but because it has entered more deeply into the Gospel; a Christianity which is in vital, organic relation with the past, but which includes the spiritual contributions of this age and of every age since the first days. We need have no fear that in such an atmosphere the Truth of Christ will suffer. In the atmosphere of brotherliness, mutual sympathy, and fellowship, the Truth of Christ will flourish and find fullest expression.

The Christianity which we now need must be loyal to the Gospel as once for all revealed in Christ, but it must believe also in progress as the very condition of its life; it must rejoice in the new as well as in the old, it must have care for and sympathy with all that brings strength and cheer and gladness to the lives of men. We must not content ourselves to-day with a mere fellowship of Protestants on the one hand and of Catholics on the other. This would fall far short of the brotherhood to which Christ calls us and might only intensify the divisions among Christians. We must stand for the fact that in Christ, and through Christ, all are to be made one; that in the great words of St. Paul, "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

It is this great vision of unity for which we pray that the Cathedral of St. John the Divine may stand, a unity based not on surrender of Christian Truth, but on development of the spirit of Christian brotherhood in its largest and fullest meaning.

I pray that the Cathedral may more and more realize the noble ideal of its founders, who declared in its constitution that, while it is the Cathedral of the Episcopal Church, it is also a House of Prayer for the use of all people who may resort thereto, and is "an instrument of church unity and a center of intellectual light and leading in the spirit of Jesus Christ." Throughout its history the Cathedral has stood, as it should stand, in wide and large relationship with the life of the city as a whole, and I think I may say that it has never stood in this relationship more fully than it does to-day. By its influence it is, I believe, helping practically and powerfully

to strengthen the spirit of unity among Christians of all names and to draw all men into truer fellowship.

I pray that it may be more and more a great center of faith and love and brotherhood in our common life. And may we all do our part to strengthen that spirit of brotherhood, and to hasten the fulfilment of our Lord's own vision and prayer, that in Him we may all be drawn into fellowship with each other, and with our Father who is in Heaven.

[From *The Living Church*, Milwaukee, Wis.]

Unity Features South American Congress at Montevideo

THE Congress on Christian work in South America was held in Montevideo, Uruguay, March 29 to April 8. It was a really notable gathering in which the spirit of unity triumphed over a score of national, mental, temperamental, and spiritual diversities and bound them together in one. Ever since the meeting of the evangelical forces of North and South America at Panama, in 1916, there has been expectation and desire of a distinctly South American Congress on South American soil and under South American leadership. The missions and evangelical churches asked the Committee on Co-operation in Latin America, which is made up of the mission boards in the United States and Canada at work in Latin America, to make the preparations for the congress; and this the committee did in constant correspondence with the agencies on the field.

The Montevideo congress was like and unlike any other congress of Christian forces. It was like Edinburgh and Panama in its study of commission reports published in advance and dealing with the main subjects of discussion. It was like the last Shanghai conference in being under the administration of nationals. But unlike these gatherings, it sought to go beyond general discussions to direct and concrete questions of life and work and to unite upon definite findings; it bound nationals, missionaries, and delegates from the home lands together in a quite new way; and it sought to grapple with the problems of the evangelical forces of our entire continent.

The president of the congress was Dr. Erasmo Braga of Brazil, and I am sure no one at the congress had ever seen a more admirable presiding officer. With the most perfect courtesy, gentleness, alertness, decision, and charm, as well as with deep Christian spirit and rare ability, Dr. Braga conducted the work of the congress in such a way as to command the unlimited respect and deep affection of all. The standard language of the congress was Spanish, but Dr. Braga could translate the words of any speaker in Spanish, Portuguese, French, or Eng-

lish. The Portuguese speaking delegates from Brazil and the Spanish speaking delegates from the rest of South America could understand one another without interpretation, but all important statements in Spanish and Portuguese were summarized in English for the benefit of those who did not know Spanish and Portuguese, and any important statements in English were translated into Spanish.

Just as the president and the language of the congress were Latin American, so were its spirit and purpose. The reports of the twelve commissions were made up of material prepared on the field, though condensed and put in final form in New York. Those reports had all been published both in English and in either Spanish or Portuguese. Of the score or so of speakers at the evening meeting only two were from the North American delegation, and only one was a missionary. The discussion of the commission reports was shared in, one would judge, about equally by nationals and missionaries.

No one could attend this congress and have any doubt as to the reality and power of the evangelical churches in South America. Those who regard the continent as the preserve of the Roman Catholic Church are in double error. They forget the vast numbers of the South American people who are outside the Roman Catholic Church and all churches, and they also forget these evangelical churches. When the Protestant churches of the United States and Europe come here to give their help they are not intruding where they are not wanted. They are coming to work with sister churches, which are as truly national here and have as valid a title as the Roman Catholic Church.

The congress brought out the great diversity of strength and influence of the evangelical churches in different countries. It was obvious that they are far and away strongest in Brazil. Indeed, there are more evangelical Christians in Brazil than in all the rest of Latin America combined. The Brazilian delegation in the congress was remarkable. Its leaders were the peers of any, missionaries and visitors alike. It was clear that their position at home was very different from that of the Protestant leaders in some other countries. In Brazil the evangelical churches have won an outstanding position. They are financially and ecclesiastically independent. They are conscious of their strength and command the respect and regard of the nation. And it was inspiring to see the confidence and courage with which they are pushing out in their work into all the life of their huge country.

The congress opened on Sunday afternoon with two strong addresses by Dr. Erasmo Braga and Rev. John Mackay, a missionary in Peru of the Free Church of Scotland and one of the ablest missionaries in South America, and it closed on Wednesday morning, April 8, with a remarkable address by Bishop Francis J. McConnell, summing up the congress. Each half-day session was devoted to one of the commission reports, of which there were twelve: Occupation of the Field, Indians, Education, Evangelism, Social Movements, Medical and Health Ministry, the Church in the Community, Religious Education, Literature, Relations Between National and Foreign Workers, Special Religious Problems, Co-operation and Unity. Some one presented each report in a statement of from twenty to thirty-five minutes, and then as many speakers followed in seven or five minute speeches as the time allowed.

Each morning began with an informal prayer time and ended at noon with a half-hour devotional address and then a time of intercession. At 6 o'clock a meeting was held in the Ateneo for the public, and in the evening the congress met again for a simple meeting of its own to hear prominent Latin Americans tell of currents of thought and feeling in South America, or the European delegates speak of their church life in its relation to South America, or other members of the congress witness to the meaning and power of the gospel.

There were 315 delegates and visitors, of whom about two-thirds were official delegates or invited guests, and the remainder visitors who came for the gathering from many lands. About one-third of the delegates were nationals. Of the delegates proper forty-three were from the United States. Thirty-six different organizations were represented, and members of all the evangelical churches at work in South America, I think, were in attendance.

The sessions of the congress were held, and all the delegates lived together, in the Hotel Pocitos, a summer hotel on the seashore in a pleasant section of Montevideo. April is the beginning of the autumn in South America. The hotel, having closed its summer season, gave itself over completely to the congress. The Panama congress had had this same experience of living and working under one roof, in the Tivoli hotel at Panama in 1916. It meant a great deal to have so many people from eighteen different nations living together as one common family for all these days.

It was stimulating and inspiring to see and hear these scattered evangelical forces facing so courageously their great

tasks. Leaving out of account altogether the Roman Catholic Church, there is a vast field of need for helping the ignorant and neglected and for seeking to bring the Gospel to great classes of intelligent people who have rejected it or are indifferent to it. And nothing better can happen to the Roman Catholic Church here than to have beside it as strong evangelical churches as there are in the United States.

There must be a great future before these lands. No one knows the extent of their resources, and no one can know their people without affection and regard. It is sure that for them, as for the people of North America, everything depends on one thing—our common readiness to follow the way of Christ.

[From Dr. Robert E. Speer in *The Continent*, New York.]

Unite in Religious Music

A NOTABLE feature of the second annual Music Week in Boston was a sacred concert held in Symphony Hall, Sunday afternoon, May 10. A great ensemble choir filled the spacious platform. It included the choirs of the Jewish Temple Israel, and Roman Catholic and Protestant churches. The programme said: "The directors and singers of these choirs are co-operating for the purpose of creating greater public interest in worthy religious music, and to sound a strong note of spiritual unity." That purpose was achieved. Several of the choirs sang selections by themselves. The larger part of the programme was by the united assembly of choirs, in which all seemed to be in unison of spirit and purpose. The result was a musical triumph. It was even more significant and inspiring as a demonstration of essential unity. The Congregational churches represented were the Wellesley Church and Eliot Church, Newton.

[From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, Mass.]

BOOK REVIEWS

THE FAITH OF MODERNISM. By Shailer Mathews, Dean of the Divinity School, University of Chicago. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Modernism is a very general term. It covers a multitude of meanings. It stands for something good or bad according to the predilections and prepossessions of the person using it. For Dean Mathews in this remarkable book it stands for a method and a spirit. What the method is may be seen from the outline of the chapter on "What Is Modernism?" The points in the discussion of the real nature of modernism in this chapter are: "A phase of scientific struggle for freedom in thought and belief"; "Modernists' acceptance of the results of science"; "The application of scientific methods in the study of the Bible and religion"; "The application of Christianity to social problems"; "The justification of Christian faith by a knowledge of other realities"; "The evangelicalism of the scientific mind." "In brief, then," writes Dr. Mathews at the end of this chapter, "the use of scientific, historical, social methods in understanding and applying evangelical Christianity to the needs of living persons, is modernism. Its interests are not those of theological controversy or appeal to authority. They do not involve the rejection of the supernatural when rightly defined. Modernists believe that they can discover the ideals and directions needed for Christian living by the application of critical and historical methods to the study of the Bible; that they can discover by similar methods the permanent attitudes and convictions of Christians constituting a continuous and developing group; and that these permanent elements will help and inspire the intelligent and sympathetic organization of life under modern conditions. Modernists are thus evangelical Christians who use modern methods to meet modern needs. Confessionalism is the evangelicalism of the dogmatic mind. Modernism is the evangelicalism of the scientific mind."

Something of the constructive and affirmative spirit of the movement and of this exposition of it is revealed in the following paragraph in the chapter on "The Affirmations of Faith": "Just because they are loyal to the convictions which have given rise to the Christian movements, modernists cannot stop with ethics, history, science, sociology, and biblical literature. They seek to come themselves and bring others into the very presence of God revealed in Jesus Christ. Only thus can they lay hold upon the God who works in the world of nature and of men. They want men to pray as well as plan, to find the way to spiritual reserves in order that they may get power to resist evil and endure success. The result of their efforts to accomplish these ends is not a philosophy but a religion enabling men and women engrossed in their daily life and social tasks to co-operate with the immanent God of love."

Modernism, therefore, is like the great revivals which have preceded it, a movement for the further liberation of the spirit and power of the Gospel and for its more intensive, extensive, and effectual application to the life and needs of the world. It has positive principles, aims, and methods. Its faith centers in Jesus. In the chapter on "Jesus and Human Needs," Dr. Mathews says: "Jesus Christ, the Saviour, rather than dogma or even the Bible, is the center of the modernist's faith. It cannot be otherwise." "Loyalty to Jesus as the one competent to reveal the saving power of God whatever may be the need of humanity, is at the heart of the Christian movement. The modernist knows no other center for his faith. He seeks only to make that loyalty a source of power. He wishes to introduce Jesus Christ to the world, believing that the world needs Him and that He can help satisfy the world's needs. But, in such presentation He would meet the modern world on its own basis. Its needs must be met by a Christ who is not an archaeological problem or a theological doctrine but a person translatable into influence."

What place then has the Bible in modernism? This is important, and a very excellent chapter is devoted to "Modernism and the Bible." "Deep within the modernist movement is a method of appreciating and using the Bible." What is this method? "The true method is followed by the modernist: to study the Bible with full respect for its sanctity but with equal respect for the student's intellectual integrity. We must begin with the facts concerning it, interpret its actual value, and use it for what it is actually worth. Only thus can it properly minister to our spiritual needs." The modernist's position regarding the Bible is therefore not negative and destructive, but positive and constructive. "He does not deny the truth of the Scriptures. On the contrary, he is devoted to the Scriptures and the endeavour to place them in their true position in modern life."

What, finally, is modernism all about? One reads this great book to find that the movement of which it is an exposition is a great, serious, intelligent endeavour to lay hold of the everlasting energies of the Gospel and of the spirit of Christianity and to bring them to bear on the needs and problems of this lost world as it actually is and to save it with a salvation as real and full and complete, individually and socially, ethically and spiritually, as the Kingdom of God. This book should mark an epoch in this modern movement. From this point onward modernism should be increasingly an affirmative, constructive, enlightening, and evangelizing factor in the religion and life of the modern world. [H. C. A.]

CHRISTIANITY AND MODERNISM. By Francis J. Hall, D.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the General Theological Seminary, New York. New York: Edwin S. Gorham.

A competent analysis and discussion of the present general theological controversy, such as is presented in this book, renders valuable service not only to the general cause of truth and understanding but also to the cause of unity. Christian unity, like every other great Christian enterprise, must reckon with theology. Whoever, therefore, brings light to bear on the problems of theology by so much makes a contribution to Christian unity. In this very instructive book Dr. Hall does two important things.

First, in a clear and discerning statement of the case, outlining the rise and progress of the controversy, and setting forth the factors of which it is composed, he defines the issue as being "a battle of standpoints." "In Protestant theology the standpoints involved are those of liberalism and fundamentalism. Within Catholic communions, including our own, the battle lies between the standpoints of modernism and Catholic conservatism, modernism being, in some ways, akin to liberalism, but in important regards quite distinct." Liberalism, in Professor Hall's view, owes its development and principles chiefly to German rationalism and reflects the influence of Kant's critical philosophy, of negative Biblical criticism, of Schleiermacher's emphasis on experience, and of Ritschl's "value judgments." In it private judgment comes to full sway as against both Biblical and ecclesiastical authority. Fundamentalism, on the other hand, is a Protestant recoil from liberalism and is an effort to maintain the orthodoxy of Protestant confessionalism. "Real fundamentalists are the extremists among Protestants who are fighting liberalism; and, in rejecting established modern knowledge upon the basis of a highly precarious inference from Biblical inspiration, they weaken rather than help the cause of Protestant orthodoxy. They seem to be fighting for a lost cause." Modernism had its origin in the Roman Communion and grew out of the effort "to reconcile papal allegiance with the modern mind and with scientific and critical knowledge and thought." Among Anglicans and Episcopalians it becomes the effort to reconcile allegiance to the Catholic creeds and principles with the present day scientific and critical point of view. Over against all of these is what may be called, in general, the Catholic position, which takes the standpoint of historical Christianity and which "is rooted in acceptance of the supernatural, of a specific and miraculous manifestation of God in history, and of the eternal, inherent, and full possession by our Lord of the unique and indivisible Godhead."

Second, Professor Hall has helped to clear the ground by an able and constructive discussion of the interpretations which these opposing schools of thought make of the great creeds and doctrines of the Church, especially of the Virgin Birth of our Lord and of his Resurrection. It is a constructive, helpful, and irenic book on a difficult and troublesome question. It will do good. [H. C. A.]

THE FOREIGN STUDENT IN AMERICA. A Study by the Commission on Survey of Foreign Students in the United States of America, under the Auspices of the Friendly Relations Committees of the Young Men's Christian Association and the Young Women's Christian Association. Edited by W. Reginald Wheeler, Henry H. King, and Alexander B. Davidson. New York: Association Press.

One of the most welcome and important of all the groups of "strangers within our gates" is that large and increasing number of young men and women of other lands who come to the United States for study and professional training. There are now more than eight thousand of these students in our colleges and universities, and if the secondary schools be included the number is well over fourteen thousand. They come to spend several years, and the estimate which they form of things American and Christian will be an important factor in their influence as leaders after they return to their own countries. It is important, therefore, that every effort be made to enable them to get a right and adequate idea of American life and of the spirit of America. Especially is it important that they come to understand the real place which the spirit and teachings of Christ have in American life. This is not always an easy matter. Mr. Hurrey, speaking for thoughtful students from every land, says: "Most of the students from non-Christian lands admire the life and teaching of Christ; they freely admit that our world would be a happier place if all people followed Him. Often they are more eager than we are to talk about Him and his philosophy; their challenge to us is: 'We would see Jesus.' But they find his face veiled by man-made obstructions, theological controversy, sectarian strife, ecclesiastical organization, ritualistic formalism. 'It is not your Christ,' they say, 'that we reject, but you, his followers. We want to know the universal Christ, unlimited by geography, race, language, or sex; not alone the victorious Christ of the triumphant entry, but Christ, the servant washing the disciples' feet, the apparently defeated Christ, dying with criminals, the forgiving Christ, the friendly Christ, the living Christ—where can we find Him?'"

This study is an effort to become better acquainted with these students and the world and background from which they come, and with the problems they meet and conditions which confront them here, all with a view to co-operation with them and for them for the good of all concerned. [H. C. A.]

MY DUEL WITH THE VATICAN. The Autobiography of a Catholic Modernist. By Alfred Loisy, Professor in the Collège de France. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company.

In this sincere and well tempered autobiography the great French modernist and scholar in a very earnest and moving manner tells the story

of his career in search of truth, and of the controversy which his views brought upon him, and which ended in his excommunication. It is indeed a story of "fruitful experiences, wherein exaltations of spirit have mingled with external reverses and internal agonies." It is not intended as an apologetic in his life and work, nor is it a condemnation of the Roman Catholic Church. It is a plain record which undertakes to set forth clearly and fairly just what occurred. The translator, in a long introductory chapter, has written an account and appreciation of Professor Loisy and of his writings and work which adds greatly to the value of the book. In this account the book is estimated as deserving to rank with those acknowledged masterpieces of religious autobiography, the *Apologia pro Vita Sua* of John Henry Newman and the *Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse* of Ernest Renan. The translation and publication of this book is of special interest and importance at this time because of the contribution it makes to the current theological discussion in which modernism and traditionalism are the contending points of view. [H. C. A.]

WHY THE CHURCH? What is Its Contribution to the Promotion of the Christian Way of Life in the World? A Syllabus of Questions for Use by Discussion Classes. Commission on the Church of the National Conference on the Christian Way of Life, 129 E. 52nd Street, New York City.

This is a syllabus of illuminating and thought-provoking questions. It is published in connection with the preparations which are being made for a proposed national conference on "the meaning of Christianity for human relationships, with special attention to industry, citizenship, and race relations in the United States, and the function of the Church in social and civic affairs." Four commissions are at work as follows: "The Church and the Christian Way of Life," "Christianity and International Relations," "Christianity and Industry," and "Christianity and Race Relations." This syllabus is the work of the first named of these commissions. It deals in a practical way with about all of the more important phases of the Church's work and relation to the life of the world. Chapter III, on "The Church as a Fellowship," is of special interest to those who are interested in Christian unity. [H. C. A.]

THE GOSPEL OF FELLOWSHIP. By The Rt. Rev. Charles D. Williams, D. D., Late Bishop of Michigan (Revell). The very title of this book sets forth the greatest need in the Church to-day, namely, a "gospel" of Christian unity, a "gospel" to be preached in season and out of season, every-

where." Moreover here is light on the real meaning of Christian unity, a definition of unity in terms of fellowship. The lectures which make up the book, however, are not limited to the question of fellowship in religion but deal with the principle and problem of fellowship in all of the major areas of life. Every chapter heading gives a sermon topic that ought to be preached on in every pulpit in the land. The chapters are, "The Need and Nature of Fellowship," "Fellowship Between Races," "Fellowship Between the Nations," "Fellowship in Industry," "Fellowship Among the Churches," and "The Fellowship of the Mystery." This book is heartily commended to all preachers and to others interested in better relations among men. [H. C. A.]

GOOD HEALTH AND LONG LIFE. By Lucien C. Warner, M. D., LL. D., author of *Functions and Diseases of Women*, *Man in Health and Disease*, *Personal Memoirs*, etc. (Association Press). This is a useful book on an important matter. It is not a book of fads and theories but a work in which one well qualified for the task has attempted to put into simple language the latest discoveries and teachings of the most eminent physicians on the subject of food, diet, exercise, and the general care of the health. [H. C. A.]

THE LION IN HIS DEN. A Series of Discussions of Books and Life. By Lynn Harold Hough (Association Press). Dr. Hough has written a most delightful and refreshing volume on a wide variety of topics, themes, persons, and things. "What is attempted," says the author, "is a criticism of life expressed in epigrams and not in weighty and sententious dissertations." [H. C. A.]

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, 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.

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

The Editor's Notes:

Stockholm Conferences — The World Alliance — Faith and Order — Christian Union Quarterly Dinner—Life and Work

Sermon at the Opening of the Universal

Christian Conference on

Life and Work . . . LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER, ENGLAND

The Church's Obligation in View of God's Purpose

for the World ALFRED E. GARVIE

The Essence of Christian Love

ARVID RUNESTAM

The Work of International Friendship

Through the Churches

SIR WILLOUGHBY DICKINSON

Christianity and Crime

WALTER SIMONS

Unity Between All Peoples

SELMA LAGERLÖF

The Church and Christian Education

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN

Closing Sermon

ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA

Reports of the Commissions of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work

The Message of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work

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

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

CONTENTS

OCTOBER, 1925

VOL. XV.

No. 2.

<i>THE EDITOR'S NOTES</i>	117
<i>SERMON AT THE OPENING OF THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK</i>LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER, ENGLAND	130
<i>THE CHURCH'S OBLIGATION IN VIEW OF GOD'S PURPOSE FOR THE WORLD</i>ALFRED E. GARVIE	136
<i>THE ESSENCE OF CHRISTIAN LOVE</i>ARVID RUNESTAM	143
<i>THE WORK OF INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES</i>SIR WILLOUGHBY DICKINSON	156
<i>CHRISTIANITY AND CRIME</i>WALTER SIMONS	162
<i>UNITY BETWEEN ALL PEOPLES</i> ...SELMA LAGERLÖF	180
<i>THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN EDUCATION</i>WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN	189
<i>CLOSING SERMON</i>ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA	196
<i>REPORTS OF THE COMMISSIONS OF THE UNI- VERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK</i>	202
<i>THE MESSAGE OF THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK</i>	241

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 EDWIN S. LINES,
Newark, N. J. |
| BISHOP CHARLES P. ANDERSON,
Chicago, Ill. | DR. FREDERICK LYNCH,
New York, N. Y. |
| REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. | VERY REV. J. A. M'CLYMONT, D.D.,
Edinburgh, Scotland. |
| BISHOP CHARLES H. BRENT,
Buffalo, N. Y. | PROF. SAMUEL McCOMB,
Cambridge, Mass. |
| DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn. | BISHOP FRANCIS J. McCONNELL,
Pittsburgh, Pa. |
| PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N. Y. | BISHOP WILLIAM F. McDOWELL,
Washington, D. C. |
| REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass. | THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER,
Manchester, England. |
| BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR.,
Washington, D. C. | REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. |
| PROF. DR. J. EUGENE CHOISY,
Geneva, Switzerland. | DR. WILFRED MONOD,
Paris, France. |
| 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. |
| REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky | PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa. |
| DEAN H. E. W. FOSBROKE,
New York, N. Y. | PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England. |
| DEAN W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill. | REV. J. H. SHAKESPEARE, D.D.,
London, England. |
| PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England. | PASTOR DR. FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND-
SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany. |
| MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor. | DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N. Y. |
| PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C. | THE ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA,
Upsala, Sweden. |
| DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Shanghai, China. | DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J. |
| REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. | REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich. |
| DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England. | BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio. |
| PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa. | BISHOP LUTHER B. WILSON,
New York, N. Y. |

The Cementing Prayer

IN ORDER TO OBTAIN THIS IMPORTANT RESULT, THERE IS NO NECESSITY OF REVISING OUR CREEDS AND OUR SYMBOLS. CHRISTIANITY WILL NEVER CEASE TO CONTEMPLATE, IN ADORATION, "THE LAMB OF GOD WHICH TAKETH AWAY THE SIN OF THE WORLD." BUT IT SHOULD REGARD WITH INCREASING UNDERSTANDING THE EXTENT AND THE EAGERNESS OF THE BATTLE FOR THE EXTERMINATION OF INIQUITY. LET, THEREFORE, THE CHRISTIAN WORLD MEDITATE AT THE FEET OF THE CROSS UPON THE PRAYER TAUGHT US BY THE SAVIOUR, THE PRAYER WHICH CEMENTS THE DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE CHRISTIAN EDIFICE, THE PRAYER WHICH COULD EVEN UNITE ALL THE FOLLOWERS OF ALL RELIGIONS, ALL THOSE WHO PRAY SINCERELY IN THE WHOLE WORLD, FOR IT CONTAINS NOT ONE SINGLE FORMULA OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY; BUT BLOSSOMS IN ITS FULNESS ON THE RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL PLANE OF EVANGELIC MESSIANIC FAITH.

—WILFRED MONOD, of *Paris, France*, at the *Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Stockholm, Sweden*.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

OCTOBER, 1925

THE EDITOR'S NOTES

Stockholm Conferences

IF all Christendom were divided into pro-papal and anti-papal, Rome and Stockholm would have been the respective capitals during the month of August, when multitudes from the anti-papal communions met in Stockholm in that which more closely approached an ecumenical conference than any Christian gathering in the last thousand years. The pro-papal communion was invited. Had the invitation been accepted it would have been an ecumenical conference with voices from the whole Church of Christ.

But as it was it marked an epoch in co-operative Christianity, when a majority of the Church was represented, for the first time since the division, in a conference that dealt with the great social, economic, industrial, and international relations from the Christian attitude. It marked a new day in the breaking down of barriers, in discovering better understandings, and in laying foundations for permanent relationships. It will be difficult for many to go back of Stockholm, 1925. Henceforth, we look forward, refreshed and hopeful.

The Swedish capital is an ideal city for such a conference. It is beautifully and conveniently located. Sweden holds an approach to all the nations, having been neutral during the World War. If it be thought of ecclesiastically, its see of Upsala can be traced back, without a break, so that its episcopacy is as valid as Rome's, but this was not thought of in the discussion of the great problems that had to do with Life and Work. The delightful climate of Stockholm, the hospitality of Sweden, the fine spirit of the conferences, the evidence of freedom in thinking together, the growth of fellowship, the genius of the Archbishop of Upsala were some of the things that called for frequent and friendly comment.

There were three conferences. Their sessions covered nearly a month. They were the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches, the World Conference on Faith and Order, and the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. The first two were the meetings of their international committees; the last was the outstanding meeting which has been in preparation for five years. A report of any one of these conferences might consume many pages, for they are all movements of great importance, bringing together men and women from many nations and many churches into fellowships that are abundant in achievement and promise.

The World Alliance

One of the foremost of all organizations making for world peace is the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches. It had its beginning at Constance, Germany, August, 1914, out of the labours of a few earnest men of several nations, who sought to bring to bear the principles of Christian fellowship upon the international life of the world. Among those who were there and who are still active in this work, to whose leadership we are greatly indebted, are Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson and Dr. Frederick Lynch. The World War broke out on the day of the Constance Conference and the World Alliance was necessarily checked in its activities until the peace treaties had been signed. Then it started forth again and it has made a remarkable contribution in the assertion of good-will for the nations of the world.

Its International Committee, which met in Stockholm, consisted of representatives from twenty-eight councils, distributed in as many nations, so that Europe, Asia, and America sat together in counsel. The American council is represented on the International Committee by thirteen members, the British, French, and German councils by eight each, and the remaining twenty-four councils by four each. Dr. Nehemiah Boynton, of America, is the chairman of the Committee, over which he presides skillfully. Dr. Alexander Ramsay has been the organization secretary for Europe. He has done very satisfactory

work, and it was deeply regretted that ill health necessitated his resigning.

This was the sixth meeting of the International Committee. It has been in existence nine years, in which time it has emphasized that the only cure of the world lies in applying the spirit of Christ to world problems, urging Christians in all lands, as Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson says in his report, "to manifest this spirit in the face of all influences which make for national egoism and bitterness of feeling; to strive unceasingly for the diffusion of such good-will and reasonableness as will demand the settlement of international disputes by methods of conciliation and arbitration, and a readiness on the part of every nation to make sacrifices for the general well-being; and to abound in prayer to the God and Father of all men that He may guide the nations into the way of true and righteous peace."

The World Alliance is the friend of the League of Nations and the World Court. It sees in these the two great international agencies that lend the only possibilities of adjusting international disputes without war. The American section is constantly apologizing for American short-sightedness and explaining how a local partizan quarrel has kept America from co-operating with other nations for the peace of the world. One of the great evils in American life is intense party spirit. In this instance it has driven America backward from the door of opportunity for service to the world and made herself, in the eyes of other nations, the conundrum of this century.

Many of the most influential men of the nations were spokesmen—educators, jurists, editors, heads of large business interests, ministers, and specialists of many departments. The World Alliance has a place. That place is daily growing larger. It must continue to grow until all the churches feel its influence. Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, who is the secretary of the American council of the World Alliance, has been indefatigable both in America and Europe in this work. The number of workers must multiply. These years furnish the beginnings for great results. This way is right. It lies open to great possibilities. The churches must be the channels of these activities. Upon them great responsibilities rest. The peace of the world is no song to

be put in a Christmas cantata. It must become the passion of all who confess Jesus as Lord and Saviour. Christians cannot escape being the interpreters of good-will to all races, nations, and peoples. It is a part of our life, which, if allowed to be unexpressed, deadens the whole life. All the world is in a league of kinship. It is the task of Christians to make those bonds strong and visible. The rise of a movement to that end comes with fitting benediction upon these troubled days.

Faith and Order

The world movement for theological understanding is the World Conference on Faith and Order. It had its beginning in America in 1910. Through the rare leadership of the late Robert H. Gardiner as its secretary, this work was made known in every church in every part of the world. He gave to it an introduction in spiritual passion and in fair-mindedness that lifted it into friendly consideration by nearly the whole Church, so that it was possible to hold the preliminary conference at Geneva in 1920.

This was a remarkable gathering. Eastern Orthodox prelates, Anglicans, and Protestants sat down together in friendly conference over the theological questions that had divided Christendom for centuries. It was the opening of a new chapter in theological reconciliation. When people come together from great distances with open minds for the discussion of disputed questions and go away in friendly attitude, it is a definite and permanent advance. Such was Geneva in 1920.

The meeting at Stockholm was that of the Continuation Committee, of which Bishop Charles H. Brent is chairman, and into whose hands the guidance of the Faith and Order movement largely rests. Many details regarding the World Conference were discussed as to subjects, methods, time, place, and delegations. The time will be August, 1927. The place will possibly be Lausanne, Switzerland, if suitable accommodation can be secured. There will be about five hundred representatives from the churches among whom is the expressed desirability for many of the younger element. There are also to

be about a hundred places reserved for scholars and other persons whose presence is desirable and who might not be appointed by the churches. All these provisions are wise. In such a conference we need both youth and scholarship. The churches will be informed of all these particulars by the first of the year.

The movement is a necessary part of the general movement going on throughout the world for the unity of Christendom. The questions of Faith and Order have their place. Part of the Church regards creedal statements and the priesthood as a necessary and vital part of the Church; another part would hold to the creedal statements, but not to the priesthood; still another part would dissent from both creedal statements and the priesthood. The World Conference furnishes the opportunity, such as the Church has never had before, for discussing frankly these great questions and all sides will have something to learn from the others.

The plans that are being put forth will be sent out from the secretariat at Boston and will endeavour to prepare the way for the conference two years hence. The time is short, but much work has been done since 1910. In the next two years it is possible to so popularize this call that when the conference convenes there will be a deep interest on the part of the churches back of all the representatives. This will mean a universal awakening for the unity of Christendom. One dares not predict the possibilities of such a conference, but indications now are that it will mark a very definite advance of Christian understanding and spiritual fellowship. Both of these are necessary factors in all growth toward unity.

Christian Union Quarterly Dinner

Every day throughout the Stockholm conferences there were groups for luncheon, for tea, and for dinner, frequently bringing together ten to twenty persons of different communions and different nationalities. They were among the richest experiences in that they gave personal interpretations and helped toward permanent friendships, which are the foundations for good-will,

whether applied to communions, nations, or races. Perhaps the very best of all these, at any rate it was so affirmed by many who attended, was *The Christian Union Quarterly* dinner. Of the forty-six members of the Editorial Council sixteen were present in Stockholm, representing ten nationalities and almost as many communions. The discussion lasted four hours. Every man spoke. The unity of the Church was the dominating thought. Difficulties, encouragements, present day movements, national activities, and universal outlook were discussed with remarkable frankness.

We have come to the place where many of our misunderstandings lie in suspicions, strange, some centuries old, some of to-day, but all of them weakening by the growing sense of reconciliation. We are getting to know each other better. The mission fields are furnishing not only examples but necessities of co-operation that are prophecies of better days. The union of three large communions in Canada is an example for the whole Church of what may be done at home.

In working together we must find a reconciling theology. They go together. Both call for patience, time, and understanding. The youth of the world are more interested in co-operating than cultivating those attitudes that divide us. They are not interested in denominational differences. It is a question whether, even if the effort were put forth, they could be brought to be as interested in these differences as their parents are. This new day calls for new emphases and new alinements. The world is moving forward and permanently forward. The Church must endeavour to make visible the Lord Himself at the Lord's Table and all that that Presence implies.

In every part of the world one may find groups in conferences or in prayer, or both, concerned about the unity of the Church. It is no longer confined to any one communion or any one country. Our next move is to popularize it. There is need of evangelists going forth calling for a united Christendom. Such were some of the thoughts that came from this group of earnest hearted Christian men. It was a meeting that will linger with us because of its informal, brotherly, and sane outlook upon a divided Church.

Life and Work

The Council of Nicæa met in 325. For some time prior to its meeting dissensions had swept through the Church. It was thought that an ecumenical council would afford an opportunity for reconciliation. Representatives came from all parts of the Roman Empire, which about marked the boundaries of the then known world, and to the men of those days it was larger than our world now is to us. It was a great meeting. They prayed, they quarreled, they fought with fists and kicked, they danced, they debated, they wrote the Nicene Creed, and for the next thousand years or more the standards of orthodoxy were largely in the realm of definitions, and in some instances may be said to be so now.

Sixteen hundred years have passed. In August, 1925, the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work met in Stockholm. For five years plans were in preparation for the Conference. There was a common recognition of a growing unity among all the disciples of Jesus. The Conference was the opportunity to give expression to that unity. The whole Church was invited. The majority of Christendom was represented by about five hundred and fifty delegates from most of the European countries, from Asia, from North America, from Australia, from Africa, and from South America. It was regretted that the Roman Catholic Church did not accept the invitation, but the Conference had a friendly outlook toward all Christendom. There was a spirit of fraternity, simplicity, and interest throughout every session. It was truly a Christian gathering.

The interest never lagged, in spite of the fact that nearly every speech was given in two other languages by the interpreter other than the language in which it was spoken. The opening was most auspicious. There must have been twelve hundred to fifteen hundred people who assembled in the Palace, where the King was formally apprized of the presence of the delegates, and he, in a brief address, announced the opening of the Conference. Everything contributed to the spectacular. Down long corridors, up marble stairs, into a great hall, banked with sculpture and paintings, came delegates from all parts of the

world, some in plain clothes, others in academic gowns, others in clerical dress, and the Eastern prelates in their robes of office. The King and the Queen, the Crown Prince and the Crown Princess, and the nobility moved among the crowd, shaking hands and chatting, in such democratic fashion as to strengthen one's faith in the growing democracy of the world. A great crowd filled the cathedral in Stockholm to hear the opening sermon by the Lord Bishop of Winchester, England, and, perhaps, a still larger crowd to hear the closing sermon by the Archbishop of Upsala at the cathedral in Upsala, a few miles out of Stockholm. The Academy of Music, where most of the sessions were held, was full at the opening session of the general programme and still more crowded at the closing session.

Every morning promptly at 9:30 a devotional period was held. At ten o'clock the subject for the day's discussion was opened by presenting a carefully prepared report, coming from a committee which had received reports from Great Britain, Continental Europe, America, and sometimes from the Eastern Orthodox representatives. Delegates were free to take part on sending their cards to the platform. The speakers sought to think in terms of God's moral purpose in the world and around the following subjects all the discussions centered: "The Church and Economic and Industrial Problems"; "The Church and Social and Moral Problems," including a special report on the "Drink Problem"; "The Church and International Relations," including a special report on the "Race Problem" and a report on the "Substitution of Law for War"; "The Church and Christian Education," including a special report on "Text-books"; and "Methods of Co-operative and Federative Efforts by the Christian Communion." The reports of these committees and sub-committees are published in full in this issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly*. A few of the addresses are also published in order that our readers in all parts of the world—for *The Quarterly* goes into about thirty-four different countries—may be able to catch some of the conference spirit and share in its great work.

To avoid the appearance of partiality to any country or communion there were four presidents—the Patriarch of Constantinople, represented by Archbishop Germanos of the Eastern Orthodox Church; the Archbishop of Canterbury, represented by the Lord Bishop of Winchester of the Anglican Church; the Archbishop of Upsala, representing Continental Protestantism; and Rev. Dr. Arthur J. Brown, representing American Protestantism, each one of these presiding on successive days. The secretariat was equally well distributed with Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, of New York, as the head of that department.

Perhaps there is no country in the world where the Church and the State are so well bound together as in Sweden and, therefore, a hospitality was dispensed that could not be surpassed. Homes were opened for the delegates or part payment was made on their hotel bills, with banquets, luncheons, sometimes free rides on the railroad and in other instances reduced fare, entertainment in ancient castles, and courtesies from attendants that made for delightful memories and permanent friendships.

The Stockholm Conference opened a new chapter in the study of Christian ethics. The name was well chosen—the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. It furnished an approach to the ripest field for agreement and, at the same time, emphasized the most hopeful route to the unity of Christendom. When Christians of different communions find ethical agreements and work shoulder to shoulder at their common tasks, they are better prepared to find theological agreements. Attempts to reverse this order will prove as artificial and unfruitful in the future as they have in the past. This hopeful method of approach and the freedom with which delegates from all communions entered into it will be counted one of the largest contributions of the Conference. The fact that representatives were there from so many different communions, from many different countries, and were so free in their approaches to each other and equally free in their approaches for discussion to subjects upon which would naturally be differences of opinion,

indicated that we are already in a new day that is crowded with abundant hope.

These were the general impressions in the minds of many. Dr. Shailer Mathews, of Chicago, summing up his impressions, said: "(1) The significance of the Conference itself. The mere fact that hundreds of men and women from widely different religious organizations should meet together is of outstanding importance. The size of the different delegations, the high and responsible positions held by many of their members, gave the Conference genuine dignity. It has further made possible a number of personal contacts which have developed into genuine friendship between the members of the different communions. Indeed the Conference might almost be described as the Universal Conference of Christian Friends. (2) The universal agreement that Christianity is a religion with an inner significance rather than a merely ethical or philosophical system. Throughout the discussions there was repeated an emphasis upon the purpose of God in the world. (3) Profound differences between the different groups, due to personal characteristics, ecclesiastical history, political and national situation; yet these differences, while frankly expressed, were balanced by a Christian courtesy that avoided misrepresentation and criticism. (4) An evident difference between the groups relative to the extent to which the Church should participate in social and economic affairs. On the one side were the English, French, and American sections, who stood for a marked extension of the Christian spirit into all forms of all the relations of society; on the other side were the continental churches, with one or two exceptions, hesitating to make an equal commitment of themselves to social activities. (5) A growing general agreement, despite marked differences as to details, that the Church has a social task and opportunity. (6) A sense of the need of further study of conditions, as a basis for the extension of Christian principles into society. (7) The belief that the Conference is one phase of a wide movement toward the development of Christian unity and solidarity."

As great and significant as the Conference was it needs to be said that strength would have been added to it had one-

third, at least, of the delegates and speakers on the programme been men and women in the thirties; some few in the twenties. It would have been helpful if a voice had been heard in each section of the programme from the student body of the world. Another generation is coming and we must think with them lest they break with us and think alone.

Too many of the speakers were safe, so safe that one could feel the traditions of the past or colloquial environments firmly holding them. There was a marked hesitancy in taking chart and compass into the future, rather a desire to even up where we are. Now and then a prophetic utterance broke forth. It was refreshing to hear Bishop Brent plead for the abolition of war and say: "I may be regarded as a fool; if so, I am God's fool." In the memory of the World War and with calls coming from around the world for the abolition of war, one would suppose that the Conference would have been unanimous for such action, yet it would have been difficult, perhaps impossible, to have passed a resolution on the outlawry of war, such as have been passed by labour groups, or by laymen from some of the churches represented there, or by the youth movement, whereas a ringing resolution would have been dynamic, calling for the equality of opportunity for capital and labour, for the outlawry of war, for the admission of Germany into the League of Nations, for a friendly attitude toward Russia, and for the identities of secular and religious education. The whole world would have taken notice. Christians must go ahead of politicians. If the Christians of the world would combine on this issue and face it squarely, war could be abolished in a single generation; on the other hand, if they do not, the next war will rightly be laid at the door of a divided and backward Church.

Dr. William Adams Brown explained, on presenting *The Message of the Conference*, that it was the best that could be done in the midst of so many divergent opinions and that it had received the unanimous endorsement of the committee, but he hoped that ten years hence we would be able to go much further. It was a well said word. One of the speakers was surprised that *The Message* went as far as it did, which indicated that, in his own mind, he had registered the prevailing thought

of the Conference in its social interpretations. Another speaker affirmed that the section on war was worth nothing, which brought forth a loud and prolonged applause from about one-third of the Conference. It gave some of us a better understanding of the Roman Catholic Church and its policies. That great church can only go as far as the entire body moves lest it break to pieces. Of course, the danger of this policy, whether Roman Catholic or other than Roman Catholic, is the danger of losing the prophetic note for advancement, with which the Church is so frequently justly charged.

The Church has got to assume the attitude of the prophet and say to militarism: You shall not murder another 10,000,000 of our young men. You shall not send back home from the battle fields millions of our young men wounded, crippled, and blind. You shall not starve by blockade hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children or drown by submarines thousands of other men, women, and children. You shall not again collect the enormous toll in human life, in property, in money, in lost ideals, and in a broken down civilization. You have got to go because the Christian conscience of the world demands your abolition!

What difference does it make if it arouses the antagonism of the military parties in the governments of the world? Say it still louder: War must go with all its villainy of murder and stealing and lying and hate. The Church has a clear course before her and that course is an unwillingness to accede to anything less than the absolute outlawry of war, naming it among the greatest crimes of civilization and taking her stand of refusal to share any longer in that crime. It may be costly for the Church to take such a position. She needs some costly task. Only permanent things are built of costly material.

Not only regarding war, but the whole social Gospel was frequently at a disadvantage; likewise Christian unity might have been dealt with more directly. Instead of five minutes in an afternoon session, an evening address might have been given to a Canadian to tell the story of the most outstanding instance of unity in modern times. However, what was given of the Canadian union was warmly applauded, indicating an eager-

ness for more of such practical results. It was not enough for the Conference to have maintained a gracious and fraternal spirit. These are days for action, action, action. There are wrongs to be righted. The Church must speak with the courage of the prophets, indifferent to consequences other than a testimony for justice, righteousness, and brotherhood.

But the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work was a great gathering. It is well to find out where the Church is; in fact, it is essential to have this knowledge if we would discover the paths of advancement. The Conference was one of those beginnings that characterize these times with the hope of a better world. Two words have been left us as interpretative of its character. The first is the word "*understanding*," which was used by the Crown Prince in his address at the closing session, when he said, "We have come to an understanding." The second is the word "*crusade*," which was used by the Lord Bishop of Winchester, that we must crusade for the life and work of the Church.

There was much good thinking done, touching the social, moral, economic, industrial, educational, international, and co-operative problems. Doors were opened in which prophets will stand. The Continuation Committee will carry forward the work of study, conference, diligent application of the teachings of Christ to the needs of an aching world. A great and good work has been started that has in it vast possibilities.

Too much cannot be said for the skill and fidelity with which the Archbishop of Upsala developed the idea of Life and Work and carried it through so splendidly. His staff of helpers are to be heartily praised. Co-operation, unity, brotherhood will have intensified meanings as we think of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. We will see more and more the possibilities in each other of growth toward God. A lamp has been lighted and we shall go forward in its light to the glory of God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

PETER AINSLIE.

SERMON AT THE OPENING OF THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CON- FERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK *

BY THE LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER, ENGLAND

Repent ye; for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.—Matt. 4:17.

CHANGE your mind! Adopt a new outlook; Get a fresh point of view! That was Christ's challenge to his own generation. That is the challenge which in his name we make to the men and women of these modern days. To accept that challenge is life. To reject it is death. Civilization has two alternatives. It can go down or it can go up. It cannot remain where it is. *Facilis descensus averno. Difficilis ascensus per Christum.*

We believe in that descent. We believe in the Kingdom of Heaven. We are conspirators for its establishment. That is why we are here. That is the meaning of this Conference.

Other Christian conferences there have been and are—Faith and Order and World Alliance for International Fellowship through the Churches. Our concern is the same and yet different. The same, in that we work *ad maiorem Dei gloriam*. Different, for our concern is not the doctrine of the Church, not the government of the Church, but the establishment of the sovereignty of Jesus Christ through the whole range of human affairs. Our creed can best be expressed in one sentence—"On his vesture and on his thigh is a name written, King of kings and Lord of lords." *In vestimento et in femore suo scriptum, Rex Regum, et Dominus dominantium.*

I. To admit that sovereignty is for most men a spiritual and mental revolution. Our business is to promote that revo-

*Delivered in Storkyrkav (Cathedral of Stockholm), August 19, 1925, in the presence of the King and Queen of Sweden and delegates and visitors to the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work.

lution. For on its accomplishment, or even partial accomplishment, depends the fate of the twentieth century. A new age is being built. Epoch making is a mysterious process, but we are allowed a hand in it. The nineteenth century was a wonderful epoch. In science, in commerce, in mechanical invention it was one of the great ages of history. But the material outran the spiritual. The movements of the century were tremendous, but for the most part they were centered in selfishness—national selfishness, commercial selfishness, industrial selfishness. And the wages of selfishness is death—death in the great war, death in the cut-throat competition of commerce, death in the hideous antagonisms of industry. But we want life. The whole world wants life. Multitudes are searching for it. Some think that they will find it by knocking to pieces our present civilization. “Destroy, destroy,” they cry, and then hope for something better. Some see salvation in keeping things as they are—a great army of grey-headed men, the defenders of the *status quo*—their motto being, “No change.”

But we must change. If you are ill, you go to the expert, the specialist. The human race is ill. It must go to the Specialist, the Prince of men, the great Physician. His advice is plain enough.

Change your mind. “Repent ye; for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.” In the nineteenth century, for all their cleverness and energy they forgot this. They built churches, but they piled up armaments. They sang Christian hymns, hymns of love, but in commerce and in industry they were more often hymns of another kind. They talked much about Christian civilization, but they forgot to apply their Christianity. The result was that the spiritual was kept separate from the material. Doctrines, churches, Sundays, services, they naturally went together in one carriage. Politics, commerce, industry went in another carriage. They were all very polite, but they kept their distance. They did not mix. When the politician was planning a policy he hardly ever thought of asking himself, “Is this Christian?” When business firms were competing with one another, the principles of Christ were often locked away in a cupboard. When matters of finance or questions of labour were under dis-

cussion, men did not always seek first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness. And we were to blame. We of the churches. We forgot the salvation of society. Yet the individual often achieved much. In politics, in industry, in social life, there were then as now, men in every nation who put their Christianity in the forefront of their work, and kept it untarnished. It is perfectly true that God does not save the world by committees but by persons. But men forgot that the change of mind which Christ called for was not only a change of the individual mind but a change of the community mind: that in redeeming the world he redeemed men not only personally but socially: that when a man comes to Jesus he changes not only his individual outlook but his social behaviour: that because the Gospel is a Gospel of forgiveness and love, for that very reason it involves for the community a new way of love and service: that the Church is responsible not only to preach but to live that Gospel: that only in so far as the behaviour of the community conforms to this way of life can it be called a Christian community, whether it be a nation, or a group within the nation. This new way of life means, so far as it goes, the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven: it means the introduction into this weary world of truer principles, happier relationships, better methods: it means that human beings thus submitting to the sovereignty of Jesus, introduce the Kingdom of God upon earth, and thus prepare for that great day when the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.

II. This establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven may seem to some a mere Utopia, impossible of achievement. And pessimism is one of the great dangers of our day. Some people despair of the human race. Human nature being what it is, they say, things cannot improve. That is blasphemy against God and man. We are concerned not only with human nature as it is, but as Christ can make it. As a witty Englishman once said, "The extraordinary thing about a Christian is you never can tell what he'll be up to next." When once a man or a community is redeemed there is no limit to what they can become. And we have our Christian pessimists—men who, believing in God, think of his Kingdom belonging to another order altogether. "This

world is too bad," they say, "it must end in destruction." Only after that will the Kingdom be set up. So thought the writers of Apocalypse, both ancient and modern. This view is summed up in the great hymn of St. Bernard of Morlaix:

Hora novissima tempora pessima sunt: vigilemus!
Ecce minaciter imminet arbiter ille upremus!
Imminet, imminet ut mala terminet æqua coronet
Recta remuneret anxia liberet æthera donet.

Indeed history itself in one sense bears witness to it, for the course of the world has been neither steady nor quiet. There have been times when matters have come to a crisis. Some great movement has reached its zenith and there has been an earthquake before any new beginning could be made. We at least of this generation have known how true this is, for we have lived through one of the most terrific explosions in the long story of the world. There have been great scholars of our time who have maintained that this was the main burden of our Lord's message, and that as to problems of conduct, personal or social, He merely provided an "interim ethic" which should be sufficient to carry men through to the great denouement. The temptation to this point of view is strong enough in all conscience in our day. We find the nations still suspicious of each other, still spending colossal sums of money on armaments. We find movements on every hand, nationalistic, industrial, social, largely based on self-interest, almost wholly concerned with the tangible and material aspects of life, leaving out of count those great moral foundations upon which alone any true life can be based.

Yet the Kingdom of God is here. There has been a marvelous change of outlook. Increasingly men and nations are consciously and unconsciously doing homage to Him who is their Lord. As a direct result of the gradual spread of the ideas which He came to inculcate, the whole standard of righteousness has been rising in the world at large. A few examples will make this clear. The sanctities of treaties, the tendency toward a larger recognition of international law, the whole movement toward a better relationship between the peoples as exemplified in the League of Nations, a movement equally definite in those

countries at present outside the League. The same phenomenon is obvious when we look at such matters as the conditions of labour, the growing condemnation of any standard of values which exalts things above souls or property above personality. We have only to recall the extraordinary progress made in the last half century in the treatment of women, the care for motherhood, the education of the children. We may sum it up in fact by saying that a new community-conscience is fast being formed and that this is already making itself felt as something to be reckoned with both in the dealings of nations with one another and in the dealings of groups and persons within those nations. A new bulwark has been built against every kind of tyranny, and this has been the result of centuries of personal influence and active propaganda on the part of those who believe in the Kingdom of God.

Both of these great points of view are right. The pessimist and the optimist can join hands. In the progress of the Kingdom of God there has been and there will be catastrophe.

The world has already seen many days of judgment. Yet God does not despair of the world. He loves it now as He loved it when the mother laid her Babe in the manger, and when the Cross was set up on Calvary. At this moment He is at work to redeem it. What else do our churches exist for? What else is the meaning of this Conference? We are here because we have been called to work with God. We are here to study God's Mind; to investigate God's Will. That mind is knowable.

The fact is that in Christ, his life, his character, his behaviour, we are admitted to the mind of God. In the laws of nature we see something of the mind of God. Gravitation it may be, or relativity, or the laws of electricity or of the ether. No one but a fool would think of opposing these laws or disobeying them. But it takes an even greater fool to defy the mind of God as unveiled in the behaviour of Jesus Christ. Look for a moment at the behaviour—his amazing patriotism for example! No greater patriot ever breathed. But his patriotism never stopped short of the whole human family. *Nil humanum alienum putavit*. He loved his own nation because He believed it was capable of doing a real service to this larger family. Is

that our patriotism? If not, then change your mind, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. Look again at his neighbourliness: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." And who is my neighbour? Every one to whom He is neighbour; the Supreme Neighbour who loved them and died for them. Does any one dare to narrow that neighbourliness—in business, in industry, in the relations of capital and labour, of employer and employed? Look at Jesus and learn that God wills fellowship. Is that our standpoint as we gather here? If not, "Repent ye; for the Kingdom of God is at hand."

Once more look at his revaluation of life. His tariff of life's goods is so different from ours. Money, comfort, position, success—all low down on his list. And at the top—kindness, service, sacrifice, in one word LOVE. Have we adopted his valuation? If not, then "Repent ye; for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."

Aye, that is the glory of it all. The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. For the man, for the church, for the conference that humbly seeks to know the mind of God and to act upon it, the whole resources of Heaven are available. The power to see the larger vision, and, seeing it, to accomplish it in the ordinary affairs of daily life. And we shall need that power. To set up the Kingdom of God in this complicated civilization of the twentieth century is a colossal task—a task which demands thought, skill, patience, wisdom. But, I repeat, in Christ we can do the impossible. Therefore, in this opening act of worship we do our homage to Him. We believe that his Spirit will guide us in our deliberations. We confess that in Him alone is our hope. For He is *Rex regum, Dominus dominantium. Sursum corda. Habemus ad Dominum.*

THE CHURCH'S OBLIGATION IN VIEW OF GOD'S PURPOSE FOR THE WORLD *

BY PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D.
New College, Hampstead, London.

WHILE there may be a morality which is independent of religion, there is usually a close relation; and the value of the morality will depend on the truth of the religion. The *quality* of a religion depends on the kind of thought there is of God. The morality of Christianity is a morality which has its motive and principle in religion: and the character of the Christian religion is determined by the conception of God which is given in the redemptive revelation of God by Christ. Christ is not the bearer of a message from God only, as Mohammed claimed to be the prophet of Allah. His revelation of God is not in word and deed only, but in all He Himself was, did, and suffered as man. He is Himself the Word of God Incarnate, the self-revealing activity of God under the conditions and within the limitations of the life of man. In Him "the truth is embodied in a tale"; and He wrought "the creed of creeds in loveliness of perfect deeds." His perfect moral character—the holy love which, sinless, suffers for, forgives, and saves from sin—and his perfect religious consciousness, as Son of God, as Father in his immediate contact, intimate communion, absolute dependence, and complete submission in relation to God, are the sources of his perfect mediatorial efficacy in revealing God to man, and redeeming man to God. In Him culminates the progressive revelation of God of which the Old Testament is the literary record; He is central to the evangelical testimony and apostolic interpretation, of which the New Testament is the literature. He is the standard of judgment, both for the Old Testament and the New; and that only is of final authority

*One of the opening addresses of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Stockholm, August 19, 1925.

for Christian faith in the conception of God, which either belongs to, or, whatever be its source, is consistent with this redemptive revelation of God as Father in Christ, as Son and Saviour.

What, then, is the conception of God which is given by Christ and in Him?

God's holiness, his moral perfection — the *ethical monotheism* of the prophets—is assumed. What is distinctive is that this holiness is also love—a perfection, which is self-communicative. God seeks to bring men into fellowship with Himself that He may impart his likeness to men. This is surely what is meant by the concrete embodiment of the abstract quality of holy love in the relation of Fatherhood. God as Father is not mainly, or solely Creator, Preserver, and Ruler, although all these relations, as subordinate elements, enter into the Fatherhood; but He is chiefly, if not wholly, Father, because He sets such a value on man, and has such an interest in man, that He purposes for man nothing other or less as his good than that he should have constant communion with Himself, and should attain complete resemblance to Himself, even his eternal perfection. This purpose of God for man expresses the very nature of God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, or *social personality*: in the Son the likeness of God is revealed, through the Spirit the fellowship with God is realized. Christ as the Divine-human Son is the firstborn among many brethren, the beginning of the Divine-human family of the redeemed race of man.

This purpose of God is in its fulfilment conditioned by man's freedom, his sin, and his suffering.

It is evident that the fellowship of man with God, and the likeness of man to God is personal, that is, voluntary. God cannot by his omnipotence make men his children in this sense. Men must freely receive and respond to God's Fatherhood. If men were puppets, and not persons, God could not set such a value, or take such an interest, or purpose such a good. Love can give itself to, and find itself again, only in a person, capable of loving.

The reality of freedom involves the possibility of sin; love can be refused and resisted as well as received and returned.

Holiness may be missed as well as gained. This alone explains God's permission and tolerance of sin. God did not will the actuality of sin, but only the possibility, as the condition of the good which He purposed for man.

There is physical evil apart from, and not due to, sin; but with this we are not, for our present purpose, concerned, except to indicate that much, if not all of it, can be regarded as a condition of the discipline and development of man, a means of his education, and if need be, correction. But not only can a great deal of suffering be directly traced to sin as its consequence, but also the suffering that cannot be so traced can be aggravated or mitigated by the attitude or the action of man. As the world is, man may use his pains and sorrows as steps to higher things, a moral and religious good which, as far as we can now see, he could not otherwise attain.

In the fulfilment of his purpose as Father, God respects man's freedom, grieves for man's sin (condemning the sin, and compassionating the sinner), and shares the sorrow of man. As free man is *fellow-worker* with God, and God is fellow-sufferer with man as suffering.

God fulfils the purpose for man, not apart from man, but by means of man. The love of God through the grace of Christ must be received in the faith which becomes active in the love to God and man, which is the motive and the principle of the Christian morality. Man can hinder or help, delay or advance the fulfilment of God's purpose. In the endeavour to better the lot and the life of man this is a consideration which must never be lost sight of; it is not a human enterprise limited by human resources; but it is a Divine intention that can command Divine resources, and yet, by its very nature as personal and concerned with persons, cannot be achieved by these Divine resources without human co-operation.

Again God fulfils this purpose for man in intimate relation with man. As Father He is not a God so exalted above man as to be indifferent to anything that affects man; He is *interested* in man in the strictest sense of the word; He is *among* man's lot and life, sharer of man's whole experience, bearer of his burdens, and labouring in his labours. Whatever hurts man

grieves God. Neglect of man is indifference to God: cruelty to man is injury to God; contempt for man is insult to God. Jesus' parable of the judgment reveals a God who is fellow-sufferer with man. This too is a consideration which enforces every human claim.

Central to the Christian conception of God is the revelation of the Cross of Christ, the salvation of man from sin by the sacrifice of God. That God might reproduce his perfection in man, that is, realize his Fatherhood, man must be reconciled to God, and redeemed from sin; the hindrance to his relation as child to God as Father, due to sin, must be removed. The guilt of sin must be canceled and its power over man ended. In the forgiveness of sin the Divine judgment on the sin no longer falls on the sinner, who, by his penitence and faith, has separated himself from his sin and attached himself to God, and God's favour, no longer impeded by his sin, freely and fully rests upon him. By the new motive of gratitude for forgiveness the hold of sin is loosened, and by the power of the Spirit given to all united to Christ by faith as Saviour and Lord is the victory over sin completed. This reconciliation and redemption comes to man in Christ's Cross through the faith which the grace there displayed evokes. Without now attempting to show how this salvation of man is connected with this sacrifice of God, as Christian experience permanently and universally attests, it must suffice to indicate that in this grace God shows Himself fellow-sufferer with man, and in this faith man proves himself fellow-worker with God. Thus is the fellowship of man with God maintained, and the likeness of man to God attained; the Fatherhood revealed and the sonship realized.

I have hitherto spoken of man, meaning thereby mankind, not the individual only but the race, and, in the last paragraph, of man as sinful. This is what the New Testament means by the term *the world*. It is mankind as a whole in estrangement from, and disobedience to, God. The term as so used suggests a double unity, the unity within the individual of all his necessities, interests, and activities, and the unity of individuals within the race. When we think of God's purpose we must always preserve our sense of the unity in both respects. We must

not separate physical necessities from spiritual interests, or individual from social good. It is *the whole manhood of all mankind* with which God's purpose is concerned. This consideration will save us from many an error and many a failure which the neglect of it in the past has involved in Christian life and work.

Science, whether physiology or psychology, is teaching us insistently the unity of manhood. Man is neither soulless beast nor disembodied angel; and the care of the body is no less included in God's purpose of good for man than the cure of the soul. No less is the development of the human personality dependent on economic conditions, social relations, and political organization. Morality and religion cannot be separated from the rest of life as only parts of it. Morality is a quality of all human activity, and religion is the motive and the principle of morality. Nothing else and nothing less than the whole manhood must be taken into account.

The outcome of human history has been the increasing unification of all mankind. Commerce, conquest, colonization—movements of men and their goods from land to land—all bring the ends of the earth together. Steamship, railway, telegraph, telephone, aero-plane, and wireless are abolishing distance as a permanent division of mankind. The spiritual unification has not kept pace with the material. Racial prejudice, national antagonism, social discord, conflicting economic interests still divide mankind, despite the increasing mutual dependence. The physical unification becomes a growing danger without the spiritual. Proximity increases the sense of difference, and so provokes discord. Only as the unity of all mankind in the higher interests is secured, can this attendant evil of closer contact be averted. It is all mankind as one race that must be regarded as the object of the love of God; under his Fatherhood it must grow into one family.

There is one God who is Father and one world which is embraced in this purpose of good; and, accordingly, there must needs be one Church as the human partner with God in the fulfilment of that purpose.

As I conceive the Church as the society of all believers, there has been, is, and can only be *one* Church; the body of

Christ, the community of the Spirit, and the temple of God. To forget, ignore, or neglect this seems to me to involve a fundamental misconception of what Christianity is. The source of the Divine purpose in Christ is the unity of God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and the issue is the unity of the one redeemed family of man. This abstract truth imposes a concrete duty. The unity must not only be confessed, but practiced. The invisible reality must, as far as is at all practicable, be made a visible actuality. Without entering on all the difficult questions of faith and order, with which another conference will be called on to deal, let me express my conviction that this does not demand a uniformity of creed, ritual, or polity. The world's need for the Church's united service is, however, clamorous. Whether it be in the sphere of economic conditions or of international relations, the reconciling spirit and the redemptive purpose of God in Christ calls for the mediating service of the Church. As his body it must become for Him one voice to deliver his message, one pair of hands to discharge his mission, one heart to feel the sorrow of man and to sympathize as He does.

This primary demand involves, *secondly*, that the Church shall transcend, in its interest and effort, the divisions of race, nation, or class. Differences may, and even must, continue, but they need not become the provocations of division; they may even be contributory to a larger, richer unity in variety. So strong is the hold of these divisive conditions of life on sentiment and opinion, that only an intense possession of the Church by the Spirit of God, the redeeming and reconciling spirit, can make the bonds of a common Christian fellowship closer than these racial, national, and social bonds. The Christian universalism must more and more mark the interest and effort of the Church of Christ.

While thus transcending the limitations of the world as it now is, the Church must more and more become immanent in the world; not *of* the world, it must be *in* the world. As God in Christ has shown Himself to be the fellow-sufferer with man, so must the Church know the fellowship of Christ's sufferings, becoming conformable to his death. As He the "holy, harmless and undefiled, separate from sinners" as regards any personal

sin, yet so identified Himself with sinful mankind as, in Paul's startling words, to become *sin* and *a curse* for us, that is, to share to the full all in the lot of men that sin has brought upon Him, so must the Church not stand apart and hold aloof from this sinning, struggling, suffering world; but must know its need so intimately as to feel that need so intensely, that it will serve at whatever cost for the relief of that need. What the world needs, if God's purpose is to be fulfilled, is the Church crucified with Christ. Study, sympathy, service, sacrifice,—this is the *via dolorosa* for the Church of Christ, if it is to be the body of Christ in the world, through which He completes his work, and so fulfils God's purpose in Him.

If in the history of the Church on earth the Resurrection followed on the Crucifixion; in the history of the Church, because it is the body of the Risen Lord, it is at the same time being crucified and raised to life again with Him. It knows the power of his resurrection, the power by which God raised Him from the dead mediated by Him, even as it is knowing the fellowship of his suffering. What we need to realize is that, if the Church attempted to be crucified for the world without Christ and the power of his resurrection as its strength and stay, it would perish. It cannot go the *via dolorosa* described above without the invisible, but not less real Companion. As in conference we face the problems of the world, clamouring for solution, if the purpose of God is to be fulfilled, we must realize that we (the whole Church of Christ if it were even bending all its human energies to the vast tasks) would not be sufficient for these things. Our sufficiency must come from God; the Risen Saviour and Lord must impart his Spirit, the spirit of wisdom, and power, and love, the very life of God in the life of man. As for the Church, the Resurrection of Christ was completed in Pentecost; so our conference, however abundant and accurate our knowledge, however deliberate and confident our judgment, however sincere and intense our intention, will be vain, unless the love of the Father, revealed in the grace of the Son, is realized by us in the community (*Koinonia*) the common possession of the Holy Spirit.

THE ESSENCE OF CHRISTIAN LOVE *

BY ARVID RUNESTAM, D.D.

Professor of Dogmatics and Moral Theology,
University of Upsala, Upsala, Sweden

1. *Two wrong aspects of the question*

THE word love meets us in many connections. We speak not only of Christian love but also of other kinds: love between children and parents, between men and women, love for the native county, and so forth. Christian love has not been exposed to any great risk of being confounded with love in these forms. But its relation has not been the same toward other emotions, which, too, come under the head of love, or toward a closely related form, the so-called "general love of mankind," sympathy, altruism, feeling for humanity, social fellow-feeling with the broad social strata, a feeling of social solidarity, and whatever other forms might be named.

It is easy to understand why Christian love has been more often confused with the latter form of love than with the former, which, in one way or another, is more conditioned by the laws of nature. It obviously is due to the fact that men considered the form and essence of love as dependent on the object, toward which it was directed. The "general love for mankind," or the social fellow-feeling, has been more easily confused with Christian love as the object for love in both cases was or seemed to be the same: all men without exception. Love was found here as there to be universal in its object, in contrast to the limited object of a father's, mother's, or a patriotic love. Thus the comprehensiveness and breadth of love has come to decide the form of love. But the comprehensiveness of love has come to decide not only the kind of love, but also its *worth*. The more great and varied the object has been, the more worthy has the love been considered. Love for the whole human race has been es-

*An address delivered at the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Stockholm, August 20, 1925.

teemed better than love of one's native land, and love for one's family and relatives less worthy than love for the whole race. Christian love and social sympathy have thus not only been confused with one another, but both have been valued as the highest form of love, for the reason and in the degree that both of them in principal concern all. And love for the closer circle, relatives, and native land, has been considered with suspicion and as hardly possible except at the expense of the "greater" love for all men.

But the confusion between Christian love and a socially-directed general love for mankind has still other grounds, namely, the idea that love is worth more, the more it goes against men's instinctive feelings and inclinations, and the more effort it costs. The all-inclusive love for mankind is more meritorious than love between parents and children, and so forth, because it is not, like them, based on a natural instinct, which makes it "easy," but because it is more of an effort. In this connection, the conception also easily arises that love toward those who are at a greater distance is of more worth than toward those who are nearest, whom it is only "natural" to love. That is to say, love, from the point of view of human power of achievement and according to this method of observation, rests upon the theory that love is something self-acquired and something which can be successfully demanded of men.

But if love is conceived as something that can be produced through the mere demand to love, then its contents must necessarily be changed: from the center of life, character, it is moved out into the periphery; it becomes outer acts, charity, helpfulness, and, generally, all that which we can achieve by exerting our strength—but which can well exist without *love*. The feeling of social sympathy has indeed not escaped this fate. And Christian love has in this very way often been immediately mistaken for this, as not even Christians have always kept the spirit, but have at times replaced it by outward works of love and philanthropy and similar acts, which have the appearance of love without possessing its strength.

Neither is it only representatives of the socially organized love for mankind, with its cosmopolitan touch, who have been

to blame for the confusion in question and who have proclaimed themselves the heirs to Christian love. The point of view which lies at the bottom of this conception of love's value has, to a great extent, been accepted even by Christians. In highly-developed Christian groups it has, however, been recognized that Christian love has suffered through its identification with the humane moral conception of general love for mankind and has lost depth and strength by being associated with this modern aspect. But it has been difficult to distinguish in principle the two forms of love and to establish their individual characteristics.

The alternative chosen, when the need was felt for protecting Christian love from this mistake, has usually consisted in saying that Christian love was love to the *soul*, to the *eternal* in man, to the *personal* in him. It concerns nothing so peripheral as the daily and temporal life with its social relationships; in any case not directly. If it shall be concerned with such, then, according to this point of view, the personal and the eternal in man and the salvation of souls is the final aim.

Thus both points of view make the worth of love dependent on the *object* of love. The difference is only that, for the one, it is the *extent* and the *quantity* of the object which determines the worth of love, and, for the other, it is the object's *depth*, its *quality*, and the *worth of the object itself*.

My assertion is that neither of these attitudes quite represent the true idea of Christian love.

2. *Love is of no greater value just because it embraces a greater number or a larger area*

The Gospel does not make love's worth primarily dependent on the comprehensiveness of the object of love. Neither does it make the worth of love dependent on the human effort visible in the outer results of the working of love.

Christianity even certainly recognizes a universality of love. But it is different from the "general" love for mankind. It is this which was overlooked in Christian fields when, through fear of being surpassed by the modern, moral welfare urge for

general love for mankind, men vied with each other to assert the universality of the love of Christianity. The result has been that men have all too easily accepted the moral philosophical interpretation of the word and stopped at the explanation that Christian love is love toward all men, toward the whole race, toward all mankind. But the Gospel knows no such love. Its demand of love is, however, not lower than that of moral humanity. On the contrary, it is in truth, quite boundless. For in the extreme it is nothing less than that we should love with God's own love. And that knows no bounds. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." Jesus does not proceed from the actual ability of man, but from the supremacy of ideals, in demanding likeness to God as the essence of moral goodness.

But the demands of the Gospel concern, first, not the extent of the object of love, but its own depth. It confines itself closely to the field of reality and does not *call* love that which is not really love. It reckons with man's bondage through the limits of time and space and it assumes generally as self-evident, that love and hate are dependent on the relationships in which men have personal intercourse and in which a personal sacrifice is possible. That love should consist in our including the sum of all men in a general sympathy for the human race or in general good-will and a feeling for humanity, and so forth: this thought does not lie within the horizon of the Gospel and is certainly not its conception of *love*. For the love of which the Gospel speaks, is always assumed to be a *personal sacrifice*. In that conception the whole is included. And therewith is meant not only or, in the first place, an outward act of love, but an event, a breaking through, an act of creation in the inner world of the spirit. Depths are opened up and new forces rise from the depth out into human life, forces which inherently tend to express themselves in action. The depth is the love of God. And human love is of worth, not in relation to its ability to achieve all kinds of feelings of sympathy or to accomplish self-appointed tasks, but rather in relation to its power to break down barriers before the spontaneous flow of the Divine love.

Thus the universality of Christian love does consequently not consist in my including all men in a general love for mankind, but consists rather in that, first, *God's* love includes all peoples, times, and individuals, both bad and good; second, that this *should* be *our* love, inasmuch as we are commanded to be like God, perfect, as He is perfect; and third, that no barriers raised by men between peoples and individuals may prevent me from becoming a "neighbour" and from making a personal contribution everywhere God opens to me possibilities through the order of nature and the events of history.

A socially-directed love is not herewith dismissed as unchristian. I will return to this later. If it is a personal contribution, an offer brought *by effort from the depths* of one's personality, it is Christian, whether it appears in the name of Christianity or not. But there is a socially-concerned "love for mankind," which is diametrically opposed and cannot be too sharply separated from it. The type is familiar to us. I mean the kind whose *general* love for mankind and interest in the *general* is nourished by lack of interest for that which lies nearer, for one's own family, surroundings, vocation, and the health of one's own soul; who seeks his "neighbour" past his nearest, not because the need and claim for love has been satisfied but because he does not get along with himself and those belonging to him and with his duties. This devotion to the general is often nothing but a lack of personal depth, a lack of seriousness, of willingness to enter into relations which demand personal sacrifice and personal contribution, a desire to live on the surface, to escape the necessity of personal claims, which close relationships always assert, perhaps, also the desire to shine through one's own love of mankind and to be moved—perhaps most by one's own goodness—while in the depths of one's heart remaining hard, and cold, saving its coolness for those who are closest.

Thus if Christian love must regard with suspicion or open protest the universal love for mankind proclaimed from non-Christian centers, and its manifestations, it appears, on the other hand, when all is considered, to be more closely related to

the form of love conditioned by nature, as love between parents and children, love for one's native country, and so forth, than at first appeared. "The structure" is the same. It shares the spontaneity of natural love. One can accomplish nothing through one's own strength. The difference is only that, in the one case, the source from which strength flows is "grace," in the other, "nature." But here nature can be a "gift to the spirit." Even the natural love is, if it be sincere, grace, an overflowing of God's love, smoothing the way for the deeper love which springs from the fountain of forgiveness. Along this path Christian love has, therefore, always advanced in its many forms to the human heart. Who can count the number of times a mother's heart has been the messenger of Divine love? Who will deny that a spiritualized love between man and woman is the most valuable gift of God's love and one which can lead the way further into God's love? And that a love of one's native land that is full of a feeling of responsibility and zealousness can, by the attitude and force of the Christian faith, be blessed and welded together with Christian love into personal work for the fatherland, into prayer and spirit and deed?

Thus we have already suggested that Christian love is possible not only when individuals come into personal contact with one another. There is also Christian love to groups of individuals, to peoples, even to mankind. Such is *God's* love and the love of Christ, as it shines brightest from Golgotha. The love which suffered there includes *all*. But Jesus did not experience this love as "general love for mankind" in the modern sense of charity and moral sympathy—not a bit. Must this be said? For Jesus there is in his death at once a *personal* contribution and a contribution for *humanity*. In a personal way, He experiences, in his suffering and in his death, the need of humanity. In the depths of his love humanity is actually *one*, one lone man. That is the mystery. History has not challenged this. It is in this secret that it still finds strength and life.

Before this love of Jesus who will lay claim to a "universal love for mankind," a love for the whole race? *His* love at least forbids us to let words about love for *all* fall lightly from our

lips. It tells us that only in the measure in which love takes upon itself and bears personal voluntary sacrifices can it spread over multitudes, over greater areas, without becoming superficial and sterile. Only in the measure in which a human being actually enters into the life of the surroundings, in the people's own need, their spiritual as well as their bodily, their anxieties in life, above all their responsibilities, and sins and guilt; and into the nation and to humanity brings the love of God for the relief of want, the removal of guilt, and the strengthening of responsibility; in that measure, but only in that measure, can man widen the object of his love without its becoming impersonal and ceasing to be love.

Love is thus not more valuable as including many, but in the degree in which love deepens itself it stretches its influence, as necessary, over a greater and greater area. In this lies, therefore, the universalism of Christian love: the more deep it is, the more universal its object. The depth of love decides not only its worth but also its comprehensiveness.

In this line of deep personal sacrifice there is indeed no competition between the love for the less inclusive object and the love for the more inclusive. The man who loves his home and his dear ones, *he* is the best friend to the fatherland, and he, who in his love enters deepest into the need of the people, loves humanity best. No one has loved his *nation* so much as he who suffers on the cross for *humanity*.

3. *Love is not more valuable through being directed toward a more valuable object*

We are led on in the analysis of Christian love by a discussion of the point of view which declares that the worth of love is dependent on the worth of the object loved, and that Christian love is greater than all else because it is love to something more than flesh and blood: to the soul, to the eternal in man, to personality. The idea that lies behind this point of view is, in any case, correct—that the life of the soul and of the spirit is higher and more precious than the life of the body. The one is perishable, the other imperishable, the one is tem-

poral, the other eternal. Everything shall serve the personality, higher spiritual culture, as well as material culture. "Personality is the greatest thing in history," says a Swedish philosopher. But for the conclusion: it is then love which directs itself toward personality and its needs, higher than love which is full of mercy for human bodily needs: is this in accordance with the Gospel?

The answer seems to be both yes and no. God's love as it appears in Jesus' life, seems to answer yes. Or was that not love for the *soul*, for the *individuality* of Jesus Christ, the love with which God loved his only begotten son? For otherwise it seems impossible to understand Jesus' Passion and death: God loved his Son before all men, when He let Him suffer and die for mankind. For God so loved not only the world, but also his Son, that He gave Him in death. Did not He then clearly love the personality, the eternal soul, in Jesus? And is it not, therefore, that the Son is the crystallized personality which saves struggling personal life?

One thing we cannot overlook in considering this unsparing love: Jesus' own picture in the Gospels, when He went around doing good and serving all, bodily and spiritually. This must make us think before speaking disparagingly of the bodily life and temporal need and of the love which concerns itself with this. Have we right and do we presume before Him, to set ourselves up as judges over the love of those who busy themselves with humble things, which we perhaps do not consider objects worthy of our feeling and our trouble? Jesus' love certainly demands a revision of the statement that love is worth more than the object toward which it is directed. For that would imply dubious conclusions which would correspond badly with the testimony of Jesus as to the love of God. From the statement it would also follow that love for the good and righteous is better than love for the sinner. But it is the ninety and nine righteous men that Divine love deserted when it went after the lost sinner. And it is unceasingly to poor fallen and shipwrecked children of men that Jesus stretches out his hands. And not only to their *souls*. There is so much that is apparently worthless that Jesus has loved and spilled his affection on: in-

firm, perishable human life of creatures of flesh and blood, as well as torn, strayed souls. No, before the love of Jesus, it is impossible to affirm the statement, as it is formulated, that love is worth as much as its object—at least according to our own method of distinguishing objects. It may be that all his love, becoming ultimately with concentrated energy, *was* love for souls, that the personal sacrifice made even for outward needs was but a link in the deeper reaching act of love and redemption. But his love did not ask each time it was given whether the need was great enough for Him to worry over it. It sufficed that there was need and his heart burned with pity.

Thus the criterion of Christian love cannot consist in that it has its value from the object of its love. To declare this would be to deny the “divinity” of love. For this consists just in that it lowers itself from the high to the low, that God lowers Himself to man, and the Son of God to children of men, sinful and burdened with guilt. This is indeed the direction which the love Christianity brought into the world tends to take.

He who makes the worth of love depend on the object upon which love’s mercy is directed, reverses the Divine direction of love. He fails to see that the stream flows from the spring; he puts human longing in the place of Divine love.

4. *The value of love does not depend upon the object loved but upon the subject who loves*

Herewith we have reached the main idea which casts light over the various, apparently contradictory, aspects of the “Divine” Christian love. It is simple enough: *Love’s center of gravity lies not in the object loved but in the subject loving.* So it is, moreover, in all sincere love, even in the love between man and woman and between mother and child. He who *loves* is the valuable one. The object that draws love to itself may be the most unworthy of all; the love is not, therefore, less deep and strong, not less valuable. The center of gravity, the fundamental value, upon which everything in reality hangs, lies in the love itself. Love itself is the primarily worthful and worth-creating.

It is not only an unevangelic mental process, but also confused psychology behind the words, that Christian love is love to the soul, to the personality. Personality is made the highest thing and the love for this, the highest form of love, and the fact that it is love itself that builds the deepest foundations for personality is overlooked. The sacrificing, self-giving love is the inner life of personality. It means, that personality, "the soul," which through love shall be saved from destruction, is saved not only through being the object of love, but through itself being the *subject who loves*. The important thing is that love is there. There is nothing higher than the love which offers itself. A "soul," "a personality," which is more than love and for which that is merely the means, does not exist. The life of love is its very purpose, and is itself the crown of personality. Toward that goal love leads all real Christian love; but not by intentionally directing itself toward the salvation of the soul and turning away from the physical needs of life. Real Christian love brings love to life simply by being there, by revealing love. A man loves his neighbour's personality by revealing in his love personal life. And this happens when his love brims "divinely" over all the needy, undisturbed by the magnitude or smallness of the object concerned. From this love a beam of light may be cast into the life of another—without having been directed intentionally toward its *soul*—and open his eyes to the fountain of love, and his soul to the life of love—perhaps most often through some insignificant deed of love, which your love and mine pass by haughtily as an unworthy object of our imagined idea.

God's love is, therefore, not the highest because He loves the soul with its "infinite value," but because He is love. And only through the soul's becoming a part of his love does it become a "soul" in the true meaning of the word. The sinner gone astray is, in God's eyes, "worth more" than the ninety-nine righteous men, because He sees that the sinner needs and can receive love, or because He looks upon the sinner as though he were already what he through God's love may become. God's love creates the object of his love. And so it is with the deeper Christian love between men. If only love exists there, we need

not be anxious about the *object* of our mercy. It may reveal itself in commiseration for bodily or spiritual need: if only the love is there, it not only offers needed help, but creates the life which gives fundamental value to reality, the personal life of love.

In this sense Christian love is always love to the *soul*. It creates the "soul," even when it is directed toward the relief of bodily and temporal needs. But we understand now why God seems more than we to love *souls*, why his love to the Son was so unsparing, that He gave Him up in death. That is because the Son has come nearer than any other to the holy burning fire, and also because He more than any other became the bearer of Divine love and took upon Himself the suffering. If it was *God's* love which did not spare Him, it was also Jesus' own love which forced Him to death. "The sacrifice" which his own love demanded of Him became, as love grew, more urgent and profound than that of any one. That is, then, the secret of God's unsparing love. To come too near the flame of love has its risk. The fire can be lit even at the hearth's own altar and crave its sacrifice. It is thus God loves those who are dear to Him, making them the bearers of the love which suffers voluntarily. It is also misleading to speak of Jesus' suffering and the suffering of our times in the same breath and to look for God's unfathomable love behind both of them. Our suffering beside the suffering of Jesus: it is the robber's cross beside the cross of Jesus. "We receive the due reward of our deeds; but this man hath done nothing amiss."

Into love's own suffering God will lead men. It is not possible, if they themselves do not experience love, to come near the flame, which *warms*, before it lights and burns. But, therefore, love must too seek men, where they are available, perhaps through commiseration for their mere temporal needs. But if it lies in the essence of Christian love to create "soul" and awaken love, even through personal pity for external suffering, its effect is dependent on the fact that it pities without double intention. For the very purity of love is dependent on that. It is often unheard-of untruthfulness, or, at least, unheard-of self-deception, of which we are guilty, when we are striving to choose

a sufficiently high object for affection. This is only a sign that love lacks the "divinity" which marked the love of Christ, or a sign that love is dead. For it is a proof, not of the human limitation but of the Divine immensity, unselfishness, and richness of Jesus' love, that He wasted so much time and devotion even to save also from sickness and need perishable bodies of men. What good did it do, we are prepared to say, we the wise and calculating; He might better have concentrated on saving souls. But Jesus loves and cannot act otherwise than love moves Him to do. And He does not show commiseration for bodily needs with any double intention, as thus to win souls. Without double intention his love pours over the souls and bodies of poor sinful men. A conscious attempt to save the soul by saving the body would mean death for human love too. It would destroy love's holy spontaneity. Viewed psychologically it is apparent that the effect fails to appear if such a purpose is seen. "*Man merkt die Absicht und wird verstimmt.*" And not only "*verstimmt.*" Such calculating love can arouse fatal impulses and feelings in those who are the object of this "love." No, Jesus loves without double intentions. Moreover, they were no temptation for Him. For He saw more clearly than we a part of the enemy's power that He must fight, even in bodily suffering and need. He saw more clearly than we the connection between the spiritual and the material.

Simple pity for temporal suffering can also reveal more of the healing, loving life of the soul than the so-called love for the soul. If we love, the effect on the soul will not fail, even though we may not see it. It is enough that God holds the threads in his hand and sees the sancity. He arranges that love, however humble the position to which it stretched a helping hand, shall bear harvest in the kingdom of the spirit. We will follow after the high purpose in his love and order our lives with foresight and with a broad point of view. But let us not be wiser than Jesus and betray love through wisdom. It is better that we should see less of the connection between the spiritual and the material, between the eternal and the temporal, and in faith hold fast to the love of God, than that we, thinking we see more clearly, set a high goal for ourselves and lose love.

But the love of Jesus does not merely show that He in no way passed by temporal need with indifference. It shows too what happens to a man who comes near enough to God and is seized by the fire of his love. The stronger this begins to burn in his heart, the greater sacrifice it demands, not only sacrifices of outward comforts and strength, but deeper personal contributions, which have their roots in life far below the surface where bodily suffering rules. In Galilean and Judean villages He went around doing good and serving all men. But on the cross He took upon Himself the responsibility for your life and for mine, suffering for our sins, bore our guilt.

Love is thus not more valuable in that it is directed toward a more valuable object, but the more valuable love becomes, the deeper a personal contribution it demands, and the deeper it reaches down into the central stratum of life, in there, where *all* need has its extreme foundations: the need of common responsibility, sin and guilt.

We must go to where love calls us, to high or humble tasks, to lowly acts of pity, or possibly to personal efforts, which force us in to a deeper suffering. The faith which anchors us to God's life of love, must cast upon Him all anxiety for the result of our love's efforts. For it is finally the necessary condition for a right Christian love: that faith holds it fast in life's depths, to God's own love, so that it does not drift into superficial feelings or big phrases claiming proudly to embrace the circle of the earth and the depth of human life. From the unfathomable source of his love we draw our strength when the depth opens in us. Every time the wave of love rushes forth it is faith which opens the dams before the flood of his love. A love produced without these forces from the depths is no revelation of God's love. But it is this that Christianity shall reveal. It shall from God, who is the source of love, lead the eternal stream of love through human life.

THE WORK OF INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES *

BY RT. HON. SIR WILLOUGHBY DICKINSON, K.B.E.
London, England

I HAVE been asked to speak upon the work of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches, and I have fifteen minutes in which to do it. I could easily fill an hour of your time; but I will not offend against the rules. And, indeed, it is not necessary for me to speak at length inasmuch as the previous speakers have exhausted all that can be said on the general principles for which the Alliance stands. If talking about peace alone could bring peace, we might leave this Conference certain that the vision of the Prophet Isaiah is on the point of being realized and that the swords are already ploughshares and the spears pruning-hooks.

But this is not so, and we know it. I do not believe that any one of our orators, even after his most flowing rhapsody on Christian fellowship, really believes that his words will stop the next war. Peace is not a plant that lives on air. It must be firmly rooted in the ground; and, for this, one must labour on the land, must clear the soil, plough it and water it. What we want now is work as well as words. Christian sentiments are very well; but they are not enough. Does not St. Paul himself tell us that "faith without works is dead"?

That the ground requires to be worked is evident. No one can travel in Europe or Asia or America and not be appalled at the rocky state of the ground. Is there a single spot where the seeds of peace are taking root of themselves? I know of none. The world is ripe for war. Human passions are rising in the hearts of millions of men and in hardly a country can you find more than a handful of persons labouring to calm those passions.

*An address delivered at the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Stockholm, August 26, 1925.

It was in order to do this work that the World Alliance was instituted and it is as an organ of practical Christianity that I wish to present it to you to-day.

The Alliance is a permanent body, based on a definite constitution, agreed to by twenty-eight federated councils, whose members are drawn from many different lands and from many different communions. Its object is declared to be (1) to "bring about good and friendly relations between the nations" and (2) to "enlist the churches in a joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship and the avoidance of war." It has no other object than that which is expressed in these simple words, and yet there are persons who represent the Alliance as being an institution which, of sinister purpose, would lead the churches astray from pure religion into the devious paths of politics or diplomacy. The Alliance has nothing to do with either the one or the other; although it might not be amiss if it were to instil into the minds of our politicians a little Christianity here and there. Its object is one to which every Christian can subscribe, and this is proved by the fact that almost all the Evangelical communions and a great part of the Orthodox Eastern Church has given in their adhesion to our movement and send delegates to the meetings of the Alliance.

The system under which the Alliance works is also permanent and is also acceptable to the churches. Three things only are demanded of the national councils. First, they must draw into their membership representatives of as many communions as possible; secondly, they must have a constitution which is consistent with the main objects of the Alliance; and, thirdly, they must report to the central office, once a year, upon the work they have accomplished. Subject to these conditions every council is free to make its own rules and to carry on its work in such manner as it thinks best. Democratic principles, guided by the Gospel, is what we depend upon for our success. Indeed, this plan is the only possible one for such a body as ours. The conditions in every country and in every church differ so widely that we are bound to leave discretion to the people in each locality to regulate their own affairs.

Above these national councils is the International Committee, with its executive and other sub-committees. The International Committee is also democratically constituted. It consists of one hundred and thirty persons appointed by the national councils and holding office for three years with a president and fifteen vice-presidents and a joint secretariat of eight persons, each hailing from a different country. Thus the international character of the organization is maintained and its power of conducting permanent operations is assured.

I have given you these details in order that you may see that if the Church of Christ deems it to be its duty to lead mankind into the paths of peace it has at its disposal an organization that is ready for the task, capable of performing it and fired already with that enthusiasm which is indispensable to so great an endeavour.

Let me pass now to the work that the Alliance does or attempts to do. As regards the national councils their operations vary to so great an extent that I can only refer you to the handbook of the Alliance wherein you will find their reports and be able to judge for yourselves as to their respective activities. The same publication gives particulars of the five meetings held by the International Committee between 1914 and 1925. At these gatherings the committee concerned itself with the question as to what should be the Christian attitude towards certain problems of an international character that raise serious moral issues. For example there was the question of the re-establishment of the Mission-fields after the war; methods of reconciliation between former belligerents, the problem of the religious minorities and the settlement of certain post-war difficulties by the exercise of brotherly aid and mutual sacrifice. In all these matters the committee approached its task, not from a political, but from a Christian standpoint, believing that it is only by such means that any permanent good result can be attained.

But it is not through its debates or its resolutions that the Alliance does its most useful work. Far more valuable are the indirect results flowing from the gathering together of its members. Once in three years we bring into close converse some

hundred people who would otherwise never meet. These men are the live men in their particular churches. Were they not, they would not take the trouble to travel these great distances. They meet as strangers; they disperse as acquaintances and the next time they reassemble as friends. The Alliance has already brought into being an international personal friendship which is opening a way to the wider friendship for which it was established. This, of itself, has its special advantage since it gives to these men, when they return to their own lands and encounter their own difficulties, the knowledge that in other countries they have friends labouring for the same cause and meeting the same difficulties as themselves and this gives them confidence and courage.

The large conferences which occur once in three years are not the only occasions offered by the Alliance for consultation between its members. During the past two years we have organized seven conferences on a smaller scale when delegates from the councils in neighbouring lands have been brought together. These meetings have taken place in Yugo-Slavia, Hungary, France, Latvia, Czecho-Slovakia, Roumania, and Italy. At each of these gatherings we had some thirty or forty persons present, representing four or five countries and a still greater number of churches. At all of these meetings questions were discussed which at the moment were creating discord and animosity between the peoples concerned. These discussions were carried on with entire frankness but in that Christian spirit which always facilitates intercourse and they have proved that, in this method of procedure, there is to be found a way to solve the most difficult international problems.

How far these meetings attained their purpose it is impossible to say. It is possible that they had little effect upon the general public. It is probable that they had no effect upon the statesmen of Europe, who think that so long as they can keep up the value of currency, or quiet the working man by doles, peace will be secured. It may be that they appear to the diplomat as a foolish interference with his prerogative of crying, "Peace," where there is no peace. This may all be true; but it is also true that the Kingdom of heaven is like unto

"leaven which a woman hid in three measures of meal until the whole was leavened." No Christian can know what will be the outcome of an act done in the service of his Lord; but he is sure that it will not be fruitless. He will probably never see the fruit. He does not expect to. Herein lies his power. He knows he is labouring for Christ and for humanity and that in his good time the harvest, he has laboured for, will be safely garnered in.

But I am certain that these conferences have an immediate value in the countries where they take place, where, as a rule, there has been up to now little talk about peace. There the mere fact that Christian ministers have come together to speak of peace has struck the public mind forceably. In Riga five thousand people stood in the cathedral for three hours listening to addresses in seven different languages. In Novisad we held consecutive services in the Orthodox cathedral and in the German, Hungarian, and Slovene churches. In the beautiful monastery of Sinaia it was noted that Greeks, Roumanians, and Bulgars took council together on the burning interracial questions which divide these nations and make the Balkans still the danger spot of Europe.

All this has its influence upon the people who see it. It tends to make them think about peace and also it makes them think about the Church. They see the Church doing a bit of practical work and they are the more ready to rally to its side. They also see that the churches, which hitherto they have regarded as torn by inter-confessional differences, are able to unite upon one great human issue. This is of itself a service rendered by the Alliance to Christendom, since Evangelical Christendom, in particular, is wasting its strength through its excessive nationalism. In view of the common difficulties which all religious communions have to cope with and the international character of the materialistic forces against which Christ's followers have to contend, it is foolish—indeed it is suicidal—for the Church to allow political and racial divisions to weaken its influence with the masses of the people. The Son of God came into the world to save mankind. He recognized no frontiers, neither political, racial, nor linguistic. And St. Paul

asserted that "in Jesus Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free." If the churches would act up to this principle they would do more to stop the next war than by any amount of speechifying either here or elsewhere.

I have no doubt that there is a great opportunity offered to-day to the churches. They have indeed a chance of saving modern civilization, the whole fabric of which was shaken by the war. Our immensely complex social system has been built up under the ægis of Christianity and it has failed because it has been disloyal to its own standard. Unless we can make our so-called Christian civilization *Christian*, it will go the way of other civilizations long since decadent or dead. This is the task that lies before the churches and, in order to perform it, they must make a united and organized effort. For one section of this work, namely the Christianizing of international relations, the World Alliance is ready for action. Up to now its operations have been restricted through the paucity of workers and insufficiency of funds. All that it has been possible to do has been to construct the machinery and put it into working order. We have men in every country who are willing to work and international arrangements whereby their work may be properly organized. We have very many of the regular ecclesiastical bodies prepared to co-operate in our movement. If this machine were only set to work over the vast field of Christendom it could evoke the forces of religious fervour and conviction and enlist them on the side of peace in a great crusade for universal brotherhood. But it cannot even start on such crusade unless it can count upon the moral and material support that is essential to so great an endeavour. May I appeal to those who have come here from all parts of the world in order to find ways by which the Church of Christ may best serve the social needs of mankind to give us their support in this attempt to make straight the way of the Lord and to guide the nations into the paths of peace.

CHRISTIANITY AND CRIME *

BY DR. WALTER SIMONS

President of the Supreme Court at Leipzig, Germany

THE theme allotted to me by the International Committee for my address at the Universal Conference, on the Attitude of Christianity to the Social Problems of Crime and Punishment, has seemed to me to increase in difficulty the longer I have studied it. And this I have done for many years, for I was appointed a judge at an early age, and I have reflected a great deal on the problem: whether and why my Christian conscience would allow me to sit in judgment on crimes committed by my brethren, whilst I was obliged to confess with Goethe: "There is scarcely a crime the capacity for which I have not detected in myself." But when I sought in the doctrines of our Christian Church for clear guidance in regard to the principles and conduct of my office, when I searched the writings of the Fathers and of the philosophers in quest of such guidance, I found no safe path. The attitude of the Christian communities to crime and punishment has since times of old often been vacillating, obscure, and contradictory.

That is no reproach, nor is this to be wondered at. Crime and punishment are terms belonging to the sphere of justice and power in the relations between men. But the Christian religion and the Christian Church, which is the guardian of religion in earthly things, are concerned with the relations of the human soul of the human community to God. They do not pay regard to crime, but to sin; they are not solicitous about punishment, but about repentance, penitence, and confession. Nay, one must indeed go a step further and record the fact that the Christian religion from the outset was in some ways in opposition to the judicature of the State in its attitude toward crime punishment.

*An address delivered at the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Stockholm, August 22, 1925.

Just as Jesus Christ, our Lord and Master, refused to be set up as a judge or divider in legal matters between his followers, so also He declined to pass judgment on a criminal. When they brought before Him the adulteress, who, according to Jewish law, had been guilty of a crime which entailed the death penalty of stoning, He declined to condemn her, although He was not, like her accusers, silenced by the consciousness of his own guilt, but was the embodiment of Divine justice. Even to this criminal He merely said: "Go and sin no more." And to the malefactor on the Cross, who confessed Him, He promised paradise.

Is not the cross, is not the foundation of the Christian religion itself, a vehement and eternal protest against the attitude of the State toward crime and punishment? According to the public law then in force in the country of Jesus, his doctrines and teaching were undubitably at variance with the constitution of Church and State; his accusers and his judges were by no means wicked men who were committing a judicial murder for selfish motives. Alongside of the traitor Judas and the false witnesses, there were sincere zealots for creed and law, there were dutiful officials who believed what since then has so often been believed, that it was better that a man die than that the whole people should perish. In their view, it was a case of proved crime and the cross was the penalty laid down by law. Jesus, who had been condemned of high treason, had no claim to the mercy granted by the people to the murderer Barabbas. This Our Lord knew full well ere He set out on his fatal way to Jerusalem. Submitting to the penalty, He prayed to his Father to forgive his judges and tormentors because they knew not what they did.

This religious opposition toward the State system of crime and punishment is to be found even in the Old Testament; and in several passages in the Gospel which seem to guide the Christian in regard to his attitude toward crime and punishment, we find reminiscences of the Psalms and the books of the Prophets. I am thinking here especially of that great saying which is opposed to the harsh retaliatory system of punishment of the ancient Jews: "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord."

This maxim involves the demand for complete abstention from earthly punishment and agrees with the command of Jesus not to resist evil, but to overcome evil with good, to let the man that steals one's cloak also have one's coat, and to subdue defamers with humility. The saying also corresponds with the commandment of our Master: "Judge not, and ye shall not be judged"—a commandment which is daily transgressed by men to the detriment of their eternal salvation.

When thus the Old and New Testament claim the power of punishment for God alone, both proclaim alongside of the terrible penalties of estrangement and remoteness from God the all-merciful grace of God, which, over and over again, forgives the repentant, and which ought to be our model in our intercourse with our brethren. "Merciful and gracious is the Lord, longsuffering and of great lovingkindness," says the Psalmist, and Jesus adjures us to be perfect as our Father in heaven, "for He maketh his sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and his rain to fall on the just and unjust"; admonishes us "to forgive the evil-doer" "not seven times, but seventy times seven." "How can the penalization of crime exist in Christendom alongside of this injunction to love one's enemies?"

In fact the entire system of punishment which is built up on the power of the State has been condemned by many a deeply religious thinker. I do not intend to enter into the history of this school of thought, but will merely remind you of a personality who before the war wielded a great influence on the thought of Europe—Leo Tolstoi. Any one who has read his *Resurrection* will find it difficult to forget those terrible descriptions of the trial by jury and the life in prison. Tolstoi's fundamental principles are in many respects allied to those of Ghandi, whose doctrine of non-resistance also excludes penalization. In his great defence before his British judges,—which Romain Rolland has made famous throughout the continent of Europe—he characterized the deep gulf between his mission and the profession of the jurist by exclaiming: "If you will judge rightly, you have no alternative but to condemn me. Otherwise step down from your seats!"

Dostojewski also wrestled with the problem of crime and punishment in his great novel, *Guilt and Atonement*. He approached that problem in that deep religious spirit which, in spite of all deviations and aberrations, never deserted him, but also with that wonderful knowledge of the human soul in which this Russian master of psychological literature excels. If I rightly understand him, and it is not easy for a German to understand him entirely, he comes to a conclusion which is more favourable for State punishment than were the views of Tolstoi. I shall revert to this in the sequel. Here I would merely draw attention to the fact that the religious condemnation of State punishment for crime has in recent times found effective support in psychological, social, political, and humanitarian movements of thought.

The point against which the attacks of these opponents of State punishment are directed is the conception of guilt. In former times this was an acquisition of human culture; for primitive peoples punish any act which is harmful to the community, even if the doer has committed it unintentionally,—nay indeed against his will; they go so far as to punish even dumb creatures. The lucid mind of the Romans had so clearly defined the conception of guilt—in accordance with which an illegal act is brought home to the personal guilt of the doer with all its gradations, that it was regarded as established for all times. But now attempts are being made to throw this conception overboard. I do not take into account the determinist philosopher, the denier of the freedom of the will, for whom all events in the world are predetermined, whether in the sense of the theological doctrine of predestination through the will and providence of God, or in the sense of the mechanical conception of the world through the law of causality. Such deniers of the freedom of the will have always existed, and though from their point of view the conception of a just punishment is irrational, the theory of predestination has not prevented a Calvin, nor a Marxist, nor a Lenin from resorting to punishment. This suggests the story of the slave of that Stoic philosopher who taught the predetermined necessity of all human happenings. When the philosopher caught the slave thieving and was about to casti-

gate him, the slave, in his defence, exclaimed: "I was predestined to steal."—"And also to be scourged," retorted the philosopher, and brandished the whip.

Less radical and, therefore, more menacing to the continued existence of state penal justice is the attack made by psychological analysis, which searches for the origin of the criminal will in man, and shows out of what pleasurable or painful feelings it develops, from what "suppressed complexes" it suddenly breaks forth, how it overrides inhibiting motives and gives birth to the criminal act. Psycho-analysis, in my view, has entailed the danger of disintegrating not only human guilt, but also the human soul, of regarding man even in mind and soul as a complex process of nature, which can indeed be influenced, but which cannot be made responsible for its operations. Every time I hear a jurist speak about the accountability of an accused from a psychiatric point of view, I am conscious of a danger for penal justice. Many of the grounds which I have heard adduced for the irresponsibility of a particular culprit who is supposed to be mentally abnormal, are applicable also to any culprit, even if normal, who acts under the pressure of abnormal circumstances, and finally lead to the elimination of all responsibility.

Here the attack of the sociologists sets in. They emphasize rightly that the majority of present day crimes which fill our prisons with miserable culprits and our dwelling-places with unhappy victims, are to be traced to perverted social conditions which bring dishonour upon our civilization. Heartrending scenes of such an apparently enforced social training in crime are to be found in a book to which my attention has recently been drawn, with the title: *The Prisoner: New Views on Education in the Penitentiary*. This book was written by a warm friend of the people, Dr. Otto Zirker, who, until his death last spring, was superintendent of the juvenile prison at Eisenach. It also contains cases which seem to confirm that repulsive doctrine of the born criminal in which the ancient theory of predestination has assumed its modern "mechanical" form. But, generally speaking, this Italian school, the school of Lombroso, has been superseded by the sociological school, whose leader

was the famous German criminologist, Franz v. Liszt, and which is also represented by the Italian Ferri. Liszt has said: "Social politics are the best criminal politics," and Ferri based his well-known draft penal code for Italy on sociological foundations. From this point of view, the problem of crime and punishment assumes quite a different aspect: it addresses itself to the forms in which a disease of the people manifests itself and to means for suppressing it, both viewed not from a biological, but from a sociological standpoint.

Individual adherents of this school actually go further. Professor Freudenthal of Frankfurt, a well-known German criminologist, delivered a lecture last Whitsuntide at Halle on the meaning of punishment; in this he asserted that criminality in itself was something normal, that it was to be regarded not as a pathological, but primarily as a social condition. According to him, crime plays the same part in the life of society as bacteria in the human body. A certain amount, in his view, is normal. The body of society, like the human body, digests them or throws them off. Bacteria and crimes do not become a danger until they increase in such numbers that the necessary antidotes are no longer supplied by the body. Among the social antidotes against crime he includes—in addition to social political measures of various kinds and a good social education—also punishment, but punishment only in the very last resort. He, moreover, adopts the principle of the German law for juvenile offenders, in which it is laid down: "If the Court considers reformatory measures to be adequate, punishment shall be foregone." Also in the new draft penal code for Germany this view has been adopted in a large measure; it embodies certain procedure for the reformation of criminals, but here punishment is in the foreground and measures of education and reform are adopted merely by way of supplementation.

I must admit that from a strictly sociological point of view, Freudenthal's contention, that punishment ought to be imposed only in the last resort and only in proportion to the social noxiousness of the criminal, seems more logical than the German draft code, which is obviously based on a compromise. Nevertheless, this view of punishment is not entirely consistent. For

if the danger to society is made the sole criterion, there is no essential difference between an ordinary criminal and a criminal lunatic or a rapacious animal, and I fail to see why the one is to be punished, whereas the other is to be rendered innocuous. In all these cases it is necessary to protect society against the danger with which it is menaced from the malefactor; the character of the methods to be adopted to avert that danger will be governed by the dictates of humanity. The rapacious animal will be shot, the criminal lunatic interned and if possible cured, the ordinary criminal will be placed under surveillance, educated, and, if possible, reformed. What justifies us then in designating certain severe forms of surveillance and reform as "punishment"?

Hence, it is becoming the increasing practice in criminal procedure to adopt the reformatory method of merely threatening punishment, in order that the culprit may pull himself together. This may take the form that the culprit is released "on good behaviour" after he has obediently submitted to part of the punishment, or that the judge, in passing judgment, remits the penalty conditionally on a fixed term of probation. Since I became a judge, this conditional remission of the penalty has been adopted in almost all civilized countries. In the leading circles of those countries it has been viewed with great approval, and, according to statistical data, — which, however, are of somewhat dubious value,—it has well answered its purpose. But, nevertheless, it has aroused the strong opposition of the man in the street. Any one who will listen to what is being said on this subject among the people, will notice this opposition. Recently I passed through the solitary alleys of Eisenach by night, accompanied by a hotel porter who had met me at the station. He seized this occasion to pour out his heart over many an injustice in the world—as supreme judge I hear and read many such outpourings of the heart—and wound up by saying: "The judges are no longer doing their duty. They are letting the criminals go. What use is it to have courts if they merely condemn criminals, but do not carry out the sentence?"

This entire movement, which at bottom is also a protest against the State system of punishment in the forms which it

has assumed up to the present, is connected with its practical break-down. The humanitarian movement of modern times, which is for ever associated with the name of Beccaria, had gradually abolished the severe and cruel retaliatory punishments of ancient days, corporal punishment and the death penalty, and had replaced them by imprisonment, which seemed to give the widest play to the humanitarian ideals of education and reform, without being entirely divested of the character of threat and deterrence. But this one-sided system of punishment has missed its aim in both directions. Neither solitary confinement nor corporate imprisonment affords any security for education and reform. Solitary confinement, when systematically carried out, is, in the long run, ruinous to the mind and soul of by far the great majority of all prisoners, and the result of corporate imprisonment is that the criminal mentality is transmitted like a pestilence from the habitual criminal to the chance criminal. The punishment which was designed to act as a deterrent has so missed the mark that at the beginning of the cold season many a criminal action is committed only in order that the doer may be able to count on a warm abode and regular food. I have been for some years superintendent of a small prison of arrest, and I know what I am saying. The statistics of relapse are a clear condemnation to the entire system. If it really is the object of State punishment to deter the criminal from the act, and to educate and reform him after it has been committed, then the State has signally failed in attaining that object. Dickens, that great sociologist and judge of human nature, foresaw this. We, doubtless, all remember that description in *David Copperfield* of the visit to the penitentiary, where the hypocritical criminal had contrived so well to turn to his own advantage the reformatory aim of the establishment. But Dickens was wrong in his final conclusion: "It is better to override a bad hobby: the sooner it will be ridden to death" for the one-sided system of punishment by imprisonment has persisted for a great length of time.

Therefore, in Germany, as in several other countries, imprisonment is being superseded to a great extent by fines. Formerly the reverse procedure was adopted: if the judge had

found an offence to be so venial that it could be atoned by a fine, he threatened to enforce the payment of the fine by imprisonment. Among the people a fine is always regarded as a less severe penalty than imprisonment: the threat was thus effective. In accordance with the new German law in regard to fines, the judge, if, owing to the gravity of the case, he is obliged to sentence the offender to several months imprisonment, may allow the culprit to get off that penalty by paying a fixed sum of money into the Treasury. The new system has certain advantages: the culprit is preserved from the demoralizing influence of imprisonment, and the tax-payer is saved the expense of his upkeep during incarceration: in fact, he receives a contribution toward other expenditure for the administration of justice. But the idea that the criminal can buy off from the State a legally recognized and justly meted out punishment by means of money tends to undermine the confidence of the people in the administration of justice, and, moreover, seems to me objectionable from the Christian point of view, because it satisfies neither justice nor mercy.

I have led you into a labyrinth of opinions, but all the paths seem to converge in one point, at which the original conception of punishment is dissolved. Will the Christian Church follow on this way? Will the materialists and the determinists, the exponents of psycho-analysis and the sociologists ally themselves and rise in arms against the system of punishment by which the State endeavours to protect itself against crime? Before we decide to answer this question in the affirmative, we must hear the opponents of these views, the adherents of retributory punishment. They are indeed in the minority, but they have by no means owned themselves beaten. Quite recently a society for criminal jurisprudence has been founded in Germany, which, in contradistinction from the International Criminalist Association, does not follow Franz v. Liszt, but the earlier or so-called classical, school of criminal law. This school proceeds not so much from the personality of the culprit, whose antisocial or dangerous characteristics are brought to light by the crime, and are rendered innocuous as far as possible by State action, but rather from the criminal act, the objective

violation of the order of justice. In the view of this school, punishment is the means by which the violated order of justice is restored. Punishment bows under the will of society the will of the offender who has set himself counter to its will, in that it compels him to give up a right—freedom, honour, fortune, nay, life itself—in atonement for having encroached on a right protected by law. The gravity of the crime is gauged according to the magnitude of the right which has been infringed by the evil-doer, and the severity of the punishment must in turn correspond to the gravity of the crime. The scales in the hand of the goddess of Justice is the ancient symbol for the equilibrium between crime and punishment. Punishment as a means of education and a means for the protection of society need not, strictly speaking, be based on the criminal act, if the antisocial, dangerous mentality of the malefactor is recognizable in other ways; but in any case its duration and severity should be gauged by the effect it has on the mind of the criminal, and not according to the effect of the deed on the order of justice. Hence the increasing tendency to punish attempts at crime, nay, even preparatory actions; hence the increasingly wider latitude given by the law to the judge in varying the severity of the punishment for the same crime; hence the demand for sentences to imprisonment of indefinite duration. All this is at variance with the principles of the classical school; in the view of the latter, Themis has her eyes bandaged, she knows no respect of persons. The rule is: equal punishment for equal crime. Only when the scales of justice have weighed crime and punishment according to their gravity and character, the circumstances which caused the criminal will of the culprit to mature before the deed, and which determined it in the perpetration of the act, may be taken into consideration so far as the law allows. In these views the classical school proceeds from the accountability of the adult for his action; it holds him to account for having violated the order of justice, that is, it treats him as the possessor of a free will, determined by himself. The classical school has done a service to human liberty also in another direction: it protects the liberty of the citizen from the unrestricted estimate of the power of the State with which it is threatened by

the sociological school. Hitherto, it is true, that estimate has been utilized by this humanitarian age chiefly in order to weaken the administration of justice. But it is also liable to lead to the result that the officially appointed sociologists and psychologists who are set to decide the fate of their fellow-men, may, on the slightest provocation, resort to the most serious encroachments on their rights and liberties, if the social danger of those victims is sufficiently proved to their scientific minds. In this way we would come to a variety of those subjective or partizan punishments which we know from the history of all political and religious persecutions, from antiquity down to quite modern times. Such punishments have always been held to be the worst form of penal justice. Only clear and firm laws, only definite and just penalties can rescue liberty.

As we have seen, the two schools follow radically different views, which each of them designates as justice: the sociological school also would have the punishment adjusted to the crime, but in such a way that the psychological antidote against the dangers of an antisocial individual in each separate case is selected according to the character of that individual; the classical school would adjust the crime to the criminal by gauging the extent of the punishment by the gravity of the breach of justice. What is justice? This question presses for an answer when we hear how each school casts in the teeth of the other that its method leads to injustice, and when we see how each has been compelled to make concessions to the other—the sociological school by gauging the dangerousness of the malefactor by the gravity of the crime, the classical school by estimating the gravity of the violation of justice according to the strength of the criminal will. And once more we ask: What is the attitude of Christianity to these fundamentally opposed views?

So far as I can see, even Christianity fails to give a clear answer to this question. So much indeed is certain that neither our Lord, nor his disciples, nor any other recognized teacher of the Christian Church, has adopted the anarchist views of Tolstoi, who condemned any human penalty applied by force. If Jesus forbade his followers to pursue the malefactor with pun-

ishment, He made no attempt to forbid the authorities to protect the State community, for the order and administration of which they were responsible, by penalties imposed on criminals. If He declined the office of judge and warned his disciples against judging others, He, nevertheless, assumed the perpetual existence of that office as part of the order of justice: He refers to it in his teaching and parables, without any attempts to exercise any direct influence on its constitution and procedure. And St. Paul who, in the famous thirteenth chapter of his epistle to the Romans, designates "the higher powers," in the capacity of administrators of penal justice, actually as the ministers of God, regards them as appointed for the good of man, of the Christian. I need scarcely mention that Luther, in this respect, completely agreed with St. Paul. This view receives its full due even alongside of the commandment to love one's enemies; both virtues acquire their value only in a community where it is possible to take vengeance on one's enemies, where injustice can be punished, but where, in the spirit of Jesus, the injured person, nevertheless, abstains. In a community where crime reigns unrestricted, love of one's enemies and readiness to forgive will, perhaps, still remain an internal process of ethical and religious value, but the aim which Jesus sets before us, to overcome evil with good, is no longer attainable.

Whilst recognizing the penal power of the State, our great Christian teachers have adopted a different attitude to the purpose of punishment, with regard to which the schools diverge. Luther, who, in his reflections on the purpose of punishment, proceeded from ecclesiastical punishments, expressed himself repeatedly in favour of educative punishment. Thus in the sermon on the ban, he says that "It is the nature and character of all punishment to reform sin." True that he was not entirely consistent: at any rate his attitude toward the rebellious peasants, if it was not based on the right of self-defence against the menaced order of society, is explicable only on the principle of retaliatory punishment. This would be in conformity with the teaching of St. Paul, that the higher power as the minister of God, "is a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." The uncertainty in the motives assigned for punishment,

which I noted at the beginning of this address with reference to Christianity, is shown with special clearness in the controverted question as to the justification of the death penalty. The only solid ground on which that penalty can be based is the purpose of retribution; it can indeed also be motivated with the purpose of deterrence, although that object is never effectively attained; but it cannot possibly be founded on the purpose of education or reform (the execution of a human being, owing to his danger to society, is as such no punishment but merely an act of self-defence).

Now the Christian Church from its very first origin recognized ecclesiastical punishment; but, if one sets aside the death of Ananias and Sapphira, which is related to us not as an ecclesiastical but as a Divine punishment, the Church has always borne in mind the word of the Scripture: "God would not the death of the sinner, but that he may repent and live." That the Church, nevertheless, notably at the time of the Inquisition, availed itself of its "worldly arm" in order to put to death heretics and other opponents of the Church, is one of the darkest chapters in church history. I have already alluded to the fact that Luther just with reference to ecclesiastical punishment emphasized the reformatory purpose of all punishment, and that the reformatory purpose excludes the death penalty. But even here St. Paul shows us that the Christian view of the State and its Divine function does not exclude in principle the death penalty. In the same passage in which he designates the authorities as the ministers of God, he continues: "But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain." The sword of justice signifies the power of life and death. Thus, from a Christian point of view, we must leave it to the politician to decide the question as to whether the judiciary power of the State requires the death penalty in order to combat crime and restore the order of justice. We, in consideration of the infinite worth of every human soul, will endeavour to restrict the death penalty as far as possible, in order to gain time for repentance and penitence. But we will also remember that in Christian and enlightened countries heinous crimes have again and again compelled public opinion to de-

mand the death penalty. At any rate, we find good Christians both among the opponents and the adherents of the death penalty.

I am convinced that the uncertainty and confusion in the views on crime and punishment are due to the fact that people have always tried to base them on a single ethical or practical foundation, whereas they really have a double root, which is connected with the profound dualism of our human thinking and knowledge. The child knows and perceives by becoming conscious of the differences and conformity of his feelings; according to the law of contradiction and the law of identity, he learns that all men differ from one another, and that all men resemble one another. Justice, whose function it is to establish order among the volitional impulses of man, differs fundamentally according as it lays down laws with reference to equality or to inequality. We see this already in the family, the original cell from which the State has developed. Among the children of the same nursery the right of equality holds sway; any child who tries to get more than others will be deprived even of what is his, one who beats a brother will be beaten in turn, the order of justice is executed on the principle of the primeval talion, or law of retaliation, according to the maxim: "As you treat me, so I treat you." Between parents and children the law of inequality is in force: the will of the father commands, the will of the son obeys. If the will of the son attempted to place itself on a level with that of the father, he would violate the order of justice, whereas in relation to his brothers that order is based only on equality. The order of justice between parent and child is executed by means of educative and reformatory punishment, according to the maxim: "He who will not hear must feel"; and, if deterring punishment is brought in, one need only think of the rod behind the mirror. The mitigation of retributory justice is forgiveness, the mitigation of educated justice is mercy. In this connection it may be noted that children and primitive peoples regard retaliation as a sacred duty, for example, the vendetta in Corsica and Albania, and that one-sided mercy of feuds the sense of justice, e. g., in Germany amnesties granted only to reactionary or only to communist disturbers of

the peace. The Roman people, which possessed a natural genius for law, had two different terms for the two principles of justice: justice among equals was termed *jus*, whilst that justice which descended from above was known as *fas*. *Jus* was administered to the citizens by the judge, *fas* was imparted to the masses through kings and priests. Even to the present day the distinction is well kept in the popular consciousness. In the case of crimes committed by a fellow-citizen in violation of rights belonging to another, and through which he does injury to one of his equals, the injured person demands retribution, and the people support him in that demand. But in the case of violations of official orders which are intended to sustain the complex organism of the modern State community, public opinion is much more indulgent, and, indeed, sometimes takes the side of the offender against the authorities, especially since the excessive issue of official regulations during the war period.

As it is the function of our Christian Church to permeate all conditions of life to the best of her power with the spirit of Christ, she ought not to be brought to a halt before the problems of crime and punishment. True that she will use most of her power in order to prevent crime and thus also punishment. Against the violation of justice among equals, and thus against retaliatory punishment, she acts by impressing the commandment of Jesus: "Love thy neighbour as thyself." Against the violation of justice through disobedience, she acts by referring to the words of our Lord: "Give unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," and to the words of St. Paul: "Be ye subject to the higher powers." But in so doing she ought not to neglect to safeguard justice among equals by means of a better and more equitable distribution of the good things on this earth, by prevailing upon human society to preserve the spirit of brotherhood also in legislation. On the other hand, she ought not to neglect to warn the State against ruthless exploitation of its authority, in order that overgovernment may not be transformed into lawlessness, and "aganarchy" into anarchy. It is a mistake for Christian circles to believe themselves obliged to stand out for mild penalties and far-reaching mercy. The Christian needs a gracious God, but also a just State. In the

case of offences against official regulations the State may mitigate or remit the penalty, according to its interest in the system which is to be maintained. But in the execution of retributory punishments it must think more than is at present customary about the injured person.

The reprieve of a criminal who has not forgiven his victim is a menace to the order of justice. Jesus Himself connected Divine grace and forgiveness in a mysterious way with our human forgiving love; ought not then the Church to shrink from demanding mercy from the State for a criminal who has not yet reconciled himself with a brother whose rights he has violated? She would otherwise be forgetting the profound lesson which that great pagan poet Æschylus has given us in the last act of his *Orestes*. Orestes had fulfilled the duty of murderous revenge and had slain the murderer of his father: but in so doing he committed the heinous crime of murdering his mother. The goddess Athene saves him from the pursuit of the Erinyes, the spirits of retribution: she submits the crime to the judgment of the Areopagus, the supreme court of Athens, and when the judges are found to be divided in opinion, she herself gives the casting vote for acquittal. She appeases the infuriated Erinyes by bestowing on them divine honours, that is by recognizing the principle of retribution. But she warns the court not to be lax in imposing just penalties, in order that the Erinyes may not re-emerge from the depths and take the retribution into their own hands. This warning is in place even at the present day.

But the most arduous task of the Church and of the Christian community sets in after the crime has been committed, the sentence pronounced and the expiation of the crime has begun. This subject has been so thoroughly and admirably discussed in the preparatory memoranda drawn up for this Universal Conference that I have but little to add. And indeed I do not consider that it is the function of a church community to enter too deeply into the technical details of the execution of punishment and the prisons system. I merely wish to endorse the demand made by the *rapporteur* that the servants of our Church should never and, in no circumstances, be denied the oppor-

tunity of imparting advice and consolation to the condemned, to open up his soul, if possible, even though it be on the way to the place of execution, to feelings of repentance and need of salvation, and to recover him as a living member of the Christian community. The same applies to the relatives of the culprit whilst he is undergoing the penalty, and to the culprit himself on his release and return to a suspicious world. The Church and the Christian community will find here a wide field for following Christ's example in the care of these their neighbours.

But we should never forget that every crime has two victims, the evil doer and the injured one. Nowadays we are concerned solely about the criminal. But the second victim or his family is no less in need of Christian deeds of love. Quite apart from the material distress into which they are often plunged in consequence of the crime, they suffer under the mental distress of the feelings of hatred and revenge which are the stronger and the more bitter the less these persons are protected and supported by the outside world. To help them out of both these kinds of distress is a Christian duty. They must be consoled by effective help and be persuaded to sincere forgiveness. Merely to stand on the safe haven of one's own uninjured rights of and to preach forgiveness to the tempestuous waves of their feelings of revenge, that will not carry conviction.

I thus come to my concluding point. In one respect the Christian Church, in my view, ought to endeavour to exercise influence on the State system of punishment: that is in the selection of the penalty with which the violated order of justice is intended to be restored. The best restoration seems to me that through which the injury committed by the evil-doer is as far as possible made good. A human being whose soul has not been entirely perverted, himself feels a deep need of atonement if he has committed a criminal act: he is conscious that it is not a chain of circumstances, but he himself that has committed the act, that the responsibility rests on him, and that atonement will relieve him of the burden. But how can he be relieved so long as his victim is suffering? On this aspect of the problem the State lays too little weight. It carries out the penalty and leaves the victim to take care of himself. Instead of that the

State ought, above all things, to ensure that the evil-doer sincerely expiates his act by work for his victim, preferably voluntary work of a systematic character, but when necessary in a workhouse. I am convinced that the Church in such endeavours will obtain the support of the adherents of retributory justice as well as of the psychologists and sociologists. True that, humanly speaking, it will be difficult to realize this idea. But, if we are imbued with its inner truth, it will not be impossible. All things are possible to him that believeth.

It was with great hesitation that I, a theological layman, undertook to address this Universal Conference, at which so many highly learned luminaries of the Church are assembled, on the subject of Crime and Punishment from the point of view of the Church and religion. I have done so because I believed that it might be of interest for you to hear how a judge, who confesses himself a Christian, thinks about these difficult matters, a judge who believes with Luther that the position of the criminal judge before God is more precarious than that of the punished criminal. The problem is now being widened from the sphere of the human soul to that of international relations: the Peace of Versailles, the Covenant of the League of Nations, and the Geneva Protocol have now extended the conceptions of Crime and Punishment to nations and to international law. Thus arises a new great field for every international jurist and for the whole of Christendom. But this is a task which I must leave to others.

UNITY BETWEEN ALL PEOPLES*

BY DR. SELMA LAGERLÖF

Author of *Gosta Berling*, *The Wonderful Adventures of Nils*, etc.

I SHOULD like to tell the Conference about an incident that took place about fifty years ago. It was a foggy night out on the Atlantic. Two great ships had collided, and one of them, a powerful mail-steamer on her way from New York to Havre, had sprung a leak amidships and gone to the bottom. The other ship, an immense sailing vessel, had disappeared in the fog without making any attempt to help the many passengers on the mail-steamer.

Among these unfortunates was a young American woman, at that time residing in Chicago. She was wealthy, beautiful, and talented, married to a good and prominent man, and the mother of four lovely little girls. She had undertaken the journey in order to visit her aged parents, who resided in Paris, and show them her children. For this reason she had all four daughters with her on board the ship. When the collision occurred a terrible confusion had arisen on the sinking ship. Boats had been sent out, to be sure, but neither she nor her children had got a place in a boat. When the steamer finally sank all five of them were washed out into the sea.

She was first drawn far down into the depths by the suction from the sinking ship, and then ejected to the surface again. Then she realized that her children had been turned away from her, and that they had been drowned. She could not swim. In a moment she would be drawn down into the depths again, and that would mean death.

Then in her last extremity, she thought no longer about her husband or children. She thought only about lifting up her soul to God.

*An address delivered at the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Stockholm, August 26, 1925.

Just before this she had witnessed terrible scenes. In the face of inevitable destruction, the passengers on the wrecked ship had lost all presence of mind. There had arisen a wild struggle over the boats, which in no way could have accommodated the five hundred passengers. The stronger men and women had made their way with blows and kicks. The weak and the sick had been pushed aside, trodden upon, or merely cast into the sea. The same terrible struggle for life was going on all about her now, on the surface of the ocean. Several heavily loaded boats passed by, and the people sitting in them had drawn knives to keep off the swimmers who approached to grasp the edge of the boat. Horrible cries and curses were heard on all sides. But from all these scenes of cruelty and chaos, of merciless savagery and pitiful terror of death, she released her soul to uplift it to God.

And her soul rose up like a released captive. She felt how it rejoiced in casting off the heavy fetters of human life, how with exultation it prepared to soar to its rightful home.

"It is so easy to die?" she thought.

Then she heard a mighty voice, a voice from the other world, that filled her ears with a thundering reply.

"It is true that it is easy to die. That which is difficult is to live."

It seemed to her that this was the greatest of truths, and she assented joyfully: "Yes, yes, it is true that it is difficult to live."

And with a feeling of pity for those who still continued to live, she thought: "Why need it be so? Could not life on earth be so arranged that it could become as easy to live as it now is to die?"

Then, she again heard the mighty voice, which answered her: "That which is required in order that it may become easy to live on the earth is unity, unity, unity."

While the words still echoed in her ears she was rescued. It was the great sailing-vessel, which had twined back and sent out boats. She was taken up in one of these boats, and later, together with about eighty other survivors, she was put ashore in a European harbour.

This incident and this message came into my mind when I first heard about the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. I fancied that after the great collision—the terrible shipwreck—that had befallen Christianity, many of its best members had felt themselves cast out into a bottomless deep, with the dear ones lost, with aversion to life, ready to accept the threatening annihilation as a release. But out of this abyss of agony, voices from another world have reached these despairing ones. They too have heard, amid the wild tumult and bloodshed, the cry of unity, unity, unity; and it is for this reason that they have now gathered here from the four corners of the world to create the peace and harmony that people have yearned after for thousands of years, which surely should make life easier to live.

This was the first thought that came to me upon hearing about the Conference. The second was that I should like to participate by bidding the Conference welcome. For I thought, no matter how the attempt may succeed, the idea is great and bold, and worthy to be greeted as a forerunner of brighter days.

May I relate further about the ship-wrecked woman's life and work? The problem that she had to solve was the same as that of this Conference, although on a different scale. And I may well admit that when I meditated upon her life, my heart trembled. I seemed to see a message written by God's own finger—a message of guidance, of awakening, of trust—which should be read by just this gathering.

But let me say first that the young American woman, Anne Spafford, received the message that had come to her that terrible night as the true Word of God. She did not tell herself that it was illusion and self-deception, but interpreted it as a sacred command, which it was her task to convert into reality.

Several years went by, however, before she made a serious attempt. She was too entirely broken down with sorrow over the lost children. Two new daughters grew up in the home, but the sense of loss continued. At last she realized that help and consolation would not be hers until she had dedicated her life to the establishing of unity in the disunited world.

But unity—what is unity? How can it be realized? How can one live in unity with one's fellow-men as they now are,—selfish, self-righteous, false, dissipated, sinful? Let us go to meet the great difficulty.

Is it not really necessary that all become perfect before any kind of unity can reign here on this earth? A single person, who tried to live in unity with his fellow-men—would he not be scoffed at, trodden down, crucified?

Anne Spafford adopted the usual expedient. She, her husband, and twenty of their friends, founded a community whose members pledged themselves to live in unity with each other and to serve and help all humanity.

These Chicagoans sought in no way to introduce a new religion. They were all fervent and tried Christians, and they buried themselves in the study of *The Acts of the Apostles* in order to find, in the first Christian way of living, a guiding principle for their conduct. Following their example they moved together in a single large household. They introduced community of goods, they served one another without compensation, and they were surprized over the feeling of ease and security that entered into their lives.

While they thus sought to emulate the first confessors of Christianity, whose lives in Jerusalem were continually in their thoughts, news came to them that disease and famine were devastating the Holy City. This aroused a desire to transfer their activities there, and their desire came to fulfilment. Several other reasons doubtless contributed to their decision. They lived in the warmth and hopefulness of the first enthusiasm. The message that had been given to Anne Spafford seemed to them the very essence of Christianity and they felt that it should be propagated from the place in which our religion had its source.

In 1881 the members of the community arrived in Jerusalem. They took lodgings in a beautiful little house close to the city wall, where from the roof terraces one could look out toward the circle of beautiful hills which frame the landscape. Their occupation was to search out the sick in the narrow lanes

of the Holy City, to feed the hungry, and to help and care for orphaned children. They lived a simple life, taking their meals together and performing earnest devotions. They concerned themselves but little with preaching the principles that had led them to this place. But to all who visited them they related of the Divine message that had rung in the ears of the ship-wrecked woman, and said that they through their mode of living would bear witness to this truth.

Let us stop here for a moment. Does it not seem strange that this community, which desired to spread unity over the world, should have chosen to proclaim its beliefs through good works actions? It demanded no uniformity in dogmas. It desired, like this Conference, to bring about Christian unanimity in work and modes of living.

It also came to pass that a few, through seeing the peace, the harmony, and quiet happiness that prevailed in the little circle, became convinced that theirs was the right course, and requested that they might attach themselves to the American colony. There were a number of Syrians from the coast cities of Palestine, several baptized Jews, and a few travelers from Europe and other parts of the world, but most of the new members were Orientals. In this way the community was increased until the new arrivals numbered forty, a small number in itself, but when one considers that the new entrants were asked to give up their old lives, move to the colony in Jerusalem, surrender all their property to the community, and submit themselves to a strict and abstinent mode of living, one almost wonders that the influx became so considerable.

The largest addition to the American colony came, however, not from Palestine, but—strangely enough—from Sweden. A group of peasants in Nas parish in Dalarna had organized a similar religious cult. Through countrymen who had emigrated to Chicago they came to hear of the Americans who had moved to Jerusalem in order that they might lead the lives of the first Christians, in unity and perfection. These peasants were seized with the desire to unite themselves with the colony. They sold their farms, renounced home and fatherland, and journeyed to Jerusalem. This happened in 1896, when the Americans had

lived in Jerusalem for fifteen years. The Swedish emigrants numbered about forty, but among them were several minors.

Does not the thought of this fill one with wonder? The colony in Jerusalem was composed chiefly of the same nations who have gathered for this Conference. To the colony came small groups of people from the far West and the far North in order to work for unity in association with a few Orientals. There, as here, Anglo-Saxon energy met with Oriental mysticism and Northern sincerity. Here we have also the privilege of having Gallic clearness to our aid. There, as here, Calvinists, Lutherans and Orthodox Churchmen hearkened to the cry of unity, while the people of the South made no move. Is it not like a sign, that these who have gathered here will make a start toward the great union, the awakening of brotherhood among Christian peoples, and community of action?

But let us go further. From the very beginning the colony had assumed a distinct position among the many Christian communities in Jerusalem. Its members had always felt it a duty to display a Christian character toward the Oriental surroundings, and to hold fast to the idea of unity. They had heard the Jews and Mohammedans derisively lamenting over the constant quarrels that divided the Christians, and they wished to set them a better example. The colonists, who were cultured, loyal, peaceful people, had always enjoyed the greatest esteem among the natives of the city, and this was not only among the poor. Such aristocratic Arabic and Jewish families as there were in the city visited the colonists and were their true friends. But to many of the Christian communities in Jerusalem and the Orient the colony became from the first a rock of offense. They would not understand what this layman's organization, which exerted no missionary activity and made itself friends among the opponents of Christianity, had to do in Jerusalem. They were accused of leading despicable lives, and attempts were made to harm them and make it impossible for them to live in the Orient.

Is there any one present here who doubts that the Conference will meet with the same fate? Is it not certain that the best among the non-Christians will greet such a conference as

this with joy and follow it with good wishes? And is it not equally certain that its worst adversaries will arise out of Christianity itself, that from this quarter will come the voices that misinterpret its motives and seek to frustrate its resolutions?

I hardly need say it. At any rate it is clear to everyone that the colony in Jerusalem could not live in undisturbed peace, but that it came to be agitated by serious internal contentions. The most dangerous of these arose from the fact that the colonists had adopted purely ascetic rules of living, such as not to take payment for any kind of work—not even for work that was performed for wealthy people outside of the colony. Likewise they strove after the greatest abstinence in the relations between men and women. Out of these disputes arose poverty, dissatisfaction, and many unnecessary conflicts, especially since the colony's children had begun to grow up into youths and maidens. But gradually the leaders of the colony came to realize that these ascetic practices were not necessary for unity, and they were discontinued. It is an upright and charitable life that is demanded from the colonists, but no regulations that conflict with human nature are imposed upon them. They are allowed to receive compensation for their services, and ever since this permission was given a cheerful spirit of industry has prevailed in every corner of the colony. They are allowed to marry and live in their own homes, near the great palace-like main building of the colony. Ever since these ascetic questions were settled the colony's reputation and prosperity have been continually increasing. A great many Swedes, myself among them, have visited the colony and have afterward spoken of it with admiration and interest. They testify to the sincere Christian spirit, the unbroken unity, and the life together that is intrinsically so deep and serious, but, nevertheless, so full and happy.

It seems to me that the Conference should not fail to take warning from this. The Conference is to introduce Christian law into the relations between peoples. The Conference will do this with the discreet consideration that the nations are living beings whose natures cannot be changed; and not impose un-

necessary restrictions—only those that are necessary to maintain unity and create confidence.

The foundress of the community died two years ago at the age of eighty-one, after having given her entire life to leading and serving the community. It has never become powerful and world-encompassing, as she had perhaps hoped in the beginning—it includes not fully a hundred members. But on her death-bed she was able to say to herself that the Divine voice had led her aright. Unity had surrounded her life like a protecting wall. Sorrow had not been absent, but shared by many faithful and sympathetic hearts it had lost its bitterness. And the ability to help—to lighten others' burdens, had increased in a wondrous way. She could tell herself that for the former poverty-stricken Jerusalem her colony had been a great blessing. She could think of bands of Jewish refugees whom her colony had rescued, of suffering pilgrims in danger of death to whom they had ministered, of the five hundred hungry who had daily been fed. She felt that the people who had been trained in the colony were sincere, pure-hearted, cheerful, mild, and happy in serving others.

Surely it was far from her thoughts to boast, on her death-bed, of worldly success; but nevertheless, she considered that God, even in this way, had chosen to show that unity was the blessing of human life. The colony now owned a great palace, located not far from the Gate of Damascus, as well as six smaller buildings. It owned dromedaries and horses, cows and goats, buildings and land, olive and fig trees, shops and work-rooms. Photographs of Palestine from its studio were sold all over the world, and it outfitted caravans which transported travelers far and wide in Palestine and Syria.

Her once so despised colony had become a resting place, a haven of peace, in the Holy City. In the evenings people gathered on the terraces for prayer and conference, song and music. Thoughts of peace went out from this place during the hopeless darkness of the World War. Unity is possible, unity can be attained between the peoples of different nations, unity can also reign between the government and the people.

But does there not lie, in the success of the humble predecessor, the most glorious promise for the mighty successor? Does not one feel how God in this way promises this blessing to the work for unity among all human beings, the unity of mankind? Will He not say to us that in the sign of unity all mankind shall attain to a more perfect development, that in this sign prosperity shall increase, the power to help and make happy shall be multiplied, and the sorrows that must follow human life shall in manifold ways be diminished?

Let us hear! Let us listen! He whose voice, through the thunders of the World War, spoke to us of unity, speaks to us also through the humble creation of his lowly servant. "Unity!" she calls to us. Unity between Calvinists and Lutherans, unity between Protestants and Greeks, unity between Greeks and Catholics, unity between Christians and non-Christians, unity, unity, unity, between all the peoples of the earth.

THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN EDUCATION *

BY PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, D.D.

Chairman of the Commission on the Church and Christian Education of the
Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Stockholm, Sweden

OUR experience in the Commission on Education has been an epitome of the experience of the Conference as a whole. By a process of education through contact we have been discovering our unity in variety.

There were nineteen members in our Commission. They were of three continents, eleven languages, twelve countries, sixteen different ecclesiastical bodies, and almost every type of educational philosophy. It included Greek Orthodox, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Reformed, Anglicans, Episcopalians, Congregationalists, and a member of the National Church of Czecho-Slovakia. Four bishops of as many countries—Japan, Czecho-Slovakia, Denmark, the United States, were included in its membership. Yet the report which we present you is unanimous.

This result was not reached by the surrender of individual conviction—we tried that method for two days without success; rather by the gradual welding together of view which took place in the course of our discussion. The report in its present form represents the work of no single mind, but the common conclusion of us all.

We have been materially assisted in our work by the reports of the sectional committees, English, American, and Continental, to which we make frequent reference. Each contributed something essential and they should be regarded not simply as preliminary studies but as integral parts of the present report.

Two convictions dominate the thought of the Commission: first, that as Christians we are responsible for bringing the

*This address was delivered on presenting the Report of the Commission on the Church and Christian Education at the Stockholm Conference.

spiritual resources of the Gospel to bear upon the life of our generation; secondly, that we cannot discharge this obligation aright unless we apply our Christian principles consistently to all the relations of life, and that it is our duty as teachers to find out how this can be done.

We realize only too well that in saying this we are saying nothing new. With almost monotonous repetition, one Commission after another has been reminding us that we cannot divide life into two parts, religious and secular: one, controlled by the Spirit of God; the other, in which we follow our own selfish impulses. All our relationships must be Christianized; not least those in which brotherhood is most difficult. If this cannot be done, our doctrine of God's Fatherhood loses its reality. Apart from human brotherhood, the Fatherhood of God remains but a phrase. But there is this difference between our Commission and the others: they have been concerned with the goal, we with the way; they have been telling us what we ought to do, you have asked us to tell *how we should do it*. In the last analysis every commission has brought us face to face with an educational problem. For it has led us back to the heart of man where motives and ideals have their home. To do right one must know the right and one must will the right.

This sets us our task as Christian teachers. It is our duty

1. To understand the persons whom we seek to influence for Christ;

2. To develop to the full the resources for character building which the Gospel puts at our disposal;

3. To find the appropriate point of contact which will open the way for our message in circles with which the Church is at present out of touch.

And first, of the conditions which confront us. Of these I have time to refer only to one. This is the growing tendency among teachers to regard education as coextensive with life and to make the teacher responsible for physical and moral as well as for purely intellectual training. The school is regarded as a miniature society in which the pupil practices on a small scale the activities which he is afterwards to exercise on a larger scale. This enlarged conception of the teacher's function

confronts the Church at once with an opportunity and with a danger: an opportunity in that it provides a welcome point of contact with the Christian view of education as the training of the entire personality for fellowship with God and service of man; a danger, lest in the desire to make place for the new material which the sciences are pressing upon us, religion, the oldest and the most abiding of man's interests, be crowded out or relegated to a subordinate place.

And it is not simply in the school and the university that this danger presents itself. Other social units besides the school are concerning themselves with education and working out a philosophy of life which moulds the character of those who come under their influence. This is true of labour, big business, the youth movement, the State. Each is organizing research, carrying on propaganda, influencing public opinions. In a very literal sense of the word, all the world has become a school.

We gladly recognize that in each of these great centers spiritual forces are active, and ideals of brotherhood and service are upheld. In each, consecrated men are working and giving their lives for a cause which is larger than self. The Church should recognize the existence of these spiritual forces and ideals, and should support those who are striving to realize them. But at the same time she should be on her guard against the danger they present, the danger, namely, that in the name of brotherhood, aims will be followed which are really narrow and divisive, and ends, good in themselves, be promoted by an appeal to motives which are selfish. We must be on our guard lest in our desire to find a point of contact with men whom we wish to help, we lower our own standard and substitute any lesser goal for that brotherhood in Christ, to which by her Divine charter the Church is committed.

How then, faced with such an opportunity and with such a danger, can the Church discharge the responsibility divinely committed to her as a teacher:

1. By making earnest with our obligation to be consistently Christian in the sphere of life which we can control;
2. By seeking every possible point of contact with the larger sphere of life we desire to influence.

Christian education to be effective must begin at home. On this we are all agreed. If we have failed in the larger sphere, it is because we have first of all failed there. We have spoken of love, and too often our conduct has given our words "the lie." We have preached brotherhood and lived as strangers, sometimes even as enemies. Much has been said and rightly about the impossibility of a Christian society apart from the Christian individuals who compose it, and doubts have been expressed even in this Conference as to whether such a society is really possible. But may it not prove that one reason why the christianization of society as a whole seems so impossible is because we who call ourselves Christians have made so poor a showing in the sphere in which we profess to believe that the Christian life is possible. With one heart and mind, we confess our common sin; and pray for that life-giving Spirit which is able to renew and to transform each surrendered soul.

What God can do for us if we have faith to trust Him, He can do for others, He can do for the world.

In accepting this tremendous responsibility, we do not conceal from ourselves the magnitude of the task. All the agencies at our disposal must co-operate in the work of Christian education; not simply the Church and the school, but the home, the playground and all those voluntary organizations like the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A., which are so noticeable a feature of our time. All parts of life must be seen in their educational significance—practice as well as theory, instinct and emotion as well as reason. We must begin with the child to be sure; but we must remember that the child begins with his parents. We must begin with the child, but we must follow him all through his life, and surround him wherever he is, as workman, teacher, parent, artist, statesman, with those moral and spiritual influences implicit in the Christian religion, without which a full and rounded life is impossible.

Above all, we must realize the central place which *worship* plays in the complete life and we must draw the appropriate consequences for education. All the world over, there is a revival of the spirit of prayer born of the sense of human helplessness, of human need. But prayer to be effective must be

intelligent. It requires concentration, practice, self-mastery. Jesus *taught* his disciples to pray.

We begin then with Spirit. But Spirit, to be effective, requires a body through which it can act. If the Church is to enter into touch with the powerful social agencies of which we have spoken—economic, racial, governmental—she must use the points of contact available, and create new ties where they are lacking. Here the sectional reports give much interesting and encouraging information, to which we refer our readers who desire suggestions in detail.

It is clear that in dealing with units of such magnitude, the individual Christian, even the individual Church, is at a disadvantage. A co-operative approach is the only effective method, such as is provided by our existing federations and councils. The response already given to this Universal Conference in the most widely different quarters is the most convincing demonstration of this fact.

An opposite illustration is given in the report of our sub-committee on text-books. This report draws attention to a serious danger—the danger that history, which should be our great teacher of brotherhood, may be used for partisan, or at least for narrowly national purposes. The report makes definite recommendations which the Committee as a whole heartily approve.

But this is only one illustration of many that could be given of the way in which the Church's influence is hampered by our lack of access to the necessary facts. "The Church," as the American report rightly reminds us, "has no miraculous means of learning facts. The sincerity of our purpose will not prevent us from falling into error, if we neglect the rules of evidence which we follow in other departments of life."

We suggest, therefore, to this Conference (and in this we are simply voicing what has been expressed independently by many other speakers) that it recommend to the appropriate authority the creation of an International Bureau of Education and Research to serve as a clearing house of information for the various Christian communions on those moral and religious matters in which they have a common concern.

In making this recommendation, we do not have in mind a committee with executive responsibility, authorized to commit the churches to any definite line of action, but simply a convenient centre, such as now exists in more than one country, through which the needed information can be assembled and distributed. As to the nature of this Bureau in detail, and the manner of its appointment, if approved, we prefer to make no recommendation, leaving that for the consideration of such Continuation Committee as the conference as a whole may decide to appoint.

On one point we desire to lay special stress: the new Bureau, if established, should not be a *substitute for existing educational and fact distributing agencies*, but a means of correlating and interpreting them. As this Conference would have been impossible, had it not been preceded by a *long period of preparation and prayer*, during which many preliminary conferences had laid the necessary foundations, so our Continuation Committee will be useless save as it becomes the center of a wider educational process in which the whole Church takes part.

It is the more necessary for us to emphasize this, since the Conference has revealed to us—as many of us had never realized before—how much *we have still to learn* before we are fitted to teach. God has revealed much to us of his purpose for man and his power to save, for which we humbly thank Him and to which we confidently witness. But He has still more to teach us, we are well assured, as to the way in which that power can be applied and that purpose realized; and this understanding He can only communicate to us if we approach Him together.

But knowledge of facts alone is not enough; there must be training in sympathy. I would make my own that fine word which Dr. Hough spoke: "If the Church would win the mind of the world, she must keep the whole world in mind. If the Church would win the heart of the world, she must bear the whole world on her heart."

Will you pardon me if in concluding I say a single word as a theological teacher, to my colleagues who are teachers? We, too, have our sins to confess; we especially. When I think

of my own career as a teacher—how provincial has been my outlook, how narrow my sympathy, how abstract and theoretical my teaching in comparison with this wonderful world of reality into the midst of which it has pleased God for these unforgettable days to introduce me—I am filled with shame. How the technical terms of which I have been making use in the class-room — Orthodox, Anglican, Lutheran, and the like — have grown warm and living, as I have seen them interpreted and transfigured in the persons of the men and women with whom I have worked on this Commission and in this Conference. Too long we have studied and taught as individuals. We need to organize our thinking as our colleagues in the physical sciences have organized theirs. Too long we have confined our teaching to our own little section of God's truth, overlooking what He has revealed to our brothers in other ages and in other churches. The time has come for a larger conception of the teacher's responsibility. I, for one, propose, God willing, to go back to make my class-room as never before a place in which to interpret to the ministers of the future the infinite variety and inexhaustible riches of the Church universal.

CLOSING SERMON*

BY THE ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA

Upsala, Sweden

"Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ."

Veni, Sancte Spiritus:

Reple tuorum corda fidelium.

Et tui amoris in eis ignem accende,

Qui per diversitatem linguarum cunctarum

Gentes in unitate fidei congregasti:

Halleluja! Halleluja!

JESUS said: "Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. 18:20).

We are more than two or three. But however many hundreds we may be, and however many thousands or millions our Conference may represent, however wise and good, however powerful and influential men may be — yet their number and position in the world gives no authority and power in the Kingdom of God. That depends on whether Jesus is with them.

If Jesus is with them, if people are gathered together in his Name, in his Spirit, so that He is in the midst of them, then the little group that was wont to come together in Jerusalem in the upper chamber, round Mary and John, is able to conquer the world. In that case Augustine and his mother Monica can wander through the heavenly spaces. Valdes and his friends, *Pauperes de Lugduno*, form a small community which no gathering of human power has been able to destroy. The love of Christ made Saint Francis and his companions irresistible. The psalms and the words from the Bible which resounded on the "Mayflower," in spite of the seaway, still re-echo like a mighty thorough-bass through the institutions and

*Delivered at the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Upsala, August 30, 1925.

“melting-pot” of North America. The resolution taken by the brothers Wesley and their two companions behind the now darkened wall of Lincoln College changed, against their will, the history of the Church.

Not even the lonely man need be alone. Jesus said of Himself: “Ye shall be scattered and shall leave Me alone: and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with Me” (John 16:32). Jesus said of us: “If a man love Me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and We will come unto him, and make our abode with him” (John 14:23).

The lonely Paul boasted of his weakness in order that the power of Christ might rest upon him (II Cor. 12:9).

Because Christ was with him, the lonely Luther influenced the history of the world more profoundly and more permanently than any man since our Saviour. The lonely John Calvin spiritually built up his Geneva, in its vale of wondrous beauty, into a city upon the rock.

“So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy” (Rom. 9:16).

“With force of ours we nothing can.”

The Lord has been with us. It is He that hath compelled us. His is the work. We have perceived the might of his spirit. We have experienced during our meeting something of the severe discipline of the Lord and of his unconceivable mercy.

Two men are here gathered together. John, the Apostle of tender love and contemplation, had at our Lord’s breast learned the rule: Brethren, love one another. Paul, the greatest disciple of the Saviour, bore witness: “I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me” (I Cor. 15:10). His faith worked by love (Gal. 5:6).

The third man, Peter, the spokesman of the disciples, still tarries. Christendom stands out as divided, but Christ is one. The division cannot be according to his will. When Christendom is gathered together in life and work around the Saviour He will be in the midst of us, irresistible through the almighty power of love.

“Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them.”

Let us offer to Him a silent prayer each of us in the words that He Himself has taught us;
(The Lord's Prayer in silence.)

The old Gospel for the twelfth Sunday after Trinity, which the law of the church in this country requires us to consider today, has been read from the altar. It tells us (Mark 7:31-37) how Jesus said sighing to a man who was deaf and had an impediment in his speech: "Be opened." "His ears were opened, and the string of his tongue was loosed, and he spake plain." The event made such an impression on those who were present that the meaning of the words on the lips of Jesus has been preserved in its Aramaic form even in the Greek text and in all translations: "Ephphatha."

To-day the message to the Church and congregation of Christ is "Ephphatha."

Ephphatha, open our ears and hear.

Ephphatha, open our mouth and speak.

I.

The Church will surely listen. The Church is too ready to adapt itself to what is said in what are known as ecclesiastical or well-minded circles. Jesus acted otherwise. "If your righteousness doth not exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter the Kingdom of Heaven." The Church listens too much to man, too little to God. Let no one imagine that he hears the voice of God better because he turns a deaf ear to what is said and heard in his own day. Woe unto you, says Jesus, because you do not learn from the signs of the times.

Jesus mentions (in Luke 8) what stops up the ears. In the first place temptation and resistance. In the second place cares and riches and pleasures of this life. In the third place, and perhaps this holds good of most people, the enjoyment of the good things of life. In order to hear we have to watch and pray.

When the multitude heard only a thunder or the voice of an angel (John 12:29), Jesus heard the voice of the Father and spoke and acted accordingly. What is perceived in the

questions that have occupied our prayers, our consideration and our counsels before now and which have now compelled us to come together in Stockholm? Answer: terrifying thunders have rumbled around, a confusing turmoil rages round us: the tranquillizing voices of angels are also heard, but do they speak truth? We must now search our hearts and ask ourselves: Have we during these days heard somewhat better than before what the heavenly voice has to say to us?

II.

Ephphatha, loose the string of the tongue and talk. There is talking enough in Christendom. There is preaching without end. Luther's rule is seldom followed: "*Erst den Maul aufmachen, dann etwas sagen, dann den Maul zumachen.*" The boy wakes during the sermon and asks his father: "Is he not through yet?"—"Yes, he is through, but he cannot stop." Hear from St. Paul how things ought to be in our churches (I. Cor. 12:24-25): "If there come in one that believeth not or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all. And thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so, falling down on his face, he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth."

Very little has been recorded of what Jesus said. But Jesus thought for thirty years about what He was to say. And what He said is heard through the ages. Our lips often hold their peace when they should speak, while many times they speak when silence would be better. The right words said at the right moment, how often have we longed for them during the last few years in order that they might comfort the conscience of Christendom and give voice that should be heard over the whole world to dumb lamentations, a dumb sense of sin, a dumb striving after righteousness.

But words are not enough. Words are cheap. We must give ourselves. "The waste of life lies in the love we have *not* given, the powers we have *not* used."

Our first action must be that we, as Christians and members and servants of the Church, must acknowledge our ob-

stinate deafness and our loquacious dumbness. Our next action must be that Christianity, following the Master's example, should show the world its spiritual unity.

Otherwise, according to Jesus' own words, the world cannot believe that He came in God's name. The divisions and silence of Christendom impede the Saviour's work.

He was himself the everlasting Word of God. He spoke through the service in which He gave his life. Logos, the eternal truth of God, was made flesh and blood in Him, voice and action in us; and through us and through the congregation on earth, God's living Word wishes to speak the will of God and carry out the will of God in our communities.

A Swedish workman writes: "Preachers and priests sin greatly in not preaching against the social and economic injustices. It is a shame that the Christians did not become friends of peace until they were frightened into it by the experiences of the war and their terror of a Bolshevik revolution. Why did not the Bible teach them? I hope that a blessing may rest on the Ecumenical Conference." Such an expectation involves a terrible responsibility.

A spokesman for millions of working and thinking men greeted our meeting with the following words: "Multitudes of people have again and again been turned away mourning because when a testimony of faith in the imperious rule of the Christian spirit was demanded to check and shame the passions and the follies of blind men, that testimony was not delivered, but something so feeble, so temporizing, and so false was given out instead."

And this correspondent goes further. He is not content with strong words. He continues: "The state of the world today once more calls for the aid of the Christian spirit, not only as a judge and a healer, but as a guide. Whilst men and nations in their distress of fear run hither and thither seeking safety where the experience of centuries shows there is no refuge, it is the duty of the Church to rally them to a confidence in the inner light and its attending moral courage, so that they may walk with firm confidence in the ways of the spirit which are the ways of both honour and life."

"O, Eternal Lord,
Mighty word of God,
Word made flesh that dwelt among us,
Solacement of human dumbness,
With Thy hand that healed
Touch our lips long sealed.

Let us not pass by,
Coldly, heedlessly,
Needs that cry aloud for succour,
But let love in us make answer,
And our words inspire
With Thy Love's pure fire.—

Chiefly let us be
Peacemakers like Thee
Gospel-seed around us sowing,
Peace, Goodwill like Thee bestowing,
Where some darkened life
Falters in the strife.—

O Incarnate Word
Lead us up to God.
Show Thy way: Let not its steepness
Seem to mock our mortal weakness.
Yea of promise. Ah,
Cry, Lord, Ephphatha."

REPORTS OF THE COMMISSIONS OF THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CON- FERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK, STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN, AUGUST 19-30, 1925

THE CHURCH AND ECONOMIC AND INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS

An examination of the Reports presented shows that though their methods of statement differ, they all assert that the work of the Church is to proclaim the message of salvation through Jesus Christ and so to lead men to a Christian faith in God and a new life in love. The social mission of the Church does not lie outside her religious work, but is entirely involved in it. Where the Gospel of Christ is the power which really governs the life of men it will also rule their business and their social relations. A Christian society can only be built by men who have the spirit of Christ.

Christians pray: "Thy Kingdom come. Thy Will be done, *on earth* as it is in Heaven." Therefore, Christians must be "workers together with God" to prepare the way for the coming of the Kingdom on earth. The conditions now prevailing in economic life are in many respects inconsistent with the ideal of the Kingdom and with the teaching of Christ about the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. The Church of Christ cannot remain silent in the presence of the evils of these conditions.

She has to confess that she is not without guilt. All too lightly has she taken her responsibility for the physical and spiritual injury done to human life. All too little has she understood how to bring the teaching of the Gospel and the judgment of the Christian conscience to bear upon the results of the industrial revolution. She has underestimated the power of Christ to liberate the whole of human life and overcome its evils.

The Church must endeavour, not only to penetrate more deeply into the living truth of the Gospel, but also to apply more effectively its message to social life, and fearlessly expose the evils which prevail.

The fundamental Christian principles which ought to guide the Church in this work may be summarized in the following statements:

1. *Love*. Against the current belief that the powers which rule the world are force and self-interest, we Christians assert that love is the strongest power. God is Love, and all human well-being, all moral progress is advanced by love, expressing itself in good-will, co-operation, mutual helpfulness, service and self-sacrifice.

2. *Brotherhood.* As children of the one Father, we are all members of the same family: each one being precious in the eyes of the Father, we ought to recognize theoretically and practically the value of every human being. Therefore, the development of human personality is more important than wealth, man more important than money. In all economic problems the human factor is of more importance than material gain.

3. *Justice.* No social order can endure or satisfy human aspirations unless it is just. God has so made man that he can never rest content under unjust conditions. The present discontent with industrial conditions arises in part from a sense of injustice, no way having yet been found whereby rewards are equitably adjusted to work or merit.

Love, Brotherhood, Justice are not mere phrases. They are part of the Eternal Order, ruling ideas which have Divine authority.

All the Reports agree that the Church cannot commit herself to any special scheme or schemes for the reconstruction of the social order. Such schemes are constantly modified by growing social experience. The function of the Church is by purifying and deepening the human conscience to give men clearer eyes and better wills.

Applied to the prevailing conditions of economic life the fundamental Christian principles lead to the following practical conclusions on the subject referred to this Commission:

Man and Property

Christianity regards all possessions not as ends but as means held in stewardship, and, therefore, those who control any kind of property ought to regard themselves as stewards of God and as servants of society, responsible for the manner in which their property is used. The greed of gain without corresponding work or service, particularly when it makes itself felt in unhealthy speculation harmful to economic life, is to be condemned.

The duty of service is equally obligatory upon all. No privileged position can dispense any member of society from this duty.

The Church has in the past always recognized it as her task to alleviate suffering and render loving service to the afflicted. This task is still hers. But in her future discharge of it she must also more and more act, as far as is possible, through and with the social agencies which the community now provides for the care of the weak and unfortunate.

Co-operation in Industry

Industry should be a co-operative effort to supply adequately the needs of all, and so for all create the material conditions requisite for personal spiritual life, which is the highest of all values. In the organization of industry the aim should be the development of co-operation between all engaged. By this means the wage-earners will have the value of their work

heightened and feel they are not mere tools in the hands of outside interests. Such co-operation would give the workman greater security of employment and at the same time make for industrial peace. Experience proves the great advantage of the method.

The necessary organization of work requires a division and distribution of tasks which must be decided in accordance with the goal to be reached. It is to the interest of all that the most capable should attain the leading positions and secure due independence both in relation to capital and to those engaged in the undertaking. But earnest consideration must also be given to the workers' need of a personal share in the undertaking. It seems just that they should have some share also in control, particularly where their interests are vitally concerned and they are able to make an effective contribution to production. Responsibility should go hand in hand with authority, and no division or gradation within the organized undertaking be allowed to prevail against the spirit of co-operation and fellowship which ought to animate it as a whole.

The constant warfare in the industrial world of to-day contrasts sharply with the ideal of the Christian community. So long as industrial strife continues, the reckless and unfair methods often employed must be condemned, and, likewise, the tendency of public opinion to express itself in judgment on matters of contention without adequate information.

Child and Adolescent Labour

The welfare of the child and the welfare of the community alike require the abolition of child labour. The premature entry of the child into industry puts a stop to education before the results of early teaching have had time to take root, and too often arrests physical, mental, and moral development to the spoiling of the man, the worker, and the citizen. But the mischief does not end there. By the competition of children the adult labour market is disturbed. Men and women stand idle while children work, or see the standard of their earnings disastrously lowered by the rivalry of boys and girls who ought to be at school. This competition should cease.

Where employment of adolescents is in question similar considerations apply, but in a modified form. Employment of young people should as far as possible include training in and for industry, and the hours of labour should be so regulated as to permit of that continued general education needful for the development of the whole man.

The evil of child labour is international in its ill effects. The standards of one country react on those of another.

Unemployment

The evils of unemployment are impressive: the strain of anxiety, the sickness of hope deferred, the gradual loss of unused skill, the moral degradation of continued idleness, the growing mood of despair. Unemployment

insurance, which in some countries has done much to prevent the physical breakdown of the unemployed worker and his dependents, cannot save from these moral miseries. The Christian must regard with profound sorrow and alarm the manufacture of "unemployables," and cannot accept the doctrine of the continuous reserve as sufficient excuse for the existence of a permanent army of casual labourers. Where unemployed youth is in question the responsibility of the nation and the Church becomes evident and deeply disquieting.

The evils of unemployment are intolerable to the moral sense. The causes must be sought and removed.

The problem of unemployment must not be regarded as insoluble. Active steps are being taken in many countries to discover the most effective means of dispelling this universal menace to the character and happiness of the industrial worker. The Church is deeply interested in these researches, and should press their importance upon the attention of all Christian people.

The Christian Church has not by herself to carry out programmes of reform but to impart the life-giving spirit to them, and take part in them where desirable. It is not required of her that she should furnish economic systems or technical details or political programmes, but it is expected of her to regenerate with the power which comes only from on high. It is demanded that she herself shall be a centre of spiritual fellowship, and above all that she insist on the great creative power of love, brotherhood and justice. In order to make this possible, all Christians who believe in the social teaching of the Gospel ought often to meet together and help each other to think out the problem as to how the ideals of Christianity may be better realized under the conditions of modern industrial life. For this purpose we are here assembled. But this meeting is only the beginning. Our movement, to be really effective, must be carried on. This can be done in many ways. (For each of us the question now is not to forget what he can do and ought to do.) When we leave this assembly with the inspiring impulses it has given us, let us then go home resolved, each in his sphere, to do what he can to rouse our churches, our congregations to think out the application of Christian principles to the problems of life in their own country and among their own people.

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL AND MORAL PROBLEMS

I.

PROFESSION OR VOCATION?

There are many of us at the present time who do not find any real satisfaction in our work.

This is partly due to the kind of occupations in which we find ourselves, to the effects of machinery, to specialization and overpressure and also because some of us have to take up a profession for which we are not suited. But the chief reason for this lack of satisfaction is the absence of a moral ideal governing the conception of work.

If we only regard work as a means of earning our daily bread or of satisfying our own selfish ends, we must search for happiness outside our work. The craving for pleasure, which manifests itself in all classes of people, is a clear indication that the conception of work is often unworthy.

We cannot hope for any change for the better unless the Christian Spirit penetrates all aspects of labour. We need to realize the Christian ideal of vocation in our work. Vocation is more than fidelity—it involves a religious conviction.

There are three aspects of this conviction:

1. The Christian believes that God is able to guide him to his right work in life, by means of the talents and inclinations given him and also through opportunities and openings all through life;

2. The Christian is convinced that God wishes him to serve Him in a particular position, where he can improve in his work, advance in his physical, intellectual, and moral capacities, and use his powers in the service of his neighbours and people in general;

3. The Christian is convinced that he is responsible for his work before God, Holy and Omniscient.

The present generation finds difficulty in accepting the religious significance of the idea of vocation and in putting it in practice, for it is still too closely associated with the old-fashioned patriarchal conception, which took no account of endeavours after liberty and independence, and thus hampered the joy of progress and of rising in the social scale.

But many of these associations have nothing to do with the general idea of vocation. This idea in itself is of eternal value; it affirms the duty of work as fundamental: it ennobles the most humble work as the service of God and includes nevertheless the highest human positions. It condemns all immoral work.

It is, therefore, of the greatest importance that we again consider work as a vocation from God in his service on earth.

What should the Church do?

Taking into consideration the general feeling that the inner conflict in modern man is unbearable and that the human feeling of solidarity issues from the Christian Spirit, and also considering the abandonment, more and more marked, of the materialistic and egoistic conceptions of life, the Church must, wherever possible, strongly emphasize the Christian idea of vocation, in the education of the young, in sermons and especially in the

press in order to attract the general public. Further, the Church must help Christians to carry this out in practical life.

The Church must greet with joy all technical developments tending to save men from the most monotonous and soul-killing work. She must encourage those who are still victims of this kind of work and plant in them the feeling that they are, nevertheless, serving the community and are valuable members of human Society.

But above all, the Church must see that we workers of to-day do not forget that we have a soul which must not be destroyed through our daily work nor through a too optimistic conception of culture, and which really cannot live except in communion with God.

In conclusion:

1. We affirm that the modern conception of work, deprived of its moral and religious import, leads to tyranny and slavery and in consequence to the dissolution of human society and to the death of the souls of both the wealthy and poor.

2. We not only consider that work ought to be penetrated by the Christian Spirit, but that it can be penetrated.

3. We urge that respect for the soul, and the conception of work as service, and a strong feeling of responsibility must inspire our labour in all spheres.

II.

PRINCIPLES

1. The Christian Gospel is the "Gospel of the Kingdom of God."

2. The Kingdom of God means reconciliation between God and man and between man and man, the discovery of God as the Father and of mankind as a brotherhood, through Jesus Christ. It means a new manhood and a new society.

3. The Church of Christ is God's instrument to hasten the coming of the Kingdom. Its first task is to bring the individual to God, but because there is a "solidarity" of mankind, its further task is not only to ensure to all men and to the whole of each man the revelation of God, but also to secure for all men "the right to salvation."

4. The chief modern peril is the lack of a consciousness of sin as revolt against God and the root-cause of social disorder. The foremost duty of the Church is to emphasize the tragical quality of sin, through the proclamation of the holiness of God, the sanctity of the moral law, and the inevitable consequences for society of individual sin. It is not possible to make a good society out of bad men. The words of Jesus Christ are decisive. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God."

5. But, on the positive side, social disorders in their turn estrange men from God and hasten their deterioration, therefore, it is the duty of the

Church to address itself with a practical purpose to the moral and social problems of our time.

Home and Housing

1. The Christian conviction is that the Christian home is the foundation of society organized according to the will of God.

2. The Christian home is founded on love, which means sacrifice and co-operation. Such love can only be inspired by the vision of the home as a part of the Kingdom of God. There is no other means of ensuring the true union of the personalities of husband and wife.

3. Children are the greatest gift of God to the home. Their education is a sacred responsibility of parenthood that they may become good citizens of the Kingdom of God and of their nation. The whole family—father, mother, brothers, sisters, and friends—must co-operate in mutual education, but the place and responsibility of the mother is supreme.

4. In the Christian home, children must be taught the supreme value of human life. It is the duty of parents to make clear to children the moral disorder of the world because of sin, emphasizing their duty to serve rather than to be served, the importance of the discipline of education, and that obedience to the authority of love is the condition of freedom. All education should have as its essential aim to kindle in the child the love of Christ, for it is this love which will prepare him for true manhood, with a right conscience, a pure and brotherly heart, truth in word and conduct, all making him available for service and ready for sacrifice.

5. Each home is one of many. The sense of social responsibility engendered in the fellowship of the family, including servants and strangers, must be widened and applied to the service of the larger fellowship of the community.

6. The Church must co-operate ceaselessly in the building of such homes by bringing spiritual aid to the parents, so securing the influence of the Christian family on the life of the community of which it forms a part.

Housing

1. The home according to the Divine ideal depends on material as well as moral conditions. The housing question has a spiritual side. The pressing need at present is twofold, more houses and better housing accommodation.

2. The social and moral consequences of insufficient and unwholesome housing accommodation are tragical for the life of the family. It is the duty of the Christian Church to face courageously the whole problem. The solution is difficult because of the increased cost of building and the higher cost of living but must be found.

3. The Church must not be content to urge the removal of slums and the provision of good housing accommodation at an economic rent. Pressure

must be brought to bear upon public authorities to assist building enterprises with this object and upon Christian people to incur financial sacrifice by uniting in organized efforts to supply the need. Those with large families or who are suffering both in body and mind must be specially considered. The Church is responsible before God for her part in this activity.

Youth

1. The Church in the task of social reform must depend for support upon youth, the hope of the future. Therefore, it is her duty to seek the spiritual and moral upbuilding of the youth of the nation by means of the religious organizations at her disposal but also by hearty encouragement of the special movements for the benefit of young people.

2. The Church must show her confidence in such organizations as the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., and the Student Christian Movement, by recognizing their right to self-government and liberty of action, but the Church must none the less insist that she is the indispensable institution for the maintenance of the religious life. The youth of to-day will be attracted to the Church by her freedom from vagueness and formalism, her recognition of all aspects of individual life, her organization for social service and deep interest in the victory of Christian unity and human brotherhood, and not least by her frank acceptance that "Youth must win Youth" for the highest ends.

3. Apart from co-operation with youth movements, the Christian Church must seek by its Sunday-schools, its religious instruction before and after the "first communion," its classes for Biblical and sociological study, to overcome the danger which haunts this generation, viz., to neglect the cultivation of the religious life and to be content with physical culture and external interests.

Relation of the Sexes

1. The spiritual and moral equality of men and women before God is absolute. Destroyed by sin it has been restored by the redemption of Jesus Christ.

2. This quality does not exclude diversity, according to the plan of God, in the respective vocations of man and woman. On man rests the chief responsibility for the foundation and maintenance of the home, to woman comes the essential vocation of motherhood within the home. The Christian ideal is the harmonious union of their personalities.

3. The Christian Church asserts that this union is only legitimate in marriage, based upon mutual affection and respect, and that marriage must be between one man and one woman.

4. Preparation for marriage is one of the most important tasks of Christian education, both in the home and in the Church. There should be frank and early teaching especially by the mother concerning (1) the

blessedness, both spiritual and physical, of self-control and purity; (2) the sanctity of married life based on love and mutual service not on egotism and selfishness; (3) the grandeur of the vocation of fatherhood and motherhood and the beauty of the sacrifices this vocation demands. For the Christian Church, there is only one moral standard for both sexes, both before and during marriage.

5. The Church must be vigilant to secure the instruction of married people, united by her, in the obligations of her religious and moral life, of physical health, and of efficiency in the management of the home, which are the necessary conditions of the marriage God can bless.

6. The Church ought to affirm more than ever at the present time that a chief aim of the married life is the birth of children, and that the blessing of God is often granted to a numerous family. The Church ought to condemn concubinage, both within and without the married life. Apart from exceptional cases and those considerations of duty for which the individual rather than the Church is responsible before God, the Church should declare the limitation of birth by artificial means both anti-social and anti-Christian.

7. The Christian Church declares marriage to be fundamentally indissoluble and in agreement with the instructions of the Gospels recognizes divorce as legitimate only in the case of adultery.

8. It must be the aim of Christians to resist every encouragement of immorality and to protect womanhood from exploitation in every form. It should be more widely recognized that the creative and protective instinct in woman may be expressed otherwise than by motherhood, through ministry to children and those persons needing special care and through artistic and other activities.

Treatment of Crime

1. In undertaking moral and social reforms and in educating the religious life of the individual and improving his surroundings, the Church is necessarily engaged in resisting crime, for which the moral disorder of society is often responsible. In order to be faithful to her Master, she must not be content with methods of prevention but must seek the reform of the criminal.

2. It is the duty of Christian people to promote everywhere legislation which provides for "probationary sentences," in the case of first offenders and especially the young. Institutions which are substitutes for prison, for the benefit of abnormal and of young persons, should be encouraged.

3. The Church must be vigilant to secure the improvement of material conditions in prisons and ought always to oppose any treatment which would infringe the self-respect of the prisoner, but such amelioration of prison conditions must be limited by the necessity of the prisoner being

made to understand the gravity of his offence, the punishment of which is intended to deter from crime.

4. The Church must not forget that her duty is not to excuse the criminal but to bring to him the message of repentance unto life and of Divine forgiveness, often granted sooner than the forgiveness of man. This forgiveness of God is for him always possible even when the community judges it right that his life should be forfeited for his crime.

5. The spiritual and material care of the prisoner's family is part of Christian responsibility and the prisoner, when released, should be aided in his effort to secure work and to return to good citizenship.

Leisure

1. The Church which proclaims the "sanctity of labour" and the moral ugliness of idleness in every form and in every class of society, ought to support the right of every man to rest and recreation. Without making itself responsible for the details concerning the adoption of the "Eight Hour Day," the Church recognizes that this legislation is in accordance with the spirit of Christ. While asserting that one day's rest in seven is a necessity the Church appeals that this day should be the Lord's Day everywhere and approves of the workers' claim for a respite from work for a longer period during the year.

2. The thirst for pleasure and even for dissipation which is a characteristic of our generation, is recognized as dangerous and often evil. All the Christian forces should be united to overcome these two forms of human degradation—drunkenness and gambling. All forms of sport involving cruelty are to be discouraged.

3. The Church has a duty to contribute to the organization of leisure for useful and wholesome ends. Organizations which have as their aims, the moral, intellectual, artistic, and physical culture of workers and their families, ought to be in her programme of moral and social activity, as a consequence of her faith.

The sub-committee of this Commission had to do with the Drink Problem. Its report was separate and is as follows:

The general subject which has been assigned to this Committee is "Drink." But as the Conference which has appointed the Committee is the "Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work," the specific duty of this Committee is to consider, and if possible to answer, two practical questions: First, what should be the attitude of the Church of Jesus Christ to-day toward the use of intoxicating liquor and the traffic therein. Secondly, How can the great fundamental principles of the Gospel of the Kingdom be so applied as to reduce to a minimum, if not entirely prevent,

the awful results which have come from this traffic? In preparing this report on the subject submitted to them your Committee feel bound to have regard in the first instance to the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ the Divine King and Head of the Church, as far as it has any bearing on the question with which this Conference is called to deal. In doing so they find no condemnation of the use of wine and strong drink, as being in itself sinful.*

It is agreed, however, that the interests of society at the present time, under the circumstances in which we are placed, justify the Church in giving special emphasis to the teaching of Jesus concerning a man's duty to his fellow-man as expressed by him in the Sermon on the Mount: "Therefore, whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them," and as further exemplified in the parable of the Good Samaritan namely: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." The evils produced by the abuse of the liberty which Christians may rightfully claim are so great and manifold and far-reaching in modern times, that the law of love should constrain Christians to give up more or less the use of that which is not in itself sinful. Self-denial for the sake of others is a Christian principle which can at all times justify and will in some cases demand the surrender of Christian liberty. Such self-denial, however, if it is to have any spiritual or moral value for the individual must be voluntary, not compulsory. Only when it is a willing sacrifice can total abstinence be described as it is in the British Report on "Leisure" as a "splendid privilege of Christian service."

In our opinion the duty of the Christian Church—using that term in its widest sense—is twofold—first, to train its members to habits of sobriety and self-control by the help of the Holy Spirit and, secondly, to encourage and foster such a spirit of brotherly love as shall lead them to have regard to the effect which their example will have on the character and conduct of others. This applies not only to their influence on those with whom they are associated as friends and relatives in private life but also their responsibilities as citizens which should lead them to support such legislation as will provide all wise and reasonable safeguards for the protection of those who are unable to resist the temptation to go to excess and for the reformation of those who have already come under the bondage of evil habits and are to be regarded as confirmed drunkards, as well as to support such general legislation as will enable society to protect itself from the evil effect of the drink traffic.

Such legislation should include (1) suitable provision for the enlightenment of the citizens, especially instruction of the young, with regard to the effect of the abuse of alcohol upon the bodily organism and through it on

*At this point Dr. McClymont and Bishop Paissij have felt it to be their duty to dissent from a decision of the Committee on Drink to omit from this report any specific mention of the personal attitude of Jesus toward the use of wine in the social intercourse of life and his miracle at the wedding feast in Cana of Galilee.

the moral, spiritual and intellectual faculties of the drinker himself, leading to the degradation of social intercourse, the desecration and even the destruction of family life with its consequent evil effects upon the coming generations, and threatening the welfare of the whole community through the spread of poverty, misery, disease, vice, and crime.

(2) In addition to such educational agencies, legislative measures should be adopted for the purpose of preventing, as far as possible, such indulgence in intoxicating liquors as are likely to be injurious to the welfare of society. Speaking broadly either of two methods may be adopted for this purpose, namely, (I) Prohibition and (II) Control in one form or another, of the liquor traffic.

Of the former the most notable is the system now in operation in the U. S. A., which "to promote the general welfare," prohibits the manufacture, the sale, the transportation, the exportation and the importation of intoxicating liquors for drinking purposes. Perhaps the most carefully wrought out system of Control is the so-called Bratt-system of Sweden, which declares that its purpose is so to conduct the traffic as to do the least possible harm, the main principle being to adapt control to the circumstances of each individual case, and it is administered in what might be described as a paternal spirit.

The advocates of both systems claim that they have been attended with good results.

Proposed Resolution

Resolved: The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work hereby places on record its sense of the exceeding gravity of the problems which press for solution in dealing with the question of "Drink," and declares:—

First: In its consideration of these problems the Church must remember and emphasize the fact that her primary concern in this as in all other social questions is the redemption of men from the slavery of sin, in order that they may be led to conform their personal conduct to the life and teaching of their Lord and Master, Jesus Christ.

Second: These problems do not concern the conduct of the individual as related to himself alone. But, as our social structure becomes more complex, all activities of the individual must be considered in their relation to the social order of which he is a part. While, therefore, the Church must continue to proclaim as positively and persistently as ever the duty of personal temperance and sobriety, it must also, because of changed conditions, place increased emphasis upon the rights of society, and the consequent obligations upon individual Christians in their relation thereto.

Third: We recommend the thorough study of the whole question with open minds desirous to know all the pertinent facts, and to discover and apply methods which will protect both the individual and society as a whole from the exceedingly prevalent and destructive evils of drink. It is es-

pecially important that the youth of all nations should be taught the nature and effects of strong drink.

While watching with great interest the experiments which are being made in different countries, with varying degrees of success, to overcome these evils by various forms of restriction, or by Prohibition, we have not sufficient data to justify the recommendation of any one of these systems in preference to all others.

While we recognize that the problem is such as may not admit of a uniform solution for all countries, differing as they do in customs, traditions, and general conditions, we record it as our conviction that while it is not the duty of the Church as an organization to compel the adoption of legislation by the State, yet in view of the evil effects upon society in general, which experience has shown invariably to accompany, to a greater or a less degree, the traffic in drink, the Church cannot rest satisfied to permit the present evils to continue without most earnest efforts to secure better conditions. The Church, therefore, ought to impress upon her members the responsibility of the Christian citizenship of every country to favour and actively promote the adoption of such legislation as appears likely to prove most effective in the diminution of these evils, it being recognized that such legislation, to be effective, must be based upon the convictions of a majority of the people.

Fourth: While we recognize the right of every citizen to labour for the adoption of any method dealing with the evils of the traffic which may commend itself to his reason and conscience, we recommend that the law of the land in which he dwells be loyally and faithfully obeyed as long as it is the law, realizing, however, that any system can only be regarded as a means to the end in view.

THE CHURCH AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

We have had before us the reports prepared by the churches of North America, Great Britain (Copec), Czecho-Slovakia (Prof. Zilka), and Switzerland (Dr. Keller), also the contributions of individual members of this sub-committee and in several meetings have carefully considered them. We recognize that in these reports there is an amount of rich and valuable material brought together from various sources in a convenient form. They are not a mere academic discussion of present-day international problems, but a clothing with flesh and blood of what would otherwise be a skeleton of ideas, with a high sense of the moral responsibility of Christendom for the whole situation. In all cases the theoretical consideration guides to practical conclusions.

The reports as a whole confirm a fact often made manifest in the history of the Church—that a deep disturbance of mankind by unparalleled events (such as national catastrophes and political revolutions) has created

and intensified new problems in the region of moral and religious thought. No doubt it has been the effect of this period behind us that in all countries and in all churches a new interest has awakened and expanded itself with great energy, namely, to discover the function of the churches in establishing relations between nation and nation and between State and State, and in the upbuilding of mankind on a basis of organic unity. It is characteristic of the reports that they all regard international problems in the light of the ecumenical idea and endeavour to solve them accordingly.

It is indeed true that in one of the reports the statement is made that the churches as such should keep in the background or stand aside from the political sphere in order to give space to purely religious influences and principles and that, therefore, the subject "The Christian Churches and International Relations" is not as vital as "Christendom and International Relations." The Commission is of the opinion that this new formulation does not essentially differ from the other. Certainly there are effects due not to the churches so much as to the working of the Christian spirit through Christian personalities, but we think it should be possible to entrust to the *Church* nearly all those tasks which might be assigned to Christendom at large. For what one calls *Christendom* is a concentration of individual powers not necessarily bound to external organization. It may be effective apart from ecclesiastical forms by its immanent Divine influence, and yet the possibilities of Christendom for the evangelization of the world are much more likely to be realized by the old historic organization of the churches with their far-reaching sociological apparatus available for that purpose. There has not been any organization among men, and there is not one to-day so specialized for public ends as the Christian Church. Therefore, we must set agoing afresh this enormous machine with its technical appliances for the fulfilment of a world mission. By these means we do not desire to hinder the activity of Christian individuals or independent religious forces, but the churches as such should be mobilized themselves, so that Christianity may preach to the world the will of God in Christ Jesus and may be manifest as the salt of the earth (Matt. 5:13), the leaven of humanity (Matt. 13:33) and the light of the world (Matt. 5:14).

We do not overlook the fact that this call for a new public activity of the churches implies a certain danger. It is not that the Church by widening her external range may forget the holy obligation of her inner mission, her work especially for the salvation of the individual, that by her many-sided endeavours she may lose her function to penetrate prayerfully into the deep things of God and the soul, that by trusting in beautiful phrases and resolutions and by boasting of statistical results she may place less reliance on the supreme grace of God in Christ. Expression has been given to a sense of this danger by certain honoured leaders of the Lutheran Church. If our Conference is willing to acknowledge this danger, the first

step will have been taken toward its removal. The American report is perfectly right when it shows that in the inner history of Christendom during the last two centuries there have been two contrasted types of Christian piety—the eschatological and individualistic on the one hand, the social and universal on the other. This Commission believes that both types, which are common to all the churches, are not to be regarded as inclusive, but as complementary, just as heart and hand ought ever to be united, and we should like to recommend the Conference to consider the question how to combine Christian international activity with Christian inwardness. Without this combination all our prophesying will be as sounding brass or tinkling cymbal. If the churches are strong in inward grace, they may within the wide bounds of their public mission, co-operate directly toward the establishment and fostering of better international relations. In now suggesting how to realize this aim, we find from the reports that a number of special questions emerge which they leave unsettled, nor is it clear that the Conference is able to settle them. The new movement of ethical thought in Christianity, inspired by the commotions of the last decade, is still in a state of fermentation and not sufficiently mature to justify speedy judgment.

The Commission includes among the questions not settled, first of all "The Relation of Christianity to War." With regard to this the situation at Stockholm appears to be similar to that at the Copec Conference in Birmingham, 1924. The British report gives separately the views of those who do not accept the pacifist position, and of those who adopt it. Differences of opinion will also be found in our Conference. Nevertheless the obligation of the Church to determine moral and spiritual values is indubitable and inalienable, and the time seems to have come for as clear a declaration on war by the Church as on slavery or duelling. The world is awaiting it, and it were better for us to risk a mistake than to hesitate or equivocate. Therefore, we venture to lay before the Conference in Resolution No. 1 a pronouncement on this very important subject.

Secondly, our conclusions may tend to diverge with regard to the present League of Nations. All reports deal with this point more or less definitely, but in the American Report there is a certain reserve, not concerning the idea of the League, which is cordially approved, but as to its working. The Commission, therefore, in another resolution (No. 5) seeks to express what it believes to be the general Christian mind on this question.

It is finally the unanimous opinion of the Commission that the Conference should consider the following recommendations which we embody in the form of resolutions:

Resolved:

Resolution 1

(a) That war, considered as an institution for the settlement of international disputes by physical forces allied to guile and lying, is incompatible with the mind and method of Christ, and, therefore, incompatible with the mind and method of his Church.

(b) That war, thus viewed, is the abuse and not the use of force because it attributes to force authority and ability to determine moral values, of which it is incapable.

(c) That the aggressor in war is the nation that will not arbitrate or seek due processes of law and order.

(d) That it is the duty of the churches to throw their united weight in the direction of the organized fellowship of the nations.

(e) That none of the foregoing resolutions are to be regarded as touching the inherent right of a nation to defend itself against aggression and oppression.

Resolution 2

That the Church in fulfilling her supernatural mission among the nations should impress upon her members that while loyal to worthy national ideals they should avoid "national bigotry, race prejudice, and an attitude of mind susceptible to the war appeal" as well as a weak cosmopolitanism which evaporates in mere sentiment.

Resolution 3

That the Church should recognize the *teaching of the Word* as foremost among the means at her disposal for the furtherance of friendly international relations, and should include in this function not only sermons from the pulpit, but also educational teaching and the use of the press to reach a wider public, hoping thus to develop a general Christian opinion which will be the strongest counteractive to war. In proclaiming the word these aspects of truth should be particularly emphasized: (a) The idea of blood unity among all nations (Acts 17:26), (b) the idea of the oneness of all disciples of Christ, according to the unanimous witness of the New Testament with that of world reconciliation realized through the Cross of Christ (Eph. 5:14 ff.), (c) the idea of Christian solidarity and sympathy (Gal. 6:2, I Cor. 12:12-27), (d) the idea that each individual Christian, church and nation, has its contribution of service to render to the Kingdom of God.

Resolution 4

That the Church believes that the Word should ever find expression in the Deed (Gal. 5:6) and would recommend as a model for the future humanitarian activity of the churches the great international charity work of the last few years, by which they have organized their gifts in the presence of general calamity without regard to the nationality of the needy and suffering.

Resolution 5

That the Church considers that the League of Nations is at present the only organized instrument for security establishing an international fellow-

ship of the peoples of the earth, and, therefore, would recommend it to the sympathy and support of all Christians, in the hope that by the enlargement of its membership and the increase of its spiritual influence, it may become still more effective for that end. At the same time she recognizes her direct responsibility for a policy of international friendship and for that reason endorses the aims and work of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches, while looking forward also to an understanding with the churches still outside that Alliance so that they may unite in the same common endeavour.

Resolution 6

That the Conference regards it as an international obligation binding on all States to protect the rights of national, racial, and religious minorities as brethren in need of sympathetic help, and would emphasize that the churches themselves should be the protectors of minorities living in their respective countries.

Resolution 7

That the Church lift up her voice in favour of the development of the permanent International Court to which all judicial disputes likely to lead to war should be submitted and whereby weaker peoples in a desperate situation may obtain redress without a vain resort to arms, thus paving the way for a policy of general disarmament.

The sub-committee of this Commission had to do with the Race Problem. Its report was separate and is as follows:

PART I

INTRODUCTION

The problem of establishing right relations between the races is one of the major tasks of our day. Modern world conditions are making these problems increasingly serious and their solution increasingly urgent.

Man's mastery of Nature has abolished the age-old geographical barriers that to so large a degree have kept the races apart. To-day they are facing each other with an immediacy and an intimacy of social and cultural intercourse never before possible. This is creating among other results extraordinary race self-consciousness.

The modern ascendancy of the white races throughout the world is overwhelming. So often have they used their power to selfish ends and ruthless exploitation of weak and backward peoples, that an ominous tide of indignation, unrest and resentment is arising among all other races.

But the white man's modern knowledge and mastery of Nature is being rapidly acquired by non-white races also. A further aggravating factor is the world-wide falling death-rate resulting in an extraordinary increase of population in every part of the world. If long continued, the inevitable consequences stagger the imagination.

The development, moreover, of man's mastery of Nature and his growing control of her limitless forces has for the time being made material interests supreme. They have captured the modern mind of the West. Moral ideals and principles have been forced into the background or even out of sight. We are like children playing with fire.

But Christian leaders in the West begin now to see the situation and to realize its portentous possibilities. The question now stares us in the face—what can be done to rectify old wrongs and to meet threatening dangers? How can right relations be established between the races, justice rendered and the true welfare of all be promoted?

Manifestly this is a moral task. As such it is a task that rests uniquely on the churches of Christendom, for it is a strange and deplorable fact that the wrongs which have been done to the non-white races have been committed by men who have gone forth from so-called Christian lands.

What then is the duty of the Church? What should she teach in regard to race and race relations?

PART II

THE ROYAL NATURE AND FUNCTION OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

One fundamental cause of the deplorable tension existing to-day in the relations of the white and coloured races is the wide-spread conception that the Christian religion is exclusively a personal and private affair. The Church in every land needs to see and declare with utmost emphasis that while religion is indeed a personal matter, the individual inner relation of Man and God, the Christian religion is also a public and social matter, the moral relation of individuals and groups to other individuals and groups. "Thou shalt love thy neighbour" is as essential in the Christian religion as "Thou shalt love thy God."

The time has come for the Church to abandon one-sided individualism and subjectivism. It must proclaim the whole Gospel for the whole of life, inner and outer, personal and social, national and international. She must rise to a higher and broader conception of religion and must face her duty in the international life of the world. She may not leave to governments the sole determination of international policies on the mere basis of power. The Church should insist that nations and governments must be ruled by moral ideals and principles in dealing with other nations and especially with weak or backward races.

PART III

RACES AND RACE PROBLEMS FROM THE CHRISTIAN POINT OF VIEW

1. From the Christian point of view the existence of diverse races is a part of God's plan for mankind. Deplore as we must the tragedies that have arisen out of race conflicts through the countless ages of history, yet as Christians who believe that God is wise and good, and that He knows the end from the beginning we must believe that the fact of race is no mere chance of nature or blind fate. Races and race problems exist for some good end.

2. We may not, indeed, comprehend as yet what that end may be in its fulness, yet even now we can see that through the existence of the races and their diverse cultures we already enjoy a vast wealth of achievements in life, richness in thought and nobility in character.

3. We also can see that the higher and nobler achievements of each may contribute to the welfare of all. Thus each race may take its place in helpful service.

4. But in this process of universal interchange of the higher goods of life, mutual understanding, appreciation and good-will are vital. Enmity, suspicion, arrogance, pride, prejudice, scorn—these are not only unchristian in character, but render almost impossible the exchange between races of their better and higher achievements.

5. Moreover, we are discovering the extraordinary unity that binds mankind together. Their diverse racial and cultural characteristics all rest on a common and universal human nature. All races, whether developed or backward, are possessed of incalculable potentialities of development. All are capable of experiencing the grace of God mediated through Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Bible, and the Church.

6. In this wonderful fact we discover the moral basis of our common, universal, human brotherhood, which is rooted in the universal Fatherhood of God who is imparting his nature, his life and his character to men of every tribe and race. It is this that makes possible mutual understanding, respect, and good-will between members of races however diverse. It shows us that in a sense far deeper than that of economic interdependence, we are members one of another.

7. The ideal goal for mankind is not the speedy obliteration and destruction of diverse races and cultures, but rather the development of each to its greatest perfection in freedom and in friendly intercourse, in order that each may render its best and highest service to the welfare of all.

8. In the tragedies and the conflicts of races there still remain indeed deep mysteries. But we can already see that the solution of these mysteries and the rectification of these wrongs lie in the practice of the Christian

religion, in the realization in actual conduct of the Christian spirit, the Christian ideal and the Christian way of life.

PART IV

EQUALITY OF RACES

One of the most unique features of the Christian revelation—vividly presented in the story of Cornelius—was the insight that in spiritual matters, in the possibilities of regeneration, inspiration by the Holy Spirit, direct approach to God, and acceptability to Him, race differences do not count. Neither do social, educational or even sex differences. God is no respecter of persons. In Christ there is neither Jew nor Gentile. This does not mean, however, that these diversities cease to exist. It does mean that they do not create essential inequalities between men in spiritual experiences and privileges. Salvation is equally offered to all. Christ died for all.

The duty, therefore, of the Church is clear. She should make room for all races without discrimination in her life, in her worship, in her ministry. But in doing so she should not deny the reality of race diversities, nor ignore the patent facts of race characteristics. Some races have gifts and talents of one kind, others of other kinds. At any given time some races are culturally advanced, others are backward. And these diversities of gifts and development have inevitable consequences.

If, for instance, in the relations of two races residing in the same city, it seems desirable that they should be segregated, or that their children should attend separate schools, such arrangements cannot be either condemned or defended as a matter of Christian principle. Those principles and ideals require in regard to such arrangements that justice, good-will, and brotherhood should be observed: but they cannot prescribe the specific adjustments that may be needful for the best interests of all concerned.

It is clear that Christianity, while insisting on the equality of races, does not undertake to prescribe specific arrangements in the affairs of the daily life. But in regard to all specific arrangements, which are of necessity more or less temporary, it does proclaim and insist on justice, brotherliness, and good-will.

PART V

THE MORAL STANDARD OF RACE RELATIONS

The Golden Rule is a universal principle of Christian morality. It is binding on races no less than on individuals. In the family of nations, it is unchristian for a great and powerful people to terrorize its neighbours. The strong should bear the burdens of the weak, guided by the spirit so wonderfully taught by our Lord in his matchless parable of the Good Samaritan. Had these principles been followed by the white races during

the past four centuries what a wonderful world we should now have! But entire nations and races have sinned against God in wronging their neighbours. As of individuals, so of nations—the wages of sin is death. Christian nations cannot take the brutal attitude of Cain when he asked, “Am I my brother’s keeper?”

Yet the question for the Church to-day is not what our forefathers ought, or ought not to have done. The problem for us is our present duty. In the light of our Christian faith what should the Church teach their members to-day? What should they urge on their respective peoples and governments?

PART VI

URGENT ISSUES

World-wide resentment against the imperious domination of the white races is one of the most general and the most ominous of present-day race problems. It is a highly intricate question for in it are involved matters of economics, of politics, of governmental impotence and disorder, of industrial development, and of urgent need for raw materials.

The existing situation is not due exclusively to the wrong doings of white men and white nations. Weak and backward peoples, possessing undeveloped countries have not been prepared to deal with strangers and lawless adventurers. The extension by European nations of jurisdiction over large parts of the world have sometimes been inevitable consequences of the inability of the local populations to cope with the newcomers from white lands.

Beyond question, however, some of those newcomers have indulged in practices altogether unchristian. Theft, deceit, lust, murder, unbridled selfishness, disregard of the rights of native populations, have been too often indulged in by white men in foreign lands, resulting in their inevitable consequences. We do not forget that this is but one side of the picture. The white races through many noble representatives have also made invaluable contributions to the life of the non-white races.

We consider briefly three great problems by way of example.

(a) *The Problems of Primitive Peoples and Material Resources in Undeveloped Countries.*

The Church should insist that the native races, however primitive, have inalienable rights which white men must respect. European countries exercising control in such countries as Africa and Mesopotamia should put an end to slavery and to such forced labour as is virtually slavery. The native races should be wisely educated. They should be fitted for adequate and effective self-government. They should be trained for and given independent life as soon as they are fit for it. The raw materials and natural resources of their territories, so essential to modern civilization, are indeed to be developed, but not for the sole benefit of the white man. In a word, the ideals

of real brotherhood and of service should be applied to every concrete detail of the relations of white nations to undeveloped peoples.

(b) The Problem of Training Subject Peoples for Self-Government.

The crucial point in dealing with subject people arises from the Christian demand for the reversal of former policies based on the supposition of an indefinite maintenance of foreign domination. Every people has the right of self-determination and self-government. This problem comes most clearly to light in India.

The clamorous demand of certain groups of educated men in that land for the immediate withdrawal of all British control is receiving careful attention from the British Government. The change of that Government's policy in 1917 was of supreme importance. Whereas, its object had been up to that time to maintain *good* government, thereafter its object was to train India for self-government. We recognize in this new policy the desire of a nation which enjoys and believes in self-government to hand that advantage over to a subject people.

Such a policy requires in the white race a great change of attitude. For the ever-present sense of race-superiority inevitably hampers participation in administration even when it does not exhibit itself, as it sometimes has done, in offensive acts or words. Hearty co-operation in administration during the period of preparation for self-government may do much to relieve the tension between the races involved.

(c) The Problem of China.

The one great area and people still free from complete political domination by the white race is China. A century of increasing intercourse, however, between China and the West has resulted in many unequal treaties, in "extra-territorial rights" for white men in China, and in a disordered and crumbling public life. Yet new ideas and purposes are working mighty transformations in that great and ancient people. Millions of intelligent Chinese now demand the complete restoration of their sovereign rights. They feel that unequal treaties, special economic privileges and extra-territorial rights for foreigners, impose intolerable humiliation and unjust conditions on their developing national life. The interference of individuals representing great foreign financial interests in the inner politics of China, preventing her national unification and consolidation, is creating, they insist, a dangerous and unbearable situation.

In the light of these facts and of our Christian principles, the churches of all lands which have dealings with China should urge their respective nations to deal with China's claims and needs on the basis of justice and brotherliness.

The Problem of Race Migration

The problem of race migration has, during recent decades, taken on new interest, especially to the white races. So long as it was the whites

who were encroaching on the coloured races, white men took little interest in the problems created thereby. But when non-white races began to migrate into white men's lands, these problems appeared in a new light and are arousing keen interest.

Migration problems are highly complicated. Not always is it easy to distinguish between the various factors. These include economic and industrial competition, diverse standards of living, differing social, moral, and religious customs, race differences in the biological sense, and inter-marriage. In many instances, the real issue may be economic while in the popular mind it is thought to be racial.

The nature of the problems raised by migration may be suggested by the following questions:

Has any race or people the intrinsic right to forbid an alien race from entering or residing in its land? If so, on what basis? Is it a moral right or is it merely a matter of might? In the concrete, has California or Australia the intrinsic right to exclude all Asiatics, however much they may need to find territory for their own over-populated countries? Or, from the opposite viewpoint, have the people of an over-populated area the intrinsic moral right to demand admittance to a sparsely populated and fertile land?

These are questions of enormous difficulty both practical and theoretical. But the question for us is whether or not the Christian religion has any definite help to give in their solution. Has the Church a duty to perform in this perplexing matter? We believe it has. We believe the Church should declare with utmost emphasis that in the practical solution of the problems of migration the Church should insist that they must be solved in the light of all the facts and on Christian principles. They should not be settled on the bare basis of might and selfishness, but on the basis of brotherliness and good-will.

Intermarriage Between Races

What has the Church to say about this difficult question? In the first place the Church and all truly Christian individuals take and must take an absolute stand against irregular sex relations between races no less than within each race. The reign of passion and lust are always disastrous. The Church must also regard with abhorrence the view current in some quarters which tolerates interracial concubinage.

In the Christian view, a Christian marriage must be one in which the partners are fitted to be life-long companions in the married state, helping one another in the Christian life and in bringing up children in whom the Lord will delight. If these conditions are fulfilled in two persons of different races, the Church has no right to forbid them from marrying.

But if the differing circumstances of their upbringing, social position, education, customs, temperament and heredity are so different that it is not likely that they will be able to discharge together all the duties as

Christian man and wife: or if the social environment in which they must spend their lives is so opposed to such marriage that they, and especially their children, will be subjected to rigid ostracism with all its terrible consequences, the Church should discourage, though it may not forbid their union.

The principles of the teaching of the Church in regard to marriage are to be found in St. Paul's statement about the second marriage of a widow (I Cor. 7:39). It enshrines a universal principle in the phrase, "only in the Lord." This signifies that a Christian may marry a Christian, but not a heathen. The Church has contended for this rule with more or less success all down its history. But the full and spiritual interpretation goes far deeper. Our Lord impressed upon his disciples a high and holy ideal of marriage. No marriage can be said to be "in the Lord" which does not aim at this ideal, or is not such as is likely to realize it.

The attitude of contempt and scorn for the offspring of mixed marriages, altogether too prevalent, should be condemned by the Church as absolutely unchristian. It is cruel. It makes exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to secure for such offspring the rights and privileges of ordinary citizens and the blessings of the Gospel.

There are those who earnestly advocate the importance of preserving so-called race purity. Such a contention may or may not be scientifically sound. But neither contention may be maintained as a Christian principle. The experience of history seems to indicate that intermarriage between some races has been productive of good offspring and has enriched the human race, while intermarriage between other races has produced on the whole inferior men and women. But our knowledge of the facts about the intermixture of races is as yet very limited. We cannot claim to have attained any established results of experience. We cannot, therefore, condemn any particular inter-racial marriages as immoral, because they have always led to bad results. But wise men will discourage unions between persons widely different in race civilization, social rank, education, and tradition—although both Christians—because the results are only too likely to be unhappy.

The Race Problem and Foreign Missions

Among the most remarkable phenomena of the modern Church has been the extraordinary outburst of zeal to carry our Christian "good news" to non-Christian peoples. It has sent tens of thousands of the choicest personalities from white lands to spend their lives in unstinted carrying out of the spirit of service and good-will taught by our Lord. The contribution of these noble men and women, the welfare of the lands to which they have gone, and also even to the peoples from which they have gone, is beyond easy calculation.

But we now see that the cause to which they have devoted their lives and for which their home churches have given generous financial support,

is seriously endangered by the unchristian international conduct and policies of their own nations. The contradiction between the teachings of the missionaries and the mailed fist policies of the nations of Christendom, is fatal. The churches of the West should promptly persuade their respective nations to adopt Christian principles in their international relations: otherwise the missionary enterprise will be doomed to comparative failure. The success of foreign missions, from now on, depends in no small degree on the character of the foreign policies of Occidental nations.

PART VII

CONCLUSION

The goal before the human race is the full realization of the purposes of God revealed and made real in Christ Jesus our Lord. We know from Holy Scripture that the reconciliation of the world to God has been accomplished by the redeeming work of Christ. God's gracious purpose includes the whole human race which has been reconciled to Him and to teach others through Christ. He has broken down the middle wall separating the races and made them one. He is our peace. It now remains for us—the diverse races of the human family—to enter in and take full possession of the wonderful heritage which is ready made for us in Jesus Christ.

In proportion as we all come to the foot of the Cross and see in the face of the Eternal Son of God and Son of Man the eternal character and purpose of that God who has already reconciled the world to Himself, in that proportion shall we be reconciled to one another and be able to share in the upbuilding of his Kingdom, wherein each race shall reach its fullest perfection and each render to all its fullest service.

Then shall the kingdom of this world become the Kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.

Also associated with this Commission was a sub-committee on the Substitution of Law for War. Its report is as follows:

The subject referred to us is the substitution of Law for War in international disputes and the extension of juridical order to the relations between peoples.

In considering this problem we deem it to be essential to recognize that peace cannot be permanently assured unless there be established some system of international justice to which nations can resort as is now the case for individuals in all civilized countries. But we hold, also, that such system must be based on the teaching of Jesus Christ.

In this respect we regard the institution of the League of Nations as a valuable step in the right direction and, whilst we recognize the defects and short-comings of the League as constituted at present and the need to

have a more complete international organization before it is possible to institute a universal reign of law, we think it is wise to build on this foundation.

In adopting this method of dealing with the subject referred to us we must lay stress upon the absolute necessity of taking the Gospel of Love, as delivered by our Lord, as the corner stone of the new edifice of law and justice which we would see erected in the world. Without it the whole building will crumble to dust at the first shock to which it may be subjected.

For these reasons we propose that the Conference should make the following declaration:—

1. International law and international justice should be universally accepted in substitution for war for settling international differences.

2. Inasmuch as the members of the League of Nations have accepted the obligations of the Covenant "in order to achieve international peace and security by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among governments," this international law should be built up through the instrumentality of the League of Nations on the basis of justice and love as laid down in Christ's teaching both in relation to individual life and in relation to international life.

3. This international law must comprehend a perfectly clear scheme of a righteous intercourse between States. It must have as its organs instruments for enquiry and arbitration and, as the highest instrument, an international Court of Justice.

4. This system of international law and justice must rely upon an international conscience moulded into shape by the strength and by the common work of all the churches of the world in accordance with the will of God as revealed by Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace and the Founder of the Kingdom of God on earth.

THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

As Christians, we approach the problem of education from a distinctive viewpoint. We are not primarily concerned with the technical questions with which the student of general education has to do, but with the special contribution which religion can make to education, and particularly the responsibility which rests upon us as Christians to bring the spiritual resources of the Gospel to bear upon the life of our time. The tragic experiences of the last decade have made it clear that, unless the enlargement of knowledge, which has so marvelously increased man's power over Nature, be accompanied by a corresponding increase of good-will, education—instead of contributing to human welfare and progress—may become a source of danger and even of destruction. On all sides the cry goes up to heaven, "Give us a new generation,—a generation in which brotherhood is not only preached but practiced." It is that cry which has brought us here.

What have we as Christians to answer?

This first of all, that education must have for its chief aim the development of a full and rounded personality, and not simply the training of the individual in knowledge and technique. The most crying need of the day is a new standard of corporate life. But for this more is needed than knowledge. Good-will is needed, and consecration. It is with these inner spiritual factors that the Church is particularly concerned. She professes to know the way to God, the way by which the rising generation may be brought into communion with Him, and thereby into realization of their brotherhood with one another. The Master she serves came that men might have life, and might have it abundantly. Her primary concern, therefore, must be with persons—with the enrichment of their experience: the development of their character, the quality of their service as free and responsible members of the human family. The goal toward which she strives is fellowship with God and the permeation of all human relations with the Spirit of Christ.

This new life in Christ must express itself in all phases of human experience. We cannot divide life into two parts, religious and secular: one, controlled by the Spirit of God; the other, in which we follow our own selfish impulses. All our relationships must be Christianized: not least those in which brotherhood is most difficult to realize. If this cannot be done, our doctrine of God's Fatherhood loses its reality. Apart from human brotherhood, the Fatherhood of God remains but a phrase.

The reports of the different sections voice the eager desire of Christians of all lands that, in a society divided by clashing interests, the Church may impart to her children and young people that spirit of world-wide sympathy and understanding, which will fit them to do their part in removing the bitterness of race: in promoting justice between individuals and nations, and in making it possible through co-operative planning for all men everywhere to enjoy their daily bread.

It follows that as Christians, we cannot be indifferent to the contemporary situation. Our very consciousness of a unique responsibility, of a distinctive message, constrains us to enter sympathetically into the life of our time, striving to understand its problems, to appreciate its difficulties, and to reach out brotherly hands to those who are striving to cope with them, wherever we find them. Though the Church is not of the world, it is in the world, and it must speak to those who are in the world in language they can understand.

It is the more important for the Church to reconsider her educational responsibility, because a study of the problems considered by the other commissions shows that each of them is, in the last analysis, an educational problem. Whether we consider the economic situation, as it confronts us in the struggle between capital and labour, the racial situation, as it meets us in the rivalry of the Occident and Orient, or the international situation

as it manifests itself in the strife of nations for power and prestige, we are brought at last to the question of motive. If men cannot agree, it is because their desires clash. Where there is no common object of allegiance, strife is inevitable. Above all else the world needs a unifying faith, a common loyalty.

This need is being widely recognized in educational circles to-day. There is a growing disposition to conceive of education as co-extensive with life, and to draw all human interests and concerns within the sphere of the teacher's influence. Education is defined as the process by which one generation attempts to transmit to its successor the insight and experience, which will enable each individual to develop his capacities to the full, and so be fitted to co-operate with his fellows in the life of the nation and of humanity. According to this view, it is not simply the teacher's duty to instruct his pupil in certain subjects, but to develop his pupil's personality in all its aspects, physical, moral, and emotional, as well as intellectual. The school is regarded as a miniature society, in which the pupil practices on a small scale the activities which he is afterwards to employ on a larger.

This conception of the teacher's task confronts the Church at once with an opportunity and with a danger: an opportunity, in that it provides a welcome point of contact with the Christian view of education as the training of the entire personality for fellowship with God and service of man; a danger, lest in reliance upon purely natural forces and interests, a synthesis be attempted, which leaves religion out.

Both these aspects of the situation are pointed out in the sectional reports. They emphasize the opportunity provided by the new education and urge Christian teachers to acquaint themselves with modern pedagogy and the psychology of religion, and to make judicious use of such of their assured results as may prove helpful; but at the same time they call attention to the danger of relying upon these alone. Alike in countries where the State provides religious instruction and in those where it does not, there is a disposition to interpret man's social responsibility in purely secular terms, and to teach human brotherhood without any adequate foundation in Divine Fatherhood. This tendency has been reinforced by the widespread materialism which has been one consequence of the rapid growth of natural science with its astounding revelation of man's power over physical nature, and the corresponding temptation to extend the methods of exact science beyond the sphere to which they legitimately apply.

Over against this tendency, it is the Church's duty to point out the inadequacy of any purely materialistic philosophy to account for the facts. There are elements in the Christian experience which require God for their explanation. Christianity is not first of all a philosophy: it is a new life of trust and love and service, made possible through the redemption of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The Church exists to witness to the trans-

forming power of this life-giving Saviour. It is not enough to teach the duty of brotherhood, we must live the life of brothers.

Here we reach the deepest root of our failure. We have relied too much upon formal instruction in school and Church. We have not sufficiently translated our teaching into the language of life. We have spoken of love, and too often our conduct has given our words the lie. We have preached brotherhood, and have lived as strangers, sometimes even as enemies. With one heart and one mind we confess our common sin, and with united voice we pray for that life-giving spirit, which works within each surrendered soul, and is able to transform it into a veritable temple of God.

But a right spirit alone is not enough: there must be a body, through which the spirit finds expression. Here we face a new difficulty peculiar to our time, namely, the existence of social units, so vast, so compact, and so highly centralized as to limit the power of the individual in ways unknown in an earlier and simpler age. In the world in which the Church must work to-day we find a labour movement, highly organized and class conscious; a corresponding organization of industry in aggregations of great power and influence, having their own organs of expression and standards of corporate morality; a youth movement, self-directed, idealistic, optimistic, often critical of the Church as of all the other institutions of society; a race rivalry, which shows itself not only in the strained relations between the East and the West, but in the emergence within the different nations of smaller groups, divided by their own consciousness of race. Above all, we find the State extending its control over ever widening areas of life, and frequently acting according to a lower standard of morality than that which it demands of the individual citizen.

The problems thus raised will be discussed in detail in the reports of the other Commissions. Here we are concerned only with their educational significance. Important for our present purpose is the fact that each of these great units is entering the educational field, and is creating its own organs of public opinion.

With reference to the Church's relation to these new educational developments, we may repeat what has already been said of her relation to the educational movement as a whole. They present her at once with an opportunity and with a danger. In each of these great centers spiritual forces are active, and ideals of brotherhood and service are upheld. In each, consecrated men are working and giving their lives for a cause larger than self. The Church should recognize the existence of these ideals, and should support those who are working to realize them, so far as these ideals are consistent with that larger and more comprehensive brotherhood to which by her Divine charter she is committed. But with the opportunity there is also a danger, the danger that in the name of brotherhood, aims will be followed which are really narrow and divisive, and ends, good in

themselves, be promoted by an appeal to motives which are selfish. We must be on our guard lest, in our desire to find a point of contact with the men whom we wish to help, we lower our own standard, and substitute for the Kingdom of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, any less comprehensive goal.

How then, faced with such a situation and charged with such a task, can the Church best discharge her responsibility as a teacher?

First: by definitely recognizing her interest in all departments of man's corporate life; secondly: by finding points of contact with those social groups which she has hitherto neglected; and thirdly: above all, by applying the principles she professes within the sphere of life which is directly under her control.

(1) The Church has always recognized the duty of the individual to society, and drawn from the Divine Fatherhood its appropriate corollary in brotherhood. But in the simpler conditions of the pre-industrial era, the relations of men to one another were less complicated, and the duty of the individual Christian easier to define. The new conditions make the Church's duty to permeate all life with the Christian spirit more difficult but at the same time more imperative.

(2) The sectional reports of this Commission, as well as the reports of the other Commissions give interesting information as to the existing points of contact between the Church and other social groups, and fruitful suggestions as to how these can be multiplied and improved. Among these may be mentioned group meetings of employers and workmen, the open forum, the preparation of special textbooks for schools and colleges, the provision of courses on religion in state universities, group meetings of teachers in normal schools, the extension of facilities for adult education, the use of literature, of the theatre, and of the press, and the provision of a Christian press service.

A valuable aid in securing the needed points of contact is supplied by the federation movements of the various countries through the Social Service Commissioners and other similar agencies. Special attention is called to the Teachers' Training Schools, Vacation Bible Schools, and week-day religious instruction carried on by the different churches of a community in co-operation.

(3) Christian education, to be effective, must begin at home. The Church must not only preach the duty of Christian brotherhood, she must show how the principles of brotherhood can be applied in the lives of the children and older people who are under her influence. Through all the agencies at her disposal, the home, the Sunday-schools, the worship and preaching of the Church, the missionary societies, the playground, the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, and other similar organizations, she must train her members to be sensitive to every form of human need. She must teach them to sympathize with those of different

races and classes, and to understand their point of view: to be eager to redress social injustice, wherever found; to seek ever the welfare of the whole rather than the part, and to rely upon the Christian method of love as the only finally effective way for the betterment of society.

Here again the reports of the different sections give much interesting and useful information. Attention is called to the important part which recreation plays in the educational programme, and the demoralizing influence of many forms of commercialized amusement. The Christian High Schools of Scandinavia, i. e. (boarding schools for young people, giving four to six months courses, but without degrees) are cited as an example of a unified educational programme which includes body, mind, and spirit. Information is given concerning the adult education movement in England, and the new forces at work in the state universities in Germany and America. All agree as to the supreme importance of securing the right kind of teacher, a teacher who, whether layman or clergyman, shall have not only the requisite information, but the right spirit. All agree on the central place of the Bible in religious education, and on the importance of recovering for it again its rightful place as the great Text-book of humanity. To reproduce this material here is impossible. To deal with it adequately would require a special conference similar to the International Educational Conference recently held at Edinburgh.

One subject of special importance is dealt with in the report of a sub-committee of this Commission, that of the text-books on history used in many schools. Attention is called to a serious danger, a danger too formidable to be dealt with by any individual or group of individuals. Only the Church as a whole can meet the situation and supply the needed corrective.

But to do this effectively she must know the facts. The sincerity of her purpose cannot prevent her from falling into mistakes, unless she has access to information that is exact and reliable. Such information on many matters of vital importance to her is not at present available. *We suggest, therefore, to this Conference, that it recommend to the proper authorities the creation of an International Bureau of Education and Research to serve as a clearing house of information for the various Christian communions on those moral and religious matters in which they have a common concern.*

In making this recommendation we have in mind, not a Committee with executive responsibility, empowered to commit the Church it serves to any definite course of action, but simply a clearing house of information such as already exists in many countries (e. g., The Department of Education and Research of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America) through which the needed facts can be assembled and transmitted to those who desire to make use of them. Our sub-committee on text-books has pointed out the need of such a clearing house in the special field of their investigation, and suggested a way in which it can be secured.

We approve their recommendations, but would point out to the Conference that the same need of accurate information exists in other fields also, and that some more comprehensive method of meeting this need is desirable. As to the way in which the Bureau, if approved, is to be constituted, whether as an official representative of the churches or as a private enterprise working in co-operation with them, we prefer to make no recommendation, leaving that matter to the consideration of such Continuation Committee as the Conference as a whole may decide to appoint.

We end where we began, with a re-emphasis of our dependence on a Higher than ourselves. As we survey the programme we have outlined, we do not conceal from ourselves the magnitude and the difficulty of the task. Now, as in the days of Our Lord, the disciples of Christ face the forces of organized selfishness, not in the world without only, but in their own hearts. Only God can help us here. "Out of the heart are the issues of life." If the heart be right, the life will be right also; if the heart be corrupt, no outward machinery will avail.

For this reason, we would reaffirm our conviction that, in any complete educational programme, prayer must hold the central place. The Church that would teach must be a learning Church; but God is speaking to us now, if we have ears to hear. Let us then with open mind and reverent heart draw near to his sanctuary, that we may receive of Him the wisdom we need.

The sub-committee of this Commission had to do with Text-books. Its report is as follows:

The Sub-Committee on Text-books, having studied the reports of the Swedish Commission appointed "to make enquiries as to untrue and nationalistic statements, insulting to other peoples, in the historical text-books in different countries," beg to make the following unanimous report:

The members of the sub-committee wish to state their full adhesion to the historical parts of that report. The leading principles which have directed the deliberations of the sub-committee are the following:

(1) That God is in history and that through the historical forms of peoples and nations He fulfils his aims with the world.

(2) That, as the Church is essentially one, but historically and practically there are many churches which have to respect and to aid each other, so much more have peoples and nations to do so.

(3) That every one of them has its rights and its duties, its own place and its own character among the others and that all of them have to co-operate in mutual understanding for ideals common to mankind.

(4) That the great educational influence of the instruction of history in schools essentially consists in the acknowledgment and the practical ap-

plication of these facts and that, therefore, the material and the spirit of that instruction ought to be in accordance with the principles above mentioned.

PROPOSALS

In accordance with these general principles your sub-committee begs to propose:—

1. That the Universal Christian Conference commends a system of instruction in history which in the various school stages should pay attention to the universal development in association with the national, the cultural and spiritual development in association with the political, which, according to the results of critical research, should judge contentious questions in politics with the utmost possible objective veracity, and which should refrain from hasty and disparaging generalizations about the national characters of competing or hostile peoples and on the contrary should recognize their several contributions to the work of civilization and spiritual progress.

2. That the Conference expresses its full and grateful adhesion to the struggle against one-sided and rancorous nationalism in the schools which has been taken up by various organizations for peace and mutual understanding and which calls upon us all to co-operate.

3. That the Conference, now that the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches and the European Centre of the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace have initiated a general investigation of historical and geographical text-books since the war, recommends a co-operation between these two and other similar organizations for the maintenance and continuation of that investigation in a universal and impartial spirit.

4. That the Conference with this aim should appoint a Committee which, by means of freely-chosen fellow-workers in various countries should follow the development of text-book literature, through the medium of pedagogical reviews make the teachers acquainted with their observations and also sum them up in an enquiry which might possibly be repeated from time to time. The Conference should ask the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches to advise its national councils to select members of that Committee, and for initiating the work should the Educational Commission of the World Alliance for Promoting Friendship through the Churches, consisting of Dr. Fr. Lynch, Prof. O. Nordenskjöld, M. Jules Jézéquel, Prof. Richter and Prof. Aalders function as an Interim Committee using the Swedish Commission, the members of which are Prof. Nordenskjöld, Dr. W. Carlgrén and Dr. V. Söderberg, as a working committee.

5. That the Conference on its part recommends that if an international organ should be created by the Conference for promoting mutual understanding between the peoples, that organ should take over the management or the supervision of the text-book enquiry; and

6. That the Conference declares an increased co-operation especially between teachers of history in various civilized countries extremely desirable for promoting the aims above mentioned.

METHODS OF CO-OPERATIVE AND FEDERATIVE EFFORTS BY THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNIONS

PART I

THE PRINCIPLES OF CO-OPERATION

In introducing our recommendations to the Conference we wish to call attention to the following considerations:

1. We believe the calling of this Conference just at the present juncture to be within the plan of God: if so, loyalty requires us to follow it up.

The world now more or less has been bound together in common material, economical, and technical development, in common selfishness and sin, in common pain and sorrow. It is simply impossible that the churches should be unmoved by the challenge of modern social life and that they should remain isolated in provincial narrowness. This Conference is only one form, until now the most comprehensive, of a common grappling with most pressing problems. It would be disloyal to make such an attempt, and then give it up.

2. The value of the Conference and of its eventual continuation in some form will in the first instance depend upon willingness to be only instruments for the Divine forces.

The Conference has taken the nature of God and his purpose for the world as the basis of all its discussions. So all future work will be futile, if it does not spring from the very inmost life of the spirit. Its source is God's redeeming love in Christ, issuing in a new life in men through the Holy Spirit. The Church is not simply a more or less efficient association for some practical purposes, but the Body of Christ. The call to practical, united action is not a new doctrine, changing the nature of the Church, but it is a stimulus to realize what is in the Christian Faith, but until now very imperfectly understood and still more imperfectly put into practice. The briefest statement of our programme is indeed to be found in the Lord's Prayer. We cannot split up life into separated departments: through mutual help we must face the difficulty of combining the inner life in the absolute and eternal with the outward life in the relative and changing sphere.

3. In such co-operation no individual and no Church is to be regarded as surrendering sacred convictions, but rather as putting such convictions to the test of practical life, emulating others in, struggling to do the will of God.

The divisions of Christendom are to be regarded under a double aspect. They may be to some extent legitimate and necessary, corresponding to

religious and national history and temperament. Partly, it must be confessed, they are due to narrowness and sin. But even then they can only be overcome through gradually increasing mutual understanding and by "The more excellent way" of love, teaching men that no individual and no section in the Church has been able to grasp the fullness of Christ. The Conference, however, and its eventual continuation, is in no way concerned with matters of creed and organization. We fully recognize that each church must do its own work in its own way. But the life of each church can be greatly stimulated and enriched by mutual intercourse and inspiration. Even where Christians have serious differences they must try to co-operate and emulate one another in doing the will of God. We may differ for instance as to the possibility of reforming the world according to the will of God. We must agree that Christians are to contend for the will of God. We may differ as to the ultimate conception of the Kingdom of God: we must unite in co-operating for the fulfilment of our prayer: Thy Kingdom come; thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven. It is just in the practical life of to-day and to-morrow that there will be a vast field, where in the presence of God all doubts as to his holy will must needs disappear. Everyone must have the confidence that his convictions can stand the test of life. Just when we believe our convictions to be right, we must have the courage of trusting them so that their truth may be proved. For if any man will do the will of God, he shall know of the teaching whether it be of God or not.

4. The continuation of the Conference ought not to be a rigid organization nor a legislative institution, but a really efficient agency for service.

If such an agency should try to dominate, it would get no influence. If it can justify itself through really helpful service, it may grow into something larger.

In any case we believe that with faith and patience we shall be guided to a development in the future in accordance with the will of God. And for that future we may derive encouragement and light from the progress of the past.

PART II

THE PROGRESS OF CO-OPERATION

The Commission, having first defined the principles of co-operation, would bear witness to the gratifying progress of Christian co-operation in Life and Work since the preliminary and preparatory conference in 1920 at Geneva.

This co-operation has taken many and varied forms, both of organization and service. It has been so spontaneous and general as to indicate clearly and unmistakably the inner spiritual unity already existing which only awaited organized expression in voice and action. Boards of Foreign Missions, Home and Inner Missions and other departmental agencies of the

churches have developed co-operation both by conference and by common service in educational and social institutions. In the foreign mission field, Christian councils have engaged in united work to a high degree.

The interdenominational and international bodies for Sunday-school work and for Bible distribution have continued to enlarge their boundaries and have deepened their co-operative relationships .

In several countries local co-operation in provinces, states, and cities has multiplied, in various forms of Christian activity as evangelism, philanthropy, education, and social service.

The children of the Church, the Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., the Students' Federation and other Young Peoples' movements have increasingly circled the globe with their cords of love and friendship.

Perhaps, the most gratifying development of all has been that of national federations of churches, especially in those countries where many denominations exist, thus offering the readiest method of integrating the religious forces of the world.

Not only has co-operative service thus made striking progress within nations, but there has developed along with this an intercommunication across national boundaries, even where seas and oceans have separated the nations and the churches.

Denominational groups have held world conferences, which have deepened the sense of international sympathy and service. While there has been this deepening denominational consciousness, it has not retarded the co-operative movement.

The World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches has gone from strength to strength, and its annual conferences have brought Christians together upon the greatest task before the Churches of this day and generation. This organization has rendered a great service in preparing the way for this Conference.

Much of this international co-operation has taken the form of works of serving love, as exemplified by the Bethesda Conference of 1922 and the Central Bureau for Relief of the Evangelical Churches of Europe, which has not only served its special purpose, but has also indirectly developed the mind and spirit of co-operation and fellowship among the churches of many nations. Other agencies of relief have similarly united Christians in love across the boundaries of nations.

Out of the Edinburgh Conference has come the International Missionary Council and in Great Britain the great conference known as *Copec* has become more than a national conference or movement, and we feel its influence and incentive here in Stockholm.

The national federations of churches have constantly exchanged messages and messengers across rivers, seas, and oceans and have come to know and trust one another.

It is of the deepest interest to note that during these five years, the first time in history the American churches through their Federation have been enabled to enter with the churches of Europe into mutual relationships which are rapidly deepening and taking form. Not the least gratifying of these manifestations of the Spirit of God has been the rapidly growing acquaintance, friendship, and fellowship between the Eastern Churches and other communions which so far as most or many of the churches are concerned, has been almost entirely the result of these five years of friendly conference.

Where the spheres and areas of co-operation have been many and varied, the main forms have been:—Evangelism, Social Service, including Industrial Relations, Temperance and other interests of society as a whole, International Relations, including the war against war, Race Relations, Christian Education, Religious Publicity, Mercy and Relief, and, as has been described, Home and Foreign Missions.

Among the greatest needs is that of mutual information, such as has been already begun by the press of the various countries, and by the exchange of informational literature, including significant volumes and their translation, and the exchange of visitors and students.

We may venture to say that during those five years no development of the life of the Christian Church has been so significant as its interdenominational and international brotherhood, and that the progress of those five years has been far beyond that of the preceding half century. In view of the vital and far-reaching issues with which we are concerned, we cannot but hope for that co-operation of all the parts of the Church of Christ without which its testimony and influence in the world must be incomplete.

The experience that we have passed through between Geneva and Stockholm leads us to thank God and take courage as we face these days of prayer and counsel together and look forward into the future, trusting ourselves to the guidance of our Heavenly Father and under the leading of his Spirit forming our plans for the next step along the path of further progress.

PART III

PROPOSAL FOR A CONTINUATION COMMITTEE

The Commission reports that it has given careful consideration to various suggestions regarding the formation of some organization which shall follow the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. The Commission deems it inexpedient and beyond the proper jurisdiction of the Conference to attempt to form any authoritative or permanent organization. The Commission, however, recognizes and sympathizes with the general feeling, which has been expressed in many quarters, that the Conference should not disband without making some provision for carrying on the work which has been so auspiciously begun. It would be lamentable if a Conference which has been so long planned and prayed for, and which records a high

mark in the movement for co-operation in the fellowship and service of Christ, should evaporate in mere discussion, interesting and inspiring as it is to us who are privileged to participate in it.

It is to be clearly understood at the outset that any agency that may be appointed shall not deal with questions of creed or ecclesiastical organization, but that it shall strictly limit itself to the class of subjects under consideration at the Conference, namely, the Life and Work of the Church of Christ, and in particular the assertion and application of Christian principles to those problems, international, economic, social, civic, with which the future of civilization is so vitally concerned.

It is also to be understood that it shall have no power to speak in the name or on behalf of the churches or to take any action that shall commit any church, its deliverances being simply its own opinion unless any particular deliverance or deliverances shall be expressly approved by the church or churches concerned.

The Commission therefore recommends:—

1. That the Conference appoint a Continuation Committee from its present membership, international in character and as broadly representative as practicable, with duties which should include the following:

(a) To perpetuate and strengthen the spirit of fellowship which this Conference so happily exemplifies.

(b) To publish the proceedings of the Conference in official and also in popular form.

(c) To carry on the work of the Conference and to consider how far and in what ways its practical suggestions may be made operative.

(d) To gather information regarding the methods of co-operation among the churches in the various countries for the objects which are the concern of the Conference, to counsel with them as to methods of closer international co-operation, to do what may be found wise to facilitate the formation of such agencies in countries where they do not now exist, and to issue from time to time such publications as will serve to keep the churches informed regarding the work of the Committee and such other matters as are germane to the purposes for which the Committee exists.

(e) To consider the practicability of holding another Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work at some future date.

2. That the Continuation Committee consists of 67 members, due care being exercised to make it as representative as practicable, both geographically and denominationally, the membership for this purpose to be distributed as follows:—

American Section.....	13
British Section	10
European Continental Section.....	20
Eastern Orthodox Church Section Oriental.....	12
Churches in other lands which are not represented in the preceding sections.....	12

The distribution in the last section is to be as follows: Australia 1, Canada 1, China 2, India 2, Japan 2, South America 1, Near East 1, South Africa 2.

(a) That the representatives of the various sections who are present at this Conference be requested to nominate to the Ad Interim Committee (hereinafter described) immediately or as soon as possible after the Conference, the persons who shall represent them on the Committee, and that a meeting of the Continuation Committee, in so far as it has been elected, be held together with the Ad Interim Committee before the representatives leave Stockholm.

(b) That the Committee shall appoint such officers, Executives and Sub-Committees as it may deem desirable, determine its methods of procedure, its times and places of meeting, and such other details as are involved in the performance of its duties.

(c) That vacancies occurring in the membership of the Committee shall be filled by the Committee after consultation with and with the consent of other members of the Committee who represent the section or group in which the vacancy or vacancies occur, in order to preserve the proper distribution of the membership of the Committee.

3. That the Committee shall not attempt to raise or administer funds, except for the expenses that are necessary for the proper discharge of its duties, and that it be authorized to seek contributions for this purpose.

The Commission voted to nominate to the International Committee the four Presidents of the Conference, the Vice-President of the European Continental Section, the General Secretary of the International Committee, and the three Secretaries of this Commission, to serve as an Ad Interim Committee to convene the Continuation Committee and to act for and in its behalf until it shall be able to function.

THE MESSAGE OF THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK

I.

1. THE Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, assembled at Stockholm from August 19 to 30, 1925, and composed of representatives of the greater number of Christian communions coming from thirty-seven nations of the Old and New World, and of the Near and Far East, sends this brotherly message to all followers of Christ, beseeching them to join with them in prayer, confession, thanksgiving, study, and service. We regret that not all Christian communions have found it possible to accept our invitation, for, in view of the vital and far reaching issues with which we have been concerned, we cannot but hope for that co-operation of all parts of the Church of Christ without which its testimony and influence in the world must be incomplete.

2. For five years men and women have planned and prayed that this Conference might be held. Other efforts for closer relations between the churches have prepared the way. But this has proved the most signal instance of fellowship and co-operation, across the boundaries of nations and confessions, which the world has yet seen. The sins and sorrows, the struggles and losses of the Great War and since have compelled the Christian churches to recognize, humbly and with shame, that "the world is too strong for a divided Church." Leaving for the time our differences in Faith and Order, our aim has been to secure united practical action in Christian Life and Work. The Conference itself is a conspicuous fact. But it is only a beginning.

3. We confess before God and the world the sins and failures of which the churches have been guilty, through lack of love and sympathetic understanding. Loyal seekers after truth and righteousness have been kept away from Christ, because his followers have so imperfectly represented Him to mankind. The call of the present hour of the Church should be repentance, and with repentance a new courage springing from the inexhaustible resources which are in Christ.

4. It is a matter for deep thankfulness that, in the plan of God and through the guidance of his Spirit, the representatives of so many Christian communions have been led to assemble and have renewed in common fellowship their faith, hope, and love in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. It is a matter for deep thankfulness that, in spite of differences, sincere and

profound, they have been enabled to discuss so many difficult problems with a candour, a charity, and a self-restraint, which the Spirit of God alone could inspire. As we repeated the Lord's prayer together, each in the speech his mother taught him, we realized afresh our common faith, and experienced, as never before, the unity of the Church of Christ.

II.

5. The Conference has deepened and purified our devotion to the Captain of our Salvation. Responding to his call "Follow me," we have, in the presence of the Cross, accepted the urgent duty of applying his Gospel in all realms of human life—industrial, social, political, and international.

6. Thus, in the sphere of economics, we have declared that the soul is the supreme value, that it must not be subordinated to the rights of property or to the mechanism of industry, and that it may claim as its first right the right of salvation. Therefore we contend for the free and full development of the human personality. In the name of the Gospel we have affirmed that industry should not be based solely on the desire for individual profit, but that it should be conducted for the service of the community. Property should be regarded as a stewardship for which an account must be given to God. Co-operation should take the place of the competition which is merely selfish, so that employers and employed alike may be enabled to regard their part in industry as the fulfilment of a vocation. Thus alone can we obey our Lord's command, to do unto others as we would they should do unto us.

7. We considered next the moral and social problems of over-crowding, unemployment, laxity of morals, drink and its evils, and the causes of crime. Here we were led to recognize that these problems are so grave that they cannot be solved by individual effort alone, but that the community must accept responsibility for them and must exercise such social control over individual action as in each instance may be necessary for the common good. We have not neglected the more intimate questions which a higher appreciation of personality raises in the domain of education, the family, and the vocation, questions which affect the woman, the child, and the worker. The Church must contend not for the rights of the individual as such, but for the rights of the moral personality, since all mankind is enriched by the full unfolding of even a single soul.

8. We have also set forth the guiding principles of a Christian internationalism, equally opposed to a national bigotry and a weak cosmopolitanism. We have affirmed the universal character of the Church, and its duty to preach and practice the love of the brethren. We have considered the relation of the individual conscience to the State. We have examined the race problem, the subject of law and arbitration, and the constitution of an international order which would provide peaceable methods for removing the causes of war—questions which, in the tragic conditions of to-

day, make so deep an appeal to our hearts. We summon the churches to share with us our sense of the horror of war, and of its futility as a means of settling international disputes, and to pray and work for the fulfilment of the promise that under the scepter of the Prince of Peace, "mercy and truth shall meet together, righteousness and peace shall kiss each other."

9. We have not attempted to offer precise solutions, nor have we confirmed by a vote the results of our friendly discussions. This was due not only to our respect for the convictions of individuals or groups, but still more to the feeling that the mission of the Church is above all to state principles, and to assert the ideal, while leaving to individual consciences, and to communities, the duty of applying them with charity, wisdom, and courage.

III.

10. If this goal is to be attained, we recognize the pressing need of education. The individual must be educated by the Church, so that he may be enabled to exercise a Christian discernment in all things. The churches must educate themselves by study, conference, and prayer, so that being led by the Spirit of truth into all truth, they may be enabled, in increasing measure, to apprehend the mind of Christ. We recognize that the root evil is to be found in the human will, and we, therefore, desire to re-emphasize our conviction that this will must be surrendered to the high and holy Will of God, whose service is perfect freedom. Even Christian ideas and ideals cannot save the world, if separated from their personal source in the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and unless themselves taken up into the personal life of the believer.

11. To this end we address our appeal first to all Christians. Let each man, following his own conscience, and putting his convictions to the test of practical life, accept his full personal responsibility for the doing of God's will on earth as it is in heaven, and in working for God's Kingdom. Let him, in entire loyalty to his own church, seek to have a share in that wider fellowship and co-operation of the Christian churches of which this Conference is a promise and pledge. In the name of this wider fellowship we would send a special message of sympathy to all those who, amid circumstances of persecution and trial, are fulfilling their Christian calling, and we would comfort them with the thought that they are thus brought into fellowship with the sufferings of Christ.

12. But we cannot confine this appeal to the churches, for we gratefully recognize that now we have many allies in this holy cause.

We turn to the young. With keen appreciation we have heard of their aspirations and efforts for a better social order as expressed in the youth movements of many lands. We desire to enlist the ardour and energy of youth, the freshness and the fulness of their life, in the service of the Kingdom.

We think also of those who are seeking after truth, by whatever way, and ask their help. As Christ is the Truth, so Christ's Church heartily welcomes every advance of reason and conscience among men. Particularly we would invite the co-operation of those teachers and scholars who, in many special realms, possess the influence and command the knowledge without which the solution of our pressing practical problems is impossible.

In the name of the Son of Man, the Carpenter of Nazareth, we send this message to the workers of the world. Thankful for all those who, even under the present difficult conditions, are acting in accordance with the principles of Jesus Christ, we deplore the causes of misunderstanding and estrangement which still exist and desire to remove them. We share their aspirations after a juster social order, through which the opportunity shall be assured for the development, according to God's design, of the full manhood of every man.

13. We have said that this Conference is only a beginning. We cannot part without making some provision for the carrying on of our work. We have therefore, decided to form a Continuation Committee to follow up what has been begun, to consider how effect can be given to the suggestions which have been made, to examine the practicability of calling another such Conference at a future date, and in particular to take steps for that further study of difficult problems and that further education of ourselves and of our churches, on which all wise judgment and action must be based. May we not hope that through the work of this body, and through the increasing fellowship and co-operation of the Christians of all nations in the one Spirit, our oneness in Christ may be more and more revealed to the world in Life and Work.

14. Only as we become inwardly one, shall we attain real unity of mind and spirit. The nearer we draw to the Crucified, the nearer we come to one another, in however varied colours the Light of the World may be reflected in our faith. Under the Cross of Jesus Christ we reach out hands to one another. The Good Shepherd had to die in order that He might gather together the scattered children of God. In the Crucified and Risen Lord alone lies the World's hope.

Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the Church by Jesus Christ through all ages, world without end. Amen.

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., 1802; 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, 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.

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

The Editor's Notes:

Division Obscures Jesus—Division Is a Denial of Christianity—The Possibility of Unity

Some Ideals and Responsibilities of the United Church of
Canada

S. D. CHOWN

The Basis of Union in the Ephesian and Colossian Letters . W. J. LHAMON

Make Disciples of All the Nations A. W. FORTUNE

The Quest for Religious Unity WILLIAM A. HARPER

The American Catholic Church F. E. J. LLOYD

What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity

How Co-operation Strengthens the Churches—Contacts Create New Understandings—Is Christian Union Possible?—Creeds and Reunion—Obstacles to Reunion with Rome—Avoid Decisions Reached in Fatigue—Reunion with the Free Churches—The British Methodist Union Deadlock—Is There to Be Church Union Among Congregationalists?—Rome and Reunion—The Anglican Movement for Reunion—Some Observations on Protestantism and Roman Catholicism—The Chinese Church in Troublous Waters

Book Reviews

The Principles of Christian Living—Interchurch Government—Understanding—Christianity and World Problems—Conversations on Christian Reunion, 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

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

CONTENTS

JANUARY, 1926

VOL. XV.

No. 3

<i>THE EDITOR'S NOTES</i>	249
<i>SOME IDEALS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA</i>S. D. CHOWN	254
<i>THE BASIS OF UNION IN THE EPHESIAN AND COLOSSIAN LETTERS</i> .W. J. LHAMON	262
<i>MAKE DISCIPLES OF ALL THE NATIONS</i>A. W. FORTUNE	268
<i>THE QUEST FOR RELIGIOUS UNITY</i>WILLIAM A. HARPER	284
<i>THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC CHURCH</i>F. E. J. LLOYD	296
<i>WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY</i>	303
<i>BOOK REVIEWS</i>	346

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 their Equality before God 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 EDWIN S. LINES,
Newark, N. J. |
| BISHOP CHARLES P. ANDERSON,
Chicago, Ill. | DR. FREDERICK LYNCH,
New York, N. Y. |
| REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. | VERY REV. J. A. M'CLYMONT, D.D.,
Edinburgh, Scotland. |
| BISHOP CHARLES H. BRENT,
Buffalo, N. Y. | PROF. SAMUEL MCCOMB,
Cambridge, Mass. |
| DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn. | BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL,
Pittsburgh, Pa. |
| PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N. Y. | BISHOP WILLIAM F. MCDOWELL,
Washington, D. C. |
| REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass. | THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER,
Manchester, England. |
| BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR.,
Washington, D. C. | REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. |
| PROF. DR. J. EUGENE CHOISY,
Geneva, Switzerland. | DR. WILFRED MONOD,
Paris, France. |
| 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. |
| REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky | PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa. |
| DEAN H. E. W. FOSBROKE,
New York, N. Y. | PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England. |
| DEAN W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill. | REV. J. H. SHAKESPEARE, D.D.,
London, England. |
| PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England. | PASTOR DR. FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND-
SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany. |
| MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor. | DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N. Y. |
| PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C. | THE ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA,
Upsala, Sweden. |
| DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Shanghai, China. | DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J. |
| REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. | REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich. |
| DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England. | BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio. |
| PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa. | BISHOP LUTHER B. WILSON,
New York, N. Y. |

The Evil of Division

DIVISIONS AMONG CHRISTIANS — DENOMINATIONAL, NATIONAL, RACIAL—HAVE EVER BEEN A STUMBLINGBLOCK; BUT WITH THE SHRINKAGE OF THE WORLD THESE HAVE BECOME MORE SERIOUS AND INTOLERABLE THAN EVER. IF WE CAN FORGET THAT WE ARE AMERICANS, CANADIANS, BRITISH, GERMANS, FRENCH, OR THAT WE ARE METHODISTS, EPISCOPALIANS, PRESBYTERIANS, BAPTISTS, CONGREGATIONALISTS, LUTHERANS, IN THE WORK OF MAKING CHRIST AND HIS TEACHINGS KNOWN TO ALL MANKIND, AS A COMMON TASK, WE HAVE GONE A GREAT WAY TOWARD PROVING TO NON-CHRISTIAN PEOPLES THAT THE RELIGION OF CHRIST IS THE GREAT SOLVENT OF THE RACIAL ALIENATIONS OF THE WORLD, AND, THEREFORE, THE MIGHTIEST FORCE OPERATING AMONG MEN.

—JOHN R. MOTT.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

JANUARY, 1926

THE EDITOR'S NOTES

Division Obscures Jesus

How long will it be before the Church can be brought to believe that its divisions are the greatest scandal of history? So long as Christians regard division as merely unfortunate, or unnecessary, or uneconomical, we shall remain just about where we are. Not until we feel the sting of this scandal shall we feel uncomfortable in our churches. More than fifteen hundred years ago Julian said that if the Christians could be so divided as to break their brotherhood, they would appear ridiculous in the eyes of the world. What the Roman Emperor could not do to the Church, the Church has proudly done to itself. Because it is ancient, many think it is sacred. The older the division the greater the sin, only our memories are dulled.

In addition to our broken brotherhood there has grown up through the years a party-pride, pride of communion, so that it is common to hear it said: "I am proud that I am a Roman Catholic"; or "that I am an Episcopalian"; or "that I am a Presbyterian"; or "that I am a Baptist"; or "that I am a Methodist"; or "that I am a Disciple." This party-pride and party-rivalry have so concealed Jesus as to make Him, in many instances, an obscure character in these times.

His right to a place in education from the elementary school to the university is questioned, if not flatly denied. His voice in the industrial circles is unwelcomed. When the World War broke forth Christians might as well have been Buddhists or Mohammedans, so far as being factors in attempting to check the wild ravages of the international conflict between so-called Christian nations. The readiness with which Christians followed the dictates of politicians to murder their brethren in war, advertised to the world as nothing else could have done

our loss of the sense of Christian brotherhood. Love of the brethren is as fundamental in Christianity as that Jesus is the Christ. If unlove is to be the order of Christianity, expressing itself in these rigidly maintained divisions, we might as well henceforth regard Jesus as a mere carpenter of Nazareth. Take away either of these—the fact of Christ or the fact of the love for the whole Church of Christ—and we are left with a lame Gospel for a lost world. In consequence of this scandalous condition no communion in Christendom can preach any other than a half Gospel with a divided Christ. The shame of this condition is largely lost in the consciences of Christians.

The day of conference is here. The League of Nations is a going institution, offering an opportunity to all forward-looking nations to confer relative to co-operative measures. The World Court is a practical demonstration of the sincerity of nations in their desire to maintain co-operative principles. The communions of Christendom must, likewise, get together. In consequence of our divided Christianity the Church was too weak to lead in world co-operation; but the Church may, at least, follow the political statesmen of the world in bringing her spiritual forces into full and complete co-operation. To that end the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work was held last year at Stockholm and next year the World Conference on Faith and Order will convene in another of its meetings at Lausanne, and, likewise, other movements are opening doors of possibility.

The issue before us is supreme. There are some indications that are encouraging. There are individual voices in all communions pleading for a united Christendom. In fact, there never were so many voices pleading for unity as now. The spirit of conference and co-operation is abroad in the world and it appears to be an irresistible force. On the other hand, there are indications that are discouraging. The party-spirit is very strong, in many instances defiantly so. There is not a communion in Christendom, speaking for the whole communion or for its officers, that really wants unity except on its own terms; but every communion is pushing to its uttermost to make itself strong in the earth, and, in many instances, without

the slightest regard to any other communion. However, this need not over-discourage us, so long as voices are strong and multiplying in their appeals for unity in the House of God. The thing is right and it will become the prevailing conviction of the Church, whatever difficulties there may be on the way. Love in the Church, in the whole Church, is as truly the call of God as any message that ever came into this world. The triumph of Jesus is dependent upon its whole-hearted acceptance by the whole Church.

Division Is a Denial of Christianity

A divided Church is a denial of the foundation principles of Christianity as affirmed by the Apostle Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians. It is a more effective denial than that of out-and-out atheism. Compare the opponents of Christianity from the days of Lucian, Celsus, and Porphyry down to modern times and their injury to Christianity has been trifling as compared with the injury done Christianity by a divided Christendom, because a divided Church is anti-social, immoral, and unspiritual.

By social is meant that which pertains to society, living together, holding friendly intercourse, and cultivating companionship. But a divided Church breaks up the social life, from the home to the general affairs of the community. How frequently has it been said, where the husband and wife are members of different communions, "We never mention the Church and never discuss religion in our home." It is, perhaps, the best way to meet the scandal of a divided Church, but it reveals, at once, the anti-social results of division. Christianity is a social religion and one of its functions is to strengthen the social life of people. Ruskin says, in his *Ethics of the Dust*, "A pure and holy state of anything is that in which all its parts are helpful and consistent. The highest and the first law of the universe and the other name of life is, therefore, 'help.' The other name of death is 'separation.' Government and co-operation are, in all things and eternally, the laws of life. Anarchy and competition, eternally, and in all things, the laws of death."

The words of this art-critic and preacher-essayist challenge us to avoid death by the pathways of our separation and to find life by the experience of mutual help.

By moral is meant that which pertains to the conduct and spirit of man toward God and toward his fellows with reference to right and wrong and obligations to duty. It needs no force of argument to affirm that it is the duty of Christians to love each other. But a divided Church is the advertisement to the world that we do not love each other. From a moral obligation of love we pass without concern to the immoral attitude of unlove. We talk about following Jesus and we quarrel over a dozen disputed and unsettled questions, making them tests of fellowship, when we know that the only sign of Christian discipleship is that left us by Jesus when He said, "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." But a divided Christianity, changing conduct and spirit from normal fellowship into party-groups, makes a divided Church immoral in conduct and spirit.

By spiritual is meant that which pertains to the soul or the inner man. A divided Christianity dealing with motives, attitudes, and aspirations weakens these vital forces that have to do with man's growth toward God. A divided Church can no more attain to the best in spiritual experience than a divided home, where husband and wife are divorced, can attain to the best in ethical example. However much we may desire spiritual growth, and all of us do desire it, it can only be attained imperfectly, very imperfectly, in the atmosphere of a divided Church. The Scriptural phrase, according to Moffatt's translation, is that, when the Church is divided, Christians "behave like ordinary men" and, therefore, the Gospel power is weakened. — *Christian Union Quarterly.*

The Possibility of Unity

If it be said, and it often is said, that the unity of the whole Church is impossible when we think of the Roman Catholic Church, on one hand, with its great antiquity, wonderful organization, and growing power, and, on the other hand, the

Society of Friends, without Baptism or the Lord's Supper, but whose spiritual characters have set them in the front rank of fine examples of Christian living—the answer is that, if the union of Christendom is not possible, then either Christianity is not of God or all Christian communions are on a false basis. The notion of one church's holding all the truth and all the others holding fragmentary parts of truth belongs to the nursery of by-gone days.

But with the belief that Christianity is of God and that all communions are the holders of some truth, we are summoned by God to advance in conference, in co-operation, and in tolerance. In conference we talk at first hand regarding our differences and find new understandings and form new appreciations. In co-operation we learn to work side by side for a common end, discovering, as we work together, new worth in those from whom we differ. In tolerance we advance to a sympathetic attitude of mind toward those from whom we differ. Phillips Brooks rightly says, "In tolerance there are two elements—first, positive conviction and, second, sympathy with men whose convictions differ from our own." It is sometimes thought that tolerance is based upon indifference or uncertainty. But it is just the opposite. It is the intolerant who is afraid and so he avoids conference and refuses co-operation and sometimes he expresses his intolerance in bigotry and may go to the extent of persecution. He tries to think that he is sure. He may affirm it defiantly. Do not believe him. He is resorting to a false method to establish a false position. It is the tolerant who is unafraid. He proves that he is unafraid by trusting others in conference and in co-operation. The most tolerant person in all history was Jesus, who went to the Cross unafraid and entrusted his religion to a few simple-minded Jews of Galilee. The question that faces us is: Are we able to be Christian enough to be unafraid to trust other Christians with the truth of Christ?

PETER AINSLIE.

SOME IDEALS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA

BY REV. S. D. CHOWN, D.D., LL.D.

Former General Superintendent of the Methodist Church of Canada,
Toronto, Canada

WHEN we recall the Divine ideals we have unitedly pursued for many years, and the leadings of Providence which have brought us to this auspicious hour, we must be deeply impressed with the conviction that the Divine Head of the Church has very important purposes to fulfil in our existence.

Accordingly, I would like to say something helpful *about the peril and tragedy to which we are exposed if we entertain too limited a conception of our duty.* This is a very important matter to keep in our thought in these formative days, when our ideals as a Church are being so rapidly and with considerable permanency stamped upon us.

If I apprehend aright the purpose of God in creating this United Church of Canada, it is to supersede, as far as it is possible, at the present time, the fractional representations of Christianity, which we, as separate denominations, have hitherto presented to the world, by an organization whose high and holy purpose and whose primary passion shall be to reveal to mankind, in much larger measure than heretofore, the great spiritual realities which are hidden for us in the mind and heart of Christ. A Church with such an ideal is, I believe, the only kind which can hope for abiding success in this another spring-time in the life of the world.

The history of civilization, in comparatively recent times, chronicles a series of tragedies which are full of warning for us in this new beginning of days. I can briefly refer to but a few of these.

The French Revolution, for instance, was a never-to-be-forgotten outburst of passion for liberty; but though its chief motive was humane and right, and though it left behind it a deposit of public blessing of immeasurable value, some of its results were ghastly, so much so that the world, witnessing the anarchy and bloodshed with which it was accompanied, became afraid of freedom, and lost, for a time, the sweetness of the great word "Liberty."

Later modern democracy awoke as a panacea for political and social inequities, but, in due course, it brought its own stern disillusionment. Statesmen learned that even the coveted franchise was calamitous, unless inspired and directed by character, and that the new democracy sorely needed education to give balance to its citizens and save the State from the effects of mob psychology.

In the course of time a strong social passion for economic justice thrilled the hearts of Karl Marx and others. The Marxian theory became the Messianic hope of multitudes, but the basis of its faith was not broad enough. "Man shall not live by bread alone." And to-day, in the reactions of the extreme communistic wing of Socialism, as seen in the excesses practiced in Russia, we behold the naked tragedy of a search for Brotherhood apart from the Fatherhood of God and the sobering sanctions of Christianity.

About three-quarters of a century ago science, led by Charles Darwin as its high priest, stepped forth as a goddess of liberty enlightening the world; the hypothesis of evolution, dangerously misconceived by some of its exponents, not as a Divine method of progress, but as a self-contained and self-acting energy, postulated the superman. Germany became the chief national exponent of man's self-sufficiency, until the vaunted strength of the nation went down in cataclysmic ruin.

The League of Nations, the noblest conception in the realm of modern civilization, has come to life to lift the powers of the world out of the desperate mire of militarism. For six thousand years it had been the custom of so-called humans to kill each

other and to be killed, in satisfaction for some real or supposed affront.

Thank God for the remarkable achievements of the League already, but it does not yet appear that it can succeed in quieting the worse than bestial hatreds of men, unless the Church of Christ reinforce the conscience of the world with a deeper sense of human value, of international obligation, and breathe into it the very soul of peace. Every national banner must be surmounted by the Flag of the Prince of Peace before world unity can be relied upon.

I cannot pass along this way without expressing my feeling, that, if the Church of Christ is not soon tremendously aroused to preach with stern righteousness and yearning love the outlawry of war, its future historians will record, with burning shame, its surprising apathy at this great crisis hour of human history. The failure of the League of Nations would argue the moral insanity of the world, and the Church of Christ would be to blame for not creating a soul of deep spiritual conviction in the heart of the nations to give effect to the purposes of the League. If the Church fail in this, it will lose an opportunity fraught with infinite consequences, and, if war continue, the Church will be largely answerable for the ghastly barbarisms of war now impending; barbarisms which will make war more terrible and disastrous than imagination can portray. It is horrible to think that at this hour the old world seems to be boiling like a witch's cauldron, around which devilish harpies sing in hellish glee—

Double, double, toil and trouble,
Fire burn and cauldron bubble,
Like a hell broth boil and bubble.

Some of the nations of Europe appear to be in such unstable equilibrium as to be dancing a dance of death near the very mouth of a volcano whose eruption at any moment might lay their civilization in ashes and the people in their graves.

What an alarming challenge the facts and tendencies at work in the world to-day are to summon the Church to heroic

action for the prevention of war! May this Church cease not night or day to cry unto God until peace be established forever throughout his world. If I speak thus strongly in describing the opportunity and duty of the Church, it is not out of any disparagement of the League of Nations in its sphere, nor am I unmindful of other agencies for peace, which are working together with the Gospel message to that end, such as the price of the inevitable and inexorable chaos into which the world was plunged by the great war, the sorrow of grief stricken multitudes in many nations, the sense of the futility of war as a means of settling international issues, the staggering burdens of immense national debts, and the underlying humanitarian feeling of the human heart. These are all of vital assistance to the League, *but* it must be remembered that in its efforts at cosmic reconstruction it can, as a skilful surgeon, only set the broken bones of international life and bind on the splints, trusting to public opinion to hold the fractured members of the bodies politic in place until the knitting process is complete; and it remains for Christianity to change human nature itself and to create the brotherly love and national righteousness which will ensure the permanency of peace.

The illustrations I have mentioned reveal some of the tragedies of our civilization.

I fear we must now confess that the Church of Christ is itself suffering from tragedies of a similar nature—the tragedy of a dependence upon half-truths, or truths half realized, and consequently the tragedy of half-formed purposes. It is our task as a Church to see life whole, and also to see the truth whole, and having seen these, resolutely to set ourselves to carry forward to notable victory the whole range of responsibilities inherent in full orb'd Christianity.

We are very thankful to recall that the churches from which we sprang did in their day faithfully sound the tocsin of individual regeneration, and by that means carried our country very appreciably toward the realization of the Kingdom of God.

They also carried the social principle of Brotherhood onward to enduring benefits. They produced the rare atmosphere

of a Christian scholarship which has commanded the admiration of cultivated intellect and inspired scholars and poets to sublime heights of reason and of fancy. They have also strewn the bones of their martyrs upon the shores of many nations and have left them to whiten upon the mountains and over the prairies of large portions of the globe. Inspired by the Christian conviction, that the nations of the earth have been brought into blood relationship in a peculiar sense through the shed blood of the only-begotten Son of God, they have transmitted the universal love of the All-Father into the hearts of men this wide world over in order that every nation and people and kindred and tongue might be brought into the fellowship of the Gospel of Christ.

All these things and many more have been done through the years of our separation with varying emphases and differing degrees of success by messengers of the denominations into which we were formerly unhappily divided.

But a change having come, and union being now an accomplished fact, we should heed the call of God to produce a much more perfect and aggressive development of all the achievements to which I have referred. God is calling us to receive a fresh outpouring of pentecostal power which shall enable the members of our church to observe the first principles and purest practices of Christianity more fully than they have been obeyed in any previous period in the history of the Church of Christ.

Why should we not believe this is God's call? We have obeyed the will of God. We have healed divisions in the Body of Christ. We have answered, as best we could, the high priestly prayer of our Master that, "they all may be one." We have gone forward under the direction of his spirit to a position of obedience previously unattained by any of the denominations now constituting this church; and since we have undertaken such great things for God, why should we not also expect unprecedented blessings from Him? Previous unions of the mother churches have been marked in this way.

Then let us, with even more vigorous faith and effort than our fathers, move to the rescue of sinners from the blighting

effects of sin, through individual conversion. Let us go forward more alertly than ever and with hearts full of God's love for humanity to the solution of oppressive and unjust social problems. Let us resolve that we shall do these things with the supreme Christian intelligence of those who walk in the light of God, an intelligence so clear as to remove all lurking superstitions and banish all compromises and half-truths from the consciousness of our people. Let us carry the Gospel of salvation, for every man, and from all sin, unfettered by creeds of human craftsmanship, to the uttermost parts of the earth; and further, make it the crowning glory of our church, to promote unity, international, as well as ecclesiastical; a unity so complete and manifest as to compel the world to believe in the Divine mission of Jesus as the one sent of God to be the actual Saviour of mankind and the Leader of the life of the whole human race.

These duties are the unescapable responsibilities of our church in this age; and, moreover, we are persuaded that only with this grasp of truth and grouping of activities may we hope to receive sufficient direction and power for our unique redemptive task.

The history of any denomination which attempts to reveal Christ by emphasizing only a fraction of the Gospel message will, in due time, become a tragedy, if not of outward disaster, yet of inward deformity and comparative spiritual impotence. The best of churches, like the purest individuals, may become dire and distressful tragedies by narrow-minded insistence upon isolated religious truths and the loveless practice of isolated virtues.

The church around which our affections gather with more intensity every day, and about which our faith becomes daily filled with higher expectations, should evermore dedicate itself to the production of the whole cluster of graces that receive their inspiration from and stand within the radiance of the Cross of Christ. With such infinite interests at stake, there comes to each minister and lay representative of the United Church of Canada, yes to all members of our church every-

where, the ringing challenge of Joshua to the Israelites just as they were about to pass over the Jordan to the Promised Land: "Sanctify yourselves, for to-morrow the Lord will do wonders among you."

Let our sanctification be without reserve; let it be made in complete sincerity and with full purpose of heart, and the wonders of grace and salvation will surely follow.

May I now compress what I have further to say into one word—it is briefly this: that in this hour of consecration we should pray that the ideals of the new church may be equal to the needs of the new world, and be big enough to build into our civilization spiritual values hitherto only distantly dreamed of. The members of our church should be so increased in spiritual stature that they shall regard the whole family of nations as one living human organism, to be loved and served as though all the peoples were of the same kith and kin as ourselves.

When the magnificent steamship *Mauritania* was launched upon her trial trip, her speed proved bitterly disappointing. An expert was called in to discover the trouble. He found that her hull was perfect in outline and construction and her engines were well adapted to ensure higher speed, that her boilers were not lacking in capacity to produce plenty of steam to send her forward with much greater rapidity; but, after full examination, he pronounced her propellers, *the part of the machinery by which her motive power was applied*, to be too narrow for her bulk. Too little propulsive power was the trouble.

We believe we have now constituted a church well built and strong in every part, all its machinery being adapted, or soon to be adapted, to the purposes we desire to fulfil. We believe we have and can always claim sufficient power from God to enable us to move forward with much greater strength and speed than hitherto to the evangelization of the world. The supreme question for us to-day then is—are we ourselves, in our motives and ideals, in our prayers and purposes, sincere and broad enough as to be willing that the spirit of God should apply all the personality and power we possess to the doing of the whole work we are called of God to do? Surely the magnitude of the work

of the United Church of Canada must move mightily upon every living soul amongst us. Are we willing then so to consecrate ourselves that we shall say, as Edwin Markham said to me about himself: "You may cut my heart right away through, and you will find Jesus at the center. I am all for Him—and He is everything to me." Are we willing, in the words of another devoted servant of Christ, and of this age, to vow before God that we will take Jesus in earnest? Failing to do this, *our* history will be but another tragedy—the frustration, so far as we are concerned, of a great Divine purpose.

An appropriate prayer at this time is found in the stanzas of a poet otherwise unknown to me, William Steward Gordon, of Roseburg, Oregon.

It is couched in these sublime words—

O Master of the modern day,
Our hearts are kindled as we know
Thou walkest still along life's way
As in the ages long ago!
And by the magic of thy will
New worlds Thou art creating still.

We thank Thee that Thou rulest still
This goodly orb on which we dwell—
That Thou dost still reveal thy will
To those who would the dark dispel—
That upward o'er the peaks of time
Thy plan unfolds in form sublime.

Enlarge our minds to grasp thy thought,
Enlarge our hearts to work thy plan,
Assured thy purpose faileth not
To put thy spirit into man!
God of the present age and hour,
Thrill us anew with holy power.

S. D. CHOWN.

THE BASIS OF UNION IN THE EPHESIAN AND COLOSSIAN LETTERS

BY DEAN W. J. LHAMON

Liscomb, Iowa

THESE letters date from St. Paul's Roman imprisonment, about 61 or 62 A. D. Their main interests to us center in the soul of Paul, the doctrine of Paul, and the condition of the churches.

The soul of Paul is wonderful. He rejoices in his sufferings. He thinks of himself as a prisoner "for the Lord's sake."* He finds power in weakness. He glows with enthusiasm. He revels in superlatives. His spirit rises and soars and will not be beaten. He makes an asset of adversities. He could recount his "perils by sea," his "perils by land," his "perils among false brethren"; how often he was stoned—"three times"; how often he was beaten with rods—"five times"; and almost literally he could say, "My head is bloody but unbowed." If ever a man was "*invictus*" that man was Paul. Through his own pages he walks in spiritual triumph. "Over the top" at Chatteau Thierry was great; but "over the top" in a lonely spiritual march through Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece, and Rome was sublime.

These letters are *letters*. They are not creeds, dogmas, encyclicals, *ex cathedras*, or in any sense final statements of final dogmas. St. Paul was a theologian, but he was not a pope. His attitude is that of a brother, and his approach that of a teacher. He prays; he pleads; he directs; he inspires; he encourages; but he does not command. The question of authority seems not to concern him. He seeks rather to create an atmosphere. Over these young churches in Ephesus and in Colossæ he would throw a halo of light, and he would wrap them in a garment of love. Authority in religion does not make for union; it makes for division. Union comes naturally under the leadings of light and love.

* Quotations are from Goodspeed's Translation.

In the scheme of Paul Christ is first. He is "the head of the Church." It is "his body." He is "the beginning, the first-born from among the dead—that He might come to stand first in everything." This pre-eminence of Christ is a capital point in the matter of union. The very focus of union is in his adorable person. "All the Divine fulness chose to dwell in Him, and through Him to reconcile to God all things on earth or in heaven, making peace through his blood shed on the Cross." How different is this from "our little systems"—"our little systems, that have their day, and cease to be."

The doctrine of Paul is, therefore, entirely Christo-centric. He is a Christo-logian first, and a theologian afterward. God is Father because Christ is brother. The blessings of the Father come to us through Christ. Our foreordination to become "his sons" is through Christ. It is "through union with Him and through his blood that we have been delivered, and our offenses forgiven." The "glorious Father" exerted a "mighty strength in raising Christ from the dead, and seating Him at his right hand in heaven, far above all hierarchies, authorities, powers, and dominions, and all titles that can be bestowed not only in this world but in the world to come." Christological language could not be more absolute. But the Apostle goes further, repeating, reiterating, emphasizing, adding clause on clause, approaching his central thought from this angle and that, heightening it, illuminating it, and by every possibility of language making it unmistakable. On his stage Christ is the central figure, and the lime-light follows Him.

In seeking the basis of union in the Ephesian and Colossian letters one must face some negative facts. A number of our contentions are not so much as named, or even remotely suggested. There is not a syllable about the virgin birth, but the resurrection is affirmed. There is not a word about the Bible in our sense of the word, or about its inspiration, or its inerrancy. For Paul our Bible did not exist. Unconsciously he was helping to make it by writing these letters. He does refer to "the commonwealth of Israel," and he reminds the Ephesian Christians that they had been "strangers to the agreements about God's promises." As to the Old Testament law with its

"rules and regulations," the Apostle saw that as a "barrier" to union between Jews and Gentiles, and he declares that Jesus had broken it down—that He had "abolished" it, so that He Himself could be "our peace." Only by the abolition of the Mosaic law could the Gentiles become "fellow-citizens of God's people and members of his family." Only by their release from the law could Christians, both Jews and Gentiles, be built upon the foundation of "the apostles and prophets," Jesus Christ Himself being "the corner-stone." This is an entirely different use of the Old Testament from the one that a mistaken theory of inspiration seeks to force upon us. Paul does not think of "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible" as a basis of union, but, on the contrary, he demands that certain parts of it, what he calls "the law," shall be taken out of the way. It is through "union with Christ" that we "who are far away" shall be "brought near."

The doctrine of the second coming, so prominent in St. Paul's Thessalonian letters, has no place in these his late-in-life letters. There is at best one quite casual reference to it in Colossians 3:4, but vital interest in it has passed away from the mind of Paul. With him it no longer signifies much, so great has been the change in his mind during the ten or twelve years that elapsed between those his earlier, and these his later, letters.

We are accustomed to "contend earnestly" for one or another of some four types of church organization. We demand it shall be congregational, or presbyterian, or episcopal, or papal in form. But in these letters no form of government appears. No elders are addressed, or deacons. The Ephesian letter is addressed to "God's people who are steadfast in Christ Jesus," and the Colossian letter to "the devoted and steadfast Christian brothers who are in Colossæ." There are "brothers in Laodicea," and there is a "church" that meets in the house of Nympha. As to church officials—strictly speaking there are none. In the Ephesian letter there is a list of leaders rather than officers, and the Apostle speaks of them as "gifts to mankind," to "fit the people for the work of service, for building the body of Christ, until we all attain to unity of faith, and the knowledge of the

Son of God, and reach mature manhood, and that full measure of development found in Christ." These leaders are named as "apostles, prophets, missionaries, pastors, and teachers." Their functions are not to rule, but to teach and build, and prepare the people for service, and cultivate "unity of faith." If there was any organization at all in those churches it was of a most primitive and incipient kind. Those young churches were simply little bands of brothers. The body of believers in each place constituted a pure democracy. No "board of elders" appears, or of deacons, or of presbyters, or of bishops. There are no priests. Organization was yet to come. At a later date Timothy was left in Ephesus to "set in order the things that were wanting." St. Paul was not interested in the mechanics of church government, but he was mightily interested in the spirit of fellowship. So far as he was concerned organization was a secondary matter, and might take care of itself, as ultimately it must do, growing and changing according to the exigencies of times and conditions.

Viewed thus no type of organization should stand in the way of union. We must come to the realization that there is no final form of organization revealed or authorized in the New Testament. The Old Testament conception that there was "a pattern shown in the mount," and that all things must be made according to that, is foreign to the teaching and spirit of Paul, and, for that matter, of the New Testament in toto. Organism rather than organization is the final fact in church polity, and with organism there must be, as with all living things, freedom to grow, and change, and find the way to live and function under imposed conditions. We can look to the New Testament only for hints, norms, and beginnings. We must look to history for developments.

In general, the same may be said of systems of doctrine. There is no hint in these letters of the Nicene Creed, for instance. That creed was a development answering to fourth century conditions. Our mistake has been in the assumption of its finality, and in the further assumption that it must be imposed as final under twentieth century conditions. But the twentieth century begins loudly to insist on its own liberties

and rights in the way of doctrinal developments as being on a par with those of the fourth, or fifth, or any other. Instead of finding finality in creeds, instead of making everlasting dogmas of them, we must rather let them grow and change, and come and go, and function for what they are worth while coming and going. Only thus can we find the way of liberty, and the way of liberty is the way of union. What is said above of the Nicene Creed may be said of all the others. To attempt to carry the creeds with us as finalities is to imitate the wayfaring Irishman who pulled down the sign-board at a crossing and tucked it under his arm for the next crossroads.

At any rate, St. Paul and his young churches in Ephesus and Colossæ got along and maintained a high degree of spiritual life and unity without our "historic creeds," and without our "historic developments of polity." One can, and must, grant the conditional utility of creeds and polities, but their finality is a different matter. The moment one grants that he opens the door for every kind of sectarian mischief.

It is not usual with us in our discussions of union to think or say much about the Christian way of living. We have tacitly assumed that the whole question was one of doctrines and governments, or, in other words, of "faith and order." But St. Paul knew better. He knew that in Christian living there is a bond of union. In the first verses of the fourth chapter of the Ephesian letter he rises into a rhapsody of exhortation to Christian living in connection with a proposed ultimate basis of union. The whole paragraph must be quoted in order to give its full measure of force. I have called it a rhapsody of exhortation. It is a personal plea, a poem, an argument, and a philosophy of Christian union. It runs in Goodspeed's translation as follows: "So I, the prisoner for the Lord's sake, appeal to you to live lives worthy of the summons you have received; with perfect humility and gentleness, with patience, bearing with one another lovingly. Make every effort to maintain the unity of the spirit through the tie of peace. There is but one body and one Spirit, just as there is but one hope that belongs to the summons you received. There is but one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above us all, pervades us all, and is within us all."

Christian union may, in its last analysis, be more largely a pragmatic matter than a doctrinal one. And, if so, we shall see a double value in St. Paul's insistent exhortations to Christian living coupled with his like insistent exhortations to Christian union.

In Summary. We must simplify in order to unite. Simplicity and unity are close cousins. That is the first lesson of these letters. We must go with naked minds into the presence of Paul and follow him as he leads us into the more sacred presence of Jesus. With the march of time doctrines, dogmas, ceremonies, and forms of government may become useless baggage, or even mischievous *impediments*, as the Romans would say. It may happen that we must unload in order to make time.

Another lesson of these letters is that the person of Jesus must be the center of union. Of all religions Christianity is the most personal and the least doctrinal. The "one faith" is faith in the "one Lord," and that faith must be your faith for you, and my faith for me. You cannot formulate mine for me; I cannot formulate yours for you. There is a sacred meeting-place between each soul and his Saviour, and no one must be allowed to intrude. In that sacred presence we may "reason together," we may pray together, we may help one another to "grow in grace," but no one may hold a whip-hand of dogmatism over any other man's soul. Where my soul meets my Saviour there my soul finds its sovereign, and priests and popes and councils and creeds must stand aside. The Saviour is central and He is sovereign.

Once more. These letters lead us into the sanctuary of holy living and holy labour together. St. Paul's exhortations to husbands and wives, and fathers and children, and even masters and slaves, are not foreign to the ultimate conditions of Christian union. Our pulling together does not depend on uniformity of dogmatic harness. On the contrary, our pulling together may result in our discovery that the harness is a quite secondary matter, the only question being if it really helps us to draw the load to-day. If so, well and good. If not, better discard it and find some other, only remembering that the load must go forward.

W. J. LHAMON.

MAKE DISCIPLES OF ALL THE NATIONS

BY A. W. FORTUNE, PH. D.

Minister of the Central Christian Church, Lexington, Ky.

THE one task which the Master left to the Church is to make disciples of all the nations. Our Father is no respecter of persons; He made of one every nation of men. Jesus came to give expression to God's universal love. He lived among the Jews, it is true, but He said God loved the world. Jesus had but one passion, and that was to get men to accept God as Father and live as his children. He left the task which He had begun to his disciples to carry on to completion. From the mount of vision He pointed out beyond their own borders; He told them to make disciples of all the nations.

My subject has in it the sweep which challenges. It fixes our interest, not upon section, or race, but upon all nations; not upon a few gathered out of the masses, but upon all peoples. Our task is to constrain the nations of the world to accept Jesus as Lord and Master and follow his ideals. The ambition is not to win the peoples of the world to the communion which I represent, but to do our best to influence them to become followers of the great Teacher. What God wants is not members of this communion, or that; He wants a world that does his will.

The task which Jesus left to the Church is tremendous. If we understood its sweep and its implications it would become so compelling that many of the things which have been absorbing our interest would drop into the background. The Church of our day is anxious and troubled about many things; it should give attention to the one thing needful.

The Church has not been entirely idle during the centuries; much has been accomplished in the task which the Master left it. We are the heirs of a glorious past. The foundation has been

laid and the scaffolding is in place. We are surrounded by a mighty host of witnesses who bore testimony to the faith and finished their course with joy.

There are many things in the world's life which have a tendency to discourage us and make us pessimistic, but one of the most hopeful signs the world around is the missionaries and their achievements. We see them in the walled cities of China and in the countless villages of India. We see them in the educational centers of Japan and in the jungles of Africa. We see them on the highlands of Tibet and in the valleys of Korea. We see them in the islands of the Philippines and in all parts of Latin America. These Christian centers, where the missionaries have been labouring all over the world, are the hope of the civilization of the future.

Now is the day of the Church's opportunity. Fifty years ago they prayed for open doors. The doors have been opened and our fathers have built highways into all these lands. Because of their achievements God is challenging us to go forward and make the nations Christian.

I. A NEW STAGE IN MISSIONS.

We have entered upon a new stage in the missionary task which makes it imperative that we seek to know what God wants us to do. We must not mistake the need of a new adjustment for an opportunity to quit.

We passed through the pioneer period. A pagan world challenged a few brave souls who believed the command of our Lord, to make disciples of all the nations, should be obeyed. Their going was an experiment. There was nothing to serve as a guide; they had to blaze new trails. Those heroes of faith who endured hardships and privations, and even martyrdom, for Christ's sake have been the inspiration of the Church.

We passed through the period of sentiment. There was a time when the Church gave for missions for sentimental reasons. Sentiment played an important part in the enlistment of volunteers. It was the story of the millions' sitting in darkness that moved young people to go as missionaries. It was the story

told by these missionaries that moved our sympathies and led us to give for the support of their work.

There is a romance in missions that will continue as long as men are moved by the story of human suffering and degradation; but we have passed the time when young people volunteer their lives, or men and women give their money, because their sympathies have been aroused. The speech that moves the feelings is no longer essential to missionary giving. We give because we want to have part in a programme in which we believe.

We passed through the destructive period in missions. We are not far removed from the time when it was thought that the task of the Church was to transport western civilization to the non-Christian lands. It was assumed that their religions were all bad, and even of the Devil. The aim was to tear down other civilizations and rebuild them according to our own pattern. The appeal was made to prejudice.

We still believe that ours is a superior civilization and that Christianity is the religion the world needs; but we have ceased to think that everything in these other civilizations is bad, and we have come to feel that even in their religions they have been reaching out after God. Our method is constructive: instead of seeking to destroy everything in the old civilizations and the old religions, we seek to find what is good and build upon this that which we believe is better.

We are passing through the denominational period. It was natural, and almost inevitable, that the churches in their missionary programme should transplant to foreign fields all their denominational machinery and prejudices. The aim was not merely to convert pagan peoples to Christianity, but to denominational Christianity.

The missionary leaders have seen the folly of that method. The resistance of a non-Christian world has been forcing the churches together. The leaders on the field think of the situation as Christianity on the one hand and paganism on the other. As they have faced the gigantic task sectarianism has been forgotten. Men who have the world vision no longer think

of making disciples of all the nations in denominational terms; their aim is to make followers of Jesus Christ, and they feel that this demands the united action of the Church.

We have entered upon a new stage which has been created by the mingling of civilizations. A few years ago a curtain separated the East from the West, and Christianity was judged by the lives of the missionaries. The trader and the tourist from the Christian lands too often have presented a picture which has contradicted the teaching of the missionaries. The native press features the crimes of the Christian nations and their unchristian diplomacy. This has greatly complicated the work of missions.

During recent years there has been a wonderful development in education in many of the non-Christian lands. This new scientific attitude has caused the peoples to compare civilization and point out elements of strength and weakness. The world is becoming more highly organized along scientific lines, and it is more difficult for the missionaries to give direction to this scientific knowledge than it was to influence ignorance. In some of these lands there has been marked progress in the system of education maintained by the State. This demands a new type of missionary, for, if Christian education is to minister to these people, the missionary must be the intellectual equal, if not the superior, of these government teachers.

This problem has been further complicated by the army of students from the Orient who have been coming to the universities of Christendom. During the last twenty-five years they have been coming in increasing numbers. This has helped and hindered in missionary work. Sometimes young Christians who have come from mission schools to study in the universities of Christian lands have gone back adherents of the old faiths. A brilliant young Indian student said to an American fellow passenger bound for India: "When I came to England I was a Christian as a result of my study in a mission school; after five years in England I go back to India as a Hindu." A Chinese student remarked: "I nearly accepted Christianity as I understood it when I was in China, but changed my mind in

the United States." Dr. Robert E. Speer said: "American life and the Christian Church have never met a more severe and searching test than they are meeting to-day in the presence of these foreign students in our schools. These young men and young women from many lands are testing the honesty of the political and social axioms which have constituted our American tradition. They are testing the reality of our profession of Christian brotherhood and equality. Almost all of them came here full of confidence and hope. Many of them are going back disillusioned, some bitter, some sorrowful." Dr. Speer rightly says: "The Church may find in these thousands of students as many missionaries to carry Christianity back to their own lands. They will not carry back what they do not get, and they will not get what we cannot or do not give."

The spirit of industrialism is reproducing in more aggravated form many of the problems of the West. It is not unnatural that this should be identified with Christian civilization and that there should be a revolt against it. The inevitable result of these changes has been ferment throughout the East. They have been accepting our science, our athletic sports, our political institutions, many of our social customs, our outlook for womanhood, many of our evils, and confusion and unrest have naturally followed.

Along with these changes there has developed a new national and race consciousness. Rabindranath Tagore has been lecturing in China and Japan on the arrogance of the white race, and he has been calling upon the other races to combine in resisting their aggressions. This national and race suspicion has greatly hampered the work of the missionaries. Christianity is being opposed by some because it is identified with the white race and with foreign nations. The students of some of the non-Christian lands, and especially of China, are becoming antagonistic to religion in general, and to Christianity in particular, on the ground that it is opposed to modern science, and because, in their minds, it is identified with militarism and capitalism.

This unrest is not altogether to be deplored, for it is a striving after something which they have not yet found; something which will lift these nations to heights of which they are just beginning to dream. The leaders of this new day are looking for something that will bring deliverance to their lands. We believe we have in our keeping the remedy for the ills of the world. We believe there has been committed to us that which will transform the nations and lead humanity into a new day.

Dr. Stanley Jones of India made one of the outstanding addresses at the Washington Conference. In this address he said he was one day with some prominent men of India, all of whom were non-Christians, when he turned to them and asked: "Brothers, what are we going to do with these sixty million outcasts?" Continuing, he said: "They are a millstone around our national neck, and we can never be strong until we lift them." A non-Christian arose and said: "Sir, it will take a Christ to lift them." In that address Dr. Jones showed why Christ can lift a people when other moral and spiritual leaders have failed. He puts an ideal in the hearts of his followers which makes them have a helpful attitude toward others. This missionary, whose religion sent him out to serve those whose religions had left them helpless, stated the strength of Christianity in a wonderful comparison. He summed up the religions of the world by pointing out their central ideal: "Greece said 'Be moderate; know thyself'; Confucianism says, 'Be superior, correct thyself'; Buddhism says, 'Be disillusioned, annihilate thyself'; Hinduism says, 'Be separated, merge thyself'; Mohammedism says, 'Be submissive, bend thyself'; Shintoism says, 'Be loyal, suppress thyself'; Judaism says, 'Be holy, conform thyself'; . . . Christianity says, 'Be Christlike, give thyself.' "

I know of a world that is sunk in shame,
Where hearts oft faint and tire;
But I know of a name, a precious name,
That can set that world on fire;
Its sound is sweet, its letters flame;
I know of a name, a precious name—
'Tis Jesus.

II. A NEW ATTITUDE DEMANDED.

This new situation which we are facing demands a new attitude on our part.

We cannot hope to win the non-Christian peoples unless we have a sympathetic attitude toward them; unless we are able to see the good in their institutions and in their religions. Unless we are willing to recognize the good in their civilization, we cannot hope that they will look with favour upon ours. Unless we understand their religions and appreciate the good, we will not be able to point out their defects and offer them something better.

We cannot help other peoples if we are too much wedded to our own customs. We need to remember that our customs grew up in our Western world and seem queer to the peoples of the Orient. Their customs reach back through the centuries and have become a vital part of their life. We misunderstand Christianity when we identify our customs with our faith; their customs may become even more Christian than ours.

If we are to make disciples of the nations, we must be big enough to rise above national and race prejudice. It is imperative that the peoples of the white race have the right attitude toward the rest of the world. We quote the statement of Paul: "He made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth," but we have accepted it with reservations. Many would agree with Meredith Townsend who said: "Something radical, something unalterable and indestructible, divides the Asiatic from the European. . . . They are fenced off from each other by an invisible, implacable, but impassable wall as rigid and inflexible as that which divides the master from his dog." If that statement is correct, misunderstanding and conflict are inevitable. One must dominate the other, and the only question to be decided is which is the master and which is the dog. If that statement represents the feeling of the white race, we have need to fear the rising tide of colour.

Because of the attitude of those peoples who profess to be followers of Jesus, there is a growing race antagonism through-

out the East. Some of the churches of China and Japan are assuming their own support because they are unwilling to continue accepting aid from the white nations. While it is desirable for these churches to become self-supporting, it would be a calamity for them to become alienated from the churches of England and America. It would be difficult for us to help a people who is prejudiced against us, and it would be impossible for us to do much for them if we have prejudice in our own hearts. Prejudice debases others while it exalts self. If we have prejudice in our hearts we cannot be true disciples of Him who said: "One is your Father and all ye are brethren." Our task is to break down walls which separate and build a world fellowship.

If we are to make disciples of all the nations, we must remember that we are the ambassadors of Christianity rather than of Western civilization. The world does not need our civilization, but it does need that which has been the inspiration of the best that there is in our civilization. We sometimes forget that Christianity started as an Oriental religion. We have westernized it, and its glory has been its ability to adapt itself to the needs of the peoples who have embraced it. The other peoples of the world do not need the Church as we have organized it; they do not need Christianity just as we have interpreted it; they need Christianity as a native religion, and, having that, they may more nearly represent Jesus than do we.

The Church is definitely established in many of the non-Christian lands, and in some of these countries it is moving rapidly toward self-support and self-control. Many are alarmed at this situation because they know that many radical changes will necessarily follow. This should be an occasion for thanksgiving. God has always trusted his Church, and, under the leadership of his spirit, He can trust it in China and Japan. The fact that native churches are beginning to think of self-control is the greatest indication of the progress of the Kingdom. We must have the spirit of John the Baptist and be glad to see native leadership increase. A French king said to the tutor he had engaged for his children: "Make yourself useless

as soon as possible." That must be our attitude in the mission stations of the world.

We cannot make disciples of the nations unless we take Christ seriously. For too long a time we have been adulterating Christianity to satisfy our own tastes, and we have spent most of the time idle in the market place while God's vineyard has been unworked.

We cannot make disciples of the nations unless we seriously try to follow Christ's programme in our own land. We must make the tree good if the fruit is to be good. Two streams of influence have gone forth from America. The one represented by the missionaries and those who have supported them has been unselfish and holy. This has been counteracted by another stream of influence that has been destructive, and even debasing. Professor Cornelius, a brilliant native teacher in the University of Lucknow, India, made this significant statement in his address at the Washington Conference: "Unfortunately Christianity came to us from the West, and became identified with the lives of men who came to India singing,

Ship me somewhere East of Suez,
Where the best is like the worst,
And there ain't no Ten Commandments,
And a man can raise a thirst.

The churches of Christendom have been carrying on a missionary programme at tremendous cost in men and money. This work has been hindered because these peoples whom the churches have tried to help have been exploited industrially and politically by the nations whom the churches represent. Professor Cornelius, in the round table discussion at the Williamstown Institute of Politics this summer, asked, "What does Western prestige mean?" He said: "When I point a revolver at your head and take your goods, I am a criminal; on the other hand, when you plant yourself solidly on other people with the aid of guns, we speak of it as carrying civilization to the backward state." The time has come when we must abandon our missionary programme or practice our own Gospel.

A significant meeting of the Institute of Pacific Relations was held in Honolulu in July. This conference was composed of people from the lands around the Pacific who were anxious to find a way for maintaining good-will in those countries around the peaceful ocean. There is enough truth in the indictment which Chester H. Rowell of California made of the Christian nations to humble us in sackcloth and ashes. He and the American group did not mince words when they said: "The whole Orient is challenging the claim of Christendom to moral leadership. The Christianity of Christ the East understands and might accept, but it denies that the Christianity of Christ is the Christianity of Christendom. Was the war in Europe between Christian nations a Christian war? Was the God to whom each side prayed to destroy the other the heavenly Father of Christ? Is the fierce greed of the white man to exploit the yellow man industrially a reflection of the Sermon on the Mount? By what title may the Occident send missionaries to the Orient until it becomes Christian itself?" Such international proceedings as that of the recent action of the British at Shanghai gives basis for this indictment. When a body of unarmed students were protesting against the shooting of a Chinese worker in a Japanese cotton mill the British police fired on them, killing about a dozen and wounding as many more. It is no wonder that these students are seeking to stir up their people against the Christian nations.

We must face the question whether we dare be Christian. We must answer that question in our own land first. We must decide whether we dare follow Jesus; whether we are courageous enough to accept his ideals. We have faltered and compromised during the past. The nation has compromised; the Church has compromised; the ministers have compromised; individuals have compromised. There is not much chance for throwing stones because we are all guilty. The great heresy of our age is the unwillingness to take Christ seriously and establish his Kingdom in human society. If the Church is to make progress we must have a higher type of Christianity. If Christianity is

to build a new civilization we must accept and follow the ideals of Jesus.

The world is ready for a campaign for the acceptance of Jesus' way of living. A leading thinker of India said: "There is nobody who is seriously bidding for the heart of the world except Jesus Christ." In his reply to the question, How can Christianity be made a more effective power for India's uplift? Gandhi gave expression to things fundamental. He said: "I would suggest, first, that all Christians, missionaries and all, live more like Christ. If you come to us in the spirit of Jesus Christ then we cannot resist you. Second, I would suggest that you practice your religion without adulterating it or toning it down. Do not adulterate Christianity; give it to us in its rugged simplicity and its high demands, and live out the life; then we cannot resist it."

Many of the leaders of the Far East feel that real disciples of Jesus are the only hope of the future. During the Institute of Pacific Relations, T. Z. Koo was selected to deliver the Sunday morning address in the Central Union Church. This young Chinese has been slated by the International Young Men's Christian Association to succeed John R. Mott as the guiding spirit of the World's Student Federation. He was giving expression to the best thought of the Orient when he said: "What is drawing the Eastern world inevitably to Jesus is the consciousness that He has the true secret of living for the individual and the nations, the effective cure for the human spirit and the spirit of society. His was a personality conscious of the eternal Father and of that Father's love, who points the way through the unselfish life to happiness and hope for the race. In Him is the dynamic of progress, as truly for the Orient as for the Roman Empire in the first century."

The opposition to Christianity that is developing in non-Christian lands is in reality not opposition to Jesus and his programme. Mr. Koo spoke of the present non-Christian agitation in China. This movement publishes a violent non-Christian paper called *The Awakening*. In a recent issue there were forty letters of denunciation—twenty-four against Christian churches

and dogmas, eight against the defects and vices of Christendom, seven against certain individual Christians, but only one against Christ. "The Orient," said Mr. Koo, "has no quarrel with Christ."

We cannot make disciples of the nations until we think in terms of the Christianity of Christ. We have thought for so long a time in terms of our own church that we have come to identify that with Christianity. We have for so long a time repeated our creeds and defended our doctrines and dogmas that we take it for granted that these were the things that Jesus taught. We feel so certain about our own religious and scientific interpretations that we have no doubt that these are what the world needs.

The mind of the world cannot be crushed into a narrow mould. A sectarian and dogmatic Christianity cannot win America, and men of vision who are interested in the redemption of our own land are calling for a reconstructed Church. It is worse than useless to take to other peoples that which all must feel has been inadequate in our own land. Mr. Koo, in his address at Honolulu, declared that Christian leaders must have a bigger conception of their task. He was emphatic in his conviction that every dollar put into merely denominational, theological, or dogmatic Christianity in the Orient is worse than wasted. He declared that a divisive denominational Christendom has no chance in the China that is awakening. —

This does not mean that we should at once sever our denominational affiliation, but it does mean that we shall seek to establish Christianity in the world rather than build up our own communion. In the language of one of our own laymen in his address at the Washington Conference, we can favour denominational loyalty only when it considers itself a part of the whole of Christianity. We must work through our own organization, but we must work in co-operation with all the rest of God's people. We cannot do our part in helping to make disciples of all the nations until we are unsectarian and undogmatic in spirit. We cannot make our contribution to the task until we are more anxious to Christianize America than we are

(2)

G.W. Fortu

to build up our own church; until we are willing to lose ourselves if the world can thus be won to Christ.

III. DO WE DARE ACCEPT THE CHALLENGE THAT COMES TO US FROM ALL PARTS OF THE WORLD AND GO FORWARD INTO THE NEW DAY?

Are our missionary leaders ready to lead us into the enlarged programme which God, through the need and unrest of the world, is challenging us to accept? We dare not mark time when nations are in a plastic condition ready for the moulding.

We must not get the impression that the task is almost done. Two out of three of the world's inhabitants are ignorant of Christ. China has 1,500 walled cities without any Christian worker. If America were China, South Carolina would have one doctor; North and South Carolina together would have one hospital. We say that it is glorious that there are nearly half a million Christians in China, but we must remember that 438,000,000 people live there. Notwithstanding all our successes, Christianity has not been able to overtake the increase in the non-Christian population. What is needed is a general advance in missionary endeavour.

We must be guided rather than confused by surveys. When our missionaries tell us that their greatest need is more equipment, they do not mean that there is no further need of missionaries. When they tell us that we must give more leadership to trained natives, they do not mean that there is no further need of foreign leaders. When they tell us that the stations which we have established are moving toward self-support, they do not mean that there is no need of establishing other stations.

We must have better equipment. We must give leadership to the natives as rapidly as they are able to assume it. We must encourage our stations to assume self-support as well as self-control. But we must have capable missionaries who have had generations of Christian training back of them to give direction to this work. We must move on into new sections and take possession of them in the name of our King. I sat through the sessions of the Washington Conference and listened to a dis-

cussion of the conditions of the world. I came away with the conviction that there is great need of more missionaries, but that they must be the pick of our young people and must have the best training that it is possible for them to receive. I came away with the feeling that I would rather be a missionary now than in any other period since the beginning of modern missions.

We have a host of young people who want to go and represent us. They have volunteered their lives. Some of them have taken years of training and are standing in line, waiting to be sent. Do our missionary leaders dare take the venture of faith and send them out to the work for which they are prepared? Other splendid young men and women would volunteer if they had any assurance that they would be sent out after they had completed their training. Do our missionary leaders dare encourage them to go on and prepare themselves for the work which challenges their hearts? Do our missionary leaders dare move forward in doing that which needs to be done? Do the missionary leaders dare send out our missionaries under the instructions of the great Head of the Church to make disciples of the nations and trust them as they seek to follow the leading of God's spirit?

Are the churches ready for a forward movement? Will they stand back of our missionary leaders if they move forward in accepting the challenge of the new day? Will the churches provide the necessary funds for the promotion of an enlarged programme? It is unfair to criticize our missionary leaders if we have given them reason to feel that they cannot count on our support. Will the churches encourage the strongest young men and women to volunteer for missionary service? Will they have a sympathetic attitude toward the problem of giving these young people the best possible missionary training? Will the churches be Christian enough to want the cause of Christ promoted rather than the building up of their own machinery?

Tremendous responsibility rests upon the Church. The Archbishop of Upsala said: "What the world needs is a new soul. If the Church fails to provide that soul, it may be it will have a devil for a soul, and the last state will be worse than the

first." Do the churches have a conception of brotherhood that will enable them to disregard national and race prejudices? Are they unsectarian enough so that they can seek the extension of Christ's Kingdom? Is their faith in their brethren strong enough so that they can trust those who have consecrated their lives to the service of Christ in difficult places? Are the churches broad enough and unselfish enough to feel that Christ's spirit may find a little different expression among other peoples than it has found among us? Will the churches be generous enough to bear the burden of the weak native churches until they are strong enough to stand alone and then permit them to walk in their own freedom?

Are the ministers ready for the forward movement? The ministers are the leaders whom God has placed in the churches, and our progress will be determined by the vision of these men. It is pitiable to see the programme of world evangelization wither under the blighting touch of a narrow-souled minister. It is glorious to see the programme of a church that has been living for self expand under the leadership of a minister who thinks in world terms. Too many ministers are content to merely run the machinery of the church they are serving; their interest is limited to their own community. Christ's ministers in this day of need must think of the churches to which they minister as agencies for service; they must know that when the Church loses itself in making disciples of the nation it finds its own soul.

Can the men and women whom we have selected to lead us in the missionary enterprise count on the support of the ministers? If they are certain that they will have this support, they can lead in a programme of expansion, because they can then count on the backing of the churches. Can the men and women who for Christ's sake are labouring in the difficult parts of the world count on the support of the ministers? They have gone as our representatives; they have a right to claim our sympathy and our support. If they can feel certain that we are back of them, they will know the churches will furnish the means for an enlargement of work.

A. E. Mason wrote a book called *The Broken Road*. It is a tale of India and a young officer whose task was the making of a road. "It came winding down through the passes, over slopes of shale; it was built along the precipitous sides of cliffs; it snaked treacherously farther and farther across the rich valley of Baluchistan toward the Hindu Kush, until the people of the valley could endure it no longer." Trouble arose over the road, and before it was finished the young officer died.

His little boy grew up in England. The spell of the road was on him. He heard of the price paid, and how the road lay an unfinished thing over the hills. At last grown to manhood, he went out to take up his father's unfinished task. It is the story of life. Can't you hear the call of the broken road? Livingston, speaking to the undergraduates of Cambridge, as he went out to Africa for the last time, said: "I go back to open a path for commerce and Christianity. Do you carry out the work which I have begun. I leave it with you." A host of others died along the unfinished road that leads out to a Christian civilization. They left the work with us, we must carry on. May the call of the broken road so grip the heart of the Church that we will have no rest until we complete the highway for our King.

This is no time to retreat, or even to halt. We need to hear the clarion call sounded by Charles Hoyt:

Is this a time, O Church of Christ, to sound retreat?
 To arm with weapons cheap and blunt
 The men and women who have borne the brunt
 Of truth's fierce strife, and nobly held their ground?
 Is this the time to halt, when all around
 Horizons lift, new destinies confront?
 No, rather strengthen stakes and lengthen cords,
 Enlarge thy plans and gifts, O thou elect;
 And to thy kingdom come for such a time.
 The earth's with all its fullness is the Lord's.
 Great things attempt for Him, great things expect,
 Whose love imperial is, whose power sublime!

A. W. FORTUNE.

THE QUEST FOR RELIGIOUS UNITY

BY WILLIAM A. HARPER, LL. D.

President of Elon College, Elon College, N. C.

MEN seek not only for the unity of truth, but, with equal zest, desire also the unity of practice based on truth. As relates to religion, the unity of practice demands the abolition of sectarianism through the union of all believers and the discovery of a religion competent to meet the universal spiritual needs of mankind. There is no sound, valid reason for postponing action in reference to either of these practical necessities. The verity of this attitude will appear as we pursue our two-fold quest.

I. A UNIVERSAL RELIGION NEEDED

There are eleven living religions, each with its scriptures and followers, claiming to meet the religious needs of men and to receive their validity from Divine inspiration. The old view was to regard all of them except Judaism and Christianity as false religions and of the Devil, and we Christians were not so sure about Judaism. A more careful scholarship and a saner understanding of God's relationship to the human soul has modified that attitude, so that to-day all these living religions, as well as the countless others now dead, that have served to bring men into conscious fellowship with the great First Cause, are regarded as messages of God to men corrupted by their own imperfect understanding, but sincere efforts, at least, to comprehend his will and purpose and to interpret the same to men in such manner as to be the guide and inspiration of their life. This view is an inevitable corollary of the immanence of God.

The oldest of these religions is Hinduism, 1500 B. C., with Brahma as its chief deity. It is found in India, the land of its origin, has the *Vedas* as its sacred writings, and numbers more

than two hundred million followers. Its distinctive truth is its affirmation of the immanence of the Divine in the world. It regards human society as a divinely ordained structure and teaches that the goal of existence is union with the Divine. It is non-missionary and practically polytheistic. The doctrine of caste makes it especially distasteful to the mind accustomed to democratic ideas.

Judaism began in the twelfth century B. C., and numbers about eleven million adherents. Jehovah is its God, the *Old Testament* its sacred book, and its characteristic teaching that salvation is obtained through obedience to the righteous God. The Jews have ceased to be missionary, though they are thoroughly monotheistic. They are scattered all over the world, particularly congregated in Russia and the United States.

Five of the world's living religions arose within the century from 660 to 560 B. C. They are Shintoism, Zoroastrianism, Taoism, Jainism, and Buddhism.

Shintoism is the national religion of Japan. It is aptly summarized as the religion of nature-worship, emperor-worship, and purity. Its teaching that nature is a beautiful Divine creation has made all Japanese into artists in appreciation if not in practice. It has sixteen million followers and its chief sacred books are the *Ko-ji-ki* and *Nihon-gi*.

Zoroastrianism, founded by Zoroaster in 660 B. C., with Ahura Mazda as its deity and the *Avesta* as its Bible, is the smallest numerically of all the world's living religions. It numbers about one hundred thousand adherents, who are found in Persia and India. Zoroastrianism has had considerable influence on Christianity. The Magi were Zoroastrians and the Persian King Cyrus is described as Jehovah's Messiah (Isa. 45:1) and as his shepherd (Isa. 44:28). The idea of Satan came from this religion. Other prominent ideas present in both Zoroastrianism and Christianity are angelology, demonology, a great Saviour to come, the resurrection, the judgment, and a definitely conceived future life. The characteristic teaching of the religion is that men, in their struggle with evil, may have the active co-operation of a cosmic goodness.

Taoism is found in China. It was founded by Lao-tze and its deity is The Tao. Taoism numbers in its ranks some forty-three million. Its bible is the *Tao-Teh-King*. It is the religion of the Divine way, which men should humbly follow.

Jainism arose in India in the year 599 B. C., with Mahavira as its founder. Originally it had no deity, but its founder is now worshiped as such. Its scripture is the *Agamas* and it has a million adherents. It is the religion of asceticism. Self-renunciation is its method of salvation.

Buddhism is found in the East and is one of the three missionary religions of our day. Originally it had no deity, but now its founder, Gautama, the Buddha, is worshiped, as are also many and various others. In some forms Buddhism is revoltingly polytheistic. Its bible is the *Tripitka* and its adherents number one hundred and forty million. Buddhism is the religion of a peaceful, ethical, self-culture. Selfishness, it teaches, is the root of all suffering. Salvation it offers through inner purity and self-discipline. Nirvana, the spiritual state in which individuality is "absorbed" into the great cosmic spirit, is the ultimate goal at which each devout Buddhist hopes finally to arrive. It originated in 560 B. C.

Just nine years later, or in 551 B. C., Confucius founded the religion which bears his name. At first Heaven was its deity, but now the founder is more often so regarded. Confucianism is to China what Shintoism is to Japan, only more so. It counts two hundred and fifty million adherents, being out-numbered in the world only by Christianity. Its sacred writings, the famous *Classics*, have been for ages the basis of Chinese education and have moulded the people's character unmistakably. It is known perhaps most appropriately as the religion of social propriety and its most characteristic teaching is that human nature must be essentially good, as being divinely implanted.

Christianity arose in four B. C., and is the most numerous religion in the world, counting about one-third the race or six hundred million in its three great branches of the Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox, and Protestant churches. The scriptures

of the *Old* and *New Testaments* constitute its Bible. The world is its field, even as Jesus, its Founder, declared it should be, and it is more zealously missionary to-day than at any time during the past fifteen hundred years. It is the religion of the love of God and the love of man as revealed in its Founder. It aims to become universal in the earth. We shall examine its fitness to meet this claim more fully.

In the sixth century, or, to be exact, in 570 A. D., Mohammed founded the religion of the Moslem countries, with the *Koran* as its bible, and Allah as its deity. Mohammedanism is a violently missionary religion and now counts two hundred and thirty million adherents. Its symbol is the Crescent in contrast with the Cross of Christianity. It is the religion of submission to the world-potentate, the omnipotent God, who is not only sovereign, but also judge and rewarder of his subjects. Mohammedanism began in conscious opposition to Christianity, and is a strange mixture of Hebrew characters with the prophet's own ideas and interpretations. Its monotheism, its most characteristic teaching, it inherited from Judaism, and so it has not added a new idea to the religious conceptions of mankind. But for the crude and revolting tritheism of the Syrian Christians, whom Mohammed knew intimately, it is doubtful if this arch contestant with Christianity for the universal homage of men's hearts would ever have originated. John 14:16 and 16:7, 12-14 Mohammed interpreted to be a literal prediction by Christ Himself of Mohammed's coming.

The youngest of the religions is Sikhism, founded in 1469 A. D. by Nanak and confined to the land of its origin, India. It has the *Granth* as its scripture and worships God as the True Name. Three million persons accept its teachings. Sikhism originated as an effort to harmonize Hinduism and Mohammedanism. It is known as the religion of the disciples of the One True God and the chief religious duty it enjoins is active discipleship in his name.

An examination of these religions reveals something of permanent value in each of them, which evidences the soundness of the position that God did speak to their founders,

though they also contain many things of doubtful authenticity. The universal religion will need, and will have in it, affirmation of the immanence of God which Hinduism especially teaches. The universal religion will also accept Jainism's self-renunciation as a condition of salvation, Buddhism's teaching of selfishness as the cause of misery and of relief from suffering through inner purity, and Sikhism's demand for discipleship of the One True God with trust in his Name. It will also include Confucianism's belief in the essential goodness of human nature as divinely implanted, Taoism's behest to walk in the Divine way, with Shintoism's recognition of nature as a beautiful Divine creation. Judaism's affirmation of obedience to the God of righteousness as the sure means of complete satisfaction, the universal religion will undoubtedly accept. The conflict of good with evil forces and the belief that cosmic righteousness aids the good in this conflict which is Zoroastrianism's chief and fundamental contribution to religious conception, the universal religion will incorporate in its creed. And though Mohammedanism has supplied mankind with no new religious idea, its unrelenting insistence on monotheism and on man's duty to submit to the omnipotent God as being the means of superlative satisfaction, the universal religion will accept as its own.

But every one of these ideas is part and parcel of Christianity. Everything, therefore, that is of permanent and abiding value for the spiritual aspiration of the race is preserved for us in Christianity and is heightened and glorified in its setting there. Every great soul-stirring utterance, passage, message, or truth of the bibles of these other religions is paralleled in the Bible and as nobly expressed there, if not, as the almost unanimous verdict has it, more nobly expressed there. It would appear that Christianity has vindicated its claim to be the completional revelation for all the religions of the world, that it includes within its teachings all that is really God's truth in each and every one of them.

But Christianity can go further than that and claim that its teaching as to the great issues of life, for the solution of

which men's hearts have cried out in every age and land, is not only the most satisfying the world has yet received, but that it is so completely satisfying that it can reasonably be said to be final and ultimate, final and ultimate in concept, but requiring the unfolding experience of man to comprehend it in all its joyous beauties and varied interpretations. A brief examination of these vital issues will be convincing. We need not study them in all these living religions, but only in the three that are missionary. The one of these three that shall best answer for us the questions as to God, as to man, as to the world, and as to destiny may reasonably claim for itself the right to be accepted as the universally satisfying religion of the world. These three missionary religions are Buddhism, Mohammedanism, and Christianity. We will examine their teachings relative to these four great questions.

Christianity's conception of God as our loving spiritual Father satisfies the deep heart-hunger of the soul for a unifying principle that shall be all-inclusive in the spiritual realm. The Mohammedan conception of God as arbitrary and partial in his dealings and relations with men appals and repels us. The Buddhistic conception of Him as spiritual force and as untouched by our life, its infirmities or its achievements, fails to quicken us to noble action. But our Christian view of Him as present in his world, as vitally concerned in the consequences of our conduct, as grieved when we sin, or rejoiced when we achieve victories for his cause, as in every instance loving us, no matter how far we stray from his ideal way, such a conception wins the hearty assent of all men everywhere. The Christian God is the kind of God the world needs. We rejoice that our religion is privileged to make Him known to all mankind. We are confident they will love Him when they know Him as He is. For such a loving spiritual Father we are inwardly moved to undertake any conceivable task. Nothing is too high which his followers feel He wishes them to undertake and nothing too menial.

The Christian conception of man, too, satisfies the universal yearning for a unifying force, capable of welding the

paces of men into a social solidarity that shall end strife and enthrone peace and righteousness and good-will as the ruling passions of men's hearts. The Mohammedan religion debases man into a plaything in the hands of Deity. Buddhism holds before him the enervating absorption into Nirvana, wherein personality is regarded as the chief of evils. Our Christian religion regards man as the child of God, the object of his loving solicitude, and as brother to every other man. Spiritual Fatherhood and Spiritual Brotherhood are the obverse and the reverse of the same great conception. As brothers, so teaches our Christian faith, we must do all that becomes brothers, such brothers as the children of a loving spiritual Father should be. How puny and pitiful appear the quarrels and jealousies of men one for another in the glorious illumination of this conception of Brotherhood! Christian Brotherhood!—what infinite possibilities it offers us to exemplify the tender affections of the family life in all the experiences of living! Such conception of man as Christianity teaches satisfies the noblest longings of the heart. It honours man as the child of God and it honours God as the Father of man.

In its conception of the world our Christian religion takes sharp issue with the two other missionary religions of the world. They both agree in conceiving the world as something vile and essentially evil. The Buddhist would escape from its pollution. The Mohammedan would use it as a means of sensuous enjoyment. Our religion regards it as the handiwork of God, as eminently serviceable to the life and growth, even the spiritual life and growth, of man as essentially good, as a challenge to men to transform it wherein it is lacking, as the arena of action wherein is eventually to be realized the democracy of God. We are commanded to subdue the world and replenish it. The Christian view further conceives of God as pleased when the world and its forces are made more serviceable to the life of man. The world of the Christian can, therefore, be no static world. Progress and achievement must be characteristic of it. They have been characteristic of it and will continue to be, world without end.

But religion has also to do with destiny. To what end are all these conceptions to converge and wherein is their fulfilment to be found? We must satisfy the cry of the human heart here or we shall miserably fail. The world's religions have answered the question, but in their answers there has been a marvelous divergence of conception and a marvelous disparity of satisfaction. The Mohammedan believes in a sensuous continuation of the life that now is, with all the passion and partiality that their God is even now conceived as practicing and as delighting in. The Buddhist hopes to attain to the state of complete bliss, of endless nothingness, incorporation into Nirvana, the all-soul of unconscious spirituality. The Christian looks forward to an endless growth in spiritual concept and power, untrammelled by physical limitations, to a spiritual life begun on earth, never ending and with infinite challenges to progress, wherein he shall be satisfied because he shall see Christ as He is and grow progressively more and more like Him. For the Christian there is no break between the spiritual life of earthly experience and the spiritual life of heavenly bliss. The spiritual life we initiate here ripens and fruits into completeness of realization as the years of eternity shall unfold. This conception satisfies. The heart of man assents and the spirit of man rejoices in the prospect of such a destiny, a destiny justifying God in the creation of man and the world, a destiny worthy of the sons of God.

We have in Christianity, in addition to these splendid teachings, the wholly original concept of the Holy Spirit, or God active in his world and speaking to his children. The Holy Spirit will eventually succeed in bringing the minds and hearts of all men into complete unity with God and his truth in every realm of experience and fact, and so also into unity with each other and, therefore, necessarily into a unity of religious concept and expression. A universal religion is the goal of the Holy Spirit, the active spiritual principle in men's hearts leading them into all truth. When the universal religion is fully come, it will be the achievement of the Holy Spirit. This teaching is not only a distinctive characteristic of the

Christian religion, but it is absolutely necessary if religion is to be freed from the tyranny of religious cranks and fanatics and false prophets.

For these solid reasons, therefore, we may re-affirm our confidence that Christianity is fitted to become the universal religion of mankind. Either of these reasons would make a strong presumption for the religion that could rightfully lay claim to it. The possession of both of them makes the claim of Christianity practically incontestable. The fact that Christianity includes all the ideas of permanent and abiding value in each of the other living religions, and the further fact that it answers satisfyingly the great religious issues of the ages, encourage us to accept it as the universal religion, the religion that shall ultimately number all the men and women and children of the world in its ranks, that shall reconcile man to God and God to man in a perfected order to which we may give the name Kingdom of God. The demand for unity in religious concept is thus fully met in Christianity, and the promise of its ultimate realization is guaranteed by the Christian teaching as to the presence and work of the Holy Spirit.

II. A UNITED CHRISTENDOM NEEDED

But what of the sects? The present divided and competing situation of the Christian Church does not satisfy the heart. Denominationalism cannot justify its presence quite so well as these living religions could justify theirs. They can claim that they are earnest efforts to understand the mind of God for man and to discover his truth. But denominationalism must confess that it has sectarianized the finest revelation of God's truth the world has ever known or dreamed of. These living religions are partial because their founders were unable to comprehend the whole spiritual truth of God. Denominationalism is likewise partial, but for a far different reason. The founders of the sects in Christianity were unwilling to accept all God's spiritual truth, so they built fences around sections of it. John R. Mott has boldly said that the organic sin of the Church to-

day is its disunion and that a heathen world is the price we pay for a divided Christendom. We need a League of Nations assuredly, but we need most of all a League of Churches. The nations of the world must disarm, but the denominations must disarm too. Denominational disarmament is a crying need of the hour. The youth of the Church to-day are for union, for Christian union, because their hearts tell them that unity must characterize every cause that hopes to continue permanently in the ministry of life and because their Master prayed for the oneness of his followers. Anything He prayed for they are willing to accept as desirable and necessary for the coming of his Kingdom. Youth are for Christian union.

Aside from the co-operative and interdenominational agencies and organizations, such as the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the International Council of Religious Education, the Council of Church Boards of Education, the Home Missions Council, and many others, which some think tend to intrench the denominations more firmly in their historic positions and separateness, by furnishing a sort of lubricant for the inexcusable frictions of sectarianism that would otherwise inevitably arise, there are many signs stimulating hope for Christian union.

There has just been printed by the Oxford University Press for Rev. G. K. A. Bell, Dean of Canterbury, a book that treats the problem of Christian union for the years 1920-24 from the documentary standpoint, and there are ninety of these documents, itself an impressive fact. All these documents have originated since the World War, and all but three of them have originated since 1920. Being an Anglican, the author naturally is interested in the documents that have grown, for the most part, out of the Lambeth Conference of 1920. "Faith and Order," he thinks, are the hope of a reunited Christendom. The Church divided over these two issues and we have a long way to go to unite it on these bases. The fact, however, that ninety documents in five years have sprung forth with this idea in mind is heartening to those of our day who are tremendously

interested in Christian union as a hopeful means of promoting the religious progress of mankind.

Christian union is being approached from the Federal point of view in our country. On February 6, 1920, the American Council on Organic Union of Churches of Christ adopted its "Plan of Union." This plan granted autonomy in purely denominational affairs and provided a Council with four specific functions as follows:

(a) The Council shall harmonize and unify the work of the united churches.

(b) It shall direct such consolidation of their missionary activities as well as of particular churches in over-churched areas as is consonant with the law of the land or of the particular denomination affected. Such consolidation may be progressively achieved, as by the uniting of the boards or churches of any two or more constituent denominations, or may be accelerated, delayed, or dispensed with, as the interests of the Kingdom of God may require.

(c) If and when any two or more constituent churches, by their supreme governing or advisory bodies, submit to the Council for its arbitration any matter of mutual concern, not hereby already covered, the Council shall consider and pass upon such matter so submitted.

(d) The Council shall undertake inspirational and educational leadership of such sort and measure as may be proper, under the powers delegated to it by the constituent churches in the fields of Evangelism, Social Service, Religious Education, and the like.

Eighteen denominations through accredited representatives assisted in the working out and endorsement of this plan. The collapse of the Interchurch World Movement cast a damper over the whole programme and it fell into a state of quiescence. However, interest has again revived in it and action has been taken by the National Council of Congregational Churches approving the plan in substance.

Still another point of approach is that of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, by which there was held a world gathering at Stockholm in August, 1925. The "Life and Work" movement is placed by Dr. Bell in his book, in the appendix, as not being in favour of Christian union, since it does not accept the attitudes of the Lambeth Conference. When

Christians, however, learn to work together, they will see the folly absolutely of dwelling in partitioned-off camps and compartments. The "Life and Work" Conference was eminently worth while as a beginning.

In Canada the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches have united. This union was effective June 10, 1925. The Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church South in the United States have been working hard for union, losing in the South and winning in the North. The Lutheran churches of the United States have come together in a splendid way. The Christian Church has held parleys with the Disciples and the Free Will Baptists. Presbyterians and Congregationalists, Presbyterians and the Reformed churches are trying to unite. Other parleys or conferences are being contemplated. Christian union in the mission lands is in many places an accomplished fact. *The Christian Union Quarterly* gives every one who has a message on Christian union an open forum for the expression of his opinion. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is teaching Christians of more than thirty denominations to work together, and, while it officially denies its aim to be Christian union and sedulously excludes the subject from its programmes, findings, plans, and utterances, yet, as a by-product of its efforts, it is rendering service on behalf of a reunited Christendom.

WILLIAM A. HARPER.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY THE MOST REV. F. E. J. LLOYD, D. D.

Primate of the American Catholic Church, Chicago, Ill.

GREAT and powerful among the nations of the world, there is every reason why the United States of America should have a Christian Church of its own. For reasons valid and sound, such an American Church should be Catholic. To these propositions the American Catholic Church replies *ad sum*.

Small, perhaps, and, perhaps, late in time, yet the American Catholic Church is of an apostolic lineage more venerable than that of any religious body in the land. Her Orders issue from St. Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, and the line has been continued to this day. But, since a valid ministry is not, of itself, sufficient for Christian or Catholic unity, the American Catholic Church maintains the necessity, complete and absolute, of holding inviolate the faith once for all delivered to the saints (St. Jude), and because that faith is enshrined therein, she accepts the Nicene Creed without addition or subtraction, qualification or amendment. She also acknowledges the dogmatic decrees of the seven ecumenical councils, not merely in themselves, but as the fundamental basis of unity. In common with Catholic Christendom she believes in seven sacraments, as being a clear and concise statement of the doctrine always held therein. The American Catholic Church neither respects nor accepts the novel dogmas proposed in recent years by a considerable section of the Christian Church for acceptance by the faithful, as further means of grace ordained by Christ or authenticated by their unexpressed assent. In agreement with St. Augustine she teaches and holds that anything new in Christian doctrine is, therefore, false. She recognizes the five Patriarchates of Christendom, to one of which, that of Antioch, she herself belongs, and thence deriving as well her mission as her apostolical succession on behalf of the Americas.

Clerical celibacy in the American Catholic Church is left to the individual minister, not insisted on by her discipline. Her services are generally said and sung in the vernacular. No adoration is offered to pictures or images of sacred persons, though they are venerated as their representations. Holding that there is and can only be one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus, she, nevertheless, believes it to be both a good and useful thing to invoke our glorified brethren as we invoke the prayers of our fellows on earth. Finally, the Vincentian Canon—that is to be held which is of all places, of all people, and of all times—is her chart, and this to be sailed by by him who believes in unity concerning things necessary; in things doubtful, liberty; and in all things, love.

In spite of the Puritanism of New England, it may be asserted, without fear of contradiction, that there is no such thing as an American Christianity. Here we are not, for one moment, forgetting the cordial differences that men have on the vexed question of nationalism versus Catholicism or nationalism in religion: but, if the Mozarabic Church of Spain, the Gallican Church of France, the English Church of England, and, the Roman Church of Rome, why not the American Church?

The great and good Bishop Daniel S. Tuttle, D. D., then Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, preaching in St. Louis, at the opening of the General Convention of 1916, is reported to have said: "We want to have an American flavour in our church. When an approaching unity seems somewhat to materialize, we want to offer to our fellow Christians of other names round about us an American religion with an American flavour as our contribution." And a year earlier Bishop Anderson of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Chicago, in an address given in Orchestra Hall, Chicago, on Easter Sunday evening, 1915, is reported to have said: "Christian unity is necessary to give organic expression to the religious life of the nation. The Catholic Church is world-wide, but just because it is catholic it is also national in tone and temper. We love to call this a Christian nation, yet we shrink from attempting to define what American Christianity

is. The United States has millions of Christians and scores of churches without a Christianity that is distinctively her own. What is American Christianity? Is it not largely an importation? It is one thing to inherit Christianity in its essence; it is another to import foreign characteristics. We have imported certain national types which took their form and shape in other lands—an Italian Christianity from Italy, Lutheranism from Germany, Anglicanism from England, Presbyterianism from Scotland, Orientalism from Asia Minor,” and then asks: “Is there nothing to look forward to except the permanent establishment of foreign types on American soil?” Describing the religion of America, Bishop Anderson concludes: “It’s a heterogeneous conglomeration of imported traditions,” and, finally, inquires: “Is there not to be a Catholicism that will express the religious life of America, as Americanism expresses her national life?”

It is certain that no religion but the Catholic expresses the fulness and wealth of the Christian revelation. At least this is admitted by an ever-increasing number of our religiously-eager people. Never were we so enthusiastic about religion as we are to-day, despite the calamity howlers. Never were the rank and file of Americans so devoted to the Person and Work of our common Redeemer. Yet, we are told, over and over again, that Protestantism is played out, and Catholicism is flowing in a strong tide upon our shores. There is not one fundamental doctrine of any Christian denomination that lies outside the Catholic content, nor, to become Catholic, would there be the least need for the abandonment of such doctrine. Here is where so many fall into grievous error.

Too long has the venerable title “catholic” been used in a narrow and restricted sense, too commonly has it been applied to what is demonstrably un-catholic, so that our perceptions of what is and what is not catholic have either been blunted or surrendered. *Catholicus sum* meant the same to early followers of the Divine Saviour as *Christianus sum*. For centuries they were convertible terms. It will be so again in that glad day

when terms denoting Christian fellowship and unity are properly placed and rightly used.

I can see no reason why a Christian Presbyterian or Baptist, Methodist, Disciple, or Protestant Episcopalian should abandon anything but his sectarian—shall I say—*animus*, on becoming a Catholic. Neither should I be willing, as a Catholic bishop, to assume the dreadful responsibility of refusing to give the precious Body and Blood of our Redeemer to any duly baptized person who believes in Him as God and Saviour who might seek to be fed from our altars. In an earlier period of my life, when the veil was still over my eyes, I taught the exact contrary of this. But wherever the Table of the Divine Lord is spread, there ought his children to be fed. For we do not array a sectarian Table, nor call it by the narrow names of our distressful divisions, but 'tis his Table, 'tis his sacred Body and Blood, and to be fed with his Life is its primal and final purpose.

The American Catholic Church stands among the sects that mar the Divine Body in such grievous ways to-day, as holding the fulness of the Christian faith, so to speak, in one hand, for the Catholic, and, in the other, the open Bible for the Evangelical. And, without any idle boasting, we may be assured that the American Catholic Church is the only body in the United States that can do this without let or hindrance. Moreover, we who are of her are more than willing. We preach in any Christian church whenever we are privileged to do so, and ministers of the churches around us preach to us. Until we come to a recognition of this natural relation each to the other as Christians all, the day of Christian unity will never dawn on our denominationally-stricken land. How easy it was for us to fall in line, and into step, to fight our brothers to the death across the sea! How hard, it seems, to come together for Christ's sake, and to wage a united war against his foes!

To repeat. Let it be said with emphasis that, since Catholicism is setting in because Protestantism is getting out, and because there is, therefore, need of a church that is as truly American as truly catholic and Christian, and because there does not appear to be any such among us to-day, therefore, it is

time that the call to unity of the only truly American Catholic Church there is should be heard. To the last one among us there should be no reason — there cannot be a sound one — against a willing and complete surrender of that which is essentially sectarian in his ecclesiastical denomination. Neither do I feel that there would be, if personal love for the Lord of all was greater—as it ought to be—than any particular denominational characteristic or bias, or even tradition. There is nothing in Presbyterianism, Protestant Episcopalianism, Methodism, or Congregationalism which is essentially that, and no more, that is worth preserving, as against the urge which so many good and sound Christians feel for unity. Yet, not only does there not appear to be any sort of an indication that surrender is possible anywhere, but, on the contrary, millions of money are being collected for the sole object of hardening divisions into edifices of stone. The builders are told to build according to their skill and power at their best, the Methodist, the Baptist or the Presbyterian Church, while others are praying that 'isms might end and unity begin. How hypocritical the demand, even the prayer, for Christian unity under such contradictory conditions!

The sooner we all recognize the fact that the very life of sectarianism is arrayed against the Divine Life, and its expressions rebellion against Christ, the easier will it be for us all to shake hands across the miasma arising from the dark marshes of denominationalism, and agree to meet on a foundation that abides, with a rock under our feet which standeth sure, rather than stones around us in huge buildings which may crumble at any moment. This is the first and the loving duty of those who profess and call themselves Christians among us to-day. The "passionately egotistic sects of Christianity, miserably perverted into the missionary service of their own schism; eager only, in the records of the past, to gather evidence to the advantage of their native persuasion, and to the disgrace of all opponent forms of similar heresy or, that is to say, in every case, of nine-tenths of the religion of this world," as Ruskin describes sectarianism, conceal rather than reveal the face of the com-

passionate Christ, so that He cannot be seen for the institution that bears his holy Name.

There can be no advantage in the competition of sects, nor in the surrendering of truth to conciliate shallow modern thought about the Church. Catholicism is fuller and richer than anything proffered by the denominations, more loyal to honourable and worthy tradition and to history, never seeking other foundation than that which is laid, in order to be faithful to the priceless revelation of the Divine Will, through a Divine Person, which was given to the world two thousand years ago. After all, the one object of the Christian Church is to set forth the Person of Christ, and so to lead to the formation of Christian character. Can our unhappy divisions help, in the least degree, to such a consummation?

While I have good reason to know that among the various Oriental Orthodox Christians in America there is a deep and genuine desire for unity, and a readiness to co-operate, without hesitation, in bringing such unity about wherever they are brought into the discussion or debate, or questioned about it, the same cannot be said of the representatives of the Western Church in the United States. Intercommunion and, eventually, full communion with other Christian bodies of Orthodox soundness in the Faith, are dear to the heart of the Orientals who have come to live, to labour, and to die among us, and it affords me great satisfaction to report that the American Catholic Church is accomplishing much in this direction at the present moment. Thus, every consideration is due to these loyal and faithful, heroic Christians who, either in their own persons, or whose fathers have suffered tortures and death for Christ's sake.

One of the most satisfactory evidences of progress toward Christian unity to-day is the decadence of the advocacy or justification of Christian sectarianism. Schism has no advocate, though some would have us believe that heresy has taken its place. The religious publications to our time bear witness to conditions the more deplorable because unnecessarily brought into the open. Nine-tenths of the articles and editorials published in the pages of these journals are employed in contro-

versial strife and debate, to the discomfort of Christians, to the disparagement of Christianity itself, and to the dishonour of our Divine Lord and Master. This ceaseless strife is the greatest obstacle we who are intent on seeking the peace of Zion and the coming together of the flock of Christ, have to contend against; but no voice is lifted nor pen used to strengthen schism. This is all to the good, and if it were possible to allay, and finally, to destroy, the prevalent spirit of controversy, or to confine it to the schools rather than to our public prints, great and valuable progress would be made toward unity.

In common with all religious bodies in the United States, the American Catholic Church claims no legal status that is not theirs. However, by her entire aloofness from politics, her complete indifference to the power or authority of money (a large proportion of her clergymen work without salary), her independence of Rome, Canterbury, Moscow, or any other foreign power, her loyalty to the Faith of undivided Christendom, her unassailable catholicity, her steadfast and frank loyalty to the American Constitution, and by her earnest and single purpose to provide Americans with the fullest opportunities of enjoying all the fruits of an unimpaired Christianity, and helping them to practice Christian principles as the early Christians did, to labour, in season and out of season, in the face of every obstacle in the sacred cause of Christian unity, she has only to be known to arrest attention, to capture interest, and to largely increase her power and influence. Never was vision fairer, never opportunity more splendid than hers.

"Nothing," says the *New York Churchman*, "is more certain than this—the religious future of the United States lies neither with Protestantism nor with a foreign Catholicism, but with a catholicism which is fashioned after the primitive model, and dares to bring forth out of its treasury things new as well as old."

✠ F. E. J. LLOYD.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

How Co-operation Strengthens the Churches

It is but natural that I, as a layman and a business man, should feel that many of the principles that make for honest business success should be applied in carrying out the Christian programme. We are engaged in the greatest work of mankind, the promotion of Christian ideals and social betterment. And we have reached a stage where we must apply the same principles of efficiency to our religious activities that are applied in modern business.

That means sacrifice not only from the individual, but also from the denomination in order to bring about economy and co-operation for the benefit of all.

The fact that this organization is seeking to apply better business principles to its activities will bring us the full support of the Christian business men. These men have at times been disposed to criticize what seemed to them to be inefficient methods of church organization. While many of these criticisms may not have been justified, we must admit that some of them were. However, I feel that the Ohio Council of Churches can now show to these business men an efficient organization that has united most of the Protestant bodies in co-operative work.

In speaking of co-operative effort among denominations there comes to my mind the thought of friendship.

I place a great value upon friendships, and upon any agency that tends to promote them. And to my mind the Council of Churches can do no greater service to humanity than to bring people of different denominations together in the atmosphere of Christ's teachings so that they may better understand each other and draw upon each other for the strength that they need to become better men and better Christians.

Never before has the need for understanding throughout the world been so great as it is to-day. Misunderstanding has been the cause of much suffering not only among individuals but among nations.

For this reason I say that if we as a group of men—small in numbers perhaps in comparison with the great work to be accomplished—can demonstrate what can be accomplished by

unity of action as churches and by individual sacrifice, we have the opportunity to set in motion an influence that is capable of bringing about wonderful results.

As leaders in religious thought and action, we urge sacrifice and harmony upon others, therefore, it behooves us to practice it thoroughly ourselves. We have all agreed that the programme of Protestant unity and principles upon which we are seeking to solve interdenominational problems is for the best interests of Christianity. Therefore, we should try to outdo each other in their solution. There is only one way, and that is by denominational sacrifice. Each should give his best thought and influence to solve the over-churching problem that exists in this state, and with which you are all familiar.

This, in a sense, might be termed the application of business methods to the church problem. But it means more than just plain financial economy. It will bring about greater harmony, happiness, and religious thought in every community to which it is applied.

[From Harvey S. Firestone, President of the Ohio Council of Churches, in an address before the annual meeting of the Council.]

Contacts Create New Understandings

THE fact that a few extreme partisans, both of the ultra-liberal and ultra-conservative camps, seem determined to prove by their own utterances and examples that dissension and cleavage, and not catholicity in temper and attitude, must be the chief and basal expression of religion to-day, should not deter those who, in patient hope and action, seek to maintain and promote the contacts and co-operations that may produce a better understanding, both of truth, and on the part of all who seek truth in relation to one another.

Understanding and sympathy are the crucial needs of the age. The highest aim of discussion and controversy in the thought and purpose of the best men is not the furtherance of their own opinions but the hope of attaining and establishing truth. The man who is not ready to abandon error, no matter how intensely he may have regarded it as truth, has not the love of truth in him. How are men to know one another, and to help one another, and to help great causes which are commonly recognized as good, except along the lines of federation

and co-operation? The assumption that men of wide differences of temperament and view cannot live and work together is an assumption that is often disproven when they actually do get together.

We shall never make adequate progress toward unity until individual Christians feel the un-Christianity and disgrace of refusing fellowship with other professing Christians. If others refuse fellowship with us, let the responsibility be upon themselves, but the man who, either in the name of liberalism or of conservatism, places restrictions upon Christian fellowship and co-operation is assuming a large responsibility before God.

We are troubled far more in these days by the apparent willingness of many professed liberals to be exclusive, partisan, and militant, than we are by the traditionally exclusive and heresy-accusing policy that persists in conservative circles. Have the words of Edwin Markham lost meaning and significance?

He drew a circle that shut me out,
Heretic, rebel, a thing to flout;
But love and I had the wit to win,
We drew a circle that took him in.

When liberalism thinks more of its creed and opinions than it does of that spirit, it has begun the process of its own betrayal and has denied its highest service in progress. Fighting for truth is never so important as living the truth in love.

With wordliness, selfishness, and everything that partakes of sin, the Christian spirit can have no compromise. There are compromises that are as unholy as anything can be. But the great question confronting Christians of diversity of creed, organization, and temper, faced with the problems of faith and fellowship in the world of to-day, is whether the inclusiveness of love or the exclusiveness of dogma (whether in crystallized creed or in opinion) is to dominate in the attitude of Christian individuals and groups, respectively, toward one another. An inclusive love, producing contacts and co-operations even between honest men who differ, may possibly transform dogma; but an exclusive attitude fighting for its particular shibboleths, regardless of whether they be old shibboleths or new ones, can never create love. The catholicity of love is a creative, reconciling force; the partisan attitude of militancy on behalf of dogma has not the power to enlarge the vision or warm the heart. Love leads men into truth, but militancy lacks the power to lead men into love.

If the plans and practices of federation and co-operation in Christian circles to-day represented nothing more than a desire of men to know one another better, these plans and practices would be eminently justified. As a matter of fact, however, these new contacts are revealing to men how much they have in common. And if, at the same time, they are making clear-cut the essential cleavages and differences, they are placing upon men a new responsibility to justify in the light of truth and of this larger spirit the things that they have long believed. Can one doubt that from either standpoint the newer opportunities of fellowship are making for more wholesome and sounder conditions in the Christian world?

[From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, Mass.]

Is Christian Union Possible?

The Lambeth Conference in 1920 regarded the reunion of Christendom as an "imperative necessity," but in spite of all that was said at the conference or has been said since the different communions have gone along in the same old way perishing from lack of vision and paralyzed in their isolated vocations. The getting together of Christian communions is the greatest question before organized religion to-day. The question of Fundamentalism and Modernism is secondary and will take care of itself, but the greatest demand resting upon Christian institutions now is to get together, at whatever sacrifice to their specific accretions, in the spirit of Christ and his Gospel. There is no force in the customary excuses, evasions, and specific religious inhibitions which have become so painfully habitual. There is nothing short of constructive hypocrisy in the repeated exhortations to resort to "prayer" to further "study," to a dependence upon "spiritual guidance," or "waiting for God," or "the time" which has not yet "arrived," and all the other innocuous patent medicines, placebos, and spiritual pills administered to the credulous and conforming spirits who receive them.

It is nonsense to speak of including Roman Catholics, as we very well know, nor can we delay efforts to unite with other Protestant bodies on the theory that Catholics should be included. To argue that we should include the Catholics is to ignore the Protestants with whom we should immediately make definite progress. Roman Catholicism is much more likely to recognize a united Protestantism than when it is divided.

As the question before the nations is how far they are willing to sacrifice individual sovereignty for a world solution of this problem of international peace—so the question before the churches is how far they are willing to sacrifice their individual characteristics for a solution of “unhappy divisions.” The time calls for this challenge to be met. There is an insistent demand to drop all hypocrisy concerning it and to make a great religious renunciation of non-essential and traditional values which are now emphasized out of all proportion to their worth.

In other words, the demand is to quit the graveyards, to cease this cerebation in the cemetery, and to indulge in a great exodus from all who are either too old or too unwilling to go forward or from all who wish to “remain among the graves and lodge in the monuments”; to go out from the precincts of dead issues into a living world full of prospect and promise.

There are four reasons which demand that Protestant Christian institutions should come together.

1. The first is religious education for the young, about which so much is being said in the daily press. I do not know whether it is possible to have any religious teaching in the public schools. I do not know whether it would be wise to limit the hours of public school instruction and send children to their respective churches to be taught. I am not in favour of this for many reasons, but I do object to the prohibition of any ethical instruction at all for children in the public schools being imposed upon the schools of this country through the influence of non-churchmen, Jews, and Roman Catholics, who should be as zealous for ethical character as any one else. The only way in which these unreasoning competitive oppositions can be met is by the union of Christian Protestantism.

2. Protestant leadership is the most effective force yet developed either in religion or politics against the mistaken principle of “Divine right” which is not by any means dead, either in State or Church.

3. Foreign and domestic missionary effort results in a costly confusion because we can be neither honest nor united in teaching our different brands of religion to unsuspecting foreigners who are now beginning to explain us and criticize our lack of common sense, and our absence of religious fairness; who see through our ecclesiastical competition and who observe that we do not follow the religion which we wish to teach them. The anti-Christian organizations of China constitute a formidable argument on this point.

4. The economic waste in church extension, in over-

churched communities, in the expense of printed propaganda and the persistent upkeep of outworn establishments. These are a few of the things which are for the most part among the graves and in the monuments.

A while ago I was in China and made a visit to Kuling on the Yangtse, six thousand feet above the river, where the missionaries gather for the summer holiday. We have a splendid interdenominational school there which deserves much better support than it receives; all the missionaries are enthusiastic over it and send their children to it in gratitude for such a place. There is also a community chapel constructed sufficiently large to accommodate all the Christians. While there I was invited to preach in the church and supposed that the community church was meant, but to my amazement and bitter disappointment I found the Episcopalians had seen fit to erect their own special building which stands there as an eloquent monument to that sort of denominational superiority, which in such a place amounts to a scandal, and makes a pitiful contradiction to the spirit of the schoolhouse which stands just beyond it. This is a fine specimen of what virulent denominationalism leads to, in a summer resort for resting missionaries of all communions.

In Pittsburgh, a Presbyterian and an Episcopal Church stand side by side as an architectural illustration of Divine separatism. In New Haven, Conn., on the old green in the center of the city are three churches in a row, side by side, which is one of the most fortunate and delightful exhibitions of sectarian snobbishness to be seen anywhere in this country. I am glad they stand there as they do in order that they may furnish, in any argument on this question, what might be called "Exhibit A," in the case of Unity vs. Separatism.

One wonders how much longer our enlightened conscience will be willing to endure the glittering contradictions to which we give expression. In order to have Christian unity we do not need reconstruction but sincere recognition. Jesus criticized his disciples for rebuking one who was "cating out devils" but who did not follow them. And yet every time the question of Christian unity is brought forward — nearly every communion, and especially our own, harks back to its historicity, its special features, its particular hobby, sanctifying its difference and reconsecrating its distinctions. I venture to say there is not a communion which can show to the satisfaction of a fair-minded critic a single characteristic which now keeps it from union with the others, that could not be scrapped without doing the slightest violence to the Gospel of Christ, not as Churchianity has distorted it but as Jesus discoursed it.

It is well enough to make courteous and neighbourly gestures by inviting other ministers to share in our services, to preach in our pulpits, to sit on a platform at civic meetings, or dine side by side at occasional banquets; this is all trivial, really insignificant, and when everything is said and done a sort of playing to the galleries. If these customs mean anything let us ask ourselves how far we are willing to go with them. I would like to ask what good reason can be given for not immediately calling together the representatives of the various communions right here in this city of New York for the purpose of a free, open, honest discussion of a method for an immediate practical physical union among the churches without any more fuss, but in the spirit of an interdenominational challenge, to say things plainly and mean them honestly, and to do things immediately.

Four things I can suggest as leading to a unity of this kind:

First.—The admission that any Baptism by minister or layman, Catholic or Protestant or anybody else, without any creedal test is a sufficient fulfilment of the Gospel expectation; for Baptism is, after all, a sign of a Christian's profession, an oath of office, a symbolic dedication of life to the highest things we know; and indicates not a complete achievement but a convinced attitude, an oath of Christian endeavour.

Second.—An absolutely free Communion Table, wherever there is one, without any permission or examination or hesitation, but a Communion which will displace our present ex-Communion; that we declare this beautiful act of our belief in a human brotherhood, in our spiritual solidarity and will admit that the Table does not belong to any church of any name whatever, but to the One God whose children we all are, no matter what we call ourselves. When you consider how on an occasion during the war a few soldiers with a log for a Communion Table, opened a bottle of wine and broke a loaf of bread in the name of Him who was broken for our offenses, is any one willing to assert that there was ever a more valid Communion administered since the institution by Jesus Himself than on that occasion? Have we not lost something by relegating the Communion to the Altar of the Church instead of sharing it with the Altar of the home? Why should not a father gather his family around him and break bread and drink wine in his own home in imitation of the Master? The Communion was not instituted on an Altar but in an Upper Room, and my suggestion may reveal how far we have gone from the real spirit

of the Master and how we have actually lost the Saviour in the family and in the home. There is nothing radical in such a suggestion. It is reasonable, natural, spiritual, and homely in the highest sense of that splendid word.

Third.—To value this interchange of pulpits as nothing but a superficial courtesy; for anybody can preach with or without ordination—laymen as well as ministers, as they always have done in every church. It is disgraceful that even this custom has been hedged about with rules and limitations. But I mean to go further than that; I mean to suggest that we should immediately agree that any ordained Christian minister can take part in, share, or perform any ministerial act of whatsoever nature in any of our churches, whenever courtesy or convenience invites him; and that there will be no question or reservation about his validity or right or powers. It will be enough for us as it was for Christ that he follows the same Master and is set apart to his service in the Church of God, which is bigger and better than any one branch of it. To contradict this may be canonical or ecclesiastical, but it is not Gospel and it is not Christ. This challenge will not down. We meet it or we dodge it and that is all. I would like to see the time when an Episcopal Church would call a Presbyterian, Baptist, or Methodist minister as naturally as an Episcopalian, and when these could thus call our clergy—if they could stand it.

Fourth.—That we should become spiritual in our economic commonsense as well as in our worship and stop the extension of new churches in places where there are already churches enough; that, in small communities, where one church is enough and there are four or five too many, the others should sell out and give the proceeds to the church that has the strength, no matter what name it bears or what communion it considers itself to belong to. This may sound destructive, and so it is—for it would require a sharp break with our sanctified selfishness—but it is right, it is Christian, and that should be enough for us.

If these four suggestions find any sympathy it will mean the end of this self-saving spirit among the communions; it will stop all talk among us of historic episcopate, except as an interesting and valuable evolution, because the other communions will be able to go back of all our historicity and show that the Early Church was first Congregational, then Presbyterian, and then Episcopalian. Our boasted evolution is not as old as their origin. We have no more right to ask other communions to receive the episcopate, except as an economic con-

venience, than the Roman Catholics have a right to insist that we shall accept the Pope; both are ecclesiastical imitations of political patterns.

We cannot expect politicians to make much progress in banishing the worship of the God of War until we Christians make progress in acknowledging the Prince of Peace out of a unity of the spirit and the bond of peace among ourselves. No wonder Jesus said: "The children of the world are wiser than the children of light." The one thing that keeps us apart to-day more than anything else is our view of the ministry and its powers. We need to change our emphasis from validity to a sense of vocation and not dwell on the form in the past but on the fact in the present. Perhaps we ought to be reminded that Jesus never baptized any one; that He never heard of what we call confirmation; that St. Paul was a layman and was set apart by laymen to found churches, to baptize, to administer Communion and ordain. He denies that he received his authority from any man. He was not satisfactory to the apostles and we have a very clear record of it, yet he became the greatest apostolic force in Christianity and furnished it directive power. Nor can we charge the Holy Spirit with responsibility for leading us into the distributed organization we have to-day. These things I mention merely to show how we must rethink certain of our satisfactions if we would view them rightly. Many of them are good and ought to be sustained, but all of them should be understood whatever we do with them. The situation calls for a consecrated and heroic action. It is a very significant point in biology that whatever the controlling force regulating earlier stages of evolution may have been, it is certain that from the creature there was a persistent trial and error method, a venture or a brave and recurrent "adventure" to assist whatever force was evolving the differentiated species of the world. This constitutes a great challenge to our time to forget our specific unjust prejudices as the only way of saving our lives. The time calls for a venture on the part of Christian opinion both in Church and State; in the State, to sacrifice individual sovereignty for international success; in the Church, to sacrifice individual satisfactions for the realization of a practical intercommunion with a free and full recognition.

Unless we can move to accomplish these things, our Christian institutions will run into a deserved catastrophe and suffer the humiliation of a well-earned failure. We shall then need an institution for the treatment of pernicious and chronic inertia and of those ills from which we suffer; religious anæmia,

ecclesiastical conceit, sanctified excuses, spiritual complacency, the champion opportunists and obscurantists of the world. We shall company with those who "remain among the graves and lodge in the monuments."

We may escape a social condemnation, but we cannot for long escape a scientific explanation which will be extremely humiliating. Actually we do not believe the God of the African, the Asian, or the Pacific Islander is our God. We are practical polytheists and have created our own peculiar gods—the god of our denominational peculiarities, and we say as of old: "Our God is above all Gods"—in true tribal fashion and competition. We cannot understand that we are all colours of the one light and no one colour can say to another: "I have no need of thee." It takes all colours of the spectrum to make the white light by which men should live. Not as we compete, but as we co-operate, will essential unities be discerned. The rainbow is not a promise of the ending of floods but a parable of the unity of faiths. Physical science teaches us to-day to seek truth by seeking simplicity and unity, and that is the message of the molecule, the atom, and the electron. As there is one primal substance, there is one only Spirit, and we ought to admit it and live it. All nature says: "Be as diverse as you like, but you are one substance, diversity in unity of the one God. Get together all of you—for Good."

[From Rev. Karl Reiland, D.D., New York, in *The Churchman*, New York.]

Creeds and Reunion

WHAT are the conditions necessary for reunion? What is the minimum amount of uniformity and common organization absolutely required, if reunion is to exist? There need be no hesitation nor difference of opinion in answering this question. First, there must be some measure of defined agreement as to what Christianity is. This agreement as to what Christianity is may be called *Union in Faith*, as distinct from other agreements, which constitute *Union in Order*. Christians everywhere are practically agreed that the primary essence of Christianity consists, not in matters of conduct or observance, but in having a certain faith in God as self-revealed through Jesus Christ. This does not mean, of course, that conduct and observance are not, in a very real sense, essential to Christianity, but only that it is from the Christian faith that Christian practice is derived. Christianity is a faith, first and foremost; it

is here that it differed originally from Judaism. What made a man a Jew and a member of the Jewish Church was not the profession of any definite faith, but the fact of his nationality combined with the rite of circumcision. It was the insistence on circumcision, as the one great essential for incorporation into the chosen people, that prevented Judaism, in later days, from becoming an effectively missionary religion. When St. Paul, after severe controversy, finally gained his point, that circumcision was not to be required of Christians, he did not oppose *baptism* to circumcision, but *faith*. Of course, he required baptism from all his converts; but still, what Christianity had put instead of the requirements of the Mosaic Law, was, in his view, not another observance, but faith. From the beginning, therefore, the profession of faith was an absolute essential of the baptism service; so much so that, even in cases of infant-baptism, the Church refused to dispense with it. This profession naturally tended to be stereotyped in fixed forms, and thus it was that creeds grew up as presenting the essential faith which Christians professed in baptism.

One of these creeds, which we call the Nicene, in the end received the formal sanction of a General Council as the best available expression of what the Church believed. This is, as a matter of fact, the only creed which has ever been thus formally and universally approved; and it is now proposed as the fitting basis of agreement in faith for a reunited Christendom. The proposal is wholly acceptable to the Orthodox Church of the East, as the difference between East and West in the clause concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit is recognized now as quite superficial. The representatives of the Free Churches, who took part in the recent Conferences at Lambeth, also agreed that "there should be in the United Church a formal statement of its corporate faith in Christ, as an expression of what is intellectually implied by its confession of Him," and that the Nicene Creed should be accepted "as the sufficient statement of this corporate faith." Rome, on the other hand, has added to what she regards as the essential faith doctrines such as transubstantiation, the immaculate conception, and the infallibility of the Pope, which appear to other Christians to be either untrue in themselves, or at least to be not even implicitly contained in the original belief of Christendom. Thus, to those outside the Roman Church, the Roman position must appear to be at the present time the main obstacle to reunion in matters of faith.

[From O. C. Q. in *The Guardian*, London, England.]

Obstacles to Reunion with Rome

THE chief difference between the Roman Catholic and the Anglo-Catholic presentations of religion, and, therefore, the main obstacle to our reunion with Rome, is a difference in our conceptions of the functions of the papacy. While Anglo-Catholics are willing to accept the Pope as the Primate of Christendom, because of the primacy of St. Peter, they cannot admit the papal claims to supreme jurisdiction and infallibility. Unless those claims can be so interpreted that they will be in accord with Scripture and Catholic tradition, reunion with the papal see is out of the question for Anglo-Catholics.

There is, however, another difference which is almost as much of a bar to reunion, and that is a difference in our methods of worship. While we both stand for liturgical worship centering in the altar, and both celebrate the Eucharist as our principal act of worship, nevertheless the behaviour and spiritual attitude of the average congregation in an Anglo-Catholic church present a striking contrast to those of a Roman Catholic congregation. This contrast may be illustrated by a report of our own recent observations while on a vacation in Europe.

On the Sunday which was the festival of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, June 29th, we worshiped in St. Mark's Cathedral in Venice. We had hoped that on such a festival there would be a Pontifical High Mass, but were disappointed. There were only low masses at side altars. The interior of St. Mark's on that Sunday morning differed little from the *Piazza San Marco*, the interesting public square which is the very heart of Venice. People were walking about in groups, chatting and looking at the mosaics and the shrines. There was no sign of any reverence toward the reserved Sacrament—indeed, no indication that the Sacrament was reserved on any of the altars. Every half hour or so a bell would ring and a priest with his server would enter and begin mass at a side altar. A crowd would soon assemble as near that altar as the limited space would permit. Most of the worshipers would stand, but a few brought chairs with them on which they sat or knelt. Kneeling was the exception. When the bell rang for the *Sanctus*, or the consecration of the elements, the people bowed their heads and remained very still for a moment. After twenty minutes or so the mass was over and the little knot of worshipers went on their way, having fulfilled their Sunday obligation of hearing mass. It is called hearing mass, although not a word uttered by the celebrant was audible, except a *Dominus vobiscum* now

and then. Through most of the mass a verger picked his way through the crowd taking a collection. We saw no rosaries, and only a few books of devotion.

Two Sundays later we went to an eight-thirty mass in an Anglican church in Belgium. The priest wore a surplice and stole instead of the proper Eucharist vestments; but there were two lights on the altar, and the priest genuflected and performed all the ceremonial acts that a Catholic would expect. The congregation—about thirty in number—was devout and attentive and observed a reverent silence throughout the mass. It was not difficult to realize the presence of our Lord. Most of the worshipers followed the words of the service in their Prayer Books or books of private devotion. They all received Holy Communion, and it was evident that this was the main purpose of their being there at that early hour.

We are not criticizing the mass in St. Mark's, Venice, nor the attitude of the congregation; nor are we trying to demonstrate the superiority of the English mass, or the greater reverence of the English congregation. No doubt there are differences in race and temperament which account for the contrast. The point we are insisting on is that there is this marked difference in the atmosphere and methods of worship, and we must take cognizance of it in all that we do or say in the interests of reunion.

[From *The Guardian*, London.]

Avoid Decisions Reached in Fatigue

THE problem of reunion will not be helped forward by quick talk and impulsive resolutions, whether of individuals or of assemblies. There is a certain weakness betrayed when the Church (I mean the whole Church in all its sections) talks so much of itself; for there are things more important than the Church. The Nicene creed has been suggested as a document on which the churches could unite. An episode in its history will illustrate my point.

When Constantine became Emperor of a re-united Roman Empire, he found a divided Church. He summoned the bishops to Nicæa in the year 325, and put before them the scandal of this division. They must decide what was the real Christian faith, get it settled, and stick to it. Everybody knew how sharply Arian and non-Arian were divided, and some saw the seriousness of this issue more clearly than the Emperor did. However, Eusebius came forward with a creed of some antiquity and of

respectable origin, which seemed likely to unite everybody. At this moment, when unity was within reach, the young Athanasius made a speech which hopelessly divided Christendom. A very difficult document was drawn up deliberately to exclude one party, which became a very small party by the time all the signatures were affixed to the creed of Nicæa. There have been those who, with Thomas Carlyle in his youth (though he saw more clearly later on), have laughed at this schism over a diphthong, who, with Mr. Graham Wallas, have thought it absurd that Homoiousians and Homoiousians should have striven to exterminate one another when the world saw they ought to agree. Professor J. B. Bury, the historian, is clearer; he says bluntly that the victory of Arius would have meant the premature disappearance of Christianity.

The whole story is a warning to go to work slowly upon any eirenicon till we are clear what fundamental principles are involved. The fatigue of the war, the emotionalism that it induced, the general decline of interest in religious truth may conspire with higher motives to produce a desire to get things settled and done with; and truth is not served by decisions reached in fatigue.

[From Rev. T. R. Glover, in *The British Weekly*, London.]

Reunion with the Free Churches

THE joint conferences between Anglican and Free Church representatives on the Lambeth Appeal are suspended, but not closed. What are the gains of the meetings already held, and what is the purpose of the suspension? It might be claimed that it would have been a gain simply that the different parties should have met and discussed the subject of reunion, quite apart from results of a more direct character. This is certainly true. But there are two facts about these meetings which are without precedent in the history of English Christianity.

AGREEMENTS AND HOPES

First of all, the meetings have continued without a break for more than four years, and, in the second place, they have left certain very important agreements and hopes behind them. It was more than fortunate that, at the time of the issuing of the Lambeth Appeal, a body had just been created by the act of the different Free Churches which enabled the general Free Church opinion to be jointly and semi-officially expressed. This

was the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, which consists of official representatives of the leading English Free Churches. It at once took the Appeal in hand, its first piece of important work; and was commissioned by the Free Church assemblies to act *not* as negotiator, but as questioner, and for the work of elucidation—it is for the churches individually to negotiate. But this body could do authoritatively in the preliminary stages what distinguished Free Churchmen, unauthorized, could never have done. If it had not been for the Federal Council's existence, it is almost certain that nothing like the progress which has been made could have been made, not from lack of will but from lack of opportunity. And the historian of the Church of England, who remembers other and earlier conferences between bishops of the Church of England and Nonconformists, and their brevity, will be obliged to acknowledge these present conferences as something quite new in their spirit, the range of their discussions, and their duration. A new atmosphere has been created, a new understanding gained all round, and there has been a joint and persistent effort to discover how the long breach may be healed, and union gained.

“ARTICLES OF CONCORD”

Once more the conferences have borne definite and tangible fruit. To my mind, there are two documents—or shall we say *articles of concord*?—which stand out as of historic value. There is, first, the Joint Report on “Church Unity,” adopted by the Joint Conference as a whole, as its first action in 1922. This denotes the basis of faith on which the discussions have gone forward, and states in very positive sentences the deep and definite agreement between the Free Churchmen and the Anglicans on the nature of the Church, the ministry, and the place of a creed in the United Church. The fundamental unity must be unity in faith, and the extent of the agreement reached on, for example, the sacramental character of the Church, its God-given nature, and the continued presence and teaching of the Living Spirit in his Body, is of the greatest encouragement. Indeed, if the principles implied, for both “sides,” in the Report were really studied and carried into effect, all-round union itself need not be very far off. It will not be forgotten, incidentally, that the Joint Conference accepted the episcopate as the means for giving the authority of the whole body to the United Church of the future, and “similarly” accepted the council of presbyters and the congregation of the faithful as permanent elements in the same United Church.

The second "article of concord" was the whole-hearted acknowledgment made by the Anglican members in 1923, that within their several spheres the Free Church ministers represented on the Federal Council "are real ministers of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church." It is not to be wondered at that such a declaration as the last raised questions which could not be answered off-hand in a way completely satisfactory, to the inquirer. But, here again, it is worth remembering that an enormous step forward has been taken when the issue involved is narrowed down to the method of giving such ministers due *authority* outside their own spheres, e. g., in the Church of England. In this alone we perceive great grounds of hope.

IMPATIENT CRITICS

The critics complain that there is now a pause in the conversations. They do not realize the significance of the progress already made, or the quality of the steps taken. There is a little blindness, I think, as well as impatience in their complaint. But the purpose of the pause is clear. It is an agreed pause, the decision of the sub-committee and the joint conference itself, not the work of the Federal Council, whose resolution on the whole matter was a very friendly resolution. And its purpose has been admirably defined by the two archbishops and Dr. Scott Lidgeet, Moderator of the Federal Council, as providing opportunity for "a consideration more careful than hitherto of the results of our labours on the part of the various denominations extending throughout the world, to which the members of our conference belong." Let the rank and file now study and take in what has been done, agreeing in spirit and understanding with what has been agreed by the representatives on each side. Their interest and eager desire is necessary before the next stage can be reached: but with it that next stage will be far more fruitful, far richer in hope for the future union.

It is worth adding that the whole series of documents from 1921 to 1925 will be published almost at once by the Oxford University Press as *The Church of England and the Free Churches*.

[From the Dean of Canterbury in *The Guardian*, London.]

The British Methodist Union Deadlock

YEAR after year the voting in the Wesleyan Methodist Conference on the question of Methodist union goes on with a solid

block opposed to the scheme of union that is before the three Methodist churches. The returns from the quarterly meetings showing approximately a majority of 70 per cent. for the scheme, and the minority of 30 per cent. against it, seem to be an almost unchangeable figure. The supporters of the scheme have made a great gesture for peace in agreeing to a resolution which practically binds future Conferences that no steps should be taken to promote an Act of Parliament without a majority of 75 per cent., not only of the representative Conference, but also of the ministerial Conference. The difficulty in this matter is that the ministerial Conference last year by a very small majority defeated the scheme, and that the conversion of this Conference to a 75 per cent. majority for the scheme seems far removed. It would be disastrous if there were to be a conflict between the ministerial session and the representative session which is composed equally of ministers and laymen. In these circumstances there is a great desire on the part of the supporters of the scheme to find their way to some modification which shall reduce the minority to a figure which would enable them to carry their proposals with a majority of over 75 per cent. This could be done at once if the majority would agree to some definite doctrinal statement which would keep Wesleyan Methodist men in line with the historic Church.

In the Conference of 1923 a resolution was carried in favour of the suggestion of the Lambeth Quadrilateral on reunion that the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed should be the basis of the united church. The words were added "as interpreted by the living church." If the scheme of reunion could be made to comprise this theological basis, a number of those who are now opposed to the scheme would accept it.

The second great difficulty is in the question of the lay administration of the Sacrament. In this case the supporters of the scheme, and the minor Methodist bodies, are fighting for the exceptions and not for the rule. There is no doubt that if Methodist union is carried, the general rule in the overwhelming majority of chapels will be administration by ministers, but this very fact only strengthens the feeling on the part of the ministers of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, that it is merely the anti-ministerial element which leads to the retention of lay administration in the scheme. If the supporters of the present proposal would agree to a definite date, 10 years, 15 years, 20 years hence, when lay administration of the Sacraments should cease, this argument against the present proposals would be undermined. This was the solution arrived at in the London House Confer-

ence between the Bishop of London and a number of other bishops and representatives of the Wesleyan Methodist Church to allow a period during which non-episcopally ordained ministers should continue to celebrate the Sacrament in the Methodist churches of the re-united church, the period being the life of those who had been ordained in the Methodist ministry. Unless these concessions are made it is almost hopeless to anticipate that the next Conference will see Methodist union advanced, and if it is not advanced great bitterness will ensue. This would be a great tragedy.

[From *The Review of the Churches*, London.]

Is There to Be Church Union Among Congregationalists?

WITH a swiftness which has disconcerted some, the three most conspicuous congregational church bodies in America are facing the prospect of union or federation. The possibility has been in the air for several years. At Springfield two years ago the moderator of the national council of Congregational churches, Dr. William E. Barton, declared himself in favour of reunion between that denomination and the Universalists. But within the past three months vague and tentative approaches have suddenly solidified into formal votes looking toward action. While the Congregationalists are suggesting to the Universalists union on the basis of the Kansas City declaration of the larger body, the Unitarians are suggesting federation with the same body on the basis of the common liberalism which they share. And now all three, having placed the matter in the hands of appropriate and official committees, have to ask themselves what they really want to do. There is something almost comic in the near-bewilderment which already appears in some quarters. Church union and church federation are glorious things to talk about; they take on a different aspect at times when the talk passes into action. The Methodists can testify to that. It is far too early to predict what course the negotiations undertaken by the recent denominational conventions will take, or what their outcome will be. There is a definiteness about the approach of the Congregationalists which, at first glance, seems to augur well for the chances of their proposal. The Universalists have given remarkable evidence, during the last two or three years, of their readiness to sink denominational advantage for the good of the Kingdom. With a way apparently

open to wipe out a division which has become meaningless, it is to be hoped that they will not hesitate to enter on it.

[From *The Christian Century*, Chicago.]

Rome and Reunion

A REMARKABLE statement of the Roman attitude with regard to reunion is published in *Le Saint-Siège, "l'Eglise catholique et la Politique mondiale."* The statement is so important that it seems worth while to incorporate a full translation of it herewith, and to publish it without further comment.

Le Saint-Siège, l'Eglise catholique et la Politique mondiale.

BY MAURICE PERNOT

"This need for pacification and religious unity, which shows itself in all Christian circles, is not one of the least interesting phenomena of our times. The committee which is preparing for the World Conference on Faith and Order represents fifteen Christian communions, whose prayers are centered upon the undertaking and whose reports the committee is collecting. At the Vatican for nearly two years, bureaux especially instituted for the purpose have been framing the questionnaires which are to be sent to more than 2,000 patriarchs, metropolitans, and bishops in communion with Rome, and also to the representatives of the dissident churches invited to take part in the labours of the forthcoming ecumenical council. It is not yet known when the council will meet and in what degree the dissidents will respond to the call of the head of the Catholic Church. But it is known that Pius XI considers this assembly as the great affair of his reign and that he is sparing nothing to hasten the event and to assure its success.

"If the problem of union were merely theological in character, or even exclusively religious, it would doubtless be not so hard to solve. But the differences of dogma and of discipline which separate the Christian churches seem nowadays of slight importance in comparison with the oppositions of political interests and of national feelings which keep the churches at a distance from each other. For Anglicans as for Orthodox, the great obstacle to union is the political function which their churches have assumed, and the national tradition which they represent."

[From *The Review of the Churches*, London.]

The Anglican Movement for Reunion

The Anglican movement for reunion—initiated at Chicago in 1886, given educational method at Cincinnati in 1910, and revealing both its largeness of outlook and its dangers at Lambeth in 1920—has helped to develop world-wide realization of the evils flowing from Christian divisions, and general interest in the problem of reunion. On the other hand, as the movement has advanced the dangers by which its promotion is inevitably beset are clearly emerging.

I am not a pessimist. I confidently believe that, whatever may be the outcome of the movement in the near future, in particular of the World Conference movement, much is being achieved that is worth while. The Holy Spirit is working; and even if reactions occur and present hopes are deferred, some day the movement will be resumed with better prospects. Future workers will have gained wisdom from considering present failures. The causes that now hinder mutually separated Christians from adequately and patiently grappling with difficulties will then be more generally realized, and later promoters of unity will profit by present mistakes.

None the less, it is our duty to make the most of the present movement, and as part of this duty to realize and shun the dangers which, if not avoided, will seriously reduce the progress which can be made in this generation. I say "in this generation," for under the most favourable conditions the task of world-wide Christian reunion is quite too large for one generation to complete.

I believe that it is worth while at this juncture to give a review of the Anglican movement for reunion, with a view to emphasizing the corporate principles which have determined its method, even as against misleading utterances and schemes of some of its leading promoters. If in doing this I seem to be unduly critical, the reason is that the success of the movement depends upon realizing and combating the dangers that attend it.

In a future article I hope to deal more specifically with the fundamental requirements of unity—the questions of faith, of order, of corporate worship, and of sacramental practice which are involved.

I. ANGLICAN LEADERSHIP

The present movement for Christian reunion is undoubtedly due to the Holy Spirit; but, humanly speaking, it was given its initial and definite direction in 1886, by the Declaration on

Unity of our American House of Bishops. And, although the movement has since enlisted the co-operation of leaders in many Christian bodies, both Catholic and Protestant, Anglicans continue to be especially conspicuous in its promotion. The reason seems clear, viz., that the Anglican communion has the advantage in such work of having vital points of contact with every section of Christendom.

In common with the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Eastern Churches, this communion retains, in spite of non-essential variations, the ancient Catholic Faith and Order—the Catholic creeds, and doctrinal decrees of the ancient ecumenical councils; the historic ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons, uninterruptedly transmitted from primitive times; the sacraments, administered essentially after the primitive manner; and the Catholic working system of liturgical eucharistic worship, of the ecclesiastical calendar, and of the main lines of spiritual discipline. Even under the confusing conditions of the sixteenth century, the appeal to antiquity served to keep the Anglican Church in line with its Catholic past. We are also agreed with the Roman Church, on the one hand, in retaining various Western forms of theological thought, and, on the other hand, with the Eastern Churches in rejecting the Vatican claims.

In rejecting these claims we go a certain distance at least with Protestants, and in this limited respect the American Episcopal Church describes itself as "Protestant." Moreover, while we consider that Nonconforming Protestants have abandoned vital parts of the ancient Christian system, we accept the main positive elements of their evangelical faith as fundamental to the Christian position. Still further, while we cannot regard their rejection of the Catholic ministry and working system as in harmony with the will of Christ for his Church, we acknowledge the sincerity of their devotion to Christ, and are confirmed thereby in the conviction that the visible fruits of their devotion are evidences of the Holy Spirit's blessing.

These points of sympathy might be elaborated, but it should be sufficient for my argument to add a reference to the patent fact that the Anglican communion has retained and cherished groups of churchmen of diverse types, controlled by the tendency to emphasize respectively the distinctive principles of one or other of the several non-Anglican divisions of Christendom. No Catholic and no Protestant position, *positively considered*, fails to gain sympathetic approval among Anglicans. Is it strange that, under such circumstances, many should regard the Angli-

can communion as peculiarly equipped to be "the Church of the Reconciliation"?

II. THE INITIAL DECLARATION OF 1886

"The Quadrilateral," as it is called, appeared originally in 1886, as part of the American bishops' Declaration on Unity, above mentioned. It has been widely misunderstood, because considered in isolation from its context, and treated as a formal and, therefore, complete list of conditions of reunion. In fact the whole Declaration in question is didactic, and expressly leaves the question of definitive "conditions" of reunion to future conference and study. Inasmuch as this Declaration defines more clearly than any other official document the fundamental standpoint and guiding principles which necessarily determine the general method and the practical possibilities of corporate Anglican action with regard to reunion, it ought to be studied most carefully.*

After several eirenic preliminaries, including acknowledgment that all duly baptized Christians are members of the Catholic Church, and a disclaimer of desire to absorb other Christian communions into the Episcopal Church, the bishops define the fundamental prerequisite of Christian reunion in the following terms:

We do hereby affirm that the Christian unity now so earnestly desired . . . can be restored only by the return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence; which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian Faith and Order committed by Christ and his Apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and, therefore, incapable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men.

In this Declaration four points should be noted: (a) The bishops adhere faithfully to the principle of appeal to antiquity that determined the direction and limits of the Anglican reformation; (b) The Church, the unity of which is in view, is not one that is to be built hereafter by aggregation of diverse denominations of Christians, but is the original and still existing Catholic Church; (c) The world-wide aspect of the problem is put to the fore, "all Christian communions," "for the common and equal benefit of all men"; (d) The essential conditions of reunion, whatever incidental stipulations may have to be made in order to secure mutual understanding and working harmony

* Text given in the *Journal of the General Convention of 1886*, p. 80.

within the reunited Church, are confined to "the substantial deposit of Christian Faith and Order committed by Christ and his Apostles to the Church unto the end of the world."

The bishops proceed to give, not a comprehensive list of these essentials, but certain *leading* particulars which should be reckoned with at the outset in discussions of the conditions of unity. The bishops appear rightly to assume that real agreement concerning these particulars will effectively clear the way to more comprehensive accord. So they proceed to declare—

As inherent parts of this sacred deposit, and, therefore, as essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom, we account the following, to wit:

1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the revealed Word of God.
2. The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.
3. The two Sacraments—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with un failing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him.
4. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his Church.

It is to be noted (*a*) that although the Nicene Creed does not specify all necessary Christian doctrines, it is sufficient *for creed purposes*, and, when sincerely accepted, leads the believer on to a full Christian faith; (*b*) that the requirements as to the so-called minor sacraments, and as to a liturgical form of eucharistic worship, are in no wise abandoned. They remain for future conferences to consider; (*c*) The Historic Episcopate is given explicitly as one of the "inherent parts of this sacred deposit," the deposit from Christ and his Apostles. The common impression that it is specified only as in widespread and long-established possession, and simply on this ground *practically* necessary to be retained in a reunited Christendom, is demonstrably out of accord with explicit contents of the Declaration.

The bishops conclude with expression of "our desire and readiness . . . to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian bodies . . . with a view to the earnest study of the conditions under which so priceless a blessing might be brought to pass."

The Lambeth Conference of 1888 adopted and published the four particulars, or "Quadrilateral" as it had come to be called (unfortunately in isolation from the main Declaration that makes clear its background), as basis of discussion of "home reunion"—reunion with British Nonconformists. This no doubt helped to establish the above mentioned misinterpretation of the Declaration—as meaning that acceptance of the

Quadrilateral, regardless of its background and of other conditions, would be treated by the Anglican communion as sufficient for reunion.

Two solid reasons forbid such a conclusion. In the first place, the Declaration of 1886 still stands as the most definite official statement of the Anglican position with regard to reunion. The failure of the Lambeth Conference to take over the whole of it did not signify any departure from it, but was due to special and opportunist aims of the moment. Moreover, the pronouncement of the Lambeth Conference of 1920, subject to criticism in some details though it be, obviously preserves the world-wide outlook and Catholic background of the American Declaration.

Secondly, the striking enlargement and increased influence of the Anglo-Catholic movement has given renewed emphasis to the historic appeal of the Anglican communion to antiquity, and has immensely fortified the ecumenical Catholic outlook of Anglicans. No plan of reunion which fails to make the ancient Catholic system paramount can be adopted to-day by Anglican authorities without hopelessly dividing Anglicans among themselves.

These are facts to be reckoned with, whatever may be our sentiments with regard to them; and failure to reckon with them will bring disillusionment and a real setback to the cause of Christian reunion.

III. THE WORLD CONFERENCE MOVEMENT

The World Conference proposal was a logical sequel of our bishops' Declaration of 1886. In that declaration they had striven to transcend provincialism, and to keep in view the world-wide aspects of Christian unity. It was from an explicitly ecumenical standpoint that they invited conference for free discussion of the conditions of unity. The only official response came from the Presbyterians in 1887; and they withdrew from conference in 1896, because they could not secure official acceptance from us of the stipulation that "mutual recognition and reciprocity" of ministries should be *presupposed* in the conference.

The propositions of our so-called "Quadrilateral" were didactic. They indicated certain positions maintained by this church as being obvious *subject-matters* of conference. They were not given as *premises* of conference, required to be accepted by all participants at the outset. The bishops aimed to

secure conference *on all obstacles* to Christian unity, and such conference could not be had if determinations of questions at issue were to be required in advance. But, as I have already indicated, the exclusiveness of attention paid to the "Quadrilateral," isolated from the rest of the Declaration, prevented a just understanding; and the World Conference plan, adopted in 1910 by the General Convention at Cincinnati, was designed to make more clear, and to bring to effective realization, the original conference proposal of 1886. It is only by attention to this logical connection, and to the whole Declaration of 1886 above given, that the World Conference proposal can be rightly understood, and certain misapprehensions as to its nature and hoped-for outcome can be removed—misapprehensions in which many of our own people share.

(a) No presuppositions are required for taking part in the Conference except the most central and essential article of Christian faith, that Jesus Christ is "God and Saviour." This does not mean that the several Christian bodies which participate throw their treasured principles into solution, and commit themselves to treating them as subject-matters of compromise or of adjudication by the Conference. It simply means that every difference of Faith and Order that now divides the Christian world shall be faced frankly and courteously, and freely discussed. The aim is *educational*, to promote that mutual understanding which obviously is the indispensable condition of "the return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence . . . the substantial deposit of Christian Faith and Order committed by Christ and his Apostles to the Church unto the end of the world."

(b) In order that no fear of entanglement in compromising actions or pronouncements shall prevent any Christian body from participating, the purpose of the proposed Conference is explicitly limited to "study and discussion, without power to legislate or to adopt resolutions." And it is not proposed as a Conference on Unity; and is not concerned with schemes to bring it about. The proposal is based on the conviction that an unembarrassed discussion of questions of Faith and Order for mutual understanding "is the next step toward unity," and should be the sole business of the Conference. Sacerdotalists and anti-sacerdotalists, therefore, Catholics and Protestants, can freely take part without in the slightest degree prejudicing or imperiling their several convictions. Even if in the outcome

the Conference were to exceed its prescribed limitations, and were to be swept emotionally into doubtful resolutions or pronouncements, these results, while they would reduce, perhaps ruin, the value of the Conference, could not commit any participating communion. They would have no *authority* whatever.

(c) This church has led the way in inviting other communions, but carefully refrains from assuming any dominance in the Conference. All are to "come in on the ground floor." They are "asked to unite with us in *arranging for and conducting*" the Conference. Accordingly, our Joint Commission appointed for the purpose has confined itself to the business of engaging participation, and over seventy bodies have united in the plan, the Roman Catholic Church being the only considerable communion that has not officially accepted our invitation. Non-official participation of Roman ecclesiastics is still a possibility. The business of "arranging for and conducting" the Conference is under the control of a continuation committee, appointed in 1920, and containing representatives of the principal bodies participating in the plan.

My being a member of our World Conference Commission does not, of course, entitle me to reveal unpublished discussions and policies of the commissions and committees engaged in arranging for the Conference. My article, therefore, is concerned only with such developments of the movement as are before the world. But I do not violate privilege in admitting certain abstract possibilities, and in commenting upon them. It is *possible*, as some anxious church people fear, that the continuation committee will not be sufficiently mindful of the limitations originally stipulated for the proposed Conference; and the programme *may* be so arranged as to side-track thorny questions which ought to be freely discussed. And there *may* be disregard of the requirement that the Conference shall not "legislate" or "adopt resolutions." Some of those who have publicly discussed the plan have plainly assumed that the Conference must adopt a statement of agreements. This would require voting, and would be quite contrary to the original stipulation just mentioned, a stipulation regarded as essential at the present stage to effective promotion of unity in its *world-wide* aspect. Until considerable changes of conviction and sentiment have occurred in various quarters, and until a terminology has been developed which will be understood everywhere in the same essential sense, no such statement as is contemplated can fail to be ambiguous and illusory. It is likely to result finally in disillusionment and in mutual irritation and reaction.

Some perception of this, and considerable fears of entanglement in premature and misleading commitments, largely explain the difficulty of securing active interest in the World Conference movement among "Anglo-Catholics." Some of them have indeed taken part—more in England than in America. But, generally speaking, these churchmen hold aloof. They are more alive to the dangers I am defining than to the limited and justifiable purpose of the Conference. And they fail to see that, if the Conference succumbs to its dangers,—such an outcome cannot be made impossible in any human movement,—it will, in any case, leave the Catholic Church uncommitted. Probably its very failure will teach those concerned how large and prolonged must be the task of bringing Catholics and Protestants to that measure of agreement in questions of Faith and Order which is the essential condition of wholesome and abiding reunion.

At this point, a few remarks may be ventured on certain *Ad Interim Statements*, signed jointly by Anglican and Nonconformist leaders, that have been issued from time to time during the past decade, partly in direct connection with the World Conference movement, and partly as a result of conferences held under the auspices of the Archbishop of Canterbury since the last Lambeth Conference. Their common purpose is to define agreements concerning Faith and Order, and concerning some of the conditions of reunion—definitions of limited range, but designed to clear the ground for progress in discussing other questions and conditions of reunion. An examination of these statements proves that in the main they have been carefully and skilfully composed, and have been signed not only in an eirenic spirit, but with grave sense of responsibility. The lofty tone and purpose, the competence and standing of those who have signed them, and the fact that they ostensibly define agreements between Anglicans and Nonconformists not previously acknowledged, these circumstances establish their importance and demand their respectful and patient consideration.

But the point of view from which they ought to be examined and estimated is their value for enlarging mutual understanding between Anglicans and Nonconformists in general and their effect in promoting or retarding the larger aim of world-wide Christian reunion. When thus examined, the statements in question reveal not only important limitations but serious drawbacks. I cannot take space to discuss them in detail, but confine myself to certain broad defects, common to them all, although

in varying degrees, which the several discussions that have followed their publication appear to have established.

(a) They all contain more or less ambiguous language, ambiguous in vital aspects of the questions sought to be answered. And subsequent discussions reveal the fact that they have been signed in mutually discordant meanings. In other words, certain leading propositions are not as significant as they have been thought to be. The agreements which they express, although important, are not very comprehensive. Significant disagreements are side-tracked, and the statements in question are to a degree merely illusory verbal platforms. Their effect is to postpone questions which, so long as they are evaded, will reduce the value of conference in other matters. The Catholic doctrine of the ministry, for example, cannot be enveloped in eirenic phrases of ambiguous meaning with reasonable hope of progress in mutual understanding between Anglicans and Nonconformists. Still more obviously it cannot as between Catholic and Protestant bodies in general.

(b) In so far as these statements express real agreement between those who have signed them, they register progress in mutual understanding for which we ought to be thankful, provided the agreements are such as can finally be approved sincerely both by Nonconformists at large and by the Anglican and other Catholic churches. But, and this is an important limitation, the progress thus really achieved is that of only a few scholars in conference. It is one with which the vast majority of their co-religionists have not caught up. And this fact holds whether we reckon with the subject matters of agreement or with the decidedly exceptional temper and atmosphere of these conferences. My point is that there is danger of exaggerating the progress which these statements appear to register, and that such exaggeration is likely to result finally in disillusionment and discouragement. The statements, at their best, are *ad interim* only. They must be followed by much conference and much education; and they have not assumed, cannot yet assume, a form that can satisfy all who have to be satisfied before actual steps toward reunion can be safely undertaken.

In general, the habit being formed of publishing statements of agreement exclusively is open to two serious objections. In the first place, as has already been indicated, such statements give an illusory impression. They lead men to think that a stage has been reached at which acceptable schemes of reunion, as between Anglicans and Nonconformists at least, can be de-

vised. The fact is that the most serious obstacles to such reunion have not yet been seriously faced. And this suggests the second objection, that a habit is being hardened of evading these more serious obstacles. The important group of questions associated with what is called "sacerdotalism" and "sacramentalism" has still to be directly reckoned with. And if specific preparation for this is not hastened, the proposed World Conference will be seriously limited in value. I repeat that if the sacerdotal and anti-sacerdotal sections of Christendom, both enlisted in the World Conference movement, have not sufficient mutual love to confer frankly, and at the same time kindly and patiently, with each other concerning these questions, they are not ready to take practical steps of any kind toward reunion.

In support of what I am urging, I venture to quote a weighty passage in the late Bishop of Oxford's *Contemporary Review* article on "Reunion."* He writes that "no visible unity is worth having, indeed it would be shattered in a generation, if it is produced by diplomatic language, and is the result of political arrangement. All parties must mean the same thing and know that they mean the same thing.

It was on this rock of opposed interpretations that the attempted Concordat between the Congregational and Episcopal churches in America went to pieces. The Congregationalists sought for Episcopal ordination simply as a means of developing a ministry that would be *more generally recognized* as valid. A large and responsible section of Episcopalians, on the other hand, regarded it as formal sanction of the policy of conferring priesthood on those who notoriously did not believe in priesthood, and who would continue to use their ministry on a non-sacerdotal basis. The doctrine of priesthood was involved, and the evident opposition of convictions concerning this doctrine converted a well-meant step toward future reunion into a new cause of friction and disillusionment. The whole action led into a blind alley.

Unless those taking part in the World Conference movement, both Protestant and Catholic, have sufficiently deep and *patient* love for each other frankly to face the differences which are now being evaded, and seriously work for adequate mutual understanding concerning them, their efforts to promote a true and world-wide reunion will fail. *The time has not come for schemes. A campaign of mutual education — probably a prolonged one — is the only feasible "next step toward unity."* It is

* As quoted by the *Church Times*.

to such a campaign that the Holy Spirit is calling us at present. We need many conferences, conferences unembarrassed by pressure for immediate visible results.

IV. THE RECENT LAMBETH CONFERENCE

The Lambeth Conference of 1920 adopted a series of resolutions on unity and issued "An Appeal to All Christian People." Its language has encouraged many to hope that *effective practical steps toward reunion*, in particular between Anglicans and Nonconformists, may be taken in this generation. Such hopes, however, I believe to be premature. They are not warranted by any real prospect of sufficient removal *in the near future* of the disagreements which, while they continue, preclude wholesome and permanent reunion. They are largely based upon diplomacy, made impressive by its truly Christian and loving spirit, and upon the illusion that a loving will to unite can do duty for *a common mind in the determinative elements* of Christian faith, order, discipline, and worship.

The Lambeth pronouncement is in certain respects most notable. Its spirit is splendid, so splendid indeed that, open to criticism as some of its propositions are, its defects are not likely to nullify its influence in deepening the mutual good-will that is the first condition of progress in conference toward mutual understanding and toward the common Catholic mind upon which healthful reunion depends. None the less, while its standpoint is clearly ecumenical and Catholic, so that it has been received with a degree of approval by some Anglo-Catholic churchmen, the optimism of its framers as to possibilities of progress toward reunion in the near future has led to the inclusion of premature proposals, and to language that is illusory and unsatisfactory because ambiguous. Several illustrations may be given.

(a) The bishops say, "We believe that for all, the truly equitable approach to union is by way of mutual deference to one another's consciences." This language is ambiguous. Very likely the bulk of the bishops meant merely to define the spirit in which present conferences should be conducted — that we should not be impatient with those who are as yet unable conscientiously to agree with us. But this is not clear. The language used is readily taken to mean that divergence of conscience concerning the things that now divide Christendom need not prevent reunion, if we agree mutually to disregard or tolerate them. In brief, a shelving, rather than a removal, of them seems

to many to be suggested. Only if we qualify the bishops' language, by making it refer exclusively to non-essentials, can we justify such a proposal. In the field of convictions that determine consciences as to corporate faith, order, and common worship a common mind is indispensable. "Mutual deference to one another's consciences" when reunion takes place must have become unnecessary *in determinative matters* as between the Christian communions that reunite. It is to be remembered that the "Appeal" is concerned with conditions of *corporate* reunion—not with the tolerance that may be practiced toward the weak consciences of particular private individuals. It is agreement in the determinative elements of Faith and Order—not mutual deference in conscientious disagreement—that is required for reunion. The point is vital. We must frankly face our disagreements, and the general failure thus far to do this is proof that the mutual understanding and agreement which will make schematic proposals worth while is not yet in sight.

(b) The bishops "would say that if the authorities of other communions should so desire, we are persuaded that *terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted*" (italics mine), "bishops and clergy of our communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in one common life. . . . It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship. In so acting no one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry. God forbid that any man should repudiate a past experience rich in spiritual blessings for himself and others. . . ."

This language, as Nonconformists have quickly perceived, contains an important ambiguity. The bishops suggest mutual interchange of ministerial commission or recognition, but describe the proposed commission of Nonconformist ministers by us as "episcopal ordination." Nonconformists naturally ask if this does not imply the invalidity of their previous ordination. The unexpressed fact that we cannot consistently acknowledge the validity of such ordinations *for the Catholic Church* no doubt explains the bishops' halting language; but the result is not happy.

In any case, their proposal is hopelessly premature. That the suggested double procedure will be either necessary or

desirable when terms of union have been "otherwise satisfactorily adjusted" is very doubtful indeed. When that glad day arrives the anxiety for "saving of faces" will undoubtedly be completely overshadowed on all sides by the joy of union under one Faith and Order. And so long as Nonconformists require explicit recognition of the spiritual claims of their denominational ministries, they will be handicapped in facing the real question — "What common ministry answers to the will of Christ for his universal Church?" Very few churchmen fail to perceive that the Holy Spirit has blessed the work of non-episcopal ministers. But to require or concede an acknowledgment of this in formal action or concordat is to include among the terms of reunion what is not essential to the reunited Church. It is likely also to imply a view which Catholic churches cannot consistently affirm—the view that the origination of non-episcopal ministries was consistent with the arrangements of Christ for his Church.

(c) Closely related to the above are the proposals, under the same conditions,—that is, when actual reunion is being satisfactorily advanced,—to permit the interchange of pulpits and the occasional admission of Nonconformists to the privilege of communicating at our altars.

These proposals are also premature. The conditions under which they are suggested do not exist, and do not appear to be yet in sight. Therefore, the effect of such proposals is to encourage uncanonical irregularities; and an unsettlement of the internal discipline and order of the Anglican communion is not favourable to the cause of unity. It upsets the peace of loyal churchmen, creates internal disunity, and brings the whole reunion movement under suspicion. The bishops at Lambeth failed to realize that many of those who were to read their optimistic suggestions did not at all understand the formidable nature of the task of bringing about reunion, and were impatient for immediate action. The unhappy and unauthorized participation of English bishops in a Swedish church episcopal consecration, which occurred soon after the Lambeth Conference had adjourned, affords an illustration of impulses needing to be restrained and certain to make for disorder when given the slightest seeming encouragement by high authority. It remains, of course, that the Lambeth Conference is not a legislative body. Its resolutions necessarily have great weight, and may materially affect the future legislation of Anglican churches. But of themselves they make no action lawful for

Anglican prelates which is inconsistent with the existing canon law of these churches.

A prominent bishop of the American church once said to me in substance, "We have been talking so much about reunion that for the sake of consistency we ought to do something. If we are not prepared to take any steps toward reunion, we ought to stop talking."

Undoubtedly we ought to stop the kind of talk that implies the practicability of immediate visible steps toward reunion. It is indeed one of the two principle contentions of this paper that work for unity, in particular between Anglicans and Non-conformists, ought for some time to be confined to educational lines, to obtaining sufficient mutual understanding and agreement in determinative principles. Talk in behalf of immediate steps toward reunion is what needs to be stopped.

But, and this is my other main contention, the right kind of talk should go on, and should be candid and educational. *The differences in questions of Faith and Order should be faced instead of being put aside*, because there can be no reunion worth having until they are faced and settled in their determinative aspects. There is no call, therefore, for abandonment of conference and discussion. What is needed is to get rid of illusions, and to *stop devising schemes* which, for the present, are abortive and interfere with real progress.

[From Dr. Francis J. Hall, General Theological Seminary, in *Anglican Theological Review*, Gambier, Ohio.]

Some Observations on Protestantism and Roman Catholicism

THE writer realizes that he is treading on delicate ground when he attempts to compare or contrast certain aspects of Protestantism with Roman Catholicism and would disclaim right at the beginning any attempt at universal generalizations. It is simply that he has had the privilege of spending one month this past summer at one of the centers of Protestantism where he came in contact not only with the leaders of the church in that center but where a hundred or more of the most outstanding representatives of the German, Swiss, French, and British churches were present also. Then he went to Rome and other parts of Southern Europe where he made the most intensive study of Roman Catholicism possible in the short time at his disposal, but where he had rather unusual opportunities of close

observation. In this editorial he wishes simply to call attention to some of the contrasts that particularly interested him, and he does it for the sake of better understanding. Of one thing he is sure, not much is going to be done in the way of overcoming the great evils menacing society unless Protestantism and Roman Catholicism work together and cease all attack upon each other. The most pitiful sight in Europe was to see Protestants and Roman Catholics in controversy, and even open warfare, while paganism was openly flaunting itself, unchecked and unabashed, in the great capitals of every land.

Perhaps the first contrast one might mention could not better be seen than by doing what the writer did, going directly from Stockholm to Rome. Stockholm is wholly Protestant with hardly one Roman Catholic congregation in the whole city. Rome is wholly Roman Catholic, with one or two Protestant institutions only, which do not particularly touch the life of the city as a whole. The first thing one feels about Christianity in Stockholm is: How distinctively and emphatically *evangelical* it is. The sermon, the Gospel, the word, the personal, free contact of the soul with God: these are the ever present realities. The pulpit is the most outstanding thing in the church. To be sure there is an altar, but it means no more than a plain communion table in any Protestant church. There is "mass," but it is simply a liturgical service such as any Presbyterian or Congregational church might use, and not so elaborate as the Communion Service of the Protestant Episcopal Prayer Book. And it is the sermon for which the people go to church, and the emphasis of the sermon is always distinctly evangelical. It is seldom one hears of sacraments as a means of grace. Grace is a free gift directly to the hearts of believers.

The moment one goes to Rome everything is changed. There are about one hundred churches in the city. Their gates are never closed. Always one finds people praying before some altar. All of Sunday morning one mass follows close upon another from five to eleven. One hears little about the Gospel. It is read in the course of the mass, but is simply an incident in the service and not generally understood by the people. There is generally no sermon. (There is considerable preaching in the Roman Catholic churches on the continent, but generally it is a special service and there are specially trained men for preaching.) When there is a sermon one hears little about the free grace of God. Everything — service, sermon — is *sacramental*. The great moment in the service is when the sacraments

are lifted up and the worshipers fall upon their knees before the Christ who is present on the altar. It is right here, perhaps, that the chasm is greatest between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. One can conceive of such questions as the seat of authority in religion, free churches, or an episcopal order, even the infallibility of the Pope (when taken broadly as meaning that the church speaks with authority in spiritual matters as pertaining to her special province) being settled some time, but it is difficult to see how those fundamentally different, almost opposing views of Christianity, the evangelical and the sacramental, can ever be harmonized.

The writer not only visited many churches but he took great pains to study the sermons of Protestant and Roman Catholic communities he visited. In Stockholm he heard many sermons by many men from many lands. The *Church* was hardly mentioned in them. The Bible was always the ultimate appeal, the seat of authority in religion, the source of all spiritual guidance, the voice of God, the test of belief and conduct. One eminent Protestant leader from Germany told the writer that he did not use the word "church" in his thinking, but preferred the word "congregation." It is probably true that great groups of Protestants are moving in that direction. Dr. Glover, in his answer to the Anglican Appeal of 1920, rather went out of his way to minimize the importance of the Church, finally reducing it simply to the voluntary association of those who had been saved, which is, of course, the same thing as "congregation." (Of course there is a strong group in the Protestant churches which is breaking away from this position and assuming the Roman Catholic attitude, the so-called Fundamentalists, for instance. They are insisting, as does the Roman communion, that the interpretation of the Bible must conform to the creeds and confessions, and such a group as that led by Dr. Macartney, Professor Machan, and Dr. Straton assume the same prerogative that the Pope assumes under the dogma of papal infallibility—only there is really more justification in the Pope's claim, for he speaks as voicing the *whole* Church, not a little section of it.) When, a few days later, the writer began listening to Roman Catholic sermons—he was fortunate enough to hear the Pope preach one—and to read such contemporary sermons as he could find in the libraries of Rome and Geneva and the Roman Catholic press, he was immediately impressed by the fact that they all began and ended with the Church. The Church with her formularies and creeds and living voice was the seat

of authority in religion, the ultimate court of appeal in all matters spiritual and moral. Christ had called it into being to continue his presence on the earth, had given it all authority to speak in his name, given it power to forgive sins with his own authority, and promised it the Holy Spirit to guide it into all truth. The Bible was the product of the Church and is useful as confirming doctrine, as Newman put it in his famous passage in the *Apologia*, but is not the source of doctrine or the final authority. As in Stockholm one found the Bible the theme of every sermon, so in Rome one found the Church. One finds also that one difficulty the Roman Catholic communion in Europe has in understanding Protestantism is that to it, Protestants seem to think of the Church about as the Free Mason does of his lodge. In any conference with Roman Catholics that may ever come, Protestants must remember that, for the Roman Catholic, Christ Himself created the Church, gave it authority to speak for Him, and that for him the Church is Christ in the world to-day.

The third point where Protestantism differs from Catholicism is in the conception of the function of the Church. The writer never realized how far apart in this matter the two groups are until he had talked with some Roman Catholic ecclesiastics in the hope of interesting the Roman Catholic Church in certain great social reforms, but it is evident to any one who has had even cursory acquaintance with Roman Catholicism. The Protestant Church on the whole, and increasingly, considers all spheres of life as its province and attempts to regulate both the social order and the habits of its individual members. Social ethics are as much in its province as the relation of the soul to God. It regulates the habits of its members as much, if not more, than their prayers. Social conduct seems often to constitute religion more than worship. It forbids its members to drink certain things, forbids them certain things on Sundays, in some communions it has forbidden them to smoke, to dance, to attend the theater, and to play certain games. The Roman Catholic Church puts more emphasis on worship and the communion, and, outside of its severe attitude toward the deadly sins, interferes hardly at all with the habits of the believer. It is nobody's business but his own what he eats or drinks, what he does on Sunday, provided he has fulfilled his morning vows to God, whether he smokes or does not smoke, and his personal liberty is interfered with very little. The Protestant thinks the Roman Catholic in Europe breaks the Sabbath, the Roman

Catholic cannot see any reason in the world why he should not play all day Sunday, after he has been to church. This is the reason that it is going to be very difficult to get the Latin countries interested in prohibition. The Roman Catholic Church has never considered it its concern what a man drinks any more than what he eats, if he is temperate and faithful. *Faithful*; there is no doubt at all that the Roman Catholic Church is much more concerned in the ardent faith of its children than in their habits.

The writer was struck too, while studying this subject to note the difference in the treatment of sin. There is very little proportionate consideration of sin, so to speak, in the Protestant Church, little variance in its sinfulness. The writer remembers when a boy, that in the eyes of the villagers the man who drank a glass of wine was put in the same category with the man who had delirium tremens periodically. This is an extreme statement, perhaps, but it illustrates what on the whole is a tendency in Protestantism, namely, to rank one sin in the same category as another. The Roman Catholic Church on the other hand, takes a wholly different attitude toward one sin than it takes toward another. The writer was interested in noting how the sermons of the Romanist preachers rarely touched upon certain sins, while there were often severe denunciations of others, and the ones not often touched upon would sometimes be considered by Protestants more reprehensible than the others.

Again the difference was very striking, as was intimated a moment ago, when it came to the conception of the function of the Church in social questions. At Stockholm it would be no exaggeration to say that three-fourths of the addresses dealing with the function of the Church emphasized her duty to redeem the social order. No matter what the subject of the sermon or address, it would *always* come back to the duty of the Church to rid the world of war and often to her duty to create a new relation between capital and labour. One might say here that this was natural at Stockholm, for the Conference met to consider the social function of the Church. True, but the writer is sure that in Great Britain and America, and to a certain degree on the continent, one would find the Protestant churches Sunday by Sunday more and more emphasizing this aspect of the Church's task and duty. The Church is in the world to call nations, corporations, business, commerce, industry, government, states, cities, as well as individuals, to repentance. She should insist that nations and all groups regulate their relation-

ships on the same high, moral, Christian plane that she demands of individuals. The Roman Catholic Church, so far as the writer could discover, has not concerned itself in the least with this function of the Church. There are certain groups within the Church, especially in France, that have interested themselves in the social gospel, there are certain individuals within the Church who have been ardent propagandists of a new order, and the late Pope Pius wrote an appeal for a warless world that would delight the most pronounced pacifist, and in America the Roman Catholic Church has gone so far as to establish a bureau at Washington to deal with social problems, but the Roman Catholic Church as a whole still concerns itself purely with the salvation of the individual—and this salvation will be such a blessed thing in the next world that one need not worry too much about bodily comfort here. As the priest says in *Helbeck of Bannisdale*: The Catholic Church is concerned with Death, Judgment, Heaven, and Hell. (A prominent cardinal used almost these same words to the writer when we were discussing the possible activity of the Roman Catholic Church in the movement for international peace.)

Again, in closing, the writer would say that there may be places above where he has drawn the lines too vigorously. This would be truer of the characterizations of Protestantism than of Roman Catholicism, because Protestantism varies very much in different countries and in different communions in the same country, while Roman Catholicism is always and everywhere one. On the whole, however, he thinks his characterizations are both true and just, and in any conference between the two groups—and they must come sooner or later—these differences must be taken into account, and there must be attempt at sympathetic understanding exercised on both sides.

[From Dr. Frederick Lynch in *The Christian Work*, New York.]

The Chinese Church in Troublous Waters

THE Church considered in this article is the company of all faithful Christian people in China, especially that branch of the Church to which we belong; the troublous waters are the disturbed sea of political life in China, agitated by a violent Nationalist cyclone, and the harbour where we would be is the calm haven of God's full purpose, in which the ship of a united

Church may ride at peace, having brought its full cargo of souls safely to land in a place of quiet religious life.

A cyclone takes its birth near the heated equator and rushes upon the coast with overwhelming ferocity. So this national outburst is terrific. The whole pent-up feelings of the younger generation of Chinese, with twenty years of modern education to inform them of past controversies with the foreign nations, and with a great disappointment at the result of twelve years of republican government, from which so much was hoped, reinforced by bolshevistic advice to go the whole way and become communistic, are venting themselves in an outburst against the foreigners. The rage is born of some true causes which have their roots in past history, and of many untrue and exaggerated elements concerning the present relationship of China and the Powers, and it has in its composition much of the soul turmoil created by racial pride and impotent and ignorant revolt against national limitations within and without. The whole position is so complicated and so constantly changing that it is not possible to analyze it further in this article. Enough to say that it is deep and dangerous and will probably last for some time, or recur again and again, until China finds her place as a settled and well-ordered State honoured among the Family of Nations.

The Christian Church in China.—But it is worth our while to review the condition of our Christian ship which has to ride upon these troubled waters. Is the ship strong enough and wisely enough officered to survive the tempest?

The Church is still foreign and divided, and this is a source of great danger. It is so completely divided that the Romans and Protestants are regarded by the Chinese as following different religions, with different titles for God, different rites and customs, and as being hardly on speaking terms. There is no immediate likelihood of this being much changed: the Romans, far greater in numbers and outwardly, at least, having a closer unity, look down on the Protestants with a feeling born of doctrinal intolerance and superior religious and political status, while most Protestants regard the Romans as superstitious and crafty. Even in times of danger they hardly draw together, and the question of the Church riding out the storm may be discussed as regards the Protestant community quite apart from the Roman. There are two ships, not one—some Anglicans would say there are three. There has been much drawing together between the non-Roman missions of late years.

Many of the minor breaches have been healed. The whole Anglican body has united into one church, of which more presently. The Presbyterians have nearly succeeded in forming a General Synod for the whole of China, the actual consummation of this having been frustrated for the present by the fact that while the Presbyterians of Central and East China have only attracted to themselves the strong Congregationalist groups in those parts, the Presbyterians in North and South China have coalesced with many other groups and formed union churches.

In Central and East China the Presbyterians show a distinct inclination to incorporate a form of episcopacy with their Presbyterian church government and to include the Apostles' Creed in their doctrinal basis. Many openly state that their ideal will fail unless the Anglican Church joins in, and our forms of worship make a strong appeal to their demand for reverence and order. On the other hand, the controversy over the Scriptures has created a new rift right across every denomination.

The Chinese are impatient of the old denominational controversies: they think that modernist foreigners are at the root of the Scriptural controversy, which they, if left alone, would soon solve. Yet they have their own differences between young and old, and as regards tolerance of old non-Christian customs and modes of thought, which might hinder a whole-hearted unity. On the other hand, the political jealousies as between North and South China and between the different provinces are hardly known within the Christian Church.

In numerical and financial power and in leadership it would be possible for the Chinese Christians now to dispense with foreign help and guidance and to create a United Protestant Church of China, and such a thing might be done either under necessity, should the foreigners be unable to continue in China owing to political trouble, or as an outcome of the national movement, which might lead the Chinese Christians to demand their independence.

An Independent Church of China.—Such a Church would be poor, but it might gain strength by its independence. In the towns its ministry would be amply sufficient and, if evangelistic zeal were generated, there is no reason why the congregations in the country parts should not increase and continue to replenish the town churches, as they do now. The Church would probably be able to maintain its primary schools for Christian children and some of its higher schools in the towns, but the

large mission institutions, attracting many well-to-do non-Christian pupils, and the Christian universities would probably have to be closed. The national feeling against foreign education is already placing these schools and colleges in a precarious position. The Christian hospitals might continue their beneficent work with the help of the non-Christian gentry, and would probably be staffed mainly by Christian doctors.

It seems likely, then, that the Christian Church would probably weather the storm, even if it threw overboard its foreign pilots and foreign tackle. The pilots might be bowed off quite politely if the storm moderated for a while, and the ship might then reorganize happily and the eventual result be good and praiseworthy.

Dangers of a purely Chinese Church.—But such an outcome of the present trouble cannot be anticipated with confidence. Poverty, and perhaps persecution, would be the lot of the Church for some decades. Eight hundred thousand Christians among 400,000,000 non-Christians means 1 in 500. Their religion is stigmatized as foreign. Many of their leaders have been foreign-supported. In times of trouble they have often taken refuge behind foreign treaties. The empty foreign houses and the closed schools and colleges would testify against them. The Chinese quickly despise a cause which is declining: it “loses face.” The next generation of Chinese Christians would grow up poorly instructed: some might compromise with heathenism. Confucianism of a modern atheistical type and practical irreligion would prevail throughout the land. It would be a dark period for the struggling Church.

The Protestant churches would probably combine locally or provincially. The Chinese are practical—opportunists, one might say—and so the emergency church union would be guided by considerations of utility rather than by the lessons of history. The Presbyterian majority would lead, and episcopacy would possibly not survive, though the Chinese might come back to it. But Bible Christianity would be there, and gradually forms and rites conforming to Chinese ideas of propriety and dignity would be evolved and restored.

Nor can one overlook the danger inherent in the distrust of one another so characteristic of the Chinese. It is not likely that the Church would produce leaders able at once to command the confidence of the whole forces of the Christian community, any more than the nation has found its leaders during the last ten years. Sun Yat Sen only became a national hero after his

death. Moreover, Protestantism somewhat naturally begets suspicion. So it is unlikely that the Church would be united on a nation-wide basis, or that it would play a leading part in the formation of national policy. For all that, individual Christians would be found in high places: it is already manifest that they are needed by their nation. C. T. Wang, W. W. Yen, and others have again and again been called for and have served the Republic well.

What we may hope for.—But what we hope for is that the present anti-foreign agitation will pass away after a short period, during which a just revision of the treaties has been effected. Most missionaries would gladly carry on their work in the interior of China, trusting themselves to the reasonableness and courtesy of the Chinese, which will reassert itself once normal conditions, tranquility, and order have been restored. Many of us would like to be free from the status which gives merchants and missionaries alike the protection of consular courts. The merchant is constantly pressing the consul to protect and foster trade; the missionary only occasionally goes to the consul for advice and protection. Merchants' boats pass along the canals flying the Union-jack and selling cigarettes. The missionaries only fly the flag on Empire Day, the King's birthday, and great occasions, and never take it into the country with them. In Ningpo, when troubles occurred last autumn, the C.M.S. missionaries had only one Union-jack between six houses.

Given such modified conditions as will satisfy Chinese rights and honour, we can go on working for some years to come. But we must bend all our efforts to make the Church really united and indigenous.

As regards unity the Lambeth Appeal presents a good basis for our efforts; the only essentials we need press for are the Scriptures, the two creeds, and the continuity of the Church as represented by the Historic Episcopate and the threefold Ministry. We may hope that in the next ten years we shall see the acceptance of this basis: the natural aptitude of the Chinese for organization and their love of propriety will guarantee the survival of constitutional church government and a considerable place for liturgical worship.

Much progress toward autonomy has been made in recent years. Every diocese in China now has its synod or equivalent body, and all the dioceses are in the process of devolution of authority to these bodies. The dioceses created by C.M.S. effort

generally have church councils responsible to the synod. These church councils are like ruri-decanal bodies endowed with authority over church buildings and finance, the deanery areas being about as large as English counties. In Chekiang they include three to five parishes, each parish having several congregations ministered to by one Chinese clergyman and several catechists. In Fukien all the pastoral and evangelistic work, the primary education and the Bible-women, have been transferred to the control of the synod and its local councils. The C.M.S. gives a block grant-in-aid. Higher educational and hospital workers remain under foreign control; all other foreign workers are helpers of the Chinese Church and its pastors, under the direction of the bishop and synod.

In Chekiang we expect shortly to follow the lead of Fukien and transfer our evangelistic and primary educational work from the mission and its conference to the diocesan synod. The synod has about seventy Chinese and ten foreign members; its standing committee during the last two years has had nine Chinese members with the foreign bishop and archdeacon. The transfer, therefore, means an almost complete Chinese management of a large section of the work. Similar devolution of authority is being worked out in all the churches, except the Roman. It will be the great task of the next decade to complete the process, and then we shall see a genuine Chinese Church in union, we may hope, with the great Catholic historic fellowship now known as the Anglican communion. When this has been accomplished we shall gladly sing our *Nunc dimittis* and rejoice to see China bringing her full contribution into the City of God.

Then we shall realize that the troubles of the present time in China have fallen out to the furtherance of the Gospel.

[From Bishop Herbert J. Molony, Anglican Bishop in Chekiang, in *The East and the West*, London.]

BOOK REVIEWS

THE PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIAN LIVING. A Handbook of Christian Ethics. By Gerald Birney Smith, Professor of Christian Theology in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

This book is a pioneer volume in a field that is gradually becoming more and more of absorbing interest. The two factors in the study of Christian ethics that form the basis of this study are the application of the experimental method in the study of human behaviour and the use of the historical method of interpreting Christianity. It passes from the bases of philosophical theories to empirical surveys, where students may determine questions of right and wrong by analyzing the situation before them and attempting to trace the consequences of any proposed action. The same method, which is becoming current in the study of our social life, is applied here in the study of Christian conduct. Over against moral formulas, with their cut-and-dried systems, Professor Smith presents Christian life as a spiritual adventure, calling every Christian to his highest creative endeavour.

Christianity is an historical religion and its changing attitudes toward social, economic, and political conditions furnish an interesting study in the attempts of Christian ethics to function in changes and readjustments. After reading a book like this, which every morally-minded person should find pleasure in reading, one is more than ever convinced of the permanent idealism of Christianity "to create and maintain a fellowship of all men in the spirit of good-will." Everything changes. The past has been subject to creative changes; the future must be likewise. Ethical ideas must keep pace with changing social conditions, for "the moral education of humanity is never finished."

In its eighteen chapters are presented moral problems which must be faced by the individual Christian, such as the place of ethics in human life, the ethical ideal of Jesus, the Christian and the Church, the Christian family, the Christian attitude toward recreation, the Christian and his possessions, the Christian and the industrial problems, the Christian and politics, and the enlarging scope of Christian idealism. Actions must be judged in the light both of appeal and consequences and "all systems of ethics must, in the last analysis, be tested by their capacity to enlighten men as to the things which will bring lasting satisfaction." The philosophy of ethics is when the entire scope of human life has been covered in such a way as to give to various possibilities their appropriate valuation in such a way as to share with others the good things of life. The clue to our understanding of

the highest good and our attainment thereto "is found in a vital relationship with Jesus, whereby the Christian is enabled, with more or less success, to possess and to exhibit the spirit of Jesus in his behaviour."

Ethical ideals have been constantly developing throughout history. Frequently the code of one generation has sufficed for the needs of the next generation: but, owing to the rapid alterations of conditions of industry and the development of transportation facilities, the conditions of life are changing with such appalling rapidity that the moral scruples of the past generation are felt to be too narrow to guide creative, forward-looking endeavour of the youth of to-day. The moral tension, which is so evident, has caused, in many instances, perplexity and despair of parents and others. Safety lies in acquainting an historical understanding of the relationship between moral ideals and the actual condition of life, whereby we may come to an understanding of our new duties without a disastrous breach with the loyalties of the past.

With the Hebrews ethics consisted in doing the will of God and morality was a high and solemn religious dedication. With the primitive Christians, in order to be eligible to the Kingdom, one must live so as to receive the favourable judgment of Christ when He should come. With the Roman Catholics obedience to the officials of the church, who were regarded as the successors of the apostles, was the supreme duty of every Christian. With the Protestants it was, under Luther, loyalty to his Christian conscience and, under Calvin, to the Scriptures. All Christian denominations appeal to Jesus as authority for their beliefs; but, as Professor Smith says, "We are driven by the historical study of the gospels to seek the spirit and intention of the teachings instead of being content with a mere tabulation of precepts." While Jesus left us no programme as regards social, political, and industrial conditions, He did leave us an ideal in supreme loyalty to the Kingdom of God, and every generation, if it would share the spirit of Jesus, must share that loyalty, at the same time assuming for itself the responsibility for determining just what that loyalty involves in the way of organization. Inasmuch as Jesus completely identified Himself with the interest of the people around Him, loyalty to the Kingdom means unfailing love toward our fellow men. This would mean the unity of Christendom, the abolition of war, the establishment of proper social, economic, and political conditions. Out of this it is seen that the primary duty of every man is to become a citizen of the Kingdom of God, leading us inevitably to the conception of Christian ethics as a never ending creative task on the part of the disciples of Jesus.

Christian ethics is ever in the quest for the good. During the long and slow course of human history, mankind has been constantly learning. Conscience, like any other human capacity, is a matter of growth and education; consequently it is not fixed nor infallible. Freedom means the ability

to stop and deliberate before committing one's self to any particular activity and the conditions of that freedom are: (1) a healthy physical and mental life, (2) a broad range of interests, and (3) a capacity for intelligent valuation. Daily confession in prayer is suggested as a powerful religious means of cultivating a constant sense of responsibility. The Christian can never stop with any conventionally accepted standard of responsibility. He must strive to be "perfect even as [his] Father in heaven is perfect."

The fact of sin, the need of salvation, the Christian incentives to right living, the service rendered by the Church, the problem of Christian unity, and the growing spirit of church co-operation are subjects that make way for the discussions of the Christian family, including sex attraction and marriage, parenthood, birth-control, problem of divorce, and the Christian home as a social asset. "The Christian and His Life Work" is the title of one of the most interesting chapters. The Christian attitude toward recreation is in finding in recreation a means of developing good-will, for people who have played together will have a kindly spirit and will readily be more friendly in their industrial and social relationships. In his dealing with wealth, industrial problems, politics, and the scope of Christian idealism there is a call to look at matters through the eyes of the other fellow and to organize his life around the center of a whole-souled personal consecration to Jesus Christ. Every page in this book beams with light and wisdom.

INTERCHURCH GOVERNMENT. By Clarence R. Athearn. Research Associate, School of Religious Education and Social Service, Boston University. New York: The Century Company; 377 pages, \$3.00.

Foremost among books on Christian unity is this remarkable and timely volume. We have been waiting for just such a book. The prosperity of both State and Church is involved in a divided Church. Division of the Church is the greatest scandal in history. A divided Church is unable to function in the social discord and economic amelioration of the nation. Good men, educated men, in the pulpit and in the pew seem to be deaf to the demands of the abolition of anarchy in the Church. We hear beautiful sermons and beautiful prayers, but, as one of the popes rightly said, regarding anarchy in religion, "it leads to the ready conception of the morals of the people and to the spread of the plague of religious indifference."

This book is an appeal to laymen, who must become factors equal with ministers in advancement to the unity of the Church. It looks for authority in democracy, "democratically based upon enlightened and conscientious public opinion," where principle rather than expediency is to prevail. Mr. Athearn regards church organization as a political problem, the solution of which is the application of political principle, reminding us that faith

in God is a basis principle of democracy in both State and Church. He wisely uses philosophy and religion in determining goals, purposes, and ends, and science in finding the means towards those ends, reminding us of the Protestant contribution to modern civilization being, in the words of Troeltsch, "extraordinarily strong religious and metaphysical foundation—the religious metaphysic of freedom and of faith based on personal conviction. Let us jealously preserve that principle of freedom which draws its strength from a religious metaphysic."

The book is divided into twelve chapters and is well suited for a textbook. The introduction having to do with motive, method, and material, his chapter entitled "The Challenge of Protestantism" brings us face to face with the need of a pathway to unity. Under "Imperialism," "Cosmopolitanism," "Regionalism," and "Denominationalism" he presents a review of church conditions, the history of denominations, and the motives of their separation. In the defects of denominationalism he sees that sectarianism is a cause of immorality and irreligion, that sectarian education contains immoral elements, that sectarian organization has prevented the development of the highest morality, and that denominations are more imperial than democratic, but "the future of denominationalism demands that church and interchurch organization be brought up to the democratic standard now sought by progressive leaders in State and interstate affairs by reason of the impact of the Reformation. Luther aimed his Reformation at the Church, but because of the political winds blowing at that time it hit the State. Hence the work that Luther and Calvin began, and for which they laid the foundation in their gospels of truth, remains to be completed, namely, the reformation of the Church."

In discussing doctrinal reconciliation he sees the necessity of some agreement on the personality of God, the divinity of Christ, the inspiration of the Bible, as a record of the progressive revelation of God, the immortality of the soul, and the Kingdom of God. "Without some common knowledge and common agreement about these subjects the Christian Church, as a distinct institution, could not exist." But "unity of political organization can never come if it is made to wait upon doctrinal reconciliation alone." He dissents from the view that realinement of the future will be along liberal and conservative lines. Instead "a defensible scheme of church government must provide for the union of both conservative Christians and liberal Christians under one administration." Here is the function of Christian education, which is "the endeavour to mold dispositions after the Christly pattern." Conferences have their worth, but "efforts at practical co-operation have produced more permanent and beneficial results than many conferences on doctrinal reconciliation. In a progressive civilization there must always be doctrinal and ethical differences, but these may best be adjudicated if they all exist under a common po-

litical system which is flexible enough to adjust itself to the demands of progress."

He discusses at length interchurch administrative bureaus, and their functions and finds real expression of service in federation. There has been no better presentation of the origin, activities, achievements, jurisdiction, and representation of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America than given in these pages. His chapters on "Democracy" and "Church and State" are fine and stimulating to an extraordinary degree. The Catholic parochial school and the Protestant systems of sectarian religious education "shoot lines of sectarian cleavage among the children and youth of all the communities of the nation." There must come a system of universal Christian education if we would have a safe foundation for the popular government of the Church. The Catholic and Protestant views on the matter of Church and State are clearly presented with the urge for the Kingdom of God as to its meaning in modern thought and the significance of its ideal in modern political and religious life in finding expression, in a fellowship of service.

This is one of the most thoughtful books on a united Christendom that has appeared. It will hold a large place both for study and reference in the approaches to Christian unity. It leaves sectarianism, whether Catholic or Protestant, badly crippled and fearlessly attempts to think through the difficult problems of a divided Christendom. A book like this registers the seriousness of modern thought toward a united Church.

UNDERSTANDING. Being an Interpretation of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Held in Stockholm, August 15-30, 1925. By Charles Henry Brent, Bishop of Western New York. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.; 64 pages, 50 cents.

The October issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly* was given entirely to the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, touching some of the high points in that epoch-making gathering. In this little book Bishop Brent touches some equally high points. His choice of the title is particularly happy, for, as he says, "We sought an agreement and found an understanding." The Crown Prince of Sweden, in his address, made good use of the same word. Others have felt that, in finding an understanding, the Conference made a great step forward toward unity.

The booklet contains three addresses delivered during the Stockholm Conference by Bishop Brent—"The Bearing of the Gospel on National and International Life," his opening address, on presenting the report, on "The Church and International Relations," and his sermon on "Fatherhood and Sonship," delivered at the English Church. It also contains "The Message of the Conference," which appeared in the last issue of *The Christian*

Union Quarterly, and the address of the Crown Prince. It is not often that a member of a royal house takes such active part in a religious gathering. The Crown Prince not only addressed the Conference, but was present throughout its daily sessions. Bishop Brent's addresses are true to the social interpretations of the Gospel.

In his opening chapter on "Understanding," which covers more than a third of the booklet, he presents a survey of the Conference, giving the history of its rise and an account of its working with six hundred delegates from many nations and many communions. Referring to his own impressions of the Conference, he names three things that are indelibly fixed in his mind as follows:

"1. The effect of divisions in the Church is inability to use a common Christian ethic upon common moral, to say nothing of, common spiritual problems. We did not at the Conference secure such an ethic. The farthest we got was the formulation, with more or less definiteness, of the problems which confront the churches and which they cannot hope to meet until in a true sense the churches become the Church. The lost Christian ethic remains undiscovered.

"2. The breach in practical affairs between the churches is greater than I dreamed of. But by conference we began to heal it. Those of us who were together at this council table of the Holy Spirit understand and respect one another as never before. It is of supreme importance that we should learn the strength of those with whom we differ in order to honour those to whom honour is due. Ordinarily we search out differences in order to condemn others and exalt ourselves. I am much struck by the common habit, prevalent among professing Christians, of condemning men and movements on hearsay or from prejudice or through ignorance, before any honest effort has been made to discover the truth of the case or to give a fair hearing to those whom we place under condemnation. The words of our Lord come to mind—'Judge not according to appearance but judge righteous judgment.' The older I grow the more serious matter it becomes in my mind to have to judge.

"3. The real reason for difference among the churches, as became manifest in the Conference, lay deep beneath the surface. Time and again we had to remind ourselves that we were not considering matters of faith and order. The hour has come when we must meet with the same honesty and good-will as at Stockholm differences in the realm of theology. Controversy may have had and may have its place. Conference will always hold a superior place. It is not a question, as impatient laymen sometimes suppose, of hair-splitting differences but of the nature and being of God and of his relationship to human life. We must face problems of faith and order, of sacraments and authority. At the meeting of the Continuation Committee on Faith and Order in Stockholm on August 15th it was

decided to gather for conference on these subjects in 1927, where it is to be hoped we may reach an understanding."

This booklet is a most valuable contribution for a general understanding of the Conference and will be read with interest by those interested in world understanding.

CHRISTIANITY AND WORLD PROBLEMS. By W. E. Orchard, D. D., Author of *Foundations of Faith*, *The Safest Mind Cure*, *The Finality of Christ*, etc. New York: George H. Doran Company; 211 pages, \$1.75.

Dr. Orchard is always interesting. In this volume he makes a challenging appeal for the practical application of Christ's teachings to the world needs and does it so understandingly that one finds increasing profit in thoughtful reading of each chapter. The modern mind seems little more than a mass of problems, which have bewildered multitudes. This condition has given rise to all kinds of fads, some religious, some semi-religious, and others anti-religious, all of which betray a lack of fundamental thinking in the realm of basis faith. Since Christianity is itself a metaphysic, the solution of these problems involve philosophical inquiry, and Dr. Orchard argues that the solution lies in a world-wide acceptance and a thorough-going application of the Christian religion. Christianity's most convincing evidence lies in spiritual vision because its ultimate basis rests upon the invisible.

In the chapters on "Christ and the Universe" and "Christ and the Ages" the revelation of modern astronomy and the multiplied figures in physical and anthropological research, regarding the age of the earth and the antiquity of man, instead of staggering our faith, increases our faith in the moral immensity of the Incarnation; likewise, in the chapter on "Christ and Mankind," we are taken into the delicate problem of the multiplication of the human race and how such a people can be guided and regulated to a Divine end. The facts are faced without evasion. Dr. Orchard sees that "the only natural and effective way of regulating the productivity of mankind toward producing the spiritually best quality and quantity is the revival of faith in the future life; not in the popular form that this life is so dependent upon the next that this life and all it means is practically negligible, but in the true Christian form that everything in this life is important because our eternal condition depends upon this life, our conduct toward others, and the character we can gain from earthly experience."

In the chapters on "Christianity and the World's Religions" and "The Church and World Empires" he argues for the clearness of Christianity by the side of other religions, "groping their way to light" and for the State, as such, growing less and the Kingdom of Christ more and more. "It is

actually in such a direction that the most advanced social doctrine is now looking, away from the necessarily absolute, bureaucratic, and coercive State, and toward free co-operation; and ever larger measure of registered agreement under which we are all willing to live, an ever-growing number of voluntary combinations under which men will delight to work; but with ever less need for enforcement and coercion."

In the chapters dealing with social brotherhood, world peace, economic conditions, and human unrest, he sets Christ as the Teacher with all men as brothers. The facts and the arguments are presented with challenging force. The reading of this book will open up satisfying fields of thought. The student will read and re-read many of its passages with appreciative worth. The whole volume is fresh, stimulating, and spiritual.

CONVERSATIONS ON CHRISTIAN RE-UNION. By a Parish Priest. Baltimore: John Murphy Company; 104 pages, \$1.25.

Christian union is being discussed by all communions and in all parts of the world. Every book on this subject is welcomed at our desk. This little volume by a Roman Catholic priest is an interesting example of the desire for a united Christendom. It is a series of conversations, dealing with Roman Catholic doctrines and the doctrines of other Christian communions, concluding, as one would suppose from such a plan, with the Roman Catholic winning out in the conversations. It would have been interesting if the priest had invited a real man rather than a straw man to join in the conversations, so that his Roman Catholic readers might have got at first hand some knowledge of what the Christian communions believe and why they believe what they do. There is so much misunderstanding of each other's beliefs that the time must come when we must give first-hand information regarding the faith of each, if we are to advance toward a reasonable understanding of each other. There is so much ignorance and prejudice separating Christians to-day that it is difficult to find the paths of understanding.

In this little book is an interesting chart of the name, place of origin, founder, and year, with the source of authority quoted, of the various Christian communions. He might have given the whole list of several hundred. It is a staggering scandal that Christendom is so divided. But there is grave doubt whether a chart like this is helpful to a better understanding. The Episcopal Church, or the Church of England, was not founded by Henry VIII. Being the King of England, he was a factor, but it cannot be said that he was the founder. This kind of publication belongs by the side of the Protestant publication of the immorality of certain popes. The publication of neither of these items is helpful to a Christian understanding of each other. In the list of the "sects," named in the chart, is one entitled "Campbellites." No communion in Christendom ever assumed

that name. Those associated with Alexander Campbell had a definite purpose in taking the name Disciple of Christ or Christian as a proper contribution to the unity of Christendom—not that they are the only disciples of Christ or Christians, but that all others who had confessed Jesus as Lord and Saviour are disciples of Christ or Christians, and as such there should be no names to differentiate us. This instance, however, belongs by the side of Protestants calling the Roman Catholic Church the “Romish Church.” It is not fair to speak of each other in terms of disesteem when we are trying to find the way to unity.

The little book, though, contends earnestly for unity. It shows that there are real differences, some of them “hard as a rock.” Quoting from Archbishop Julius in an address of little more than a year ago, he says, “That rock would have to be blasted and, if the churches did not do the blasting then Bolshevism would do it for them. Every endeavour should be made to get rid of the differences and, if it could not be effected, people should at least try to live together as Christian brothers.”

PROJECTS IN WORLD-FRIENDSHIP. By John Leslie Lobingier, Author of *World-Friendship Through the Church School* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago). This little book is one in the series on “Principles and Methods of Religious Education.” While thoroughly scientific in its character, it is a popular presentation, so as to be available to Sunday-school and church workers everywhere. It is based on the conviction that children and young people can help this cause by becoming intelligent in regard to the people of other races and groups and classes. In this project method Mr. Lobingier presents a most valuable little guide book. It deals with practical problems with principles involved. It gives a record of various projects in world-friendship, carried out under Mr. Lobingier’s leadership by pupils of different age groups. It brings the study of world-peace, from which large results may be expected in the years to come. This little book may be used in all kinds of classes. It fills a need and, in its study, it gives hope to a better understanding among nations and races.

YOUTH AND THE BIBLE. Methods of Teaching the Modern View of the Bible. By Muriel Anne Streibert, Assistant Professor of Biblical History, Wellesley College. (The Macmillan Company, New York; 251 pages, \$2.25.) With a dozen years back of her as a teacher of Biblical history and several years of religious education, Miss Streibert has produced a most helpful volume. She is convinced that the modern historical view makes the Bible an intelligible, useful, and readable book over against the harm and confusion that results from the older view. This book is primarily for youth. “Shall we let children know what scholars really think about the Bible and

its various parts?" is the question raised by Dr. George A. Coe in his introduction and to which Miss Streibert sets herself to answer in fourteen chapters in a manner that will put students of the modern historical view of the Bible under great obligations to her. With the Roman Catholic doctrine of an infallible church and the Protestant doctrine of an infallible Bible, we are hedged about by numerous difficulties, but Jesus' appeal to insight, conscience, and conviction has paved the way to trust in God. Jesus was sure of God. That reality must become the experience of Christians. It is an interesting and instructive book.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. An Exposition. By Charles R. Erdman, Professor of Practical Theology, Princeton Theological Seminary, and Pastor First Presbyterian Church, Princeton, N. J. (The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 160 pages.) Dr. Erdman is the author of fourteen books, this being the fourteenth. In his expository studies he has covered the four Gospels, the Acts, the Pastoral Epistles of Paul, and the General Epistles. It is gratifying that he is on the way toward giving us a commentary on the entire New Testament, which is a very much needed service. One of the largest assets of Dr. Erdman's work in Bible study is that he brings a background of devotional attitude of mind. In his expository study of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans he moves easily through this supreme masterpiece of the great Apostle. He seeks to simplify and apply practically the lessons of the Apostles to our present day needs. It is a beautiful book and will prove helpful to all students of this wonderful epistle, about which Christians will write for ages to come.

THE BEST FRENCH SHORT STORIES OF 1923-24. And the Yearbook of the French Short Story. Edited by Richard Eaton. (Small, Maynard & Company, Boston; 462 pages, \$2.50.) The American short story and the French short story differ. It is not so much a question of superiority as of national literary standards. There are certain types of French *contes*, such as those by Daudet and De Maupassant, which conform more or less to American standards, but the great mass of French stories are according to French standards. In this volume "The Father and Son," by Paul Bourget, "Monsieur Maurice," by Colette, "The Miracle," by Georges Duhamel, "The Child Who Came Back," by J. Kessel, "The Bells of Marrakech," by J. and J. Tharaud, are fine examples of French stories. The whole collection is a compliment to the editor. Many of the stories will bear re-reading. Aside from the merit of the stories, it is another way of getting acquainted with the thought and life of another nation.

EVERLASTING SALVATION: Gospel Addresses. By Charles Forbes Taylor, Author of *The Riveter's Gang*. (Fleming H. Revell & Company, New York; 128 pages, \$1.00.) This is a book of ten sermons on familiar themes such as

"Can a Person be Saved Instantly?" "Can a Person, Once Saved, Ever be Lost?" "The Unchangeable Christ," etc. They are conservative, plain, straightforward appeals and have doubtless served to awaken people to decision for Christ and better living in his service. Some of the anecdotes are particularly strengthening. The sermons are still warm with the appeal of the author.

CHRIST AND THE PROBLEMS OF YOUTH. By John M. Versteeg. (The Abingdon Press, New York; 133 pages, 75 cents.) This is a book for young people, being thoughts growing out of young people's gatherings and morning watch services. It contains six chapters as follows: "Christ and Youth," "Christ and Our Decisions," "Christ and the Body," "Christ and Truth," "Christ and Progress," and "Christ and Our Task." It is a helpful little volume.

THE CATHOLIC REACTION IN FRANCE. By Denis Gwynn. (The Macmillan Company, New York; 186 pages.) Mr. Gwynn is an Irish Catholic journalist and he has presented a most fascinating account of the Catholic movement in France since the war. While the chapters on the Catholic press, the Catholic trade unions, and French Catholics and the depopulation menace are of special interest to Catholics, they furnish interesting data to all students of religious problems. The discussion on the proportion of Catholics in France, the reaction toward Catholicism, the clergy, the state affairs, and the real trend of the Catholic movement are valuable contributions. It is an interesting accumulation of data, which other than Catholics will avail themselves of to advantage.

SERMONS OF A CHEMIST. By Edwin E. Slosson, Ph. D., LL. D., Author of *Easy Lessons in Einstein*, etc. (Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York; 319 pages, \$2.00.) The sermons of a thoughtful layman are always interesting. Dr. Slosson is no exception. The preparation for the ministry would be strengthened considerably if it had a business course as a requirement. Present preparation for the ministry takes one too far away from the practical. These twenty-two sermons have a background of thirty years in which the author has sought to popularize science in his writings and lectures. Some of the subjects are "The Chemistry of the Greatest Miracle in the Bible," "The Spiritualization of Daily Life," "Faith," "The Great Backsliding," "The Geometry of Ethics." All of the sermons furnish interesting reading.

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. 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, 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.



"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

The Editor's Notes:

Sir Henry Lunn's Gift for Unity—Christians Are Slow to Forgive—The Scramble for Authority—The Necessity of Exploring New Ground—Popularizing Unity—An Interdenominational School of Religious Education

Preaching to the Men of Today SAMUEL McCOMB

Co-operation and Unity E. A. TURNER

Interdenominational Institute of Religious
Education GEORGE B. STEWART

Responses to President Stewart's Article

What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity

Sir Henry Lunn's Gift for Unity—A Study in Missionary Co-operation—Anglican Bishop Sees Way to Reunion—Makeshifts for Unity—The Spiritual Foundation of Unity—Student Meeting Would Break Creed Walls—The Tide is Turning—Lord Halifax Pleads Cause of Reunion at Louvain—Unity or Truth?—The Reunion of Christendom—Resolution From South America Calling for Universal Brotherhood—Bishop Brent on the World Conference on Faith and Order—Church Union in Scotland—Toward the Cure of Presbyterian Fissures.

Book Reviews

Personal Religion and the Life of Fellowship—The Thinking Man—The Biological Unity of the Church—Modernism and the Christian Church—What is Faith? etc.

Contents of Vol. XV

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, 1926

VOL. XV.

No. 4

<i>THE EDITOR'S NOTES</i>	361
<i>PREACHING TO THE MEN OF TO-DAY</i>SAMUEL McCOMB	369
<i>CO-OPERATION AND UNITY</i>E. A. TURNER	383
<i>INTERDENOMINATIONAL INSTITUTE OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION</i> .GEORGE B. STEWART	397
<i>RESPONSES TO PRESIDENT STEWART'S ARTICLE</i>	407
<i>WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY</i>	413
<i>BOOK REVIEWS</i>	453
<i>CONTENTS OF VOLUME XV</i>	461

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 their Equality before God 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 EDWIN S. LINES,
Newark, N. J. |
| BISHOP CHARLES P. ANDERSON,
Chicago, Ill. | DR. FREDERICK LYNCH,
New York, N. Y. |
| REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. | VERY REV. J. A. M'CLYMONT, D.D.,
Edinburgh, Scotland. |
| BISHOP CHARLES H. BRENT,
Buffalo, N. Y. | PROF. SAMUEL MCCOMB,
Cambridge, Mass. |
| DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn. | BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL,
Pittsburgh, Pa. |
| PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N. Y. | BISHOP WILLIAM F. MCDOWELL,
Washington, D. C. |
| REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass. | THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER,
Manchester, England. |
| BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR.,
Washington, D. C. | REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. |
| PROF. DR. J. EUGENE CHOISY,
Geneva, Switzerland. | DR. WILFRED MONOD,
Paris, France. |
| 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. |
| REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky | PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa. |
| DEAN H. E. W. FOSBROKE,
New York, N. Y. | PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England. |
| DEAN W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill. | REV. J. H. SHAKESPEARE, D.D.,
London, England. |
| PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England. | PASTOR DR. FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND-
SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany. |
| MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor. | DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N. Y. |
| PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C. | THE ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA,
Upsala, Sweden. |
| DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Shanghai, China. | DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J. |
| REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. | REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich. |
| DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England. | BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio. |
| PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa. | BISHOP LUTHER B. WILSON,
New York, N. Y. |

True Tolerance

BE MORE AFRAID OF THE LITTLENESS THAN
THE LARGENESS OF LIFE.

SEEK WITH STUDY AND WITH PRAYER FOR
THE MOST CLEAR AND CONFIDENT CONVIC-
TIONS; AND WHEN YOU HAVE WON THEM,
HOLD THEM SO LARGELY AND VITALLY THAT
THEY SHALL BE TO YOU, NOT THE WALLS
WHICH SEPARATE YOU FROM YOUR BRETHREN
WHO HAVE OTHER CONVICTIONS THAN YOURS,
BUT THE MEDIUM THROUGH WHICH YOU ENTER
INTO UNDERSTANDING OF AND SYMPATHY
WITH THEM, AS THE OCEAN, WHICH ONCE WAS
THE BARRIER BETWEEN NATIONS, IS NOW THE
HIGHWAY FOR THEIR NEVER-RESTING SHIPS,
AND MAKES THE WHOLE WORLD ONE.

THIS IS TRUE TOLERANCE. INTO A DEEPER
AND DEEPER ABUNDANCE OF THAT TOLERANCE
MAY OUR MASTER LEAD ALL OF US WHOM HE
HAS CALLED TO BE HIS MINISTERS!

—PHILLIPS BROOKS.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1926

THE EDITOR'S NOTES

Sir Henry Lunn's Gift for Unity

On another page of *The Christian Union Quarterly* will be found an account of Sir Henry Lunn's munificent gift for the establishment of a foundation in the interest of Christian unity and international good-will. This foundation will make possible the continuation of *The Review of the Churches*, which is a high class quarterly journal devoted to Christian unity and international relations. Other interests having to do with peace in the House of God and among the nations of the world will be served by funds from this foundation. It is a prophetic idea and the announcement of it is refreshing in the midst of denominational rivalries.

It sets up a new standard. Millions of dollars have been used for denominational memorials; while other millions have been used for economic and social causes which have contributed to better understanding among Christians, but this is the first foundation of its kind in the world. The fact of it releases the thought of Christian giving—giving for Christian unity rather than for denominational perpetuation. Mr. Andrew Carnegie was the outstanding American prophet for world peace. His great gifts for that cause drew the attention of the world to his prophetic outlook. He hesitated to use the channels of the churches for the promotion of peace among the nations while the churches had not been able to establish peace among themselves; but, in 1914, five months before the outbreak of the World War, he established the Church Peace Union, having on its board of trustees Jews, Roman Catholics, and Protestants.

It has been said by Dr. Frederick Lynch, of New York, who was close to Mr. Carnegie, and who was one of his ad-

visors in establishing the Church Peace Union, that, had Mr. Carnegie lived, his purpose was to consider establishing a foundation for Christian unity. It would have been the irony of history for a man who was not identified with any church, because of the multitude of divisions, to give millions of dollars for the promotion of the unity of the Church, whose members were giving their hundreds, and thousands, and, in some instances, their millions for the perpetuation of the division of the Church by making denominationalism strong in the earth.

The gift of Sir Henry is a reminder to us that men of great wealth are thinking in terms of a united Christendom. Others will follow. It would not be at all surprising if some American made a similar gift. There is certainly great need of it for publications, conferences, and the sending out of evangelists. While the various communions are raising their millions, largely for party work, the cause of Christian unity is barely eking out an existence financially. But, instead of its advocates growing less, they are steadily increasing. They are from all communions and their voices are being heard. *The Christian Union Quarterly*, a separate corporation and unidentified with any one communion, but friendly to all, Roman Catholic and Protestant, has sought to be a servant in these pioneer days. Its service has been made possible chiefly by Mr. W. H. Hoover, North Canton, Ohio—an unassuming, modest Christian gentleman, whose interest in the unity of Christendom burns like a constant flame—and other interested Disciples. This rising tide of interest will find others whose finances will make it possible to give wide range to the many prophets who are now speaking. Christian unity is an idea, a dream, a passion; it will win the whole Church in time, in preparation for its winning the whole world for Christ.

Christians Are Slow to Forgive

So long as those denominations in the United States that divided over Negro slavery remain divided it is an advertisement to the world that Christians are slow to forgive. Several years ago the Lutherans healed their breach, leaving the broken

households of Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists standing firmly apart. Various reasons are given, but, after all has been said, it goes back to the old quarrel over Negro slavery. Those who were spokesmen in the quarrel are dead; the issue is dead; but the memory of the quarrel is still alive in the hearts of those Christians who compose those communions.

The writer of these words is a Southerner and his father was a Virginia slaveholder, but he is at a loss to know why the South moves toward unity less rapidly than the North. Speaking with a Southern Baptist recently he affirmed that there was no sentiment among Southern Baptists for unity, not even any particular desire for unity with the Northern Baptists. There is some sentiment among Southern Presbyterians, however, for unity, both with their own household and for the unity of the whole Church, and they are working together on the foreign mission field. The Methodists have had their household stirred by the agitation of the possibility of unity of the Northern and Southern Methodists by the votes in their various conferences. Some of the bishops in the Southern Methodist Church are uncompromising in their attitude toward unity of the two branches of Methodism. They appear to find special virtue in pointing out the faults of their Northern brethren.

Dr. Frank Crane, writing in one of the daily papers, says:

The Rev. Edwin Du Bose Mouzon, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, speaking recently in St. Paul, deplored the division of North and South in his denomination. He said:

"It looks as if we Methodists might come to the Kingdom at such a time as this if we might fling our differences away and move like a mighty army. It is now probable that the Methodist Church South will not have the necessary majority to carry out the unification plan at this time. This adverse vote means, not a failure, but simply a delay in getting together."

Nobody knows or cares much now about the subjects which separated the Methodist from the Episcopal Church, the Baptist from the Presbyterian, or which otherwise were the original issues upon which denominations were founded. The fences which divide religious people are almost all made of dead timber.

Nevertheless, the multitudes gather around these dead timbers and are forever trying to explain the attitude of their

dead forebears. We need an evangelism that will make us forget the things that are behind and "press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." The world must discover the direction in which we are moving;— that direction must not be by affirming loyalty to Christ in isolation, but by affirming loyalty to our brethren to whom Christ is Brother and Redeemer. What applies to conditions between the North and the South relative to the Baptist, Presbyterian, and Methodist households likewise applies to all our divisions. There is a way to break them down and the way to do it is to do it, working in season and out of season, until the world shall see that we have forgiven all. A clean slate means the incoming of a new spirit in the hearts of all Christians.

The Scramble for Authority

Since the appearance of Auguste Sabatier's *Religions of Authority*, more than twenty years ago, it is being observed that authority can be no other than relative. The scientists have led the way, particularly those pioneers like Galileo and Bacon, in the realm of physics, and Descartes, in that of philosophy. Religious doctrines have been greatly modified as the result of definite scientific conclusions. The critical examination of the infallibility both of the Church and the Bible has brought the scientific method into a permanent place in religious thought, so that the whole Church is being powerfully influenced by it. Practical experience of the power of Christianity on the individual life is giving experimental religion a growing place in spiritual life. The Roman Catholic Church has its danger in yielding too slowly to the scientific method, while Protestantism has its danger in becoming too much entangled in the political and economic order, with the loss of the adventure of romance for a spiritual society.

This is a dangerous condition from either angle, which can be met only by uniting the best in both types of Christianity for the good of all. Professor David E. Owen, of the department of history in Yale University, recently speaking, according to a press dispatch, said that Protestantism has removed much of

the romance and beauty from Christianity, and that it has tended to debase itself to the ideals of the political and economic order and has not supplied the need for a supernatural society. He further said:

The factors which account for the weakness in Protestantism are the constant search for authority and the setting up of one authority after another, only to see each bowled over, and the division of Christendom into sects which to-day have outlived whatever relation they may have had to the original separation.

The division into sects is unnecessary, there not being enough difference in belief to warrant the Protestants calling themselves Baptists, Congregationalists, or Methodists.

Whether one be a Roman Catholic or a Protestant, he must recognize the abnormality of conditions in the religious world of the present day and not be afraid to help in reducing this abnormality to normality. All that science and experience can give us must be commandeered to our service to make it possible for the Kingdom of God to come into the hearts of the world.

The Necessity of Exploring New Ground

At a well attended meeting of Anglicans and Free Churchmen at the Archway Road Baptist Chapel, London, which was to deepen devotional experience and to cultivate sympathetic relations, an address was made by the Rev. Canon Woods, of Holy Trinity Church, Cambridge, which *The Christian World* describes as follows:

He reviewed the history of the movement toward reunion, showing how a deep sense of the need for it arose from the experiences of the war, and how this came to expression in the Lambeth Conference. He pointed out that for the moment a halt had been called, not because interest or desire had slackened, or because a deadlock had been reached, but in order that new ground might be explored and that the rank and file might have time to catch up with the leaders. Before a fresh advance could be made, three things were necessary: penitence, that the different churches are content to remain satisfied with a condition that they know is alien to the mind of Christ; thanksgiving for the rich variety of Christian experience represented and expressed by the different churches; and the vision of a fairer

country toward which the spirit is leading us—the vision which we are apt to lose as we leave youth behind.

These are three important considerations — penitence, thanksgiving, and vision. There is now little thought of penitence in regard to the divided Church. To see that this whole thing is wrong and that all of us are sharers in the wrong must come into the experience of the whole Church before very much advance can be made to unity. These divisions are so ancient, so respectable, with their great buildings and high sounding achievements, that it is difficult to get one's eyes off of these things and see Christ and an unredeemed world.

Already there is evidence for appreciation of each other's service, irrespective of our party affiliations. It will be a real day when we can publicly and sincerely give thanks for the service and contribution of this communion and that communion as though we were members of them all; but that day will come, and then a great vision will come to the whole Church. These things are in process. It is our task to hasten the day.

Popularizing Unity

With all the centuries of Christian history back of us, we are just beginning to take seriously the necessity of a united Christendom. There are more people in the world to-day who are interested in Christian unity than at any other time in the history of Christianity. The time has arrived for a movement for popularizing the ideals of unity. Last year the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work called attention to the ethics of Christianity and next year the World Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne is to call attention to its theological side. Bishop Charles H. Brent, of Buffalo, New York, speaking recently in the interest of the latter conference, is quoted by the daily press as follows:

Preparatory to this conference, Bishop Brent said the churches "must popularize the question of unity and widen the vision of church membership on the subject." There is no doubt, he said, that the mass of people in this country are not deeply interested in church unity because the majority of clergy have not preached unity.

"The so-called Christian nations instead of Christianizing themselves have nationalized Christianity, and consequently Christianity in this and other nations has a relatively small influence."

Condemning American pragmatism for leading church people of this country to the belief that religion lies in the pursuit of truth, Bishop Brent urged a unity which, he said, should penetrate the whole realm of Christian thought and include the idealistic and not merely the practical side of the faith.

The purpose of ecclesiastical unity, he pointed out, is not to establish uniformity but to allow the Church as a group to benefit from the special gift possessed by the individual church.

In this country, he said, there are 202 Protestant denominations having different bases of theological organization, but which do not differ in actual practice of their Christianity.

"If we look at the Roman Catholic Church," he continued, "we see an example of unity which far outweighs all opposition we may have for the practice of that church. One of the chief aims of Protestantism should be to understand the Roman Catholic Church through its own literature, rather than through literature given out by other churches."

He said that generalizations on religious unity should be avoided, as should generalizations on religion and science. "It is foolish to say that there is no difference between religion and science unless one specifies whether one refers to the science of evolution, biology, or some other division of the general term," he said. "Just so we should not attempt the abolition of creeds in our efforts toward Christian unity. I am in favour of the retention of creeds, for Christian unity must not be limited, but must be inclusive of the whole Church."

Bishop Brent said that he did not believe that the conference at Lausanne would bring about complete unity of the Christian churches. However, he said, the conference will insure an "enlarged understanding and will go further to show that we are living in a day of conference rather than controversy."

If a group of men of Bishop Brent's type could be released for a time from the burdens of their office, in order to evangelize the nation for Christian unity, it would carry this great idea to the hearts and consciences as nothing else could do. The method of holding conferences with small groups and delivering public addresses to large audiences would do just what is needed at this time. A few people cannot solve the problem involved in Christian unity. It belongs to every person who is a believer in Jesus Christ. The printed page will help, but the human voice will help more.

An Interdenominational School of Religious Education

The denominational school is gradually losing its force in modern education. It served once with great usefulness. In fact, it was the only thing that the denominations could do in the matter of education; but, in the last few years, the interdenominationalizing of religious education is being thought of around the world. It has come with force on the mission fields and the strict denominational school in the home lands is gradually breaking down and giving way to the interdenominational attitude. American educators are facing these conditions seriously. The movement must be gradual, but it must come if religious education is to function properly in the making of a better civilization.

On another page of *The Quarterly* President George B. Stewart, of Auburn Theological Seminary, New York, has contributed a most interesting article relative to establishing an interdenominational school of religious education. The idea is challenging. To combine the Protestant communions of America in such a task would contribute as nothing else could toward a better understanding in the Protestant household and unify those interests in a real co-operation that would give the right meaning both to education and to Christianity. Until we learn to think together and work together we cannot make very satisfactory advancement. Such a school as that proposed by President Stewart would be of inestimable worth for Protestant Christianity in America. Washington would be a good location. It is a new field. Other institutions of a cosmopolitan character have located there. An interdenominational school of religious education belongs there. It is to be hoped that President Stewart will carry forward this idea of an interdenominational school of religious education in Washington until it becomes a fact. Men and money will come to its support because the idea is both practical and possible.

PETER AINSLIE.

PREACHING TO THE MEN OF TO-DAY

BY SAMUEL McCOMB, PH. D.

Professor of Pastoral Theology, Episcopal Theological Seminary,
Cambridge, Mass.

LET us begin by asking: Wherein lies the power of the pulpit? It cannot be in critical or literary information about the Bible, for this can be obtained much more accurately and fully from the writings of scholars; nor can it be in fine thoughts finely expressed, for these we can enjoy in the magazine article and the book of essays; nor yet again in the splendour of oratory, because there are many more great speakers outside the pulpit than in it. Where, then, does it lie? I answer: In the possession of a valid, permanent, and indispensable message to the soul of man, and in such a presentation of it as will win a vital response and make it the creator of a new character, a new life. The preacher and his message stand related in a unique and signal fashion. In the pulpit the speaker has no meaning apart from his Gospel; his significance lies wholly in the extent to which he has been first of all fashioned by his message. As Joubert finely says: "You may do what you like, mankind will believe no one but God; and he only can persuade mankind who believes that God has spoken to him. No one can give faith unless he has faith; the persuaded persuade as the indulgent disarm." Here is the great Either-Or; either we have a message or we have it not. One of the prevailing weaknesses of the pulpit is the uncertainty on the part of the preacher as to whether he has any definite and living word which he can afford to utter with absolute confidence, as to whether there is any solid ground on which he can take his stand and thence defy the onset of doubt or the paralyzing power of a universe that seems all too mechanical. One thing is clear: Never have

men longed for faith as they long to-day. They may call themselves agnostics, skeptics, non-religious, but at heart they yearn for a vision of a spiritual order, for a revolution of truth and goodness, and the man to whom this revealing vision has come will find an audience even in the wilderness.

It is true that the old type of sermon hardly appeals to men to-day, except to those who need no conversion. It took too much for granted, and it had for its background doctrines and principles now called in question. But it is also true that never were thoughtful men more open to a rational presentation of the Christian Gospel. They turn away from arid debates about the Person of Christ, but they feel instinctively that He has the secret of a new and joyous life for the individual and for society, though they cannot explicate it in rational terms, nor give it commanding power over the intellect and the will. How can the modern preacher face the spiritual situation thus created if he has not grasped the primary and fundamental truths of the Christian religion?

What, then, is the message which the preacher is summoned to proclaim? Is it an old idea revitalized and gifted by Jesus with power over the human heart, such as, for example, the Fatherhood of God or the Kingdom of Heaven? Is it the complex of traditional dogma shaped by Greek philosophy and Roman legalism and dubbed with some pretentious and high-sounding title? Is it a panacea for economic ills, a programme for the reconstruction of the social order which Jesus came to promulgate but which the Church has elaborately ignored? Is it a republication of natural religion, a reformed and higher Judaism mingled, perhaps, with the magic and mystery of Oriental cults? No! Not one of these alone nor all of them together, whatever elements of truth may be discernible in them, rise to the challenge of Christianity, nor can they satisfy the typical experience of the Christian soul throughout the centuries. We do not reach the heart of the matter until we see that the Gospel was and is nothing less than an outpouring of the Spirit of God, the influx of ultimate, creative, or re-creative forces, transfiguring human life, and lifting the human

soul to new levels of consciousness, where it can breathe an ampler air freed from the incubus of the past, and where it can commune with a present and a living God. Christ came, indeed, not to "destroy, but to fulfil." And his revelation is the completion and perfection of antecedent spiritual movements, stepping forth as it were on the stage of history, projecting from Himself a source of creative energy, of a new and diviner life rendered forever available to men in Christ. The appearance of Christ in the first century on this planet was an event not only in human history but, if we may say so, in the history of God. It was the fruit of a redemptive impulse in the heart of the Eternal, manifesting itself as a new dynamic,—permanent, creative, exhaustless. Hence our message is not a doctrine, not even the doctrine of the Incarnation; it is Christ as a creative revelation of power, and peace, and forgiveness; it is the will and energy of God in direct action on the soul for its redemption and release. It makes all the difference in the world to our Gospel, whether we believe that Christ is active in the sense that the impression produced on us by a contemplation of Him as a figure in an ever-vanishing past awakens our faith, or that faith is evoked by contact with Christ Himself who lives in another order of being but who ever energizes in hearts and minds open to his influence. The all-important factor in the Gospel is not a theological theorem, such as justification by faith, nor yet a religious experience such as conversion; it is the fact that here and now there is a veritable and vital force issuing from the Personality of the Redeemer who, enfranchised from all terrestrial limitations, is now set free to work his saving miracles in the souls and lives of men. Not in what Christ has said or done or suffered in the days of his flesh, but in what He *is* here and now and continues to be from moment to moment, in the ever-fresh, unfolding of the unsearchable potentialities of his being, is the article of a standing or a falling Church. "The Gospel is thoroughly definite; but it is quick with life, and like all living things it exists not as a finished entity but as a vital impulse never to be spent." And it is this because at its heart is a present, living, ruling, and joyously

creative Christ. Renan has said that the life of St. Francis of Assisi made it possible for him to believe in Jesus as a historic reality. But the great mystic found the spring of his light and love not merely in the sweet Galilean teacher, but in a present day living Master and Friend. Hence the modern preacher will do well to emphasize what is fundamental in Christian life and faith, facts of experience rather than theories of the discursive understanding. He will study Jesus Christ with all the aids that historical criticism and experimental psychology can provide. He will steep himself in his truths and principles so as to make clear to himself what Christ now is from what history shows Him to have been. Then let him boldly and confidently preach Him and rich will be his reward, for if we set men face to face with Christ He may be trusted to prove the reality of his claim, to assert his sovereignty over spirits that are akin to Him in the deepest places of their being.

Such, then, is our message. It has endless relations; its effects are concerned with the whole compass of human existence—intellectual and spiritual and physical; it is universal in its scope and range—but all this must here be left without discussion. We must rather ask: How is this message to be presented so that it shall evoke an emotional and volitional response on the part of the hearer? A critic of the modern pulpit says that *power* is absent from a large part of America's preaching, and attributes this weakness to a tendency to unconvincing evangelical platitudes, pietistic sentimentality, dry intellectualism, fighting controversial battles that have long ceased to interest, shallow socialism with economic theorizing, but little human appeal. There is a large measure of truth in this indictment. The crying need is for a reform in pulpit methods. And the first step in the path of reform is to grasp clearly the true aim and end of all genuine preaching, which is the redemption of the individual through the impartation of the power of an endless life, quickening the conscience, illumining the mind, kindling joy within the heart, strengthening the will, reinforcing the impulses of the better self, with a resultant transfiguration of all human relations, and therefore of all social

institutions. How is this aim to be realized amid modern conditions?

1. The preaching of the modern age *must be dominated by great constructive ideas*. One of the lost ideals of preaching in sore need of recovery is that which is found in the Gospel a revelation of truth, of ultimate reality. To-day men feel that religion is either everything or nothing. They will sift it to the bottom. No longer can it be based on traditional dogmas armed with ecclesiastical authority, but on absolute truthfulness and personal conviction. Interest in minute refinements or nice doctrinal distinctions is dead, and in its place has come a yearning for a grasp of truths that grip life at its roots and go down to the source of things. The Gospel is not a philosophy, nevertheless it has a philosophical background, and while it is friendly to any idealistic conception of the universe, there are current world-views that are fatal to its existence. The preacher must know what these are and must be able, on fit occasion, to vindicate his faith as an act in harmony with the highest reason. Further, he must be inspired with a sense of the ethical and intellectual grandeur of Christianity, with its boundless wealth of truth, which touches life at every point, and satisfies the craving of the intellect for unity, largeness, and power. Read any of the great preachers who have made their mark on their own and succeeding generations—a Baxter, an Edwards, a Channing, a Beecher, a Phillips Brooks, to name but a few—and you will find that beneath their flowers of eloquence, their poetry and mysticism, their glowing fervour of appeal, there is a solid substructure of ideas, an order of majestic truths, which gives solidity and massive splendour to the discourse. We are suffering from a reaction against the dogmatism of the past. Unable to proclaim the doctrines in which our fathers rejoiced, we are tempted to abandon the efforts to understand our religion, and to take refuge in pious sentimentalities or in practical external activities which dispense with the necessity of rational reflection. Now this procedure spells a sterile Church and a decadent religion. Great practical results can be the fruit only of a principle grasped by the intelligence. Consistent

and effective action is born of deep convictions. Unhappily most of our religious thought has been hardened into dogmas, and therefore the mass of men can find in it no motive to action. The preacher must recast a dogmatic formula in terms of contemporary life, and make it available for use. But if the dogma is shown to be false by the Christian consciousness of our time, it must be rejected and replaced by expressions more acceptable and rational. For the day of trial is here, the searching fires of a world-calamity are burning up the hay, wood, and stubble, and men's hearts are failing them for fear of what may befall the Temple of Faith itself. The cry of the hour is for men who will restudy and revitalize the ruling ideas of the Gospel of Christ, who will steep them in the living realities of experience and make them once more the possession of heart and conscience. The age for mere impressionism is past. The average layman will tell you quite frankly that he does not understand the Bible, and we all know that within as without the Church there is an appalling ignorance of the fundamental ideas of Christianity—with the result that ancient heresies reclothed in modern dress, or neglected aspects of Christian truth now emphasized and set forth in terms that seem to make them a fresh revelation, allure and captivate minds that have never been subjected to the discipline of vigorous and solid pulpit teaching. We need, in order that the pulpit may experience a rebirth of its ancient power, a race of preachers who shall be, first and foremost, thinkers. "Beware," says Emerson, "when the great God lets loose a thinker in this planet. Then all things are at risk. It is as when a conflagration has broken out in a great city, and no man knows what is safe or where it will end." Now the great ideas that lie at the heart of the Christian religion, have a "feeling-tone," are on the way to action. God, what He really is and the sources of our knowledge of Him; human freedom and responsibility in a universe governed by iron and inviolable laws; sin, its relation to God, to self, and to the world; redemption from evil and the method by which it is achieved; Christ, who He was, and what He did, and the nature of his message to man's soul; the new life in God, how it originates

and how it is sustained; death and its meaning; the world to come, its reality, nature, and significance for the life that now is—such are some of the great truths which the modern man longs to hear about, not, indeed, as dogmas imposed on the mind of the preacher, from without and mechanically transferred to the mind of the hearer, but as ever-fresh discoveries of the preacher himself, all aglow with the fires of a noble emotion, instinct with the magic of life, strong to transform character, and to irradiate with solemn light the mysteries of existence.

2. The preaching for the new age must be *rich in suggestion*. One of the most frequent charges leveled at the pulpit is its lack of practical effectiveness in bringing religious ideas to bear upon life. Of exhortation we have enough and more than enough, but we are very scant of practical suggestions for the achievement of the goodness we are exhorted to practice. It is being more and more recognized that law obtains in the spiritual no less than in the material realm. Hence the modern man is anxious to know what these spiritual laws are and how they may be utilized for the enrichment and expression of life. As the hearer feels thrilled by a noble presentation of some aspect of the Christian character, his unspoken wish is—"If only I knew *how* to put on this virtue, if only it did not seem like a picture painted in the clouds!" Or he catches a vision of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, not in vague outlines but in hard, definite particular detail, and as he contemplates its hideous character and the dread penalties that await it, his conscience awakens, and he resolves to be a better man, and then he yearns for some word to make plain how he can be set free from the hidden shame that is ruining his happiness and paralyzing his higher powers. And if no word be spoken, he is thrown back on his old abortive efforts, the victim of ancient inhibitions, and he settles down into the despairful conviction that, as poor Robert Burns said, the Gospel is news too good to be true. Many persons haunt our churches not to seek intellectual illumination, nor yet to have their doubts dissipated, but for practical help in the management of their own characters. They hear the preacher discourse on the wonders of prayer, its bless-

edness, its power to raise the soul to the heights of the religious life, and all the time the heart is crying silently—Would to God that my faith were in proportion to my belief, that I know *how* to lay hold of the Divine energy, and lose my poor, perplexed, harassed self.

“in that mystery
Where God-in-man is one with man-in-God.”

Or the need may be of a different kind. The man of business will freely admit the nobility of a life of practical enterprise based on the Christian ideal, but what he wants to know is *how*, amid the concrete difficulties of buying and selling, the harsh realities of a system based on ruthless competition, the Christian principle may be applied and shown to be not only ideal but solidly real. Something of this may be learned from books, but not much. It is through self-knowledge, through fellowship with men, through plunging into the stream of life's experiences that we may win the spiritual tact, the moral insight that is the key to the solution of the problem and perplexities of religion when applied to the realities of existence. The pulpit that is to win influence and serve the world's necessities to-day must be rich in suggestiveness, in scientific aim, in hints that make for spiritual attainment.

3. The preaching for the new age must recover the note of *triumphant gladness*. The reader of the New Testament and of early Christian literature knows that the ground-tone of the new life which Christ created was joy. Jesus went about, as we know, turning sadness and sorrow into peace and joy unspeakable and full of glory. With profound insight the unknown mystic who composed the Fourth Gospel puts at the forefront of his writing the symbolic story of the Wedding Feast at Cana, where, transmuting the common things of sense, the Master showed forth his glory as the bringer of joy to the world. And another mystic could write from his Roman prison—“Rejoice in the Lord evermore.” This gift of joy, the legacy of Christ to his followers, suffuses with its radiance the Christian life of the primitive Church, as von Dobschütz has abundantly shown.

The "children of joy," as the primitive believers were called, had such spiritual certainty and confidence, that they created a new world in the midst of an old and dying world, inhabited by a new and "third race" of men who had the promise of all the future. In that strange and to us fantastic production of the second century, *The Shepard of Hermas*, the author, who was by temperament what we should now call a melancholy neurasthenic, received a revelation in the strength of which his moroseness and depression were conquered by a spirit of abounding faith and gladness. The Angel of Repentance appears to Hermas and says to him: "Put away sorrow from thyself; for she is the sister of double-mindedness and of angry temper." "How, sir," say I, "is she the sister of these? For angry temper seems to me to be one thing, and double-mindedness another, sorrow another." "Thou art a foolish fellow," saith he, "and perceiveth not that sorrow is more evil than all the spirits, and is most fatal to the servants of God and beyond all the spirits destroys a man and crushes out the Holy Spirit. . . . Therefore clothe thyself in cheerfulness, which hath favour with God always, and is acceptable to Him and rejoice in it." Here we discern the deepest note of the Christian religion, which has sounded again and again through the centuries, especially in the great mystics, despite the melancholy and austere voices of a Latinized theology, with its emphasis on pain and penalty as the sovereign medicines of the soul. Incalculable mischief has been done to religion by Carlyle's notion which has infected the thoughts of so many preachers that the glory of Christianity is its "worship of sorrow." Much nearer the truth is the remark of Matthew Arnold that "it is the gladness of Christianity which has made its fortune and not its sorrow." The wise old Roman Church has laid it down that only a life penetrated by spontaneity and joy can be recognized as of supreme religious perfection. She refused to canonize any saint in whose life and influence there has not been the note of expansive joy, even though faith had been present strong enough to work miracles. We greatly need the preaching that will present religion as a generous and satisfying life, the one ade-

quate outlet for the energies that in most of us are only half-used, the preaching that will thrill us into forgetfulness of evil, into the consciousness of that peaceful joy, of enthusiastic gladness under the influence of which we shall achieve undreamed-of-victories. And this will be our experience when we return to those sources of inspiration from which the early disciples and those of a like spirit in later times drew their strength and peace. Their master-conviction was the reality and nearness of the spiritual world. To them the everyday, commonplace realm of birth and death, eating and drinking, health and sickness, work and rest, were surrounded by the spiritual world as by an atmosphere. Nay, rather, the real world was invisible in which they truly lived, whereas the present material order is but a phantasmagoria which passes like the shadow of a dream. When the Church renounces her materialism, when she boldly puts first the spiritual world and relegates to the second place money and machinery, in brief, when she returns to the mystical convictions of her Founder and Lord, we may expect such an enhancement of vitality, such an influx of power and peace, that she shall transcend all the barriers of stale custom and convention, and reassume the spiritual leadership of humanity.

4. The preaching for the new age must be *democratic in its sympathies and outlook*. For good or ill democracy is here, and its universal triumph is only a matter of a little time. People wonder at the enthusiasm, the exalted mood which democracy or the ideal of popular government creates. But they would cease to wonder if they reflected that we are here dealing not merely with a political stratagem but with a deep and vital passion for equality of opportunity, for freedom to develop one's spiritual gifts, released from the tyrannies of caste and privilege. The higher democracy believes in a new type of aristocracy, a nobler guild of merit, character, and worth. As James Russell Lowell puts it—"Democracy must show capacity for producing not a higher type of average man but the highest possible types of manhood under every variety of condition, or it is a failure." How stands the Christian Gospel related to the democratic ideal? The relation is one of direct kinship. To

the eye of Christ the humblest creature that wears a human face is the potential child of Deity and heir of immortal life. He is inspired by the breath of the Infinite and his fate stirs the interest of the moral universe. Is it seemly that such a being should breathe the corrupted air of tenement slums, and suffer exploitation at the hands of the cunning and the strong from the cradle to the grave? The Christian ideal and the social order are in frightful antagonism to each other. Young and enthusiastic minds are awakening to this alarming fact, and they "are moving about in worlds not realized." Can the pulpit be silent or take refuge in fussy ecclesiastical questions which no longer interest any living mind? The Christian Gospel does not regard human beings as though they were disembodied spirits. It has no sympathy with the cant of some Christians who pretend to believe that "material things do not matter." We know that they do matter. We know that there are types of poverty which cut at the roots of all spirituality and make a worthy or religious life well-nigh impossible. That is why the poor made such an appeal to the heart of Christ. His supreme credential which He offered the doubting Baptist was not his miracles, but this : "The poor have the Gospel preached to them." And we must embody in our message the truth that the physical basis of the spiritual life is sacred, that all men are entitled to the opportunity to earn their bread, that the end and aim of religion is nothing less than a redeemed soul in a redeemed body and dwelling in a redeemed environment. The moral solution of the social problem challenges the preacher of to-day, who too often blinks the fact that if he evades the issue the Christian religion is likely to become a thing of personal and private pieties, without influence, without power to lift the collective life to higher levels of spiritual vitality. Yet the Church must not attempt to give answers to economic questions which it is incompetent to give. It must not rashly propound economic suggestions which it is not qualified to offer. The Church speaks to rich and poor, socialists and individualists alike, and she cannot commit herself to any specific doctrine which claims to be the final solution of the sociological problem. But

she is committed to the position that the social order must rest on justice or it is doomed. She is committed to those permanently valid principles which her Lord has laid down and which, freed from their temporal and evanescent forms, must constitute the foundations on which is to be built the new and lovelier world for which we yearn. The Church must tell the wage-earner that without the passion of a religious faith constraining him to the highest loyalty and service, all material advancement is as dust and ashes. The Gospel of the divineness of work must once more be proclaimed. The preacher must insist that any doctrine of labour which tends to make the worker forget his primary duty of putting conscience and zeal into his work, will prove fatal spiritually as well as materially to him who has yielded to temptation. The Church must tell the rich man that, for his soul's sake, his millions may have been won at too high a price. There was a time when we had to preach that the soul of the poor man was as precious in the sight of God as the soul of the rich; it looks as if we must now insist that the soul of the rich is as dear to God, the common Father, as that of the poor. For it means that we must warn the rich man of the evils that beset him, the danger of the service of Mammon, which uses up all his energies so that he has no time, and eventually no desire, to think about his real self, the danger that in some hour of crisis when the sacrifice of all his wealth is demanded from him, he cannot make the venture of faith; his slavery has killed his soul. And on the positive side we must proclaim, with a new accent of conviction, the doctrine of Christ that wealth is a sacred stewardship for which the steward must give account to his conscience and to God. Christ's message transcends the limitations we would impose upon it. He sees life steadily and as a whole, and, though his method may be slow, it is drastic and radical; for it involves an inner renewal and liberation of the human spirit. And perhaps the best practical contribution the preacher could make to an age governed more and more by democratic ideas would be to lay aside all scholastic and ecclesiastical infallibility and make room every Sunday for a meeting with his hearers in

order to discuss with them openly and frankly the ideas which from the pulpit he has been commending to their acceptance. Henceforth preaching by itself will not suffice. It must be supplemented by free discussion.

5. The preaching of the new age must recover the lost ideal of *artistic perfection* in matter and in form. I hold that preaching is a fine art analagous to sculpture, poetry, and music; and that it is the most exacting of them is abundantly proved by the singular scarceness of those who excel in it. One of the reasons for this paucity of adepts may well be the widespread opinion among preachers that the sermon is a purely utilitarian product with which beauty has nothing whatever to do. And this notion in turn springs, it would seem, from a confusion of thought. It is true that pure art serves no end beyond that of æsthetic satisfaction in the contemplation of beauty, and in this sense art is foreign to the work of constructing sermons. But it is also true that a work serving first and foremost a practical end may yet be so constructed, so æsthetically satisfying, that it is at once a useful object and a thing of beauty, a joy forever. The primary purpose of a church is to be a meeting-place for an assembly of worshipers. Shall we then forbid the artist to carve his loveliest designs upon the walls or to depict the face of the saint and seer upon the windows? But there is a deeper reason why, if the pulpit is to regain its waning power, it must aim to greater beauty of form. Preaching, to be sure, is much more than art. It does not exist for its own sake alone, but for the sake of persuading the mind, touching the emotions with the ultimate end of affecting the will. Still the instrument by which these things are done is language, and language has a vital relation to thought, and thought that is beautiful has a tendency to clothe itself in beautiful words. Well has it been said that He whom men called the Word of God came amongst us full not only of the truth that illumines but of the grace that charms. Hence, I agree with the remark of Mahaffy that if by the subtlest logic, by the most deliberate emotion, a man can force his own deepest convictions upon his hearers, then such artistic rhetoric is not

only defensible but strongly to be encouraged. In a letter from a private correspondent, a thoughtful layman, a significant criticism touches this point. "The preacher," he writes, "should confine himself closely to his subject. Let him prepare his sermon as a lawyer writes his brief, everything he sets down tending to throw light on the matter in hand. He should avoid being wordy, discursive, and uselessly repetitious. In a game of chess every move should count. If a player moves simply for the sake of making a move, he is apt to be in a bad way, and the game is about up with him. So a preacher should not say anything simply for the sake of saying something." My correspondent, all unwittingly, was laying down an important canon of sound oratory. To avoid mannerisms, tediousness, slipshod and negligent speech, sounding but empty phrases, lame and impotent conclusions, is a work to be achieved only by a devoted and painstaking artist. Other things being equal, that sermon will best achieve its purpose and evoke a deep response from him who hears it, which is organic, proportioned in structure, impressive by its form and diction, noble and dignified in its ornate harmony.

SAMUEL McCOMB.

TO EVERY SOUL

To every man there openeth
A way, and ways, and a way,
And the high soul climbs the high way,
And the low soul gropes the low;
And in between on the misty flats,
The rest drift too and fro.
But to every man there openeth
A high way and a low,
And every man decideth
The way his soul shall go.

—John Oxenham.

CO-OPERATION AND UNITY*

BY A. E. TURNER

Executive Secretary of the Committee on Co-operation,
Valparaiso, Chile

INTRODUCTION.

It is the duty of the Church not only to save a man's soul, but to save his whole body, his whole life. Abstract doctrine tends to divide men, but the understanding of common tasks unites them. The work of the Young Men's Christian Association shows that men of different denominations can work together for the common good. It stands for religious unity and for practical human service. No single church denomination can represent Jesus Christ to the people of any municipality when each church is doing its own work in its own way and ignoring the rest. The churches need to undertake something too great and too big for any one church and in which all must co-operate. It will mean economy in men and money. Unity must be brought about if the Church is to meet the demands of the new social situation, for only by unity of action in doing some things that ought to be done for the common and general welfare can the larger task be accomplished. (*The Church in the Community.*)

It ain't the guns nor the ammunition, nor the funds that they can pay,
But close co-operating that makes them win the day.
It ain't the individual, not the army as a whole,
But everlasting team play of every bloomin' soul.—*Kipling.*

I. GENERAL PROGRESS IN CO-OPERATION SINCE 1916.

1. In world relationships, since 1916, there has been a growing tendency among the nations of South America toward a better international understanding. The Fifth Pan-American Congress, held in Santiago, Chile, April, 1923, was an evidence of this. Nineteen of the twenty-one countries were represented by delegates at this congress. It is to be regretted that Peru and Bolivia were not present, but, on the other hand, it is encouraging that representatives of Chile and Peru were meeting

*Prepared for the Montevideo Congress on Christian Work and also read at the Regional Congress, April 21-26, 1925.

at the same time in Washington to present their arguments in the Tacna-Arica territorial dispute between those two nations to the arbitration of the President of the United States. Mexico was not present because she thought that it might be embarrassing to sit at a table with delegates from a country which had not recognized her government. President Alessandri's attitude toward international questions is and has been praise-worthy. In spite of handicaps, better relationships are being formed and Pan-Americanism moves forward.

2. In the denominational attitude the relations, on the whole, are creditable to all parties. In questions of church polity and doctrine there is an increasing evidence of a spirit of charity toward those who are not members of the co-operation organization. Those who are not co-operating directly are more and more desiring that there be unity of action.

3. Among the missionaries there has been one step forward which is noteworthy — the hearty co-operation in the Christian Workers Conference, in which eight different organizations and denominations are united in a splendid spirit for the good of all. At this conference there is no thought of denominationalism.

4. Among the national churches there is a desire on the part of the Chileans, and acquiesced in by the missionaries, to make their churches truly national. The Chilean pastors and workers are ready to co-operate with all denominations. In one case the Sunday-school workers were planning a convention in which all the denominations in the city were to take part. Some of the missionaries questioned the advisability of uniting with one of the denominations, but the Chilean workers could see no reason for not including them all.

II. CO-OPERATIVE ENTERPRISES ALREADY SANCTIONED IN CHILE.

1. Theological seminary (Methodist and Presbyterian).

2. *El Sembrador*—a union bookstore (Presbyterian and Methodist, but patronized by all denominations).

3. Christian Workers Conference — a summer camp at Angol in which eight different organizations are participating.

4. Union paper *El Heraldo Cristiano* (Methodist and Presbyterian).

5. A circulating library for missionaries and pastors.

III. CO-OPERATIVE ENTERPRISES WHICH OUGHT TO BE DEVELOPED.

1. In the larger cities like Santiago, Valparaiso, Temuco, and Concepcion, where two or more missions are at work, there exists an opportunity for helpful co-operation in conducting periodic institutes under the leadership of missionaries and pastors. Such institutes might profitably become training centers for the purpose of preparing workers, both by study and actual service, to direct Sunday-schools, lead prayer meetings, direct social activities, welfare work, gospel teams, personal work, educational work, and preaching in "locales." Such training centers and institutes might also serve as feeders to the seminary or, at least, as a testing of the candidates for the seminary. One such training center is now being conducted by the Christian Alliance Church of Temuco with good results. Institutes have also been conducted by the Methodist Church. There should be sufficient freedom of thought in these institutes to allow all denominations to enter into co-operation.

2. A language school was opened in Concepcion and participated in by the Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists. This school should be continued under the auspices of the Advisory Committee on Co-operation in Christian Work in Chile.

3. The summer conference for Christian workers (missionary) held at Angol has been so helpful that similar conferences should be opened in other parts of the country for other groups.

4. A better international relationship should be promoted through an effort to interest the English speaking churches and other foreign churches more in the national churches.

5. A scientifically planned scheme of co-operative education is urgently needed and would be of great benefit. It has been agreed to adopt uniform text-books in all mission schools, thus saving expense in ordering and handling. All schools are

working toward a course of study in keeping with the government schools and one that will lead to entrance in the university. All schools in centers like Santiago, Valparaiso, Temuco, and Concepcion might profitably unite under the management of one board of directors so as to make the work of all schools uniform, establish proper relationships to other schools in the city, minister to the general welfare of the community without overlapping in service rendered, secure local financial support, open other schools when necessary, unite in providing certain teachers who might serve all schools and unite in the management of the commissary departments of all schools.

IV. CO-OPERATION AMONG THE CHURCHES.

1. Ways in which they may co-operate to good effect:

(a) A Baptist missionary writes: "I think that the missions can work together in all social and moral reforms. I further think that we can work for better literature. The missions can co-operate with the municipalities from the pulpit by preaching law and order, by reporting cases of disorder, and by encouraging our people in every way possible to be law abiding citizens. With the public schools we can co-operate by urging the parents to send their children to school and by reporting cases where they refuse to obey the public school laws. We can co-operate with the Red Cross and other organizations by contributing and giving moral support. I like the word 'unity' which you use. Had we always used that word, instead of union, we would have understood each other better than we do. Personally I am in favour of anything that promotes the spirit of unity."

(b) All churches can co-operate in union meetings, in sending out gospel teams, in exchange of pulpits, evangelistic campaigns, civic and moral campaigns, health exhibits, baby weeks, dispensaries, clinics, and in the creation of public opinion for better conditions of health in the city.

(c) All can co-operate on the temperance problem with a central committee to carry on the propaganda for prohibition.

(*d*) "Take what you can get and keep what you can hold," was the rule of action which led to the World War into which many entered in order to eliminate war forever. If war is to be eliminated the churches must unite in teaching the world that war is sin. They also must unite in some constructive measure that will remove the cause of war. Mahatma Gandhi has given impressive proof that the Master's teachings can be applied to politics as the best means of securing justice.

(*e*) All churches can unite in publicity, in advertising, urging people to attend church, thus lessening the cost to each by paying jointly.

(*f*) Churches can unite in securing a united effort of all organizations, like the Chamber of Commerce, medical organizations, student federations, labour federations, Red Cross, and other institutions interested in public welfare, in giving to the community playgrounds, better sanitary conditions, a good water supply, clean politics, and those things which will do away with human suffering.

(*g*) Pastors can co-operate in sermons on Christian ideals for local politics and international relationships.

(*h*) Young men's clubs and Bible classes within the churches can unite in circulating literature, in writing letters to the President of the Republic, urging legislation and enforcement of law. Above all, they can become a force for the observance of law. They can also write letters to the local newspapers on subjects of vital importance to the community. Selecting from each group the strongest speakers, singers, and leaders, they can conduct, unitedly or separately, street preaching and Sunday-schools.

(*i*) Safe-guarding fundamental articles of faith and without giving up "things that are dear" to each, all denominations can and ought to unite in making a greater social impact on the communities where they work. They ought to undertake something that one of them cannot do alone. They can correlate their experiences so that they will serve for all, eliminating all possible hindrances to the building up of the Body of Christ and bringing into fellowship all who profess and call them-

selves Christians, adopting the best from all churches to make one Chilean church or, still better, a church which shall include all nations and races and make it a world conquering power.

(j) The task of the Church is large, beset with dangers, and the conditions, problems, and demands of the world can only be dealt with successfully by common action. All overlapping should, therefore, be eliminated, making one strong church where there are now two or three struggling ones; and giving better support to the pastor serving that one church, so that he can buy books, send his children to school, and live so that he will be able to do his work well and effectively.

2. The need of national conferences:

(a) A pastor suggests that provincial conferences would be helpful; or, where the provinces are small, two or three could be united in one conference for the workers of all denominations.

(b) Another urges that more fraternal visiting at all conferences and mission meetings would be helpful for the work.

(c) Conferences for laymen would increase the volunteer service of the churches.

3. The work of the Regional Committee on Co-operation:

(a) The Regional Committee should be made up of a majority of Chileans, giving them the responsibility. This committee should be so constituted that it would have a member in all the larger centers like Valparaiso, Santiago, Concepcion, and Temuco, where sub-committees could be formed with this member of the main committee as chairman. Such sub-committees would promote co-operation among the churches of these centers and the chairman would always be a connecting link with the main Regional Committee. On the sub-committees there should be:

- (1) A doctor to represent the health interests of the city.
- (2) A principal of schools to represent education.
- (3) An athlete to represent the games and sports.

(4) A labour leader to represent the working man.

(5) A boy's worker to represent the boys.

(6) A girl's worker to represent the girls.

(7) And others, possibly, that would make the committee representative of the influence in the community.

(b) The Regional Committee should conduct the language school for outcoming missionaries, and promote unity and co-operation; remove, as far as possible, hindrances, such as narrowness, prejudice, and ambition by developing in their place a Christian personality.

(c) The Regional Committee might well assume certain administrative and other duties, such as surveys and researches, so as to relieve the various missions and churches and give them time for co-operative efforts.

(d) The Regional Committee should promote, by every possible means, the spiritual life of the missions and churches, as this is the strongest factor for co-operation and unity.

4. The Co-operation Committee in Latin America. How can it help?

(a) By providing more traveling secretaries, who shall spend several months in each field, giving addresses, interviewing, and helping the workers in planning and carrying out forward steps.

(b) In the production of literature—letting it be known that the committee is disposed to print books and pamphlets written by missionaries and pastors, provided such material be for the good of all Latin America. Also distribute such literature.

(c) Send out book reviews of such books as have been published recently and will be of help to pastors and other workers. These reviews can be sent to the senior missionary in each field to be shared with their colleagues and the pastors.

(d) Establish circulating libraries for the use of pastors and other workers who cannot afford to buy books that they ought to read and study. These circulating libraries can be conducted by the union bookstore *El Sembrador*.

(e) The committee can co-operate in making the Christian Workers Conference more effective by sending speakers to give inspirational addresses and hold interviews.

(f) The committee can help greatly in general welfare work by sending out exhibits on health, food, and disease, and on methods of conducting Sunday-schools, prayer meetings, social gatherings, and other features of an up-to-date church for use in the various missions and churches in the conducting of campaigns and in the training of leaders in the work.

(g) Through *La Nueva Democracia* the committee can bring about a unity in work in the missions by asking the missionaries and pastors to co-operate more in the provision of articles for the paper and in making suggestions for the making of the paper a real factor in providing thought along lines of high ideals.

(h) The committee can and should promote the interchange or, at least, the visits of professors and students of colleges and universities.

(i) With profit the committee can organize commissions for the purpose of studying the educational and religious problems of the entire continent with a view to co-ordinating the work of the schools and the churches, so as to make a greater impact on the communities where they are located.

(j) The committee should set aside men like Dr. John A. MacKay of Lima to give all his time to delivering lectures to students and commercial men on Christian ideals. They should also set aside missionaries with experience to influence labour leaders and to direct them in the direction of right ideals for working men; and others to lead Bible classes and to do personal work.

(k) The committee can help missionaries on furlough to make better use of their time by making opportunities for them to study work done in the United States.

(l) To ensure unity and trustworthy co-operation, the committee should provide the means by which groups of workers from different nations and within each nation can get together for the discussion of their problems and encouragements

oftener than is possible by means of the conferences, like the Panama and the Montevideo Conferences.

(*m*) The committee should promote and settle definitely, in advance, policies which will obviate friction and greatly facilitate co-operation and unity. One of these should be a financial policy for the adequate support of co-operative undertakings.

(*n*) The committee should stimulate united original research and study of the larger and more significant missionary questions, such as an organized effort to fight the great social and international sins of economic exploitation, race prejudice, material standards of success, and political injustice. The committee may well serve as a clearing house, not only in connection with such study and research, but also for all essential missionary reformation.

(*o*) The committee should feel, as we expect it does, a sense of responsibility for the twenty-one nations on the continent, and use every possible means of establishing contacts between the leaders of different nations, devoting themselves to the extension of Christ's Kingdom in Latin America.

(*p*) At times there will be large and important co-operative tasks which this committee can perform for all the missions and churches, such as the one so admirably performed by Rev. S. G. Inman at the Fifth Pan-American Congress in Santiago, in 1923.

V. CO-OPERATION WITH OTHER FORCES.

1. Governmentally: The evangelical forces can and ought to co-operate with the government in

(*a*) The enforcement of law and order.

(*b*) Providing a sanitary environment, which means a good water supply, a proper sewerage and garbage disposal, the cleaning of the streets, the inspection of milk and foods.

(*c*) The control of contagious diseases through vaccination, quarantine, destruction of flies, rats, etc.

(*d*) Personal hygiene:

Medical examinations, maternity care, general education of the public in the meaning of hygiene, infant mortality, health education in the schools, clinics, dispensaries, cleaning up of conventillos, and the providing of schools for poor children who cannot go to the public schools.

(e) Providing of Christian teachers for the public schools, and, in some cases, by an agreement of various denominations, supporting strategically located Christian colleges and schools with an interdenominational faculty (such as the proposed Christian University for Mexico City).

Much of the above, if not all of it, should eventually be done by the government, but the missions must show the way to effective service in these matters. As soon as the government is ready to take the responsibility the mission should let go their hold and be ready to turn over all their advantage and knowledge.

2. Educationally: The evangelical forces can and should co-operate with the government in providing an education for all children by

(a) Conducting illiteracy campaigns, model night schools for those who cannot attend the day schools, and by opening schools in the conventillos (tenement houses).

(b) Means of talks and lectures to the working classes, reading rooms in crowded centers, and publications on temperance distributed broadcast.

(c) Making a Christian impression upon the entire community with their own mission schools.

3. Socially: The evangelical forces can and should co-operate with the government in making their cities safe, wholesome communities by

(a) Helping to establish model playgrounds and providing play-centers where men and women can spend their spare time in recreative games, such as domino, chess, checkers, billiards, take a cup of tea, non-alcoholic refreshments, light lunches, find up-to-date papers and magazines, victrola music, hear extemporaneous talks and conferences, see moving pictures—all under the leadership of Christian men and women who will

create an atmosphere that is wholesome. The moving picture business offers as a social, educational, and moral force such large opportunities that the Church should take it into account. Each mission board would do well to provide at least one outcoming missionary, with a knowledge of the moving picture business, even to the extent that he be able to produce films on temperance, good sanitation, international relationships, high ideals in business and politics, with local setting and application, applying Christian principles as a solution of each problem. The church of Chile has not yet attempted to organize the social life of the community. Much of the social life centers around the club and the moving picture.

4. Morally: Evangelical forces can and should set the moral tone of the cities where they work. Unitedly they should seek to get all the facts about a community as a basis on which to meet its needs.

5. Labour federations: The evangelical forces can and should unite to help the labour movement to attain the right ideals for the country. This can be done under the leadership of a special board, composed of one representative from each mission, which board shall form a programme of approach through the provision of schools, better housing agitation, temperance education, and the convening of conferences for the establishing of right relations between employer and employee. Mission boards may well consider the advisability of sending out missionaries with special experience and preparation on labour problems. These should devote all their time to work closely related to the labour organizations. In Valparaiso, a group of working men petitioned the Young Men's Christian Association to open an Association branch for them.

VI. WAYS OF PROMOTING A SPIRIT OF CO-OPERATION.

1. All missionaries should recognize that their work is not to make Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians out of nominal Roman Catholics, even though they cannot help doing this, simply because some form is necessary in order to teach religion. All missionaries should come with the purpose of

making all people into disciples of Jesus Christ. Keeping this constantly in mind as the main purpose of all their work, there is but a step to leaving it to the Chileans and Him to work out in their own way and time the final form of the Chilean church.

2. The Christian Workers Conference, in which eight organizations co-operate, is an example of how easy it is to work in unity and co-operation when uniting in a task which one cannot do alone. In the foregoing paragraphs of this paper ways have been suggested in which the various missions can co-operate in tasks too large for one alone.

3. The promotion of conferences is one way. Similar to the Christian Workers Conference, other summer camps and conferences should be promoted for pastors and other Christian workers, laymen, teachers, students of the mission schools, and young people of the churches and Sunday-schools. Where the two weeks' or ten days' conference is not practical a week end camp for groups of workers of all denominations will bring different people into each other's presence, which is one of the best ways of bringing about co-operation and unity.

4. There is a large group of men, especially among the intellectual and professional classes, who have withdrawn from the Roman Catholic Church and who, for many reasons, do not affiliate themselves with the Protestant churches, but who have a real interest in Christ and Christianity. All denominations in a given community may well unite in setting aside one man under their joint support to minister to this group through interviews, discussions, lectures, and worship without the usual ritual forms of the existing churches.

VII. WAYS OF CULTIVATING INTERCESSION FOR UNITY.

1. One missionary suggests a programme of interdenominational scope at the annual conferences with an ample use of the best speakers of all denominations to encourage intercessions.

2. Another missionary suggests a careful comparison of the number of professed converts with the number that actually continue faithful to see the urgent need of a deeper and more

profound spiritual experience of the teachings of Jesus to enlarge the spiritual conception of life.

3. Organize groups to meet for prayer. These groups to be made up of all workers in all denominations and without reference to denominational polity and doctrine. These groups might well choose to pray for the accomplishment of some large task in which united prayer is needed. Through prayer for a common task without thought of their own differences they will naturally come together.

4. Celebrate a "Week of Prayer" for the mission work as a whole in the country. During such week each mission might hold union meetings or separate meetings, but always for the purpose of praying for missions as a whole.

5. Uniting in prayer circles—a prayer topic being prepared by the Latin American Committee on Co-operation to include all missions, these prayer topics to be distributed by the committee to all missionaries and pastors.

VIII. METHODS OF ENLARGING SPIRITUAL CONCEPTIONS.

First of all the missionary and the national worker should develop himself free of the domineering spirit by relating himself so closely to Christ that He actually rules his life. His own outlook should be beyond his own church or school. He should see and feel the needs of the entire city and the entire country in which he works and lives. He should go further and see and feel the needs of the entire continent and world. Only then can he enlarge the spiritual conceptions of himself and others. Once he has accomplished this on himself, then he is ready to push his men forward; test them; trust them absolutely and completely; actually create (if necessary) conditions to develop them—and glory in the fact that they are developing into men who see and think and act for themselves. The missionary should be a fellow worker rather than the leader of the group of pastors and Christian workers. The pastor, likewise, should be a fellow worker of the group he develops.

Jesus brought a new conception of man. To Him every man was of infinite worth. There were no exceptions. When

Jesus came to earth nothing was so cheap as man; when He left nothing was so precious. Some of us give ourselves to causes, institutions, organizations; Jesus gave his life to people. His plans could be upset at any time by the meeting of a person. The one joy which He sought was the companionship of man. Love was the central theme of his life; so much so, that He gave us "Love your neighbour as yourself" as the rule of duty to our fellow men. It is by love that we identify ourselves with others. There are no problems which come before us in attacking the powers of evil in the world and no problems of relationships in the Church which will not yield to love.

A. E. TURNER.

THE PROPHET

He leans the shoulder of his brain
Against the doors of mystery—
Those giant, space-confining bars,
Securely braced by suns and stars,
That guard the trove of days to be.
His lever is a long, long thought;
His fulcrum is an iron will;
His strength is of the pure in heart:
And mightily do these avail.
The stubborn hinges slowly fail
Before his calm, insistent pain.
The narrow chink grows wide, until
His eager eye a glimpse has caught
Of Truth's illimitable sea;
And on his soul unfolds the chart
Of his poor race's destiny.

—E. D. Schonberger.

INTERDENOMINATIONAL INSTITUTE OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

BY PRESIDENT GEORGE B. STEWART, D.D., LL.D.

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

A SUPREME opportunity! An imperious challenge! An opportunity is always a challenge to a man of vision, if it be an open-door to something worth while. The larger the opportunity, the more imperial the challenge to the man who has consecrated his life to doing big things. This challenging opportunity is just now in the city of Washington. It is bound up with the most vital part of our educational system, being nothing less than the education of our youth in religion and morals. Publicists, statesmen, editors, educators are emphasizing the necessity for promoting this phase of the educational programme, for all are persuaded that the hope of this free and democratic country lies in the people being fundamentally moral and religious. In the rapid and radical changes which are taking place in our domestic, social, and industrial life, we have not made the necessary readjustment of our methods and agencies for religious and moral education. We must meet the new conditions which the new order creates with new methods and new agencies for the educative process in the sphere of morals and religions. The old will not answer.

In religious, as in secular, education significant changes begin at the top. The leaders and teachers must have new ideals, new methods, new training, if the old system is to give place to a system of education adapted to the new conditions. It is obvious that those who are convinced that the foundations of our civilization and our government are laid deep in the morals of the people must address themselves courageously to the task of providing an adequate and adequately trained body of teachers and leaders of religion and morals.

For this country there is no place where this adventure in the educational field can be carried forward with so large promise for complete and conspicuous and compensating results as in the city of Washington, the political, social, and educational capital of our country.

THE PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSAL

More than a quarter of a century of study and administration in the field of religious education has led the writer to the deliberate convictions expressed in this article. His purpose is to call attention to some of the elements in the pressing and vital problem of providing teachers and leaders prepared to face the demands of this new age, and to show that Washington offers a peculiar and attractive coign of vantage for the prosecution of this undertaking. He is fully convinced that there should be created in Washington a Foundation, free from denominational control or organic connection with any church, but in genuine and sympathetic relation with all the Christian churches, for the purpose of fostering the highest scholarship in the interest of religion and morals, and of furnishing the best facilities for the preparation of men and women who are to be religious leaders in their communities and in the nation and in the world. It should rank with the best professional, technical, university institutions in the academic world. It should commandeer in the interests of morals and religion all the resources of science, art, and liberal culture. He hopes that this article will make clear some good reasons for the faith that is in him.

AGENCIES FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Heretofore the agencies for religious and moral instruction have been in the main the parents in the home, the minister in his parish, and the voluntary teacher in the Sunday-school. They were well-fitted to their task and produced satisfactory results. But due to one cause and another they are not functioning as successfully to-day. The home is no longer the forceful agency in the training of the children that it was formerly. If the parents are to be reinstated in their old position of

teachers of religion they must have a fresh preparation for it. Upon the ministers is now being laid new lines of duty, and new contacts with life are now being opened to them, which require a complete revamping of their training for their high office. The voluntary teacher of religion cannot be eliminated from the scheme of religious instruction, but she must be better trained for her work and must have expert supervision and guidance from a specially instructed director.

In addition to the one-time agencies operating in this field, there are now new agencies, or old agencies functioning in new and effective ways, for the promotion of morality and religion. Among these may be mentioned music, religious periodicals, religious text-books, pageantry, drama, movies, art, architecture. We are just beginning to realize the vastness of the resources these various human interests and activities place at the disposal of the teachers of religion and the tremendous influence these teachers may wield when they have the knowledge and the skill to utilize these resources. This is but saying that the teachers of religion, ministers, teachers, parents, editors, musicians, dramatists, makers of films, ecclesiastical architects must have new goals, methods, material, training for the work the new conditions impose on them. They cannot keep on in their old way and keep up with the times. They must have a new training in many and varied directions.

This is not the place to specify the details for this training, which are numerous and in many respects technical. Sufficient for the purpose of this article to indicate here in a general way that a new type of educational institution is needed to supply the requisite training.

THE PREPARATION OF MINISTERS

Inevitably our first attention goes to the theological seminaries in which the ministers are prepared for their sacred calling. It is to be devoutly wished that this shall never cease to be a scholarly profession. The minister should always have the fine equipment of exact scholarship and full mastery of the resources of learning and the power of a cultured mind. Un-

fortunately, these qualities are all too frequently conspicuous for their absence. But they cannot be dispensed with but to the disastrous loss of efficiency, and the school which sets as its goal the training of the ministry must ever seek to provide these qualities, so far as in it lies, in the amplest measure.

But in addition to these scholarly and cultural qualities the school must also provide facilities for the technical training of the minister for the practice of his profession. It is not enough for him to know the lore of his profession, he must know the technique of it. In these latter days the activities of the Church and the resultant demands upon the ministry have expanded so enormously, along social, community, humanitarian lines, that the so-called practical training of the minister threatens completely to overshadow his intellectual training. It sometimes looks as if it made small difference whether he knew much, if only he knew how to do many things. This undue emphasis upon church machinery and ministerial managerial skill is to be deplored. Yet church machinery and ministerial administrative ability are indispensable and the institution which is preparing the minister for his job must thoroughly furnish him for the leadership of his church in its service to men in every sphere of human endeavour and interest. The huge task laid upon the institution is revealed by a consideration of the multiplied undertakings of the Church in missions, foreign, national, city; in social service for welfare and well-being of men, women, boys, girls, and little children; in ministering to the physical, social, intellectual, and spiritual pleasure and profit of the community in this present day. It must provide facilities for his spiritual, intellectual, social, physical preparation for the duties of his office. In the matter of a plant the requirement is extensive, involving chapel, auditorium, social rooms, library, lecture rooms, seminar rooms, gymnasium, athletic fields, dormitories, dining hall, museum. In the matter of faculty a similar extension of the teaching force will be required because of the expansion of the area of instruction.

We are no longer justified in thinking of the preparation of ministers in narrow terms. Ministerial training is no longer

the simple matter that it once was, when the minister was expected to preach and do simple parish work, and when the scope of his scholarship was but a small portion of the vast field of learning now opened before him.

INCREASING MINISTERIAL EFFICIENCY

The ministerial training schools by no means have discharged their whole duty toward this exacting profession when they have ushered the minister into it with a fair degree of preparation. After he has entered upon the duties of his profession they should follow him with inducements and facilities for continuous study and reading under expert guidance and supply of books. The institution which this article proposes should have a circulating library, extension reading and study courses, scholarships for postgraduate work, all designed for keeping pastors up to concert pitch in their ministerial work. Many ministers are pocketed in small parishes, devoid of stimulus to self-improvement, without books and other facilities for culture. To these and to many others more fortunate, but still needing guidance, the Institute would be an inestimable blessing.

PREPARING TEACHERS OF RELIGION

There are other leaders and workers in the sphere of religion and morals than the minister, and for the preparation of these for their task this Institute should make ample provision. A well-known teacher of teachers and a keen observer said a short while ago that in ten years there would be a demand for a hundred thousand teachers of religion, as well-prepared as teachers in the secular schools, and like the latter giving their whole time at a living wage to their profession. He then significantly added, "Where will we find them, for we are making no provision for creating this army of well equipped teachers?" The time is approaching when every live community will promote its school of religion and be proud of its zeal and success in religious education as it is now of these in secular education. This fact points the way to the founding of this Institute im-

mediately, lest we be found unprepared to meet the need when it arises. Indeed, if we cannot meet the present meager demand for these teachers, what will we do when the flood tide of the demand is upon us?

As the minister and teacher are to work together in the same parish and at a common task it is necessary they should do team work. The surest guarantee of successful teamwork is for them to be trained in the same intellectual and spiritual environment. Mutual understanding and sympathy in ideals, methods, and plans, can thus best be obtained. This is the psychological moment for the founding of this Institute in the interests of the teachers of religion. Eventually it will be founded. Better now.

PREPARING LEADERS OF CHURCH MUSIC

There is now little or no provision for the preparation of the other present or prospective agents of religion, and yet there is a growing need for it. The significant part that music has in the cultivation of the religious emotions should lead to the full preparation of organists, singers, conductors of choirs, precentors, for the skillful and effective conduct of the musical part of public worship and the elevation of the musical taste of the people. When we consider the millions of children in the Sunday-schools, the thousands of congregations aggregating millions of worshipers meeting once a week or oftener for hearing and producing music, we are impressed with the educative value of church music. It far exceeds that of the opera, concerts, and all other musical agencies in its cultural influence and value. It, therefore, should be placed on the highest level of effective service to our American communities. The proposed Institute could make a huge contribution to the musical culture of our people by furnishing the best training for these leaders of the musical activities in every neighbourhood. The improvement of the Sunday-school and church music—where is the man who will say it does not need improvement?—would make a larger contribution to the elevation of musical standards in a community than anything else that can be done toward this

end. This can best be accomplished by adequate preparation of these musical leaders for their noble task. This would be the mission of this Institute.

IMPROVING CHURCH ARCHITECTURE

A casual observer of the church architecture of our cities and towns is led to cry out, How long, O Lord, how long? The hideousness of much of it, the atrocious art in its windows and decorations, the utilitarian futility of it, the faultiness of its basic ideals are distressing even to those who are scarcely conscious of what it is that distresses them. To those who are sufficiently interested and informed to know the correct standards to which church building and ecclesiastical art should conform there comes an insistent wish that there might be a school for training architects and artists in the ecclesiastical features of their art. This Institute would have here a significant and at present unoccupied field for its activity.

EDUCATION THROUGH THE EYE

With the increased apprehension of the value of the eye as an avenue for conveying knowledge, through pictures and action, there is coming in an entire new set of agencies for religious education, which when used unskillfully may be productive of immense harm, but used wisely by experienced teachers may be beneficent to an at present unsuspected degree. For the training of such teachers this Institute would be most useful.

These are some of the purposes that this institution should serve. These are some of the ends for which there is a challenging opportunity to-day. This is the day for the salvation of our religious and moral education. And this is the way of salvation for it.

AN UNDENOMINATIONAL FOUNDATION

This Institute must be undenominational, or, interdenominational. No church or group of churches should have control. It should be free to develop its own life and do its own proper

work. But all of the churches should feel at home in it. It should serve them all. In the language of a former day, it should be a nursery of sound learning and of true piety.

This Institute should be the exponent and the acknowledged representative of the highest type of Evangelical Christianity. Care should be exercised to give to it this catholic sympathetic relationship to the whole brotherhood of Christ. Protestant Evangelical Christianity could not in any single way more effectively reveal its essential unity.

There doubtless are enough of theological seminaries and training schools. It might be thought unwise to establish another. The kind of Institute here being advocated, might easily become a sort of university after the fashion of the English universities—Oxford and Cambridge—to which might be affiliated existing seminaries and schools, each maintaining in some way its own independent life and all sharing also in a common task. It should be a graduate school of sacred learning and vocational efficiency.

WASHINGTON AN EDUCATIONAL CENTER

That Washington is destined to become the social capital of the nation and the political capital of the world is asserted by many well-informed persons. That it is making strides toward becoming a conspicuous and influential educational center would seem to be indisputable. That it offers many and exceptional advantages for the promotion of moral and religious education is the convinced opinion of those who have given the matter consideration. "Here in the federal departments and institutions are maintained valuable libraries, museums, laboratories, and depositories of records, whose doors swing wide to admit students and scholars. Here are the Congressional Library, with its 3,000,000 volumes, and scores of departmental and bureau libraries; a multitude of laboratories where scientists of international reputation carry on research; the National Museum, the Smithsonian Institute, the Bureau of Standards, the National Gallery of Art, the Corcoran Art Gallery, the Freer Art Gallery. And in addition to the government insti-

tutions there is a great group of semi-official and private organizations, national in their scope; the Carnegie Institute for the Advancement of Science, the National Research Council, the Academy of Sciences, the National Geographic Society, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Pan-American Union, and scores of others. Here are the debates in the halls of Congress; the great cases argued before the Supreme Court; here the foreign embassies; here the Mecca of all the representatives of foreign nations who come to America." Thus writes President Lewis of George Washington University. He might have greatly extended the list of the educational facilities and material to be found in the national capital. The "set" of educational organizations is toward this city. There is probably a larger number of eminent scholars and specialists residing temporarily or permanently here than in any other city in the United States. The late President Harper, himself a man of vision, is reported to have said that he could have done more toward establishing a university in Washington with a million dollars than with twenty million elsewhere. By the same token the advisability of establishing an Institute of Religious Education here is indicated. Within striking distance of this Institute would be found all needed laboratory and clinical facilities for practice work and the pursuit of the project method of study. The value to the students in the Institute of the opportunity for making national and world contacts is inestimable.

This survey, brief as it is, must not omit reference to the worth to our Protestant religion of this Foundation in the federal capital, a potent and conspicuous representative before the whole world of the ideals, faith, dignity, magnitude, and unity of our Protestant Church. In the field of education the various churches can unite and here can they find a vast increment of influence and effective service.

There never has been so great a need for this sort of an educational institution. There is no city offering so luring a center for it as Washington. There is no project appearing above the horizon so free from competition, so full of promise of big returns for adequate investment, so extensive in scope,

or so exalted in purpose claiming the attention of men who are seeking to serve in a large way their fellow men.

Whatever may be thought of Daniel Drew's ethical soundness, no one questions his large endowment of shrewd, common sense. His practical wisdom is revealed in nothing that he ever said more than in the following observation, by way of commenting on his founding educational institutions. "Every man wants his family name to be remembered. You can stick up a gravestone with your name carved on it. But that is a dead thing. But put the money into some institution—that will go on living year after year; you have hitched yourself now to something that's alive. The monument would have let your name remain unspoken, for marble is dumb. But institutions last from generation to generation, and speak out your name constantly. It is worth a man's while to build two or three of them during his lifetime, even though they are pretty costly at the time."

Even though this Foundation will have to start with several million dollars and require several million more as the days go on, yet, as Mr. Drew says, "It will speak out the name of the Founder constantly."

Now is the time for the creation of this Foundation. Washington is the place. The opportunity is limitless.

GEORGE B. STEWART.

LOVE THE MAGICIAN

Life ordained defeat and loss;
Pride rebelled and cursed the cross;
Faith was brave, but felt the wrong—
Love transformed it into song!

—*Thomas Curtis Clark.*

RESPONSES TO PRESIDENT STEWART'S ARTICLE

IN order to find the mind of other educators relative to President Stewart's proposal for the establishing of an interdenominational school of religious education in Washington, proof pages of the article were sent out. The responses are as follows:

President George W. Richards, Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa., writes:

"President Stewart's proposal of an interdenominational institute of religious education will doubtless approve itself to the better judgment of statesmen and churchmen of America. It is a vision, but it is by no means visionary. It is drawn true to the demands of our time, which is assurance of its realization, in one form or another, that the leaders of thought in every phase of life are profoundly interested in the religious education of the youth of the nation. The task is so great that it appears almost impossible of accomplishment. It will require nothing less than the closest co-operation of the Christian men and women of the United States. It cannot be done by one church alone nor by all the churches, if each acts independently of the other. We need a new form of interdenominational co-operation to put into effect any plan of religious education that is adequate to the work required. This form of co-operation can be obtained in no way more quickly than through a central interdenominational institute such as President Stewart proposes.

"The reader will agree that, if such a school is to be established, there is no more appropriate place in this country than in the capital city of Washington. The various reasons for its location there are cogently presented by President Stewart. Co-operation in an institute of this kind would further the cause of Christian union more than many tracts, addresses, and diplomatic approaches of the churches to one another.

"If one desires to invest dollars in personality and in life, to aid in the cultivation of true religion and sound patriotism,

he could find no better project than this proposed interdenominational institute, which would yield dividends annually far more precious than silver or gold — dividends that could be measured only by the standards of Christian living."

Dr. Abram W. Harris, Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church, New York, writes:

"The churches seem to be entering an era of good-will and common understanding. This statement is not in conflict with the existence of earnest differences within several denominations, in regard to varying views of theology and philosophy. These differences are not conflicts of denomination against denomination, but are the evidences of schools of thought that cut across denominational boundaries.

"So far as administration and comity are concerned, these differences tend toward common action and unity of thought in large groups in many denominational opinions. Denominational loyalty, and administration are far less divisive in spirit than they were not long ago. Within large areas of place and time these interchurch groups tend to become lateral factors of unity. Emphasis upon Calvinism, or Arminianism, or on the authority of the clergy, tend to build up walls of division; but fundamentalism and liberalism constitute a bond of unity across denominational boundaries.

"This change makes possible in many denominations the success and broad influence of academies for the training of a ministry in common. Such common enterprise ought to make possible schools ranking in equipment and staff, in scholarship and influence, with the best professional schools for other professions.

"There are already schools of this kind in which such development is taking place, some established by a single denomination and grown strong in scholarship and finance, and appealing to students of many denominational loyalties. There are also groupings of schools of more than one denomination in common centers on or near the campus of a university.

"Provided that funds, really adequate, can be found, I would welcome the establishment in the city of Washington of an interchurch or independent school of theology. Washington is, for new educational enterprises, the outstanding open city. In a way, it is common ground for all sections and for many shades of thought; it has the national mind and appeal.

"Provided, again, that adequate funds can be found, and found before the enterprise is launched, I would welcome a school of theology of interchurch appeal. Did I fear that the creation of such a school would weaken the denominational schools of theology, I would hesitate to advance the cause of an interchurch school, at least at this time. I think a Washington school of interchurch relations would not interfere with the success of the schools now existing.

"Strong schools of theology, denominational or interdenominational, tend to bring about the strengthening of the weaker schools. I do not doubt that there is money enough available for the establishment and generous support of such a free school, if the need of the money and the practicability of the place can be made clear."

Dr. William Adams Brown, Union Theological Seminary, New York, writes:

"I have read with much interest the article by President Stewart. In calling attention to the unique opportunity offered by the city of Washington for those who are interested in the higher aspects of religious education, he has preformed a real service. Our friends, the Roman Catholics, have already recognized the educational importance of Washington by locating important institutions in the capital city. It is in the interest of the people at large that Protestant Christianity should also be represented in a worthy way.

"As to the method in which this is to be done in detail, it would be premature to express any opinion, but it may be said that the general plan advocated by Dr. Stewart, of a central foundation of an undenominational or interdenominational character with which other institutions could be affiliated seems to offer a promising plan of procedure."

Dr. William Chalmers Covert, Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., Philadelphia, writes:

"I am familiar with Dr. Stewart's plan for an interdenominational training school and have read the article with a great deal of interest. All he says is true!

"Obstacles in the way to the realization of such a dream are apparent, but are always discounted by the faith and courage of a man like Dr. Stewart.

"We need more trained lay workers and a higher level of preparation for general church work in our membership. Any plan that will bring that about should have the hearty approval of Christian people everywhere."

Dr. W. O. Thompson, Central Presbyterian Church, Denver, writes:

"Some time ago I had a conference with Dr. George B. Stewart on the subject of his article appearing in the April number of *The Christian Union Quarterly*. This article, like everything else that Dr. Stewart does, is well stated and presents the case as clearly as it can well be stated. The proposal is a very clear and definite thing worthy of serious consideration. The one difficulty it presents is the co-operation of Protestantism in a great enterprise. The theory of it is perfectly sound. The practical character of the proposal would depend, of course, upon the co-operation of forces from as many of the denominations as could possibly be enlisted. Some of the smaller denominations might not have individuals able to support the movement, but all the larger denominations ought to be able to develop men who would give generously toward the Foundation. As I view it the proposal is sound and the situation set out in the article clear and direct. The incompleteness of our educational provision in the development of religious matters is more than obvious. I know of no issue in education more vital than the development of some institution where co-operative enterprise can be focused upon religious education. The proposal grips the imagination. If the spirit of co-operation can be made steadfast, and their financial support can be brought forth, I feel confident that a field of great opportunity would soon develop.

President W. W. Boyd, Western College for Women, Oxford, Ohio, writes:

"I have read with very great interest the article which has been prepared by Dr. Stewart. He has been given a dream, the realization of which would be of tremendous benefit to our nation. There can be little question regarding the need of religious preparation of educated people for leadership in this nation. And there could be no better place found than Washington City for a school where the pursuit of religious knowledge could be fostered. It seems to me that eventually there

must be built up in Washington a graduate school for all branches of knowledge. The need which Dr. Stewart presents is one for teachers who are to go directly into religious service. I should hope that it might be possible to build up a graduate school of religion side by side with the graduate work done in all fields of learning, so that our teachers who are preparing for any fields of knowledge may become imbued with the opportunity which is presented to all teachers, whether in science or foreign languages or English or history or economics or what not, and may see the great opportunity for promoting religious ideas through their own fields. We need not only teachers of religion, but we need teachers of every branch of learning who shall be imbued with religious enthusiasm. I heartily indorse Dr. Stewart's project."

Dr. John A. Marquis, Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., New York, writes:

"I am glad to have read Dr. George B. Stewart's article on The Interdenominational Institute of Religious Education. I have discussed this matter frequently with Dr. Stewart and am in thorough agreement with him on the subject. In a hundred years from now Washington bids fair to be the educational center of this country, at least along political, economic, and literary lines. The churches ought to enter while the entering is good.

"I wish Dr. Stewart had included a paragraph on the influence of such an institution on the denominational union for which we all pray."

Dean Andrew F. West, Princeton University, writes:

"The appeal of President Stewart for the establishment in Washington of a fully equipped national agency for religious training and education in connection with the growing work of all Protestant churches is timely and convincing. I trust that generous friends will furnish the large means needed to make it fully effective."

Dr. George S. Duncan, Department of Egyptology and Assyriology, of the American University, Washington, D. C., writes:

"President Stewart's article on an interdenominational institute of religious education deserves the serious consideration

of all interested in the advancement of Christ's Kingdom. His long successful pastorate in Harrisburg, his quarter century signally efficient presidency of Auburn Theological Seminary, and his trusteeship of Princeton University for many years have given him a unique knowledge for discussing religious education. The resistance of the old time theological seminaries seems to be passing. Theology and religion are now more and more studied by the scientific or historical method, unbiased by tradition, unprejudiced by denominations, and untrammelled by misconception. Only in such a spirit can we ever get at the exact truth. In the past Christianity has been overladen with a great mass of mediæval metaphysics spun from the brains of theologians who were too often dazed by one set of texts but blind to others having a quite different point of view.

"A great change is happily taking place. Christianity is being Christianized for the first time. Christ's idea of God is now occupying the supreme place in theological and religious thinking. This is finely brought out in a recent volume by Principal A. W. Garvie, D.D.—*The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead*. Criticism is giving us the true view of the Bible as containing a gradual revelation of truth from primitive conceptions to the complete statements by Jesus Christ. The scholarly Biblical commentaries, dictionaries, and introductions are now written from the point of view of the data in the Scriptures plus all the accumulated learning from allied disciplines. They are now no more denominational or sectarian than works in geology, chemistry, or astronomy. All these characteristics of present day Biblical scholarship are bound to lop off very many of those excrescences and incidentals making the dividing lines for over two hundred distinct denominations in the United States to-day.

"It would seem then that the time is genuinely ripe for such an institute as President Stewart outlines. He has not overstated the usual advantages offered by Washington for such an institution. Besides, the great riches in cultural lines mentioned by him, one should not forget that Washington has become a convention city, where great gatherings of experts in every department of knowledge assemble to discuss their respective problems from the point of view of past masters. To attend such meetings is indeed a liberal education."

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

Sir Henry Lunn's Gifts for Unity

No man in our time has been more passionately devoted to the cause of Christian unity, in spirit and in polity, than Sir Henry Lunn, who is at present a visitor to America. He is responsible for the excellent magazine, the *Review of the Churches*, and for many years has promoted conferences in Switzerland to which leaders of various churches and communions have been invited as his guests. He founded the Grindelwald Conference in 1892, and in recent years has established the Mürren Conferences. In addition to this effort to bring churches and Christians together he has been actively interested in the cause of international good-will.

Sir Henry has done so much for these causes that it is not surprising that at the age of sixty-six he is planning to turn over almost his entire fortune to the definite promotion of Christian unity and international good-will.

Sir Henry Lunn's plans, as stated by the *Boston Herald*, in a despatch from New York, to turn over his entire property and all his income, except \$2,500 a year, to the Sir Henry Lunn trust foundation which will administer the funds for the spiritual interests designated. Beginning on March 31, the foundation will control one-half of his property. The remaining half will constitute a private trust for the benefit of members of his family. As they die, their share will accrue to the foundation, which eventually will control his entire estate.

The motives underlying Sir Henry's pledging of his fortune in this way are worthy of comment. He has explained his reasons and objects in a letter written some time ago to the provost of St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh, in which he says:

"I have always held that the head of a large business is entitled to a reasonable remuneration for his work and that he is trustee for all beyond that sum. In a complex civilization like ours, where the rewards of commercial success are very great, the primitive idea of tithes has become an anachronism and an absurdity and no system of proportionate giving can satisfy the demands of justice, where the income is often many times that of a prime minister or a president of a state.

"You will, therefore, understand me when I tell you that

prefatory to the important engagements which I have undertaken to fulfil on my journey round the world I have definitely decided to divest myself of all my property and form an incorporated society which will provide the necessary funds for continuing in the future the publication of the *Review of the Churches*, issued to the clergy of all communions, as it now is, at a heavy loss, to support all movements for church unity and international peace and further other religious and social ends.

"You will appreciate the relief it will be to me, as I start out to visit the leading cities of the United States and the capitals of our dominions, to know that the question of financial gain from business developments has entirely passed out of my life."

Apart from its two main interests or as a part of these interests, the new foundation will promote foreign missions, care for invalid ministers, and finance "retreats" for ministers and laity.

While the amount of money involved is not stated, and Sir Henry himself speaks of it as of no consequence compared with the great gifts of American capitalists, the spirit in which it is given, and the vision back of it, make it of very great significance. "It is all I have and I give it gladly," says Sir Henry. His devotion and his gift will undoubtedly become an inspiring example for others. This sort of faith, backed by works, is bound to produce results. It is all a gain in the great task of turning the world from division and dissension to love and co-operation. Unity is a futile hope without the sort of faith that inspires in men devotion and consecration and that develops in them the spirit of love and co-operation.

[From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, Mass.]

A Study in Missionary Co-operation

NONE present in June, 1920, at the chateau of Crans, on the lovely slopes above the Lake of Geneva, will ever forget the first international missionary post-war meeting, amid the exquisite beauty of garden and lake, facing eternal snow-peaks. Representatives of missionary organizations in North America, Great Britain, France, Holland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, Belgium, and South Africa, together with four German missionary leaders who attended unofficially, discussed in words of truth and healing the missionary situation after the war and the path toward restored international co-operation. Proposals

for the formation of an international missionary council representative of the churches and missions, as was adumbrated at the Edinburgh Conference, were considered; a draft constitution was recommended to the national organizations. Once again the fundamental principle laid down by the Continuation Committee at the outset was reaffirmed: "This Council is established on the basis that the only bodies entitled to determine missionary policy are the missionary societies and boards or the churches which they represent, and the churches in the mission field." No proposal to depart from that principle has ever been made. It has passed from the central to the national councils in the West and in Africa, until there has grown up a group of organizations potent because they ask no surrender of privileges pertaining to other bodies and claim no prerogative except opportunity to serve.

Approval of the Crans proposals having been given, the first International Missionary Council met at Lake Mohonk in New York State in October, 1921. Organization was completed, officers were appointed—Dr. Mott as chairman, Mr. J. H. Oldham and Dr. A. L. Warnshuis as secretaries, Mr. James M. Speers as treasurer—a budget was agreed on, and the new Council, having taken over the assets of the Continuation Committee and the Emergency Committee, laid out a programme of work.

The Lake Mohonk meeting, to which no German leaders came, is memorable for the part taken in its deliberations by men of Asia and of Africa. The national Christian organizations of India, China, and Japan had been asked to include nationals among their representatives. Two men of African race, Dr. Aggrey from the Gold Coast and Dr. Moton of Tuskegee, were co-opted members. A penetrating and well-balanced minute on the relation of Church to mission, which was adopted by the Council and proved stimulating in board-rooms in the West and throughout the mission fields, was mainly the work of those who were members of mission field churches themselves. No more striking illustration could have been given that a new day was dawning, and that in world-wide missionary partnership the emphasis was shifting from the West.

At Oxford, in July, 1923, in surroundings as satisfying in their beauty as those at Crans or Lake Mohonk, the International Missionary Council met again. India, China, and Japan had representatives of their own people. It was a definite loss that no African was there. For the first time since the war German missions sent official representatives. The outstanding feature of the Oxford meeting was its adoption, after long hours

of discussion and prayer, of a valuable statement on the possibility of missionary co-operation in view of doctrinal differences. It recalled another fundamental principle of the Edinburgh co-operation, enriched by thirteen years' experience in working it out.

The International Missionary Council has never sought nor is it its function to work out a body of doctrinal opinions of its own. The only doctrinal opinions in the Council are those which the various members bring with them into it from the churches and missionary boards to which they belong. It is no part of the duty of the Council to discuss the merits of those opinions, still less to determine doctrinal questions.

But it has never been found in practice that in consequence of this the Council is left with nothing but an uncertain mass of conflicting opinions. . . . When we have been gathered together we have experienced a growing unity among ourselves in which we recognize the influence of the Holy Spirit. . . .

Every piece of co-operation in work which this Council or any Council connected with it encourages or guides is confined to those churches or missions which freely and willingly take part in it. It would be entirely out of harmony with the spirit of our movement to press for such co-operation in work as would be felt to compromise doctrinal principles or strain consciences.

An examination of the proceedings of these council meetings, and of the minutes of subordinate meetings at Canterbury in July, 1922, and at Atlantic City in January, 1925, make evident the great range and inevitable slowness of work on a world-scale. Subjects which claimed thought before the Edinburgh Conference, during the Conference, and in the days of the old Continuation Committee, are still being discussed. But beneath the surface sameness, life is creatively at work. Things have happened, knowledge has increased, stagnation is replaced by purposeful plans for action. The tasks which claimed the pioneers in missionary co-operation claim their successors still, as ever-changing environment calls for new adaptation to the needs of life. Even the problems which called for emergency action in wartime project themselves into post-war days. The cost in time, in slow continuous work, in patient waiting for measurable results, is part of the price of missionary co-operation in terms of world-wide relationship. Large part of the fascination of the story so imperfectly told in these pages lies in the interplay of forces similar in nature by which widely sundered nations and the Christian churches within them are moved.

The national missionary organizations in India, China and—a little later—in Japan, obeying the urge of inner life, independently showed movement in the same direction as the International Missionary Council. In meetings at Poona in January,

1921, and at Ranchi a year later, the National Missionary Council of India underwent a fundamental change of character. Henceforth it was related as much to the Indian churches as to the foreign missions. Its name, honoured since 1913, was by universal consent changed to the National Christian Council. Plans were laid for an increased budget and for full-time officers, the first of these being the Rev. W. Paton, who was joined later by an Indian colleague, Mr. P. O. Philip. There are few in India to-day who would not now endorse the words of the Metropolitan of India, President of the Council, spoken at the close of the Poona meeting, to the effect that the constitutional change, and the spirit of good-will and co-operation between Indians and missionaries which accompanied it, marked an epoch in the growth of the Christian movement in India.

During the same period in China great developments were maturing. Changes already in contemplation were held up until preparations for the National Christian Conference at Shanghai in May, 1922, closely following the international students' conference at Peking, were complete. The survey of the Christian occupation of China, agreed on after Dr. Mott's conferences in 1913, was made ready in its massive volume, a masterpiece of research and lucid presentation. Ready also were the reports prepared by the five commissions, mostly Chinese in membership. Into that great Conference—the story of which cannot here be retold—went the China Continuation Committee. Out of the Conference came the National Christian Council of China, with a membership more than half Chinese, calling for enlargement of budget and of staff. It was born in due time to share in projecting the new purpose of the Chinese Church into the sphere of action.

Simultaneously, there was in Japan a movement similar, but not so sure or swift. Dr. Mott, who had been in the heart of the China Conference, met the Japanese workers on the invitation of the Japanese Continuation Committee. There too the decision was taken to bring a National Christian Council into being. The Federation of Churches a little later merged itself in the new body. Most of the missions joined. The Council is gradually finding its place in the national Christian life of Japan.

Less than two years later Dr. Mott was in a position to give effect to his original purpose, frustrated by the outbreak of the war, of holding a series of conferences in Northern Africa and Western Asia, on the lines of previous conferences in the Far East. Selected local workers among Moslems met in the early

spring of 1924 at Constantine in Algeria, at Helouan near Cairo and at Brummana near Beirut. These regional conferences culminated in a conference of eighty outstanding missionaries, recognized leaders of Christian forces from all the regional areas and a few representatives of the home boards, at Jerusalem.

There, on the Mount of Olives, the Conference gave serious consideration to material carefully prepared for its use, and resolved itself into groups for corporate discussion and thought. The constructive findings are a measure of the work done. At the close, by a unanimous act of the Conference, an influential preliminary committee was appointed to take steps toward the formation of a Christian Council for Western Asia and Northern Africa on the lines of the councils in active being in the Far East. Here the ground slips away into the future. But at least the conception of such a council falls within the co-operative activities of the last fifteen years.

Missionary co-operation is strikingly exemplified in the vast area of the African continent, west and south and east. The fifteen missions in the vast Congo region held their first general missionary conference in 1902; in 1911 a continuation committee was formed, now known as the Congo Protestant Council. It has a central office and permanent secretarial staff at Kinshasa, the funds being provided by American, British, and Swedish missions. Its periodical, *The Congo Mission News*, records the working out of its strong educational programme. The Congo missions not only keep touch with one another but, through an *agent de liaison* in Brussels, with the Belgian Government.

The General Missionary Conference of South Africa has since 1904 been a unifying influence in its area. Provincial conferences in the Transvaal and in Natal are affiliated with it. Active general missionary conferences are also in being in Southern and Northern Rhodesia. The reports of these conferences show how wide is the range of co-operation, both in the subjects discussed and in the speakers selected. All that concerns the welfare of the Native is considered, not only by representatives of all the missions but by officials and Africans as well. In Kenya, Nyasaland, and other parts of British Africa, as well as in the French colony of Madagascar and the Portuguese colonies in the west and east, intermission conferences or associations are to be found. These, though not lineal descendants of the World Missionary Conference, are closely linked with the officers of the Council, contributing their thought and

experience to the common store and receiving such help as can be given.

A study of things actually happening gives a basis of reality to that chapter in *Education in East Africa* where the chairman of the Phelps-Stokes Commission sets forth his great conception of the units of co-operation for Africa and the Africans—the home population of countries in the West, the virile white people of the Union of South Africa, the colonial governments, the economic groups (including settlers and traders), and the native peoples themselves.

Nowhere has missionary co-operation rooted more deeply than in South America. That great and diversified field was not represented at the Edinburgh Conference. But the mission boards in North America took action, arranged a great conference at Panama in 1916, and formed a Committee on Co-operation in Latin America, with a full-time secretary, and a rapidly expanding programme of field visitation and organized work by committees on the field. A monthly magazine is now issued in Spanish. Thirty different missions are associated in the work of the committee. All the twenty-five countries in Latin America have gained, though in different degrees. The conception of missionary work has been deepened, comity between missions has been developed, a number of institutions—union and other—have been developed and literature has been planned or prepared. The staff at the disposal of the committee has kept pace with the growth of its work; its budget has expanded to meet the claims. Reports of the conference held at Montevideo in April, 1925, Spanish and Portuguese being the languages used, with a Brazilian chairman and over 300 delegates representing 18 nations, give ground for expectation that the work of the twelve commissions which preceded it will lead to large advance in the future.

Meantime the national missionary councils in the West had been strengthening and extending their work. Like the councils in the mission field, each is responsible only to the missions and churches which have given it being, and is linked with the international missionary body through representation in its membership and fellowship in counsel and common service.

On the continent of Europe, the German Ausschuss, already referred to, became the nucleus of the German Evangelical Missionary Union in 1922. This new body, in which nearly all the evangelical missionary organizations in Germany unite, is one of those who are represented in the International Missionary Council. A signal action in the direction of national

missionary co-operation was taken at the meeting of the Union in September, 1925. The Mission Board of the Moravian Church at Herrnhut, deeply attached to its long established Nyasa Mission, found itself unable to resume its maintenance. It was proposed to make a permanent transfer of the work to the Scottish Mission which had taken responsibility during the war. The representatives of German missions present at the meeting of the Union unanimously agreed to ask their mission boards to set aside a sum equivalent to 1 per cent of their annual income, to enable the Moravians themselves to carry on the Nyasa work.

In Holland joint headquarters for five of the largest missionary societies were established at Oegstgeest, near Leiden, and are proving successful. Each society continues to have its own treasury and its own missions abroad, but combines in a joint directorate and common officers. In 1923 the Scandinavian countries formed a Northern Missionary Council. It consists of eight members, two of whom are appointed by the national councils in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Finland respectively. The Council held a successful conference at Stockholm in August, 1925. It is strengthening the sense of unity in missionary work in Scandinavia.

The North American Conference continued to carry further the developments begun in pre-war years. Aided by a generous diminishing grant, renewed at a later date, from one of the Rockefeller funds, suitable premises at 25 Madison Avenue, New York, were secured as central office in 1915. One of the main developments made possible by this enlargement in plan and budget was the establishment and expansion of the Missionary Research Library at headquarters. Notwithstanding its large resources in books, periodicals, and rare material on missions, its organization at once simple and comprehensive, and its provision through highly qualified officials for giving expert guidance in the work of research, this great library is only on the threshold of its possibilities.

In 1920 Mr. Fennell P. Turner, long identified with the work of the North American Conference and with the Student Volunteer Movement, was elected full-time secretary of its executive body. A year later an additional full-time secretary was needed to meet the needs of multiplying work.

The British Conference, which during the whole period had been working steadily on its original lines, also found a permanent home. In 1920, through gifts from mission boards—notably the Church Missionary Society—and private donors, the

Conference purchased the leasehold of Edinburgh House (so named to perpetuate the tradition of 1910) as the center of its activities. Mr. Kenneth Maclellan, one of the secretaries of the Edinburgh Conference and of its Continuation Committee, was appointed secretary of the British Conference.

In Edinburgh House, the International Missionary Council and the *International Review of Missions*, which had moved from Edinburgh to London during the war, found central office. Experience, however, has shown that one of the international secretaries should have his working base mainly in North America, and that it is essential for the officers of the Council to keep in touch with the Christian communities and missionary organizations in Asia and Africa, and with the centers of missionary co-operation in European countries, by personal visitation from time to time.

One aspect of missionary co-operation—to some the dominant one—has not been touched on yet. Those whose relation to united work is conditioned by board-room experience of its cost—in money for the annual budget, in calls for the assignment of valued station missionaries to inter-mission work, in claims on the time of hard-pressed officials for committee and conference engagements outside their special sphere—are bound to ask the question, Is the cost worth while?

The scrutiny of expenditure is necessary and right, but the weighing of values is equally a Christian duty. With the totalled cost of missionary co-operation in the debit scale and the record of facts as here given concerning that co-operation in the other, there is little doubt that overweight will be found on the credit side.

The whole movement of missionary co-operation recorded in these pages has further to be set against the background of the general movement in the direction of co-operation and unity that is taking place throughout the world—the movements toward church union in different western countries; the growth of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; the Lambeth Appeal of 1920 and all that has since come out of it; the remarkable influence of the World Student Christian Federation during the last thirty years; the World Alliance for Promoting Friendship through the Churches and the Universal Conference on Life and Work, which met in Stockholm in August, 1925; the projected World Conference on Faith and Order, which is planned to face frankly and openly the questions of doctrine and policy that by agreement lie outside the purview of the movements concerned with practical co-opera-

tion. The League of Nations, as it is and still more as it will be, stands out in the political sphere as illustrating the drawing together of men for unselfish ends.

In this larger environment the movement which began at Edinburgh occupies a distinctive place. It represented the first attempt on the part of organizations holding a recognized place in the life of different churches to do certain things together and to provide jointly a budget for the purpose. In the range, amount, and variety of the co-operation achieved there is no parallel in the life of the Church to-day. This is only natural. Set over against the non-Christian world the differences which separate Christians, though in many instances concerned with questions of real importance, are seen in truer proportion; the fundamental things that unite those who own Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord stand out in clear distinctness. It could hardly be otherwise. In this field the greatest advance would be looked for in the consciousness of a common task and in the reaching out toward a larger view to which the different nations and Christian traditions would contribute each its own rich experience.

The significance of the growth of missionary co-operation is heightened when it is thus seen as part of a mighty movement, over against the divisive forces which have sought to rend the world asunder in the political, racial, and even religious spheres.

The story told in these pages has been presented in terms of council, conference, and committee, of survey and report. This is inevitable, but it misleads. These things are but general terms for individual action, the material form in which spirit is enshrined. Co-operation has its source in the heart of men. Its end is not found in economies effected, in organizations multiplied, nor even in the collaboration of race with race. Its true values lie elsewhere. It lifts men out of selfishness into shared interests, it develops a group mind richer than the mere total of its contributory elements, it creates a fellowship which submerges differences, it relates single—perhaps diverging—aims to one Divine Purpose for mankind.

Toward the realization of that Divine harmony all things tend. Toward it all creation is moving through its anguish and suffering. We look out on a world distracted by strife. Industrial conflict, national rivalries, racial misunderstandings and antagonisms are seen on every side. The Divine Purpose is frustrated. What the world is crying out for to-day is the healing

work of those who, as was said at Edinburgh, "loathe to differ and are determined to understand."

The movement here recorded marks in one sphere a real progress in the attainment of this temper. What of the future? Shall the missionary movement, turning to full account the experience of these fifteen years, set its face to larger and more daring adventures in the years to come? Linked in the fellowship of service with people of every race and enriched by an understanding of their outlook, may it not be given to it both to bear to the non-Christian world the supreme witness of love and unity among those who are Christ's disciples, and also to contribute to the alleviation of bitter and growing racial antagonisms by a partnership in mutual honour and genuine respects?

[From G. A. Gollock in *The International Review of Missions*, London.]

Anglican Bishop Sees Way to Reunion

THE Bishop of Gloucester, England, writing in the *Congregational Quarterly* of London, has given a remarkably clear and liberal outline of a method by which the reunion of English churches may be brought about. "I would venture to suggest," says the bishop, "that reunion between different churches should take place on the following terms: 1. Mutual recognition of orders. 2. No reordination. 3. Intercommunion between the two churches. 4. Ordination in the future on terms recognized as valid by both the uniting bodies. 5. No mixture of rite until there is a common ministry and a common rite.

"These principles, if universally adopted, would enable reunion to take place without any disparagement by any church of the ministry of the other. The real difficulty is that there is no definite and catholic standard of orders: the principles of the Roman church have varied at different times. What is important is that the ordination should be in a way which is accepted by all alike on uniting. There would be no disparagement of the orders of either side if such a proposal were adopted.

"Now let us suppose there was to be a reunion between the Episcopal and the Presbyterian Church. We have been brought up to celebrate in different ways, according to a different rite, and we would neither of us wish to change our way—the clergy of the Church of England would not feel at home or comfortable if they were celebrating according to the Presbyterian way; the

Presbyterians would not be comfortable if they were celebrating according to the Anglican way.

"Now it is quite true that if this method were adopted full and complete reunion would only come about gradually. I do not think that there would be any harm in that at all. The different churches would become used to one another; their ministers would begin by preaching in one another's churches; they would meet together on synods and councils; they would be able to be associated in teaching and in training for orders—certainly they would be associated much more closely than at present.

"The approximation would be gradual. Ultimately it might seem best, in some cases, that they should be definitely united so as to form one definite community; in other cases, and, at any rate, for a time, differences of worship and tradition would keep them somewhat apart; but in all cases there would be real intercommunion. Such a process as that, less heroic, no doubt, and less striking than a complete reunion consummated at once, would really be far wiser in every direction. I venture to suggest this for the careful consideration of all branches of the Christian church."

[From *The Christian Century*, Chicago.]

Makeshifts for Unity

MOST of us realize, at least subconsciously, that the supreme need of our time is the reunion of the shattered fragments of Christendom. Yet there is a danger, just because the need is so acute, that we should weakly acquiesce in any remedy that our well-meaning neighbours proffer to us on the ground that any remedy is better than none. For most of these current remedies are only temporary makeshifts and can never restore organic unity in Christ.

There are those who believe, for instance, that there is some magical charm in union services. If only Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Congregational, Methodist, and Unitarian neighbours can meet together on the lawn in front of the church on Sunday evenings in summer and sing *Onward, Christian Soldiers* and *I Need Thee Every Hour*, and listen to readings from the Scriptures by the Methodist minister and prayer by the Unitarian minister, and a brisk sermonette on brotherly love by the Congregational minister, it is confidently hoped that all our differences will disappear. The real result of such gatherings of course

is that the people who take part in them will gradually become convinced that it makes no difference what we believe so long as we can sit elbow to elbow and sing hymns together. In other words, it makes no difference what we think about God or what is our spiritual and moral relationship to Jesus Christ, if only we are on speaking terms with our neighbours. It ought not to take them long to make the inference that the Church is of no practical value at all and that any lodge or fraternal organization would do just as well.

Another proposed makeshift is the Federal Council of Churches. It is urged that if we can work together for moral and social ends we shall better come to understand each other and ultimately we shall bury our theological differences and amalgamate for the establishment of God's Kingdom on earth. Here again there is the danger that people will be taken in by the sophistry that faith is of no consequence and that works alone matter. But without faith it is impossible to please God. And good works without the impetus and motive and direction supplied by faith will soon be like a body without a soul. It is conceivable that the Federal Council of Churches might be so reconstituted that we could all undertake certain moral and social tasks in common, but without any ulterior motive in the direction of unity. The Federal Council might indeed lend its aid to all well considered schemes whose aim is precisely to prepare the way for unity, such as the World Conference on Faith and Order.

Another makeshift is pan-Protestantism. It is suggested that if all Protestants would ignore their creedal and institutional differences and obliterate their inherited prejudices they might reunite on the basis of the simple religion of the Gospel. They are advised by some to substitute the religion of Christ for the religion about Christ. This would be to forget that Christianity has had a history and that Christians have minds. They will ask questions as to the nature of Christ. Those questions have been asked in the past and answered. The answers are part of the creeds and theological equipment of all the great Protestant communions. It would not be so easy for them to turn their backs upon the spiritual experiences of their fathers. Moreover, the present conflict between Liberals and Fundamentalists is a further divisive factor that cannot be overlooked. A merger of any two of the great Protestant bodies of America would almost certainly result in three denominations instead of one, because many would refuse to forsake their old connections.

Christendom to-day is shattered and in ruins. But each one of us can, according to the measure of his gifts, and in the place where God has stationed him, rebuild the ancient structure of Catholicism. When all groups of Christians have reclaimed the fulness of the faith and practice of the Catholic Church which rightly belongs to them the way to organic reunion will be clear.

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

The Spiritual Foundations of Unity

WHERE is unity to be found?

It is found in absolute devotion to our Lord. It was in such devotion that the unity of the New Testament Church was grounded. Doctrinally there was serious division in that Church. No man can read the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians and say that in the realm of doctrine the Church was a unit. I think the differences separating Paul from Peter were more pronounced than those which divide the different groups in our beloved Church to-day. How were those differences bridged? By devotion to one Crucified, Risen, and Ascended Lord. Here is the passionate prayer of Paul: "That I may know Him, and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his suffering." There is the similar devotion of Peter: "Whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable, and full of glory."

Being bound to Him, they were bound to each other. The closer two persons come to a third person, the closer they approach each other. This overmastering devotion to Jesus was the mysterious something against which the marshalled might of the Roman Empire dashed itself to pieces, as the wave breaks in spray against the rocks. This apostolic devotion was not to a system, nor a confession, nor any kind of formula. The Apostles' Creed had not been formulated, and much of our New Testament had not been written. It was devotion to a Person.

Christian unity will be promoted in renewed dedication to our allotted tasks. Work unifies. Service cements. It is heart-breaking to see so much time, thought, and effort expended in angry quarrels while the world is bleeding from a million wounds, and our smitten and stricken civilization is crying out, "Who will show us any good?" Unity is to be found in Christian experience. There are facts, hopes, repentances, prayers, longings, yearnings, mysteries, compassion, helpfulness, patience, and above all, love. All these may be lodged in one active re-

ligious experience. And as we share these spiritual factors with each other we find bonds of unity which we could never find in mere intellectual concepts. Nobody with common sense asks for the abandonment of theological study. Nobody asks that serious theological differences be brushed aside as trifles. They are not trifles. But let us remember that while we are not all called to be theologians we are all called to be saints. I call for a truce in hard words, angry feelings, and rash censures. Let us enthrone the Christian spirit in its rightful place. Let us remember that the truth of God is never found by those who only bring violent tempers and angry speech to its search.

When our Lord hung upon the cross the soldiers gambled for his robe! What became of that robe? Tradition has woven strange stories about that garment, as it has about the Holy Grail. Suppose by a series of strange providences the robe of Jesus had been miraculously guarded through nineteen hundred years, and had finally become the possession of our beloved Church. At some great conference or assembly, where differing groups are gathered, we see the robe in evidence. Each group claims it for its own. There is bitterness, and there is anger, and there is even violence. Each group makes a rush for the robe, each seizes it, and between them they tear it asunder. The sound of that tear, the shriek of it, is heard through the whole Christian world. We have come perilously near to doing something worse. To rend "the seamless robe which Jesus wore" would be terrible—but how about rending his *Body*? — John J. Lawrence

[From Rev. John J. Lawrence, Moderator of the Presbyterian Synod of New York, in the *Federal Council Bulletin*, New York.]

Student Meeting Would Break Creed Walls

BELOW, in the church auditorium, sat nine hundred students, college and theological school delegates to the Interdenominational Student Conference, Evanston, Illinois. They came from 176 colleges and 20 denominations. Generally four or five would be on their feet, requesting the floor from Stanley High, author of *The Revolt of Youth*, or the Reverend Dr. Albert Parker Fitch, former president of Andover Seminary, who presided in turn.

Above, the balcony was heavy with silence of 200 attentive observers, adults. They represented the Protestant Church in its active manifestations: denominational boards, mission

boards, various sorts of councils, publications. Forbidden to speak by the committee on arrangements, they attended diligently, and at various points, in a vigorous discussion from below, nodded, leaned forward, jumped in their seats, or smiled.

The balcony was being brought to judgment by the floor. The floor was "evaluating the Church" as an organ and tool for its ideals—criticizing its shortcomings, proposing new work and methods for it, and occasionally stopping to question the ideals themselves: What is Religion? Church? Mysticism? Objective social welfare?

After four days, nine hours a day in full session, here were the main proposals made:

That the Church excommunicate war, oppose military training in schools from high school through the university, and favour internationalism through World Court, League, disarmament; that it act as fact-finder in industrial relations; that it disseminate knowledge of birth control; that it continue missions, but divorce them from propaganda for sects, powers, specific civilizations. To combat denominationalism it was proposed that young people's societies join forces as rapidly as possible under the Federal Council of Churches.

[From *The New Student*, New York.]

The Tide is Turning

NAE man can tether time or tide.—Burns.

A little while ago, in *The Christian Century*, Alva W. Taylor, secretary of the Board of Temperance and Social Welfare of the Disciples of Christ, writing on "Overchurched Communities," said:

One overwhelming fact comes out of the rural church surveys. It is that the average rural community has too many churches and too little religious activity. The religious forces are divided when . . . normative religious activity requires their complete and unified mobilization to meet the needs.

Mr. Taylor goes on to record the fact that "more than one thousand indigenous community churches have sprung up since the close of the Great War six years ago," which constitutes, he says, "the most surprising religious movement in America to-day." He continues:

These churches were born as a protest. Each had a reason for coming into being at a pro-testant. Every one of them has won its cause on every essential. . . . The unity that creates a community church is not one of compromise but of conviction. It is born in the conviction that in the es-

entials of Christianity there is already a unity, and that the things that divide us are not essentials. . . . Those things on which all evangelicals agree are quite wide enough a foundation to build a church upon. . . . Each can hug his own historic creed to his heart if only he puts the love of Christ beneath it and around it and respects his brother for doing likewise.

Now, if Christian unity, expressing itself in some form of community church, is desirable and possible in rural, small-town, and suburban communities, it is equally desirable and possible everywhere. Nobody dissents from Mr. Taylor when he declares that "no denomination holds guard to-day over a single essential to either salvation or character building that is not held by all the others. No one excels the other in producing saints, martyrs, prophets, apostles, or just good, every day Christians. To go on protesting now is to fight the air. To continue building sectarian walls is not to shut out the enemy, but to shut off vision." Remembering that we are considering the vital question of "Overchurched Communities," will we not agree that what Mr. Taylor says applies alike to both city and country? A community—whether urban, suburban, or rural—may be and often is overchurched and yet not adequately churched. The kind is more important than the number. Let us get that clear.

The best kind of a church in any sort of a community is the kind that will come nearest to including in its membership every citizen of the Kingdom of Heaven who happens to be among its constituency. Thousands of such have not united with the local church because the denominational atmosphere or the bias of sectarianism is so plainly noticeable. Would not such persons have joined the primitive Christian church in Jerusalem, Corinth, or Rome? They are being attracted to the modern counterpart of these ancient churches—the community church.

Is it not our Lord's desire that his followers be one infinitely more crucial than anything that divides them? Who dare say nay? But some, opposing organic unity, argue that we have a spiritual unity already. Amusing, almost ludicrous, is this—and pathetic. True spiritual unity would insure and hasten organic unity.

"Denominationalism has no place in the Church of Christ," asserted the Right Rev. C. P. Anderson, Episcopal Bishop of Chicago, recently. He was pleading for the idea of "one Church in the Kingdom of God." Said he:

The idea of many churches as distinct and separate entities was as foreign to the New Testament Christianity as many Christs. . . . The

Kingdom of God has been superseded by the Church. The Church has been superseded by the churches, and the churches by the denominations.

Why, then, the perpetuation of these denominations? Answer (not too loud): We have had them so long and some are so strongly intrenched that it would be well nigh impossible to change the present order. But, what means all the talk about the paramountcy of the Kingdom of Christ, and the like? Are we able to say with John the Baptist, "He (the whole Church) must increase, but I (the denomination) must decrease"? It is being recognized by everybody and admitted by a few that the property interest and the official personnel of the several denominations stand in the way of amalgamation, and that these would have to be sacrificed in any plan of union. Commissions, boards, bishops, moderators, secretaries, editors, etc., would be much reduced numerically. Unnecessary church buildings would be put on the market. All this is true and constitutes one of the many good reasons why the thing should be done without delay. Think of the overhead charges for this army of officials! And of the real Kingdom building that could be accomplished if all this financial and intellectual strength could be released and properly directed! And I am barely mentioning the mediocre pastoral and administrative inefficiency that would be reduced to a delightful minimum.

These obstacles were not insuperable in Canada. Note the splendid and much applauded example of self-effacement in the declination of General Superintendent Chown to be considered for election as the head of the United Church. Hear this testimony of one of their leaders:

The divisive tendency has run its course; and we in Canada rejoice in what we believe is the privilege of the first great step in recapturing the lost unity of the faith once delivered to the saints and in rebuilding the Holy Catholic Church on its primitive evangelical foundation.

Whatever may eventually be involved in the process of effecting unification, the ultimate result would be the functioning of the Church of Christ as the finest example of efficiency and big business yet seen. And why should not the Church be big? And efficient? It has the biggest job in the universe. Like big business in the commercial world, it could thus bring the product to near perfection, not considering analagous by-products of great value. The finished product of the Kingdom (the term "church" ought to be synonymous) of Christ is human character expressing itself in individual and collective virtues. We are all too well aware that neither the quantity nor quality

of the Church's output under denominationalism has even approximated the maximum.

But the tide is turning; praise be! We have already alluded to the union of the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Methodists of Canada. This action adds tremendously to the momentum of the movement toward organic unity everywhere. Later came the great conference on Christian Life and Work at Stockholm, embracing all Christian communions in the world save the Roman Catholics. Surely, heaven must have rejoiced to see such an assemblage, every delegate coming confessedly in the Name of the Master of all! Nor should we depreciate, much less despise, the less spectacular part being played (but in no spirit of fun) by the many widely scattered community churches in this and other lands, wherein the practicability of Christian unity is being successfully demonstrated. Whole communities are unified socially and religiously because the Church is one instead of three or four. The leaven is slowly but surely leavening the whole lump.

The number of influential religious journals of undenominational but dominantly Christian type is increasing. Even denominational publications are lending their aid. Their best articles are unsectarian. The contributing editor of the long chain of Methodist Christian Advocates writes:

One of the forward steps taken at the recent Montevideo Conference on Christian Work in Latin America was the adoption of a resolution to the effect that all denominational Protestant churches shall have displayed on the building the name "The Evangelical Church in Brazil" (or other country), followed by the name of the denomination in parenthesis. . . . We take to the mission fields only one gospel—neither that of Wesley nor Calvin—but that of Jesus Christ. The shunting of denominational affliction to the minor position of parenthesis and the emphasis on the one gospel heritage common to all is a superb endeavour to give Christ the pre-eminence in all things. May we not hope that some day North America may follow this example from South America.

The dignified organ of the United Church of Canada, *The New Outlook*, successor to and superseding three former outstanding denominational journals, will be no small factor in effecting a more comprehensive unity than even that which it now represents.

And, finally, may I quote Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, speaking as president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America (with its twenty-eight denominations united in service in ways that shall inevitably cement them more completely together), who, at the Stockholm Conference heretofore mentioned, said:

It is now the settled view of our church leaders that Protestantism will not be predominantly Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, or Congregational in its future developments. But they have little doubt that it can, if it will, be predominantly Christian, and thus win a wider hearing, and obtain a popular response impossible to any of its sectarian forms.

If it will; yes, Dr. Cadman. We believe it will.

One word more (it is hard to stop): Let me repeat the sentiments of that super-Presbyterian, Robert E. Speer, expressed by him recently:

We are coming to a common recognition of the elemental unity of life and experience among the churches. There is no Presbyterian type of sin with which only the Presbyterian church can deal. You cannot denominationalize sin. There is just one kind of sin. And there is, accordingly, just one task, elemental in its unity, before all the churches, whatever their names may be—the task of overcoming sin through the power of their one Saviour and Lord.

Yes, the tide is turning. Amen!

[From Oscar J. Randall, Washington, D. C., in *The Unity Messenger*, Park Ridge, Ill.]

Lord Halifax Pleads Cause of Reunion at Louvain

Lord Halifax, despite his eighty-seven years and the rigours of the winter season, consented to come to Louvain, at the request of his friend the Abbé Portal, to address the professors and the students of the Catholic University on the cause that has engaged all his energies for some thirty and more years of his life—the cause of the reunion of the Anglican Church with the Church of Rome.

The enthusiastic applause with which the vast assembly, sprinkled with some two or three hundred ecclesiastics, hailed his entrance into the hall, on the arm of his friend the Abbé Portal, and again his stepping upon the platform, when his turn came to speak, must have caused him to feel that those who have been invited to listen to him highly appreciated the privilege afforded them and the motives that prompted him to accept the fatiguing task. Moreover, the warm marks of approval that frequently greeted his noble and exalted sentiments, expressed clearly, told him that his hearers' hearts beat in unison with his own.

The Abbé Portal, who preceded Lord Halifax upon the speaker's tribune, by the account he gave of their long years of friendship and of what he knew of his noble friend's charity

and disinterestedness, increased the sympathy for him tenfold and made the audience the more anxious to hear him.

"No member of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul," said the Abbé, "ever did more for the poor than Lord Halifax. During the cholera epidemic of 1866 he volunteered his service to the pastor of one of the London churches, visited the sick, and waited upon them with all the devotion of an apostle of charity.

"Through his family connections, his intimacy with royalty, his wealth and his talents, Lord Halifax was destined to make his mark in English politics and to rise to the highest offices in the empire. Was not his father several times minister and is not his son the present viceroy of India? But as early as the year 1866 he turned his back upon political preferment and fame to devote himself entirely to religious action. He played an important part in the Oxford Movement and was for a long time the President of the Anglo-Catholic Association for the Reunion of Churches."

Lord Halifax began his address, which was a familiar heart to heart talk, by excusing himself for what he called his "impertinence" in attempting to speak at all in a language unfamiliar to him. "I do so," he said, "in obedience to my friend the Abbé Portal. I obey him in everything and the fact of my standing here to address you is a proof of my obedience. I am in for it and there is nothing for me to do but to pocket my self-love.

"As I am quite deaf, I can but guess at what the Abbé said of me. However, owing to experiences of the past, I am entitled to believe that he considerably overdid the picture. I'll take my revenge by saying that I could not begin to tell you all the good I think of the Abbé, who has been for years and still is the best friend I have upon earth.

"I am delighted to know that here in Belgium the Benedictines have taken the lead of the movement for the reunion of Christian churches. They appear to be providentially called for the work. Their interest in the cause carries me back to the time previous to the Reformation and my mind's eye sees them officiating in our two cathedrals of Canterbury and Westminster, both associated with all the history of England, with its triumphs and reverses, and both, once upon a time, Benedictine churches. They still bear so much the imprint of their origin that the Dean of Westminster Abbey once said to me: 'All that is wanting to it is that I am not a Benedictine.'

"The reunion of Christian churches is a matter of capital importance for Christendom and also for the security of Europe.

"It is impossible to read in Chapter XVII of the Gospel of St. John the ardent prayer of Our Lord: 'That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me and I in Thee,' without experiencing some of the sorrow that must have lacerated the heart of Jesus at the thought of the divisions of his mystical body and of the evils that would be the consequence.

"I have no doubt that you realize how consoling it is for me to witness the interest manifested in Belgium for reunion; you will realize it the more when you know that I long with all the intensity of my heart to partake Holy Communion at your altars, mine and my people's once more. Owing to my advanced years, I dare not hope to see that wish fulfilled in my life time; but I rejoice at the thought that my children will see its fulfilment and be present in St. Peter's Church, Rome, upon the day of the celebration of the first Mass of thanksgiving for the reunion of the Church of England with the Holy Catholic Church.

"To those who wish to work for the hastening of that day I presume to make the following suggestions: In the first place, let them apply themselves to understand the position of those with whom they wish to unite, to understand their mentality, to put themselves, at it were, in their place.

"Secondly, whenever differences of opinion or of interpretation arise, let them remember that the safest proceeding always is, to choose, as far as possible, that which is most favourable to union, to look at the good and beautiful side of everything. And, verily, when all is said, is that not what the law of charity demands of us?

"Thirdly, let them judge the dissenting churches not from the reprehensible sayings and doings of individuals, but from the official documents of history. Truth is never to be sacrificed; but there is a way of handling truth that is productive of good results and there is another that but envenoms the discussions.

"The prevailing opinion is that the repudiation of Catherine of Aragon by Henry VIII was the origin of the secession of England from Rome. That is a mistake: the real cause was the universally recognized necessity and urgency of certain reforms. Had the Council of Trent preceded our dissensions, the Reformation in England would have taken an altogether different turn.

"Hardly any changes were introduced in the Church of England during Henry VIII's reign. Under his successor the Breviary was shortened and also the Missal. The idea of sacrifice was gradually eliminated from the Mass, or at least greatly

undervalued; Communion was given pre-eminence over Consecration; the Eucharistic Worship was dethroned. It is coming to its own again. With regard to it, and with regard to all the other sacraments, our catechism no longer differs from your own. It is one of the results of the Oxford Movement, which took off the rust from the Church of England. Newman, Keble, and Pusey changed the whole face of that church. It is to them we owe the present Anglo-Catholic Movement, which is the Anglican Church to-day. To it belongs the future.

"You can assist that movement toward the Roman Catholic Church if you will but look at the good that is to be found in it and show some indulgence with us; if you will make an effort to understand us and to appreciate our own efforts. Then you may be sure to find among us plenty of men ready to meet you more than half way.

"Your coreligionists in England unfortunately make the mistake of refusing to see anything good in the Anglo-Catholic Movement. They believe but in individual conversions. Individual conversions, however, will never bring large numbers into the fold of the Catholic Church; they never will restore the old union that lasted one thousand years, to which we owe all our past glory and triumphs, which we wish to see again, which is the object of all our prayers.

"We are greatly solicited by the Oriental Churches and much is done to bring about a union with them; but our preferences lean toward a reunion with Rome in the first place. You may not know that we are getting nearer to it from year to year. I recall the time when a small cross was removed from the top of an altar in one of our churches because its presence there savoured of Roman image-worship. And now we erect all over the land monuments to the dead, topped not only with crosses but with crucifixes. Prayers for the dead used to be tabooed, now they are general. Our Book of Common Prayer has seen some changes introduced in it of late, all significantly Catholic. The Book is so very much Roman in fact, that some one said: 'If all Anglicans adhered faithfully to its teachings, the difficulties in the way of a reunion with Rome, which appear so great at present and are far from being so in reality, would be smoothed over at once.'

"Not so very long ago I gave a lecture before a very large London audience, on the Primacy of the See of Rome, without meeting the least opposition. Neither did I hear of any after the publication of that lecture in pamphlet form. Ten years ago I certainly should have raised a storm of protests.

"I conclude: We must pray much; we must prepare the people's mind for a reunion and never cease enlightening; we must often meet—the oftener the better—that we may learn to know each other and to understand each other."

It was pathetic, indeed, to see that grand old man who has devoted his life to the sacred cause of reunion stand there, tall, erect, slim and spare of body, yet great of mind, resting eyes, singularly meek, upon his vast audience, pause an instant in his speech and then, like another Moses in sight of the Promised Land, extend quivering hands and say:

"Let us hope for the day upon which all the nations of the earth will meet in St. Peter's, Rome—one fold under one shepherd—to sing the glorious *Te Deum* of reconciliation."

A great, deep, solemn moment of quiet followed and then a tremendous burst of applause. Was it the end? No. Lord Halifax continued:

"Before parting with you, whom I now hail as friends, I owe it to myself, to the cause that is dear to me, yea, to you, to pay a tribute of respect and gratitude to His Eminence Cardinal Mercier. True, words to express my feelings, when I think of him, fail me; but this I can say, that never in my long life have I met a man who inspired me with the confidence with which he inspired me. I thank God to be numbered among his friends and bless his Holy Name every day for having placed our cause—the greatest one of the century—in his hands."

That was the end.

[From Rev. J. van der Heyden in *The Lamp*, Graymoor, Garrison, N. Y.]

Unity or Truth?

LORD HALIFAX is a most remarkable man; a Churchman of such virility and power that in his old age he is recognized in England, even by those who differ radically with him, as one of the great religious forces of the day.

As he approaches the setting of the sun of his life, his thoughts have become so centered upon Catholic reunion that the possibility of reconciling the Anglican and the Roman positions has become, more and more, the dominating motive of his life. For this we respect and revere him; and when he found, on the Roman side, a like sentiment animating Cardinal Mercier, it is not strange that the Malines conferences should have resulted. And in those conferences we see only good.

But when it comes to the analysis of Lord Halifax's position, we believe that he speaks for very few other than himself; and his logic is sometimes painfully deficient.

For instance: As quoted in the *Church Times*, he said at a recent meeting at the Church House, London:

"The first [point] is that unless we are prepared to recognize the primacy of the holy see as being *jure divino* there is no hope of reunion with Rome"; whereupon he argues at length that that position should be accepted by Anglicans.

But the question is not whether unity can or cannot be secured without accepting any given position but, *Is it true?*

If the principle is true, we are bound to accept it, not because its acceptance will promote the cause of reunion, but because it is true. And, on the other hand, unless we are convinced that it is true, it would be almost blasphemous for us to profess it, even though that profession would bring unity at once to the Church. It is far better to have a divided Church with one part right, than a united Church affirming with unanimity a principle that is wrong.

What, then, is the authority upon which we are to hold that the bishop of Rome has, by Divine right, a permanent primacy in the Church?

There certainly is no statement to that effect in the Scriptures. It is purely an inference (with much in its favour) that St. Peter had any pre-eminence among the apostles; it is only another inference (with considerable to be said for it) that St. Peter was ever bishop of Rome; it is only a third inference (with nothing, really, to be said for it) that *if* St. Peter had any personal pre-eminence, it was a pre-eminence that was to be attached to his successors in the bishopric of Rome; and it is only a fourth inference (with great improbability to be said of it) that *if* such pre-eminence were divinely attached to that see, it was of such a final and permanent character that, for cause, it could not be forfeited. On the strength of this chain of four inferences, each of which depends upon the others, and two of which can scarcely be dignified by any stronger term than imaginings or guesses, we are asked to agree, in the interest of reunion, on a Roman primacy by Divine right.

And having reached that illogical conclusion, we should still not be much nearer to reunion with Rome. The next step that would confront us would be that of a universal supremacy over all churches, bishops, and nations by this see of Rome and its bishop. That, in turn, must lead to acceptance of a prin-

ciple of infallibility in faith and morals on the part of the same pontiff, made easy to doubters, perhaps, by an admission that nobody knows *when* the popes have ever so spoken as to demand acceptance of their utterances as infallible, or when, or how, they ever will, and by the absence of any tribunal that can determine the point. For on strictest Roman principles, if the pope should formally affirm his own infallibility, we should still have no way of knowing whether that affirmation were itself an infallible utterance and so to be esteemed as certainly true and irreversible. It is claimed only that the pope is infallible when he speaks *ex cathedra* as vicar of Christ, and no man knows when he speaks in that capacity.

In the laudable attempt to do away with the hateful recriminations of the Anglo-Roman differences, all of us have become accustomed, rightly, to dwell rather upon the agreements between the two communions than upon their differences. But, without admitting bitterness into those differences, Anglicans must not be permitted to forget how very weak the Roman Petrine arguments are. We have just been reading the Rev. T. H. Passmore's recent book, *St. Peter's Charter as Peter Read It*, and the weakness of the Roman position stands out so conspicuously in the face of his relentless—and perfectly courteous—arguments, that the impossibility of the present Roman position having ever been reached without the aid of forgeries seems to be fully established. In showing great deference to Lord Halifax in connection with his attempts to find a basis for Anglo-Roman unity, we could wish that our fellow Churchmen would refresh their memories by reading this notable work.

The strongest argument that can be made for acceptance of the principles of papal primacy, supremacy, or infallibility is that such have been seriously affirmed by important councils of the Church. But it is equally true that each of these principles is inconsistent with acts and utterances of other councils of equal authority; that belief in the first of them is based largely upon admitted forgeries and could not, probably, ever have won general acceptance among Latins without the aid of those forgeries; that the two later principles could never have been affirmed unless the first were established; that a substantial continuous line of conviction of the falsity of that principle has been maintained by the Eastern communions, to which the witness of the Anglican communion has been added since the sixteenth century; and that the principles of papal supremacy and papal infallibility rest upon nothing stronger than decrees of

a part of the Church, in spite of conviction to the contrary of other parts, of equal authority with Rome.

So if the witness of the Scriptures to a papal primacy *jure divino* is nil, the witness of the church to it is so conflicting that, on Catholic grounds, it is not established. The most that could reasonably be asked of Anglicans in the interest of unity would be an agreement that throughout the Christian ages the bishop of Rome has, in fact, generally received deference as first bishop among equals; and that the Holy Spirit, having allowed that condition continuously to exist, it cannot be against his will that such deference be given. Beyond that, it seems to us wildly improbable that the Anglican communion could go. And that deference could only be given to-day, in any formal manner, if the pope were to recede from those further claims that have justly lost to him the formal deference of important portions of the Catholic Church.

That is to say, the Anglican communion cannot accept a principle that, at best, is not proven, when the evidence in favour of that principle is so compromising as is the evidence for a primacy *jure divino*; and especially since the Roman communion itself is not willing to rest upon that principle but demands on pain of heresy the acceptance of later positions as well.

Lord Halifax has argued in favour of a corporate acceptance of the principle on the ground that Rome cannot recede from that position; therefore if, in accordance with the will of our Lord, the unity of the Church is to be restored, we must recede from ours.

But he has no right to hold that Rome cannot change her position. A part of our objection to Rome is that she has materially changed her position before, and, therefore, she can change again. It is not to Rome but to the East that the adjective "unchangeable" has long been attached; and in this present day of crisis, the "unchangeable" is rapidly changing. The Eastern Churches are now passing through just such a searching transition as the Church of England passed through in the sixteenth century. *If the Holy Spirit wills it*, a like period of flux may easily arise in the Roman communion; it may be in our lifetime, it may be generations distant. What happened in England, or what happened in Russia, could easily happen in Italy; and the very precaution taken by the Roman Church to ensure that Italian rule shall be permanently maintained may sometime be her undoing. It cannot be proven that Italians are

"by Divine right" the permanently chosen people. The peace and security of the Roman Church rest to-day upon exceedingly vulnerable foundations.

And this suggests to us the alternative to Lord Halifax's plan that may, in the Divine economy, restore the broken unity of the Catholic Church.

Ultimately, the Holy Spirit will be the arbiter between East, West, and Anglia. Is the Anglican position fundamentally wrong? He, then, must convince us of it. Or is the Roman position wrong? He is able gradually to secure its correction.

A thousand years are to Him as one day. Times and seasons are not revealed to us. *How* He leads the Church into all truth we do not know; it is obvious that the goal has not nearly been reached as yet.

If it be said that the Holy Spirit permitted the rise of the papacy, therefore it must be right, it is as easy to argue that He also permitted disunity to arise, therefore it must be right. The argument is equally fallacious in both instances. God has permitted the rise and long continuance of many wrongs, yet it does not follow that wrongs are right.

It seems cruel to press upon Lord Halifax the hard logic that his position is really based upon a lack of faith, and yet that really is the case. God *cannot* change Rome; therefore Anglicans must make terms with Rome as she is, that unity may be restored: that, in short, is the foundation principle upon which his whole argument rests. And it is exactly that principle that we deny.

We do not maintain that current Anglicanism is perfect. It may, in the pure sight of Almighty God, be no more perfect than current Romanism. What we do maintain is that both of us alike must stand for the truth as we see it, and that we cannot surrender truth for unity. Lord Halifax is asking us to change our corporate position, not because he has become convinced that it is untrue, but because he sees advantages in affirming some other position.

On the pinnacle of the high mountain of his old age, one is showing him the separated ecclesiastical kingdoms of the world, and is saying to him, "All these things will I give thee, *if* . . ."

If Lord Halifax had those kingdoms, to be blended together as his own, how magnificent the future would be! Rome and Canterbury and Constantinople and Geneva would lie down together in perfect accord. . . . The Church would be one. . . . There would be no Calvary ahead for any of us. . . . The day of

suffering would be past. . . . The world would believe. . . . Surely, surely, the End would justify the Means. . . . Only to say that wrong is right. . . . The same temptation confronted ONE before him.

[From the *Living Church*, Milwaukee, Wis.]

The Reunion of Christendom

THE time has passed when anyone who believes in the Christian religion seeks to justify the present unhappy divisions among those who profess it, and the thought that is uppermost in the minds of many is to find some way whereby all may be once more brought into the "one fold." But by this longing they **do not, in many instances,** mean what seems to the Catholic the only obvious conclusion. Protestants have so long been accustomed to division and to the tenacious holding of some minor peculiarity that about the most they can see in what they often call Christian unity is some sort of federation of sects, whereby a certain degree of co-operation and good-will will take the place of the rivalry and even active hatred which is too often displayed. To do this, they have been of late, throwing overboard the dogmatic bases of their denominations in a way which threatens to leave but little in the way of historic Christianity in case they ever are able to accomplish a degree of union.

Diametrically opposed to this scheme is the Catholic conception of unity as a mark by which the true church is known—something which distinguishes it from all else and by which it can be identified. Hence to the Catholic communion with Rome is a *sine qua non* for all efforts which seek to heal the breaches in Christendom. This does not preclude effort on Rome's part to put an end to heresy and schism, nor does it prevent her authorities from entering into conferences such as those recently held at Malines with Anglicans or meetings such as the "reunion week" in Brussels where representatives of the Catholic Church and members of the Orthodox discussed methods whereby the "way home" might be facilitated for the latter. Indeed it is with regard to the Eastern alone that a Catholic can really accept the term "reunion," for they alone have separated in such a way that they can come back to a position once occupied by their fathers in ancient times. Of the separated brethren, they alone have retained the full organization of their churches. They alone possess, as a body, valid sacraments and valid orders, and

consequently they alone have the possibility of corporate reunion. They have it and the signs of the times point to this as a most favourable opportunity for accomplishing what has been the hope of the holy see for nearly a thousand years.

It would be of little profit to go into the sad history of the great schism which has split Christendom into East and West, but it is enough that its causes were, in the first instance, rather political than religious, and that it has been the growth of nationalistic racial feelings which has been responsible for much of its continuance. It is characteristic of all schisms that they lean upon state support, and the Orthodox Churches have been particularly inclined in that direction. Even where the government was that of the unbelieving Turk, Orthodox metropolitans have often lent a more attentive ear to its directions than to those of their own patriarchs, and in many cases deplorable results have followed. This condition, however, has been much changed with the World War. The breaking up of many of the Eastern European states, the downfall of the Czar in Russia, and the uncertainty of all civil boundaries have thrown the Orthodox churchmen back upon themselves, and many of the more thoughtful are re-examining the matter of the position of Rome whose patriarch, they recall, was always in the old days given first rank among them.

SOLICITUDE OF HOLY FATHER

On our side, the popes have been vigilant in prayer and desire that these wandering sheep may once more be included in the one true fold, recognizing the vicar of Christ as their father and friend, and giving their time and attention to the upbuilding of the Faith in their respective countries. Now that they are so distressed, and, in Russia particularly, being actively persecuted by an atheistic government bent upon the destruction of all religion, the holy father longs to have them know and understand more fully his solicitude for them. The great masses of the people in these lands have never been more than formally in schism. They have meekly followed their leaders but so far as they themselves are concerned, so long as their rites and customs are respected, there is no animosity against Catholicism as such. The theological differences between the two churches are slight and what is most needed to affect a reconciliation is that the true position of Rome be made known to them. In many cases priest and people might be won in a body if this were done.

It will be seen at once that the task is a gigantic one. Russia alone contains nearly 120,000,000 souls and Greece, Armenia, the Balkan States, and Asia Minor many millions more. It is work, therefore, not of a moment, nor to be accomplished by a few workers. It is, as one American priest who knows Russia well, has said, "The prime work before the Catholic Church to-day." But it will never be done unless a beginning be made, and that is being done.

SPECIAL SEMINARY FOR RUSSIAN YOUTHS

Pope Pius XI has, even more than his immediate predecessors, a first-hand knowledge of these Eastern peoples. He is most anxious that his pontificate shall be distinguished for its efforts in their behalf. For this purpose he has determined to found in Rome itself a special seminary where Russian youths, filled with a holy zeal to become apostles to their own race, may be educated for the priesthood, and go forth to preach unity. He has also given his blessings to similar efforts which are being made especially by the Dominicans at Lille in France and by the Belgian Benedictines. Organized effort is essential to the success of such a movement, hence he has acclaimed with joy as the providential fulfilment of his dearest wishes the foundation of the Catholic Union, a society which is devoting itself to the return to the holy church of the separated brethren of Russia and the Near East.

The Catholic Union was founded a little more than two years ago by a distinguished Benedictine priest, the Rev. Augustine Count Galen, and it has been spread in that time to many European countries as well as on this side of the Atlantic. Dr. Galen has recently returned from Rome where he received the special blessing of his holiness on the work and upon all who in any way aid it, and he has, moreover, the holy father's expressed desire that it shall be made known as widely as possible among the Catholics of America.

GREAT IMPORTANCE OF UNDERTAKING

The importance of this undertaking needs to be called to the attention of those who are alive to the church's activities. The tremendous advantage to religion of having with us the great Orthodox Churches, with their intense devotion to our Lord and his blessed mother, with their zeal for keeping the traditions of the fathers, and their belief in the sacramental channels of grace, is obvious. And, on the other hand, the fact

that in Christianity alone, and in that guided by the infallible and far-seeing successors of Peter, can there be any adequate offsetting of the rising tide of anti-religious propaganda, gives it an additional claim upon our support. Bolshevism has Russia by the throat, and it is reaching out its hand to seize China and the Far East on the one side, and Western Europe and America on the other. A united Christendom alone can withstand it. Such can be secured by aiding in the work of the Catholic Union.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S PLEA

Mr. Walter T. Johnson, the president of the National Council of Catholic Men, in his message sets forth the aims of that organization and no better statement of what the Catholic Union seeks to accomplish could be made than thus:

The call is to every Catholic society and to every Catholic man to unite in a common endeavour to support the church, to correct the misunderstanding and error of her critics out of which arise the evil efforts that are directed against us, and on every proper occasion to use the power and influence of the moral force of the nearly twenty millions of Catholics in this country in her support. Our organization will act through the numerous existing lay societies. It will procure these to strive in union toward their common purposes, will bring to their aid the resources and the services of the other five departments of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and will bring to them, besides, the support of the many millions of American Catholics who do not now belong to any organization but will be members of the National Council of Catholic Men by virtue of their membership in its parish units. It does not seek the place or cover the field of any existing Catholic organization. It is all Catholic organizations and all Catholic laymen of any or no organization united in the general work of Catholic welfare common to all.

On this basis the Catholic Union seeks the co-operation of every lay organization and of every Catholic in the country. Becoming a member of the Catholic Union means that one believes in helping to fulfil our Divine Saviour's prayer "that all may be one," in helping the holy father carry out his plan for the bringing back of these separated peoples once more within his loving care, and in serving God and country well.

[From Rev. Floyd Keeler, Secretary of the Catholic Union in the *N. C. W. C. Bulletin*, New York.]

Resolution from South America Calling for Universal Brotherhood

THE following from a magazine in Santiago, Chile, is revealing:

The American Continent has a special opportunity of leading the world toward a new international co-operation, which will signify a predominance

of the moral and spiritual values over a mere economic exchange. At the present time there is visiting South America a group of North Americans intensely interested in these spiritual and moral exchanges. Probably never before has such a large group of North Americans, interested particularly in the spiritual life of the world, united together in visiting South America. This group represents a cross section of American life. There are a number of university professors, specialists in religious education, in social hygiene, in hospital work, pastors of large churches, secretaries of mission boards, officials of railroads, bankers, business men, social workers and women prominent in society and in philanthropic work.

They have come to South America on a spiritual venture, first to learn more of South American life, its problems and its hopes, and to enter fully into fellowship with South America in the solution of these problems. The immediate occasion of this visit was the holding of the Congress on Christian Work in South America. The spirit of the Congress may be understood by the following resolution which was only one of the hundred and six resolutions or findings adopted by the Congress in marking out a great programme of Christian service for South America:

"Christ calls us to universal brotherhood, peace in industry and among the nations, economic security for all, the elevation of the unprivileged classes, the development of backward races, the enrichment of all peoples by the free interchange of scientific and spiritual discoveries, the complete realization of our highest human possibilities. We, therefore, call upon all Christian forces to purge their hearts of suspicion, prejudice, and selfishness; to begin now to trust all men as brothers; to foster the spirit of goodwill in schools and churches; to become leaders in the development of a conscience whose touchstone is the Golden Rule of Christ."

Something of the way that this resolution impressed some of the most influential South Americans may be indicated from an article just written for *La Nueva Democracia* by Gabriela Mistral, distinguished alike in Latin America and Europe, a mystic, a Roman Catholic, and a crusader for human rights. She says:

Spanish America has two dominant currents, Catholicism and materialism. The materialistic current in our countries is enormous. It counts as adepts the great majority of the educators of our youth. Our church should remember its essential unity of interest with Protestantism and consider that it loses infinitely less in the free-thinker who is evangelized than in the youth of Catholic blood who embraces atheism with the furor of a Roman gladiator. Sooner or later, in an hour of travail, the two branches of the faith of Christ will come to understand that their fighting one another is the greatest misfortune for all the peoples of Spanish America.

In Chile there are many schools where the Lord's Prayer is no longer heard. One night I found myself without lodging in a southern city of our country and a North American teacher took me to her home, a North American school. I accepted because of necessity, but with a questioning conscience. Did I have the right to partake of her table without partaking of her creed? The following day, after breakfast, which was blessed with beautiful words revealing inward faith, I was invited to common prayer with the pupils. I entered the room with hesitation. The Bible was given me to select the reading for the day. I chose a psalm of David, the common expression of our faith. I read it, followed by the students, with an emotion I have seldom experienced. There was the joy of being in a school where it is possible to study every day the Holy Book, where atheistic effrontery was not able to cast out the Author of Grace, who is superior to all knowledge. Some day this example will be a revelation for my brethren in the faith, the Catholics. They will see that the materialistic movement is so

great that now they have no closer brethren than those Protestants with whom they are able to unite in the common struggle for Christ. . . . The United States has in our country the unhappy luck of being interpreted as utilitarian, as a work-shop, and not as a religious field, which it was, is and will continue to be.

[From Dr. Samuel G. Inman, Secretary of the Committee on Co-operation in Latin America, New York.]

Bishop Brent on the World Conference on Faith and Order

ON Monday evening, February 15, the Christian Unity Foundation of New York brought together a group of seventy of the most outstanding leaders of the Church to hear Bishop Brent tell of the preliminary plans for the great World Conference on Faith and Order which is to be held in Lausanne, Switzerland, during August, 1927. My readers are perhaps familiar with the history of the World Conference on Faith and Order. In 1910 the General Convention of the Episcopal Church appointed a commission to arrange for a conference for the consideration of all questions relating to faith and order, and to ask all Christian communions throughout the world to unite in arranging and participating in such a conference. Each participating communion was asked to appoint a commission to co-operate, and up to date eighty-seven groups of America and Europe have signified their willingness to co-operate. In the summer of 1920 members of these commissions and other representatives of the participating churches met at Geneva, Switzerland, where preliminary and fundamental questions were discussed and where a continuation committee was set up, with representatives from the participating bodies, to carry on the preparations for the World Conference. This continuation committee met again at Stockholm last summer during the sessions of the Life and Work Conference, and decided to call together about five hundred representatives of the churches at Lausanne for the first three weeks of August next year. Bishop Brent is the chairman of the continuation committee.

At the New York meeting, Bishop Brent not only talked about the plans for Lausanne but upon the whole problem of Christian unity. He said that a conference on the practical work of the churches, held at Stockholm, had only convinced him more thoroughly than ever that the real reason for difference among the churches lay deep beneath the surface. "Time and again we had to remind ourselves that we were not considering matters of faith and order. The hour has come when

we must meet, with the same honesty and good-will as at Stockholm, differences in theology." He emphasized the fact that the time for controversy, where each one tried to carry his own point, had passed and the time for conference, where each one tried to learn the point of view of the others, has come. He said that the great outcome of the Life and Work Conference was "understanding" and that the time had now come for the churches to make an approach at "understanding," in thought and theological conviction as well as in practical work. Conduct and creed cannot be separated. Stockholm illustrated how ideals of conduct always arose out of creed. The reason there were such differences in ideals of practical work was because there were such differences of theological belief. The address was very striking and greatly moved those who heard it.

Bishop Brent feels greatly encouraged by the interest that the various communions are taking in the proposed conference. As at Stockholm, all communions, with the possible exception of the Roman Catholic, will be represented. The great Eastern communions are showing much interest in the conference and it is expected that they will be represented by a delegation even larger and more eminent than was present at Stockholm. The Stockholm Conference was a great success because the Christian people of Europe and America had been educated about it for a year before. I wish that the pastors who would read this letter would see what a fine opportunity they have here occasionally to turn the thoughts of their people to this great subject. Tell them about Lausanne. Tell them that in the summer of 1927 all the churches of the world are going to sit together for a month, conferring on the deepest things of the faith, on the nature and being of God, his relationship to human life, his purposes for the world, on Christ and his relation to the Father, and to man. Tell them that they are going frankly to discuss the origin and nature of the Church, the sacraments, and the Christian ministry; going to see how far apart the sacramentalists and evangelicals are, how near together they can come. Write to the Faith and Order office, Box 226, Boston, and ask for literature, especially for pamphlet 41, containing the preliminary agenda. Do all in your power to educate your people that they may be ready to follow the proceedings of the great conference in 1927.

[From Dr. Frederick Lynch in *The Christian Work*, New York.]

Church Union in Scotland

THE issues of the Scottish Union controversy are becoming clearer if more critical, and it is fitting that in this organ, with its wide constituency, an attempt should be made to define them and to set forth the present aspects of the situation as they appear to us from the standpoint of world-Presbyterianism.

The General Assemblies in May moved the clock forward quite decidedly. On the part of the Church of Scotland action was taken in transmitting the new Articles of 1921 declaratory of its constitution in matters spiritual to presbyteries for their consent under the Barrier Act, and in instructing presbyteries to review the situation in the light of recent enactments and also of communications expressing the views of kirk-sessions. Preparation of an explanatory statement was also authorized, to be brought under the attention of kirk-sessions and congregations, and every indication was given that the Assembly is determined earnestly to pursue the policy of reunion. The minority was so weak as to be almost negligible. Another important point here is that through the passing of the Church of Scotland Act, 1925, the church entered upon full and uncontrolled possession of her own property. On the side of the United Free Church the Assembly by a large majority vote declared that the way was now open for the consideration of the question of union. But it wisely resolved to take the opinion of presbyteries, kirk-sessions, and congregations as to whether the main causes of separation between the churches had been removed and the time had come for entering on negotiations to make them one. The result of this remit is already sufficiently apparent. Every presbytery has voted for going ahead, though in some instances, notably Glasgow, there was a strong minority in opposition. A large majority of sessions favours a similar policy. Congregations in a proportion not as yet clearly ascertainable have also decided that the chief obstacles have been removed so as to warrant preparation of a basis of union. Literature in leaflet and pamphlet form has been freely used by both sides, and the "United Free Church Association" has become more and more uncompromising in its attitude of hostility. There are indications, however, that a considerable section of the opposition is not irreconcilable and that not a few are inclined to suspend their final judgment till the proposed basis is made public. It would seem to be practically certain that the next General Assembly will proceed upon the verdict given that the main obstacles have been removed, and will appoint a new

union committee to take the place of the present "Committee on Conference with the Church of Scotland."

Very much will depend on the basis of union provisionally agreed upon by the reconstituted joint-committees, and thereafter submitted to the inferior courts. Experience has proved, in the case of both local and general unions, that minor obstacles have blocked the way even after the chief barriers had been overpassed. And when keen feeling is aroused additional hindrances are apt to appear. It can only be hoped that the spirit which has prevailed so far and has succeeded in greatly lessening, if not entirely removing, the grounds of resistance, will be manifest yet more strikingly in the still remaining stages of this high enterprise. One thing must be clearly understood. This is not a case of absorption but of continuance and combination. Both churches are bound to maintain their continuity. On the one hand the ancient tradition of the Church of Scotland should be preserved without any violent interruption, and, on the other hand, respect is due to a testimony and practice extending over nigh two hundred years. Combination of the best features in each church, with elimination of the worst, is no less necessary for the good of the united body. A leader in this movement has referred to "the unfortunate tendency to consider the question not in terms of reality but in the controversial terms of past bitter conflict." Such ought to be discouraged on both sides. One of the anti-union tracts bears the title "Back to Establishment," as if that were a clear present issue. Harm is also done when uncompromising utterances of departed church worthies (in view of an entirely different situation) are reiterated as watchwords for to-day. Let it be frankly acknowledged that the situation has been changed not only by recent legislation but by the widening of thought and the urgencies of the time. This affects not only the old connotation of "establishment," but the meaning of "endowment" and "spiritual independence"—terms which cannot be used exactly as if nothing had happened within the last few years. The call is not to go back to an obsolete past, but to shape a new future under new conditions.

Nor can it be doubted that the day of purely national churches is dying, if not dead. It has taken us nearly four centuries to rid ourselves of the exaggerated nationalism, with the temptation to Erastianism, that marred the Protestant Reformation and that still holds too many churches in bondage. The Scottish Church after a long struggle finds it possible to be at once national, free, and international. This is a new ecclesias-

tical type as well as a great sign of emancipation and should have great consequences for the world. A certain narrowness of outlook has been charged against the Presbyterianism of Scotland. Thanks, we hope, partly to the efforts of our Alliance, and thanks now to the broad basis laid down in the new Articles, there is the prospect of a church that will look far beyond the nation to a free unity of the Church Catholic and of all humanity in Christ. We anticipate not only a federation of British Presbyterianism, bringing closer to each other the Scottish, English, Irish, and Welsh elements, but a strengthening of the whole Reformed community everywhere. And neither the limits of one country nor of one ecclesiastical system can be a bar to further progress. Congregationalism, Methodism, Episcopacy itself, are not outside the bounds of a possible synthesis with our doctrine and polity, though we may not live to see that fully realized.

Surely by keeping these considerations in view, the peril of another Presbyterian schism in Scotland may be avoided. Comprehension is dreaded by some as involving denial of distinctive principle, but have we not yet got past the notion that every distinctive principle held by a group of earnest men demands a separate denomination for its expression? The voluntary principle, in which we believe as firmly as any, will have a vast field for application in a United Scottish church and so will every other legitimate Christian policy and purpose.

We close with some words written by us fourteen years ago which do not seem to need alteration now: "The great bulk of the Scottish people are anxious to see the unity of their church restored, and we may well pray that this may happen without surrender of faithful testimony or break in Christian fellowship. It must not be forgotten that all through the days of strife and division the ideal of one great free Presbyterian Church floated before the minds of the heroes, saints, and martyrs whose memory we revere. In our building for the future, room has to be found for every true thought they expressed, every high principle of life and duty that they blazoned on their fighting banners. The task is no easy one, but valiant hearts, especially of the younger generation, may well brace themselves to the noble endeavour, knowing that it is an effort supremely worthy of them as patriots and as Christians."

[From *The Quarterly Register*, Edinburgh.]

Toward the Cure of Presbyterian Fissures

EIGHT years ago or more a joint commission of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, including representatives of the United, the Southern, and the "national" Presbyterian Churches, the Dutch Reformed Church (officially the Reformed Church in America), and the German Reformed Church (the Reformed Church in the United States), drew up a plan for a common missionary society. The General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.—that is, the "national" church—the Reformed Church in the United States, and the United Presbyterian Church approved the plan. The Southern Presbyterian Church felt that the time had not yet come to carry it into effect. The synod of the Dutch Reformed Church approved it, though with some reservations. The leaders of the denominations which had accepted the plan concluded that the time was not yet ripe for action and so did not push for any. Patience would bring the good work to pass.

A few months ago Charles Rowland, one of the prophetic souls in the Southern Presbyterian Church, took up the matter with Dr. Robert E. Speer, of the "national" Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. Dr. Speer had had the very same thought in mind. Out of that conversation came a meeting in Philadelphia in January.

Over six hundred delegates from six communions met together. For in addition to the five churches, the committee invited the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, the Reformed Presbyterian Church (commonly known as the Covenanters), and the Cumberland Church, the remnant left after the larger part of that communion reunited with the Presbyterian Church twenty years ago. The Covenanters accepted the invitation, but too late to take a part in the programme. But nine Covenanters sat in the meeting.

THE NEW MISSIONARY POINT OF VIEW

The convening body, one-third ministers, one-third laymen, and one-third women, presented about the appearance that one would expect—some of the men well groomed, clean cut, some of them with wrinkled coats and more angular faces, but pre-eminently men of strength; here and there a woman who looked the ideal—simple and with distinction—and of course a sprinkling of the older missionary meeting type, but altogether an able and forceful group.

At the opening dinner, where Dr. Harris E. Kirk, of Baltimore; Dr. John Van Ess, the distinguished Dutch Reformed missionary to Arabia; and Professor Cleland B. McAfee, of McCormick Theological Seminary, spoke, Dr. Kirk, whom New York now admires as the man with courage enough to refuse the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, struck a note which rang out time after time during the conference. Dr. Kirk put it perhaps more explicitly and more bluntly than almost any other speaker.

"The time," he said, "has come for us as Christians in our work in Oriental lands to break off all relations with Western concepts of Christianity and Western political connections, with Western civilization and Western nationalism. We will not protect our property or lives with foreign gun boats, foreign diplomats, and foreign soldiers. The day of denominationalism in foreign fields is gone. The time is coming"—and here he put the critical point—"the time is coming when we shall divorce the Christian religion, as we give it to the East, from all creedal forms shaped by medieval thought. (Applause.) I haven't any sympathy with identifying the vessel with the treasure."

THE FUTURE

The high point of the conference came with Dr. Speer's statement of the history of the movement which lay behind the present meeting, as outlined at the beginning of this article, and in the conference conducted by Dr. William E. Schell on the final morning of the conference, when, at last, the floor had a chance to enter into the discussion. The questions and suggestions fired from the delegates, some of the strongest men in the church, showed that the mind of the group was following the inevitable path. If we can do together in the mission field what we have already done and can meet in the spirit which prevails here, are we not ready for the next step toward getting together? How shall we follow up this meeting? For everyone had profited immensely by the enlargement of his horizon through looking at the foreign mission work of the five churches together.

The meeting tacitly left its continuation work to the western section of the Council of the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches. Unless all signs fail the group of Presbyterian and Reformed churches is on the way to closer and closer co-operation, not only on the field but in the administration here at home. In the sweep of the centuries which will bring the sections of the one great Church together, the Philadelphia meeting will mark but a tiny step. But it will mark a real step in the right direction.

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

BOOK REVIEWS

PERSONAL RELIGION AND THE LIFE OF FELLOWSHIP. By William Temple. Bishop of Manchester. With an Introduction by the Bishop of London. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co.; 87 pages, \$1.00.

There is no man in England whose utterances attract such wide attention as the Bishop of Manchester. His lucid thought has found expression in this little book, the title of which would immediately commend a careful reading. It fits in well with Dean Inge's *Personal Religion and the Life of Devotion* and Canon Green's *Personal Religion and Public Righteousness*. The Bishop of London has written the introduction to all these. In Dr. Temple's book the Bishop says: "So long as we church people look upon religion as 'an affair between a man and his Maker,' we are losing the whole idea of the Church as a great brotherhood, and especially the idea of the great central service of the Church, which we call Holy Communion, without realizing that Communion means Fellowship."

The book reveals a twofold message. The first has to do with the deep meaning of belief in Christ, and the second has to do with the expression of that belief in Christian fellowship. The eight chapters are as follows: "The Christian Doctrine of God," "The Christian Conception of History," "The Place of the Church in the Creed," "Worship and Fellowship," "Discipleship and Politics," "Discipleship and Economics," "The Church and the Kingdom of God," and "The Primary Need—Conversion." To find the right conception of God has been the task of ages. History is crammed with all kinds of blunders. The real evil of the past and the present is the unworthy conception of God. There had to be a portrayal of God; hence the coming of Christ, who satisfied that need. We think of God both as Creator and Redeemer. It is the combining of these "which lifts religion to the Christian level."

In the chapter on "Worship and Fellowship," he makes clear that the Christian life is a life of membership in a society, God being our Father and we all being children before Him, not to behave as if each were an only child. If one does so believe, he sets up "a form of practical polytheism, for it really involves that each has his own God." Concluding this chapter, he says: "If we receive love, of course we become more loving; we are more closely united with our brother-men; for love is the capacity for, and joy in, the union of spirits. 'If a man say that he love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar.' If a man say that he has received the Body and Blood of the Lord, and is void of love to other men, he is a liar. 'God is love'; the Body and Blood of Christ are human nature perfected in love by

uttermost sacrifice. If we are in fellowship with God we are by that very fact in fellowship with one another. If we are not in fellowship with one another, if we are envious or contemptuous, if we bear hatred or malice, if we are snobbish or exclusive, we are not in fellowship with God."

Many excerpts might be made equally as practical and appealing as this. The whole book is full of good thought and thought that is needed for the enrichment both of the individual Christian and the whole Church. It is the way for an understanding that will give Christ a larger place in Christian experience.

THE THINKING MAN. By Rev. Frederick Macdonnell, S. J. Baltimore: John Murphy Company; 327 pages, price \$1.75.

In the foreword of this interesting book the author says: "This little volume has no pretensions of being a learned work. It is addressed to each-one-in-particular of the crowd that makes up everybody-in-general. It aims, not at teaching its readers what they do not know, but at urging them to make sure of knowing what it is important that they should know." Beginning with the Declaration of Independence, and emphasizing the cherished words—equality, life, liberty, and happiness—he urges the thinking man not to fail to think enough and to induce the man that does not "think within his heart" to begin that salutary operation by listening to the voice of reason regarding law and government culminating in the claims of the Roman Catholic Church. He argues from the establishment of the United States with its constitution and supreme court that there, likewise, is the Law Book—the Bible—promising equality, life, liberty, and happiness, and the Church interprets that Law Book with unerring accuracy. In the midst of no less than 196 ecclesiastical bodies in the United States, each claiming to be the correct interpreter, he turns to the Roman Catholic Church, quoting the following words from the eminent Protestant, Thomas Babington Maccauley: "There is not and there never was, on this earth, a work of human policy so well deserving of examination as the Roman Catholic Church. The history of that Church joins together the two great ages of human civilizations . . . Nor do we see any sign which indicates that the term of her long dominion is approaching."

He refutes the various charges against the Roman Catholic Church and pleads for her right to be heard as conscientiously and earnestly as the late Cardinal Gibbons used to do. It is right, too, that the Roman Catholic argument should be heard by Protestants as the Protestant argument should be heard by Roman Catholics. A book like this will help to clear the atmosphere. There are one or two Protestant communions that make the same argument on the Declaration of Independence. It is well to get all these arguments and weigh them. Truth is never afraid of the light. That men in

their various churches have deep convictions in the things that their churches stand for and are honest in those convictions is something that all thinking people have got to recognize. In the tolerance of these times truth has the best chance in all history. Father Macdonnell sees the spiritual desolation of the world. He has written this book, arguing for his church's contribution in helping to arouse him who thinketh not "within his heart."

THE BIOLOGICAL UNITY OF THE CHURCH. A Study in the Living Organic Unity of the Body of Christ. By the Rev. L. B. Ridgely, S. T. D., of the Central Theological School, Nanking, China. New York: Edwin S. Gorham; 91 pages, \$1.00.

This book is a worth while contribution to Christian unity. Dr. Ridgely begins with the study of the human race, finding that the race is divided into two general groups—religious and non-religious, the former following some God or gods or some principle above and beyond the world of matter and sense, and the latter living without consciously following a supreme God, if not denying the existence of such God or gods. In the religious group there are those who recognize Jesus Christ as "Master," maintaining a sort of unity and at the same time a perplexing sort of diversity.

The unity appears in recognizing Jesus as Master and belonging to his Church. As the race is a manifestation of the Divine life with a certain unity and with its many sorts of diversity, the Church, coming into the world through the action of God through Jesus Christ, is also an outward manifestation of Divine life—"a visible form in which works an inward and spiritual force." He says: "Christ's Church, then, is an organism in which we may study God, see God, and act with God; in which, however, material elements and human wills have place and part."

In order to understand God and his Church one must do so "by studying it as he would study any other organism, namely, by observing and learning, not by forcing and dictating; looking for the facts, the characteristics, and the phenomena, and so learning the principles and laws of life in the organism." And the process he adopts is, first, analysis and, second, synthesis.

Under analysis he discusses unorganized believers—that scattered multitude who are unidentified with any group; grouped believers, who exclude the idea of authoritative organization, such as the Society of Friends and Plymouth Brethren; believers organized on congregational principles, such as the Unitarians, Baptists, and some others; believers organized on the basis of the general interest, such as Wesleyans, Presbyterians, Lutherans, and Disciples; disciples organized on the basis of "authority," such as Church of Christ Scientist, Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints, and Catholic Apostolic Church; and believers organized on the Catholic

principle, such as Church of Rome, Russian, Greek, Armenian, Coptic, and other Oriental orthodox churches, Church of England, including the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and all other bodies that lay stress on the idea of an established apostolate and priesthood, "a continuous order, to be maintained unbroken by an organized church forever."

Dr. Ridgely does not present this book for controversy, but to urge that all Christians "set themselves prayerfully to study the facts,—the historical manifestation of Christ in his Body, the Church,—and each strive for himself to grasp the meaning and fulfil the duties he finds revealed."

While the analysis of the development of the various groups is omitted, he calls attention to two tendencies — individualistic and corporate, the former leading to individual initiative and the latter appealing to authority, which often represses the individual. He regards neither as sufficient alone.

In the synthesis he sees the revelation of the possibilities and the limitation of the action of the Divine life among men guided by faith in Jesus, "what the fundamental principles, the real norm, and the law of progress within that norm toward the Divine ideal." And so he raises the question: "In what form is it the Divine will that the unity of the Church should manifest itself?" Rather than thinking in terms of a plan, he emphasizes the scientific method of observation and docility, "to watch and see what are the methods of God, and then combine and co-operate in these, with Him."

He raises five questions: 1. What revelation can we get of the mind of the Master, in the study of the above phenomena, 2. What is the formative principle of the Church according to the will of God as revealed in the history and characteristics of the Body up to this time?—i. e. What is the line along which the unity is actually working? 3. What is the Divine ideal of unity, "the end of the Lord," so far as we can now see it? 4. How is it coming to realization? 5. What can we do to co-operate in the advance toward it?

And he answers that unity must work itself out in history; it is not a mere form, but a living and moving thing; inevitably it must be unity in Christ, either looking back to the apostolic age or out upon the present age; authority is in Christ and acting with Him involves the whole Church. This marks a wide divergence, some believing in the sacramental system and others believing that He left "a doctrine, a principle, or a power, which we are to apprehend individually and to work out for ourselves under the unseen guidance of the Spirit alone." Both positions involve conscience.

Dr. Ridgely raises the question as to a definite scheme or describable ideal to which the Church is to conform as a pattern and he sees that "the Divine life in the Church moves always not by individual stimulus alone but by individual stimulus organized into corporate action." In answering "What shall we do?" he holds to the form of suggestion rather than pro-

grammes, recognizing the Scriptures, history, psychology, sociology, joining in philanthropic, social, moral, and educational work, and, above all, living forth the principles of Jesus, "truthing it in love."

In his conclusion he regards the Church as a mystery, psychologically and biologically, as a nation is a mystery, but more—a super-nation. However, the non-Roman Catholic nor the non-Anglican would hardly admit that he was not a member of the Church because he did not hold to the sacramental system. This is where Dr. Ridgely's presentation breaks down. We are still amid the unsettled problems upon which we differ—even the definition of the term church has not been established. He closes with a fine emphasis upon Christians' praying together. It is a stimulating book.

MODERNISM AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. Three Farm Street Lectures, to which is added a chapter on the Problem and the Prospects of Christian Union. By Francis Woodlock, S. J. With a Preface by G. K. Chesterton. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co.; 88 pages, \$1.25.

In Mr. Chesterton's introduction he regards Modernism as the mortal enemy of liberty and finds a parallel between Modernism and Calvinism, the latter being an attempt to turn the creed into pure pessimism and the former tending toward a sort of illogical optimism. He hails Father Woodlock's lectures with joy. Father Woodlock selected Modernism as his theme because of its bearing on the prospects of reunion. He regards its acceptance as a permanent and impassable barrier to reunion with Rome, the spirit of Modernism being more "opposed to the Catholic spirit and faith than is even militant Protestantism."

In his first lecture he deals with "Modernism and the Creeds," charging that Modernism changes the meaning of phrases used in the creeds or, in the words of Professor Kirsopp Lake, "that the creed is wrong and cease affirming it." Father Woodlock declares that there can be no reunion with Rome without a sincere agreement on the one faith of the Catholic creeds. His second lecture is on "Modernism and Christ," arguing the acceptance of Jesus as God, as affirmed in the creeds, if there would be reunion with Rome. He regards the Church of England as teaching contradictory doctrines when she teaches, as affirmed by Dr. Headlam, bishop of Gloucester: "I always hold that both for Modernists and for Anglo-Catholics there should be reasonable freedom of interpretation of the formulas of the Church, and just as I think with a little Christian charity we can find room for the Modernists in the Church of England, so I think that probably we can find room in exactly the same way for the people who call themselves at present Anglo-Catholics." But to Father Woodlock there is no Christian charity in being indifferent to Modernism. His third lecture deals with "Modernism and Miracle," in which he quotes many authorities, as in his

other lectures, and argues for the miracles as stated in the creeds. Concluding, he says: "What then in a few words is the message of Modernism? It is this: the creeds are incredible; Christ is a mere creature—a mere human and non-miraculous person; the virgin birth and the bodily resurrection never took place, nor has there ever in the whole of human history been a real supernatural miracle."

In his concluding chapter, dealing with the problem and the prospects of Christian union, he discusses the claims of the four groups: (1) Roman Catholic, (2) Eastern Orthodox, (3) Anglican, and (4) Protestant, and affirms that the uniting of these Christian bodies into one single corporation is hopeless, "inasmuch as every approach by Anglicans to Nonconformity is a step away from Rome and the Orthodox, and every approach toward Constantinople and Rome increases the distance from the avowed fundamental Protestantism of the sects." With the unchanging intransigence of Rome on one side and the unwillingness of Modernists to go back to the old idea of the creeds, the gulf appears very wide, but Father Woodlock, with his firm faith that Rome is the very cure, has maintained an affection and esteem for those from whom he differs. It is, perhaps, the best book that has been written by a Roman Catholic on Christian union, with the lines distinctly drawn but not without faith that Christ shall win. Our differences are discouraging, but, in tolerance, we discover the children of our Father's House. We must try other roads than theology. Agreement on other roads will unconsciously make our severe differences in theology less apparent, and who knows but that, after all, the Modernist will be the prophet whose interpretations will soften the hard places? One thing is certain and that is that we have got to do some deep ploughing, and perhaps it is the Modernist who is the ploughman of this age.

WHAT IS FAITH? By J. Gresham Machen, D. D., Assistant Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary. New York: The Macmillan Company; 263 pages, \$1.75.

The purpose of this book, as affirmed by the author in the Introduction, is "to defend the primacy of the intellect, and, in particular, to try to break down the false and disastrous opposition which has been set up between knowledge and faith." Over against this it might be well to read the wonderful chapter on "Knowledge and Faith" in Professor James Y. Simpson's book, *The Spiritual Interpretation of Nature*. Professor Machen attempts to answer the question raised by the title of his book and does it with force and scholarship, but he is too much disturbed to find fair conclusions. The atmosphere of the book is stormy. He is vexed. To have written on faith he should have found a calmer soul within himself. He says: "The retrograde, anti-intellectual movement called Modernism, a

movement which really degrades the intellect by excluding it from the sphere of religion, will be overcome, and thinking will again come to its rights." The question is at once raised, on reading such a statement, whether the Modernist would accept that statement as true. If Professor Machen is unfair in this statement relative to his opponent, what assurance have we that he is not also unfair in his attempt to define faith? It is one of the difficult conditions in religious controversy that one can rarely ever rise to the plane of making a true statement about another who differs from him theologically, but it is to one's credit to recognize that weakness and allow his opponent to make the statement and thereby avoid advertising his weakness. It is no surprise that Professor Machen is reported to have referred, in a recent press dispatch, to the United Church of Canada as "that agnostic and tyrannical Union Church in Canada," and, further, in speaking of Protestant union, as "that wicked and hateful dream."

Regarding mysticism, he says it "unquestionably is the natural result of the anti-intellectual tendency which now prevails, for mysticism is the consistent exaltation of experience at the expense of thought." He is the champion for the controversial side of religion, which, however, is giving way in these days to that better wisdom of conference, where men who differ can meet together and think through their problems. He discusses faith in God, in Christ, faith born of need, faith and the Gospel, faith and salvation, faith and works, and faith and hope. There are some fine paragraphs in some of the chapters, but, in other instances, one wishes he might have moved more cautiously in his attempt at definitions. It is a difficult field. The dogmatist delights in it. The Church bares many scars in consequence of it, and Jesus is still saying, "These are the wounds that I received in the house of my friends."

The Church has been forever defining things upon which we constantly divide. Man's knowledge of God is greatly limited. Our best thought falls far short of the mark. We can never get away from the humorous words of Leslie Stephen: "It is enough to say that they define the nature of God Almighty with an accuracy from which modest naturalists would shrink in describing the genesis of a black-beetle." But Christian life is rising in the souls of believers of all groups. Our task in this day is to understand the brother from whom we differ and many are working at the task.

THE TEACHING OF APOCRYPHA AND APOCALYPSE. By Charles Arthur Hawley, S. T. M., Ph. D., Author of *Teaching of the Prophets*, etc. (Association Press, New York; 165 pages, \$1.50). This study covers parts of I Maccabees, Daniel, Tobit, Judith, I Esdras, Esther, Wisdom Literature, Psalms, Jubilees, Twelve Patriarchs, Enoch, Baruch, Ezra, and the Apocalypse of John. In the burden of the Law, which developed a priestly religion,

seeking salvation in ceremony, the prophet's voice was hushed and the apocalypse answered the challenge, for the human mind will not be silenced by any law. A man dared not speak in his own name for fear of death and so apocalypses were written under pen names. Out of this condition was developed the apocalyptic mind, which looked to the end of the present world order and expected the physical interference of God for the adjustment of things. The apocalyptic period covered about 270 years, being the time between the Apocalypse of Daniel and the Apocalypse of John. In this period came Jesus. Consequently, for a better understanding of Jesus, one must acquaint himself with the Jewish literature of this period. This throws light on the explanation of the difference between the Jesus of the Gospels and the Jesus of the Apocalypse of John, the former being forgiving and the latter revengeful. It is a practical and helpful little book.

THE RELIGION OF UNDERGRADUATES. By Cyril Harris, Sometime University Pastor of the Episcopal Church, Cornell University (Scribner's, New York; 87 pages, \$1.25). This is a very practical little book in its attempt to interpret the mind of the undergraduate relative to such questions as, Can religion be taught? Can religion bring science to the service of the soul? Has Christianity anything important to say to modern youth about sin? What part can the Christian religion play in a modern industrial state? Can the Church give our young people their God back again? While there is no attempt to define the undergraduate's religion, it is suggestive in leading them to the young man, Jesus, "who stands looking for the young men and the young women to rediscover with them the open secret of all life, that the Kingdom of God is in our midst waiting to be recognized and possessed." When they do catch a whiff of Jesus' hardihood and Divine audacity, the author predicts a kindred audacity in service. It is a word well said in the approaches to young men and young women whose college experiences have opened new doors of knowledge, which need not alarm us so long as we recognize the evolutionary processes in the march of civilization.

COMMON PRAYER IN NINE SERVICES. Compiled and Edited by the Rev. J. M. Connell (Longmans, Green, & Co., New York; 86 pages, \$1.00). Recognizing that some of the old forms of prayer and praise can no longer be used with sincerity and spiritual advantage, this book is offered to the liberal Christian churches in the hope that it may meet the liturgical requirements of their worship. A special feature is the introduction of metrical hymns as alternatives to the chants, which is to be commended. Among the sources drawn on are *The Book of Common Worship* and books by Dr. Sadler, Dr. Martineau, Canon Hunter, Dr. Jacks, Dr. Orchard, and others. The prayers, hymns, and Scripture selections are very helpful and refreshing.

The Christian Union Quarterly

**INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND
INTERNATIONAL**

Volume XV

JULY, 1925, TO APRIL, 1926

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Abandoning Denominational Names.....	11
Ainslie, D. D., Rev. Peter. The Editor's Notes—	
Abandoning Denominational Names.....	11
Christian Union Quarterly Dinner.....	121
Christians Are Slow to Forgive.....	362
Denominational Journals.....	8
Division Is a Denial of Christianity.....	251
Division Obscures Jesus.....	249
Faith and Order.....	120
Interdenominational School of Religious Education, An.....	368
Is Christianity a Unifying Force?.....	5
Life and Work.....	123
Necessity of Exploring New Ground, The.....	365
Nicæa and Stockholm—325 and 1925.....	10
Popularizing Unity.....	366
Possibility of Unity, The.....	252
Scramble for Authority, The.....	364
Sir Henry Lunn's Gift for Unity.....	361
Stockholm Conferences.....	117
World Alliance, The.....	118
American Catholic Church, The—The Most Rev. F. E. J. Lloyd, D. D.	296
American Church Monthly, The. Makeshifts for Unity.....	424
Anglican Bishop Sees Way to Reunion—The Christian Century.....	423
Anglican Movement for Reunion, The—Dr. Francis J. Hall.....	322
Athearn, Clarence R. Interchurch Government—An Essay on the Advantages of Federation as Exemplified by the Federal Council of The Churches of Christ in America.....	46
Avoid Decisions Reached in Fatigue—Rev. T. R. Glover.....	315
Basis of Union in the Ephesian and Colossian Letters, The—Dean W. J. Lhamon.....	
	262
Bishop Brent on the World Conference on Faith and Order—Dr. Frederick Lynch.....	446
Bishop W. T. Manning on Christian Unity—The Living Church.....	101

	PAGE
British Methodist Union Deadlock, The—The Review of Churches....	318
Brown, D. D., Prof. William Adams. The Church and Christian Education	189
Canada Makes Church History—The Christian Century.....	90
Canterbury, Dean of. Reunion With the Free Churches.....	316
Catholic Record, The. The Church Unity Octave.....	98
Chinese Church in Troublous Waters, The—Bishop Herbert J. Molony	340
Chown, D. D., LL. D., Rev. S. D. Some Ideals and Responsibilities of the United Church of Canada.....	254
Christian Century, The. Anglican Bishop Sees Way to Reunion.....	423
Christian Century, The. Canada Makes Church History.....	90
Christian Century, The. Is There to be Church Union Among Congregationalists?	320
Christian Union—What Is the Goal?—Rev. J. F. Taintor.....	34
Christian Union Quarterly Dinner—The Editor's Notes.....	121
Christian Work, The. Toward the Cure of Presbyterian Fissures....	450
Christianity and Crime—Dr. Walter Simons.....	162
Christians Are Slow to Forgive—The Editor's Notes.....	362
Church and Christian Education, The—Prof. William Adams Brown, D. D.	189
Church and Christian Education, The—Reports of the Commissions of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Stockholm, Sweden, August 19-30, 1925.....	227
Church and Economic and Industrial Problems, The—Reports of the Commissions of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Stockholm, Sweden, August 19-30, 1925.....	202
Church and International Relations, The—Reports of the Commissions of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Stockholm, Sweden, August 19-30, 1925.....	214
Church and Social and Moral Problems, The—I. Profession or Vocation? II. Principles—Reports of the Commissions of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Stockholm, Sweden, August 19-30, 1925	205
Church Union in Canada—Hugh L. Keenleyside, Ph. D.....	40
Church Union in Scotland—The Quarterly Register.....	447
Church Unity Octave, The—The Catholic Record.....	98
Churches' Obligation in View of God's Purpose for the World, The—Principal Alfred E. Garvie, M. A., D. D.....	136
Clark, Thomas Curtis. Irony	28
Clark, Thomas Curtis. Love the Magician	406
Closing Sermon (Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work)—The Archbishop of Upsala.....	196
Congregationalist, The. Contacts Create New Understandings.....	304
Congregationalist, The. Sir Henry Lunn's Gifts for Unity.....	413
Congregationalist, The. Unite in Religious Music	106

	PAGE
Consummation of Church Union in Canada, The—Rev. William E. Gilroy, D. D.....	79
Contacts Create New Understandings—The Congregationalist.....	304
Co-operation and Unity—A. E. Turner.....	383
Creeds and Reunion—The Guardian.....	312
Denominational Journals—The Editor's Notes.....	8
Dickinson, K. B. E., Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby. The Work of International Friendship Through the Churches.....	156
Division Is a Denial of Christianity—The Editor's Notes.....	251
Division Obscures Jesus—The Editor's Notes.....	249
Dwight, Ph. D., Charles A. S. The Psychology of Opinion.....	29
Editor's Notes, The 5, 117, 249,	361
Essence of Christian Love, The—Arvid Runestam, D. D.....	143
Faith and Order—The Editor's Notes	120
Firestone, Harvey S. How Co-operation Strengthens the Churches..	303
Fortune, Ph. D., A. W. Make Disciples of All Nations.....	268
Function of Christian Doctrine, The—W. E. Garrison, Ph. D.....	14
Garrison, Ph. D., W. E. The Function of Christian Doctrine.....	14
Garvie, M. A., D. D., Principal Alfred E. The Churches' Obligation in View of God's Purpose for the World.....	136
George, R. E. Gordon. The Roman Catholics and Malines.....	96
Gilroy, D. D., Rev. William E. The Consummation of Church Union in Canada	79
Glover, Rev. R. T. Avoid Decisions Reached in Fatigue.....	315
Gollock, G. A. A Study in Missionary Co-operation.....	414
Guardian, The. Creeds and Reunion	312
Guardian, The. Obstacles to Reunion With Rome	314
H. C. R. Many Voices—One Lord.....	78
Hall, Dr. Francis J. The Anglican Movement for Reunion.....	322
Harper, LL. D., William A. The Quest for Religious Unity.....	284
How Co-operation Strengthens the Church—Harvey S. Firestone....	303
Inman, Dr. Samuel G. Resolution from South America Calling for Universal Brotherhood.....	444
Interchurch Government—An Essay on the Advantages of Federation as Exemplified by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America—Clarence R. Athearn.....	46
Interdenominational Institute of Religious Education — President George B. Stewart, D. D., LL. D.....	397

	PAGE
Interdenominational School of Religious Education, An—The Editor's Notes	368
Irony—Thomas Curtis Clark.....	28
Is Christian Union Possible?—Rev. Karl Reiland, D. D.....	306
Is Christianity a Unifying Force?—The Editor's Notes.....	5
Is There to Be Church Union Among Congregationalists?—The Christian Century.....	320
Jackson, Maud Frazer. Light	39
Keeler, Rev. Floyd. The Reunion of Christendom.....	441
Keenleyside, Ph. D., Hugh L. Church Union in Canada.....	40
Lagerlöf, Dr. Selma. Unity Between All Peoples.....	180
Lawrence, Rev. John J. The Spiritual Foundations of Unity.....	426
Lhamon, Dean W. J. The Basis of Union in the Ephesian and Colossian Letters.....	262
Life and Work—The Editor's Notes.....	123
Light—Maud Frazer Jackson.....	39
Living Church, The. Bishop W. T. Manning on Christian Unity.....	101
Living Church, The. Unity or Truth?.....	437
Lloyd, D. D., The Most Rev. F. E. J. The American Catholic Church.	296
Lord Halifax Pleads Cause of Reunion at Louvain—Rev. J. van der Heyden	432
Love the Magician—Thomas Curtis Clark.....	406
Lynch, Dr. Frederick. Bishop Brent on the World Conference on Faith and Order	446
Lynch, Dr. Frederick. Some Observations on Protestantism and Roman Catholicism.....	335
Make Disciples of All the Nations—A. W. Fortune, Ph. D.....	268
Makeshifts for Unity—The American Church Monthly.....	424
Many Voices—One Lord—H. C. R.....	78
McComb, Ph. D., Samuel. Preaching to the Men of To-day.....	369
Message of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, The	241
Methods of Co-operative and Federative Efforts by the Christian Communions—Reports of the Commissions of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Stockholm, Sweden, August 19-30, 1925	235
Malony, Bishop Herbert J. The Chinese Church in Troublous Waters	340
Necessity of Exploring New Ground, The—The Editor's Notes.....	365
New Student, The. Student Meeting Would Break Creed Walls.....	427
Nicæa and Stockholm—325 and 1925—The Editor's Notes.....	10

	PAGE
Obstacles to Reunion With Rome—The Guardian.....	314
Oxenham, John. To Every Soul.....	382
Popularizing Unity—The Editor's Notes.....	366
Possibility of Unity, The—The Editor's Notes.....	252
Preaching to the Men of To-day—Samuel McComb, Ph. D.....	369
Prophet, The—E. D. Schonberger.....	396
Psychology of Opinion, The—Charles A. S. Dwight, Ph. D.....	29
Quarterly Register, The. Church Union in Scotland.....	447
Quest for Religious Unity, The—William A. Harper, LL. D.....	284
Randall, Oscar J. The Tide is Turning.....	428
Reiland, D. D., Rev. Karl. Is Christian Union Possible?.....	306
Reports of the Commissions of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Stockholm, Sweden, August 19-30, 1925—	
The Church and Economic and Industrial Problems.....	202
The Church and Social and Moral Problems—I. Profession or Vo- cation? II. Principles	205
The Church and International Relations.....	214
The Church and Christian Education.....	227
Methods of Co-operative and Federative Efforts by the Christian Communities	235
Resolution from South America Calling for Universal Brotherhood— Dr. Samuel G. Inman.....	444
Responses to President Stewart's Article (Interdenominational Insti- tute of Religious Education).....	407
Reunion of Christendom, The—Rev. Floyd Keeler.....	441
Reunion With the Free Churches—Dean of Canterbury.....	316
Review of the Churches, The. The British Methodist Union Deadlock.	318
Review of the Churches, The. Rome and Reunion.....	321
Ritchie, D. L. The United Church.....	45
Ritchie, Principal D. L. The United Church of Canada and Religious Education	94
Roman Catholics and Malines, The—R. E. Gordon George.....	96
Rome and Reunion—The Review of the Churches.....	321
Runestam, D. D., Arvid. The Essence of Christian Love.....	143
Schonberger, E. D. The Prophet.....	396
Scramble for Authority, The—The Editor's Notes.....	364
Sermon at the Opening of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work—The Lord Bishop of Winchester.....	130
Simons, Dr. Walter. Christianity and Crime.....	162

	PAGE
Sir Henry Lunn's Gift for Unity—The Editor's Notes	361
Sir Henry Lunn's Gifts for Unity—The Congregationalist	413
Some Ideals and Responsibilities of the United Church of Canada— Rev. S. D. Chown, D. D., LL. D.....	254
Some Observations on Protestantism and Roman Catholicism—Dr. Frederick Lynch.....	335
Speer, Dr. Robert E. Unity Features South American Congress at Montevideo	103
Spiritual Foundations of Unity, The—Rev. John J. Lawrence.....	426
Stewart, D. D., LL. D., President George B. Interdenominational In- stitute of Religious Education.....	397
Stockholm Conferences—The Editor's Notes.....	117
Student Meeting Would Break Creed Walls—The New Student.....	427
Study in Missionary Co-operation, A—G. A. Gollock.....	414
Taintor, Rev. J. F. Christian Union—What Is the Goal?.....	34
Tide Is Turning, The—Oscar J. Randall.....	428
To Every Soul—John Oxenham.....	382
Toward the Cure of Presbyterian Fissures—The Christian Work....	450
Turner, A. E. Co-operation and Unity.....	383
Unite in Religious Music—The Congregationalist.....	106
United Church, The—D. L. Ritchie.....	45
United Church of Canada and Religious Education, The—Principal D. L. Ritchie.....	94
Unity Between All Peoples—Dr. Selma Lagerlöf.....	180
Unity Features South American Congress at Montevideo—Dr. Robert E. Speer.....	103
Unity or Truth?—The Living Church.....	437
Upsala, The Archbishop of. Closing Sermon (Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work)	196
Van der Heyden, Rev. J. Lord Halifax Pleads Cause of Reunion at Louvain	432
Watts, Isaac. When I Survey the Wondrous Cross.....	33
What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity..... 79, 303,	413
When I Survey the Wondrous Cross—Isaac Watts.....	33
Winchester, The Lord Bishop of. Sermon at the Opening of the Uni- versal Christian Conference on Life and Work.....	130
Work of International Friendship Through the Churches, The—Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby Dickinson, K. B. E.....	156
World Alliance, The—The Editor's Notes.....	118

BOOKS REVIEWED

	PAGE
Best French Short Stories of 1923-24, The. And the Yearbook of the French Short Story—Eaton.....	355
Biological Unity of the Church, The. A Study in the Living Organic Unity of the Body of Christ—Ridgely.....	455
Catholic Reaction in France, The—Gwynn.....	356
Christ and the Problems of Youth—Versteeg.....	356
Christianity and Modernism—Hall.....	108
Christianity and World Problems—Orchard	352
Common Prayer in Nine Services—Connell.....	460
Conversations on Christian Re-Union—A Parish Priest.....	353
Epistle to the Romans, The. An Exposition—Erdman.....	355
Everlasting Salvation: Gospel Addresses—Taylor.....	355
Faith of Modernism, The—Mathews.....	107
Foreign Student in America, The. A Study by the Commission on Survey of Foreign Students in the United States of America, under the Auspices of the Friendly Relations Committees of the Young Men's Christian Association and the Young Women's Christian Association—Wheeler, King, and Davidson.....	110
Good Health and Long Life—Warner.....	112
Gospel of Fellowship, The—Williams.....	111
Interchurch Government—Athearn.....	348
Lion in His Den, The. A Series of Discussions of Books and Life, Hough	112
Modernism and the Christian Church. Three Farm Street Lectures to which is added a chapter on the Problem and the Prospects of Christian Union—Woodlock	457
My Duel With the Vatican. The Autobiography of a Catholic Modernist—Loisy	110
Personal Religion and the Life of Fellowship—Temple.....	453
Principles of Christian Living, The. A Handbook of Christian Ethics—Smith	346
Projects in World-Friendship—Lobingier.....	354
Religion of Undergraduates, The—Harris.....	460
Sermons of a Chemist—Slosson.....	356
Teaching of Apocrypha and Apocalypse, The—Hawley.....	459
Thinking Man, The—Macdonnell.....	454
Understanding. Being an Interpretation of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, Held in Stockholm, August 15-30, 1925—Brent	350
What is Faith?—Machen.....	458
Why the Church? What is Its Contribution to the Promotion of the Christian Way of Life in the World? A Syllabus of Questions for Use by Discussion Classes. Commission on the Church of the National Conference on the Christian Way of Life.....	111
Youth and the Bible. Methods of Teaching the Modern View of the Bible—Streibert	354

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, Levi G. Batman, Youngstown, Ohio; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, 504 N. Fulton Ave., 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
1925-1926

DATE	ISSUED TO

