
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



**Annual
session of the
Baptist
Congress for
the ...**



AMERICAN BAPTIST
HISTORICAL SOCIETY
JUN 4 1926
New Trinity of Chicago

Proceedings of the Baptist Congress

at Chicago, Illinois, 1908

Topics

- I. Does the New Testament Contemplate the Church as an Institution?
- II. What are the Legitimate Limits of Free Speech in a Republic?
- III. The Doctrine of Atonement in Terms of Modern Thought.
- IV. What Definite Steps Should be Immediately Taken Toward the Organic Union of Baptists, Free Baptists, and Disciples of Christ?
- V. Is Psycho-Therapeutics a Function of the Church?
- VI. Christ's Prayer for Unity.

Baptist Congress

Report of W. B. Matteson, Treasurer, for the Year ending
September 30th, 1908

Receipts

Balance from last year		\$13.44
From General Committee	\$650.00	
From Annual Members	212.65	
	<u>862.65</u>	
Sale of Proceedings		124.05
Personal Donations		40.00
Central (New York City) S. S.	15.00	
Grand Rapids (Mich.) Church	10.00	
Red Bank (N. J.) Church	10.00	
	<u>35.00</u>	
Collection		11.68
		<u>1,073.38</u>
		\$1,086.82

Expenses

Traveling Expenses, Baltimore...	\$365.05	
To Proceedings	433.00	
Stationery and Printing	76.35	
Postage and Express	87.27	
Clerical and other help	40.95	
Advertising	3.80	
Incidental Expenses	26.00	
	<u>1,032.42</u>	
Balance on hand,		\$54.40

Twenty-Sixth Annual Session

OF THE

Baptist Congress

Joint Session of
Baptists, Free Baptists, and Disciples of Christ

The Memorial Church of Christ,
Chicago, Ill.

November 10, 11, and 12, 1908

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO AND NEW YORK

AMERICAN BAPTIST
HISTORICAL SOCIETY
University of Chicago
JUN 1 1926

Published January 1909

**Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.**

~~54523~~
~~838~~

BX
6206
B26
26th -
27th

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PROCEEDINGS:	
I. DOES THE NEW TESTAMENT CONTEMPLATE THE CHURCH AS AN INSTITUTION?	3
PROFESSOR JOHN H. LOGAN, PH.D.	
REV. A. W. FORTUNE.	
REV. W. B. WALLACE, D.D.	
PROFESSOR SHIRLEY J. CASE, PH.D.	
II. ADDRESSES OF WELCOME	40
PRESIDENT HARRY PRATT JUDSON, LL.D.	
RIGHT REV. SAMUEL FALLOWS, D.D., LL.D.	
RESPONSE	45
PRESIDENT AND REV. JOHN L. JACKSON, D.D.	
III. WHAT ARE THE LEGITIMATE LIMITS OF FREE SPEECH IN A REPUBLIC?	47
HON. WALLACE HECKMAN.	
PROFESSOR JAMES Q. DEALEY, PH.D.	
REV. BAYARD CRAIG, D.D.	
REV. CARL D. CASE, PH.D.	
IV. THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT IN TERMS OF MODERN THOUGHT	81
REV. B. A. JENKINS, D.D.	
REV. FREDERICK LENT, PH.D.	
PROFESSOR LEROY WATERMAN, PH.D.	
PROFESSOR ALLAN HOBEN, PH.D.	
DISCUSSION	110
PROFESSOR G. B. FOSTER, D.D.	
PROFESSOR FRANKLIN JOHNSON, D.D.	
PROFESSOR G. B. SMITH.	
REV. W. L. HAYDEN.	
REV. SAMUEL ZANE BATTEN.	
V. WHAT DEFINITE STEPS SHOULD BE IMMEDIATELY TAKEN TOWARD THE ORGANIC UNION OF BAPTISTS, FREE BAPTISTS, AND DISCIPLES OF CHRIST?	123
REV. I. J. SPENCER, LL.D.	
REV. L. A. CRANDALL, D.D.	
DISCUSSION	141
DR. JOSEPH W. MAUCK, LL.D.	
DR. HERBERT L. WILLETT.	

	DR. ALBERT G. LAWSON.	
	DR. HENRY M. FORD.	
	DR. J. H. GARRISON.	
	REV. J. STANLEY DURKEE, PH.D.	
VI. IS PSYCHO-THERAPEUTICS A FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH? .		158
	REV. ROBERT MACDONALD, D.D.	
	REV. J. STANLEY DURKEE, PH.D.	
	REV. ALLAN B. PHILPUTT.	
	REV. RUFUS P. JOHNSTON, D.D.	
DISCUSSION		194
	RIGHT REV. SAMUEL FALLOWS, D.D., LL.D.	
	PROFESSOR GEORGE B. FOSTER.	
	DR. BAYARD CRAIG.	
	REV. THOMAS MOODY.	
	DR. CARL D. CASE.	
VII. CHRIST'S PRAYER FOR UNITY		206
	REV. A. W. JEFFERSON.	
	REV. VERNON STAUFFER.	
	REV. HENRY M. SANDERS, D.D.	
VIII. CLOSING WORDS		234
	REV. HERBERT L. WILLETT.	
	REV. BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.	
	REV. J. H. GARRISON.	
	REV. W. C. BITTING, D.D.	
	PROFESSOR ERRETT GATES, PH.D.	
	PRESIDENT AND REV. JOHN L. JACKSON, D.D.	

BAPTIST CONGRESS

PLAN OF ORGANIZATION

1. *The object* of the Congress is to promote a healthful sentiment among Baptists through free and courteous discussion of current questions by suitable persons.

2. *The work* of the Congress shall be subject to the control of a General Committee of one hundred members or more. The Committee shall be composed of persons who have consented to contribute five dollars or more annually toward the expenses of the Congress.

3. *The General Committee* shall elect a permanent Executive Committee of fifteen persons residing in, or near, the city of New York, at the meetings of which Executive Committee any member of the General Committee may be present and vote; and to this Executive Committee shall be intrusted, except as may have been already provided for by the General Committee, entire control over the public meetings—e. g., determination of the time and place, the number of days and sessions each day, selection of the presiding officer, the topics, the appointed writers and speakers, the provision for volunteer speakers, and rules of discussion. The Executive Committee shall also secure a full stenographic report of the proceedings, and funds to meet any other necessary expense.

4. *A Secretary* shall be elected, who shall also be Secretary of the Executive Committee, and of the public meetings, the expenses of whose correspondence, etc., shall be met by a tax levied by the Executive Committee upon the General Committee.

5. *The General Committee* shall meet in connection with the public meetings, and when called together by the Executive Committee.

6. *The Executive Committee* shall secure the appointment of a local committee in the city or town where a public meeting is to be held, which shall provide a suitable place for the Congress, entertainment for the officers, and appointees of the Congress.

7. *Any member* of a Baptist Congregation may become an Annual Member of this Congress, and thus be entitled to all its privileges, and to a copy of the published proceedings, by the payment of the sum of two dollars.

RULES OF DISCUSSION

1. *The chairman* of the Congress shall be appointed by the Executive Committee, and on all points of order his decision shall be final.

2. *Any member* of a Baptist Congregation who, by sending his card

to the Secretary, shall signify his willingness to speak on the topic under discussion, may be called upon by the Chairman.

3. *All writers* and speakers shall take the platform, address only the Chair, and confine themselves to the subject assigned for the occasion.

4. *No person* shall speak twice on the same subject.

5. *Readers of papers* shall be allowed twenty-five minutes, appointed speakers¹ twenty minutes, and volunteer speakers ten minutes. The Secretary shall notify all participants by stroke of the bell three minutes before, and also at the expiration of their time, beyond which no one shall be allowed to proceed.

6. *No paper* shall be read in the absence of its writer, nor shall any paper be printed in the *Proceedings* except it has been read at the meeting.

7. *No resolution* or motion shall be entertained at the public conferences.

¹ Appointed speakers must not use MS, the object of their appointment being to encourage the volunteer discussion which follows their addresses.

OFFICERS OF THE CHICAGO MEETING

President

REV. JOHN L. JACKSON, D.D., Chicago

Vice-Presidents

PROFESSOR HERBERT L. WILLETT, PH.D., Chicago
PRESIDENT JOS. W. MAUCK, LL.D., Hillsdale, Mich.

Secretary

THEO. A. K. GESSLER, D.D., Landing, N. J.

Treasurer

W. B. MATTESON, D.D., Red Bank, N. J.

CHICAGO LOCAL COMMITTEE

PROFESSOR HERBERT L. WILLETT, PH.D., *Chairman*

REV. R. N. VAN DOREN, D.D., *Secretary*

WILLARD A. SMITH, ESQ.

REV. C. G. KINDRED

HON. FRANCIS W. PARKER

LEON LOEHR, ESQ.

J. G. ELSDON, ESQ.

REV. PARKER STOCKDALE

JOHN NUVEEN, ESQ.

REV. ERRETT GATES, PH.D.

GEORGE T. WEBB, ESQ.

E. M. BOWMAN, ESQ.

Stenographer

NEIL SATTERLEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CONGRESS

HENRY M. SANDERS, D.D., *Chairman*

REV. JAMES M. BRUCE

ALBERT G. LAWSON, D.D.

FRANK M. GOODCHILD, D.D.

RIVINGTON D. LORD, D.D.

WILLIAM A. GRANGER, D.D.

REV. ROBERT MACDONALD, PH.D.

RUFUS P. JOHNSTON, D.D.

J. HERMAN RANDALL, D.D.

WILLIAM M. LAWRENCE, D.D.

REV. E. T. TOMLINSON, PH.D.

THEO. A. K. GESSLER, D.D., *Secretary*

W. B. MATTESON, D.D., *Treasurer*

THE GENERAL COMMITTEE

Aked, Charles F., D.D.....New York City
Anderson, T. D., D.D.....Albany, N. Y.
Andrews, President E. Benjamin, LL.D.....Lincoln, Neb.

Anthony, Professor, A. W., D.D.....	Lewiston, Me.
Applegate, Hon. J. S., LL.D.....	Red Bank, N. J.
Armstrong, Hon. E. A.....	Camden, N. J.
Baker, Mrs. E. L.....	Adrian, Mich.
Baldwin, Jesse A.....	Chicago, Ill.
Barbour, C. A., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Barbour, T. S., D.D.....	Wollaston, Mass.
Barnes, L. C., D.D.....	New York City
Barnes, H. W., D.D.....	Binghamton, N. Y.
Barney, Mr. Eugene J.....	Dayton, Ohio
Batten, S. Z., D.D.....	Lincoln, Neb.
Beaver, Mr. F. P.....	Dayton, Ohio
Berry, Professor George R., D.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Bigelow, Mr. L. H.....	New York City
Bitting, W. C., D.D.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Boyd, Mr. S. G.....	Covington, Ky.
Braislín, Edward, D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Brown, Mr. Samuel N.....	Boston, Mass.
Brownell, Rev. Clark T.....	Newark, N. J.
Bruce, Rev. James M.....	New York City
Bryan, E. B., Ph.D.....	Franklin, Ind.
Burdette, Robert J., D.D.....	Los Angeles, Cal.
Burggraf, Mr. G. A.....	New York City
Burnham, Professor S., D.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Burton, Professor Ernest D., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Burton, N. S., D.D.....	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Butler, Mrs. Maria E.....	New York City
Calley, Walter, D.D.....	Upland, Pa.
Carpenter, Mr. Aaron A.....	Port Chester, N. Y.
Case, Rev. C. D., Ph.D.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
Cate, Carter E., D.D.....	Providence, R. I.
Chamberlain, Mr. Williard D.....	Dayton, Ohio
Cheney, Rev. J. L., Ph.D.....	Wheaton, Ill.
Clark, Mr. E. J.....	Baltimore, Md.
Clarke, Professor W. N., D.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Clinch, Hon. Edward S.....	New York City
Colby, Hon. Everett.....	Newark, N. J.
Colby, H. F., D.D.....	Dayton, Ohio
Colgate, Mr. James C.....	New York City
Colgate, Mr. Richard M.....	West Orange, N. J.

Colgate, Mr. Sidney M.....	New York City
Colwell, H. S., D.D.....	Granville, Ohio
Conwell, Russell H., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Cook, R. B., D.D.....	Wilmington, Del.
Craig, W. B., D.D.....	Denver, Colo.
Crandall, L. A., D.D.....	Minneapolis, Minn.
Cuthbert, Mr. Herman G.....	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Davis, Mr. F. H.....	Elizabeth, N. J.
de Blois, A. K., Ph.D., LL.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Dickerson, Mr. Frank.....	New York City
Dimock, Mr. G. E.....	Elizabeth, N. J.
Dodd, Charles H., D.D.....	Baltimore, Md.
Eaches, O. P., D.D.....	Hightstown, N. J.
Evans, Professor M. G., D.D.....	Chester, Pa.
Farnham, E. P., D.D.....	Richmond Hill, N. Y.
Faunce, President W. H. P., D.D., LL.D.....	Providence, R. I.
Ferris, George H., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Fikes, M. P., D.D.....	Detroit, Mich.
Fischer, Mr. W. J.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Fosdick, Rev. H. E.....	Montclair, N. J.
Foster, Professor Geo. B.....	Chicago, Ill.
Garabrant, Mr. D. G.....	Bloomfield, N. J.
Gates, Professor Errett, Ph.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Gates, Mr. I. E.....	New York City
Gessler, T. A. K., D.D.....	Landing, N. J.
Gifford, O. P., D.D.....	Brookline, Mass.
Goodchild, F. M., D.D.....	New York City
Goodchild, Mrs. F. M.....	New York City
Granger, W. A., D.D.....	Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
Gray, Rev. Clifton D., Ph.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Grenell, Z., D.D.....	Detroit, Mich.
Grippin, Mr. William A.....	Bridgeport, Conn.
Gurley, Mr. W. F.....	Troy, N. Y.
Hagerman, Mr. Jos. G.....	Red Bank, N. J.
Hedstrom, Mr. A. E.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
Hegeman, Mr. John R.....	New York City
Hills, Mr. William.....	New York City

Hobart, Professor A. S., D.D.....	Upland, Pa.
Holton, H. D., M.D.....	Brattleboro, Vt.
Horr, President George E., D.D.....	Newton Center, Mass.
Hubbard, Mr. Harry.....	New York City
Hughes, Governor Charles E., LL.D.....	Albany, N. Y.
Hunt, President Emory W., LL.D.....	Granville, Ohio
Hyde, Rev. J. Chester.....	Dexter, Me.
Jackson, J. L., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Jefferson, Albert W., D.D.....	Portland, Me.
Johnson, Rev. Herbert S.....	Boston, Mass.
Johnston, J. T. M., D.D.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Johnston, R. P., D.D.....	New York City
Jones, Carter Helm, D.D.....	Oklahoma City, Okla.
Jones, Howard L., D.D.....	Charleston, S. C.
Jones, M. Ashby, D.D.....	Columbus, Ga.
Judd, Mr. Orrin R.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Judson, President H. P., LL.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Keen, Professor W. W., M.D., LL.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Kenyon, Hon. James S.....	Providence, R. I.
Lawrence, William M., D.D.....	East Orange, N. J.
Laws, Curtis Lee, D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Lawson, Albert G., D.D.....	New York City
Lent, Rev. Frederick, Ph.D.....	New Haven, Conn.
Levering, Mr. Eugene.....	Baltimore, Md.
Lincoln, Mr. William E.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Lindsley, Mr. W. L.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Logan, Professor John H.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Lord, Rivington D., D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Loux, Rev. Edward.....	New York City
MacDonald, Robert, D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
MacDonald, Mrs. Robert.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
McDonald, Mr. William.....	Albany, N. Y.
McKibben, Mr. W. K.....	Seattle, Wash.
McLeish, Mr. Andrew.....	Chicago, Ill.
McNally, Rev. C. R.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Marston, Mr. Edgar L.....	New York City
Marvin, J. B., M.D., LL.D.....	Louisville, Ky.
Mathews, Professor E. B.....	Baltimore, Md.

Matteson, W. B., D.D.....	Red Bank, N. J.
Mauck, President Jos. W., LL.D.....	Hillsdale, Mich.
Meeser, S. B., D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Milbank, Mr. Joseph.....	New York City
Moore, Addison, D.D.....	Jersey City, N. J.
Mott, Mrs. E. E.....	New York City
Mullins, President E. Y., D.D., LL.D.....	Louisville, Ky.
Murray, Mr. George Wellwood.....	Montclair, N. J.
Nuveen, Mr. John.....	Chicago, Ill.
Parker, A. K., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Parmly, Mr. Randolph, A.M.....	New York City
Parsons, Mr. Chas. W.....	New York City
Parsons, Major Charles B.....	Red Bank, N. J.
Pease, Mr. John D.....	New York City
Porter, Hon. H. K.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Randall, J. H., D.D.....	New York City
Rauschenbusch, Professor Walter, D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Rhees, President Rush, D.D., LL.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Roe, Mr. Charles M.....	Battle Creek, Mich.
Rosselle, Rev. W. Quay, Ph.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Rowland, A. J., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Rullman, Mr. Henry D.....	Baltimore, Md.
Sampey, Professor John R., D.D.....	Louisville, Ky.
Samson, Thomas S., D.D.....	Germantown, Pa.
Sanders, Henry M., D.D.....	New York City
Schulte, Mr. Theo. E.....	New York City
Scott, Rev. Walter.....	North Cambridge, Mass.
Shallenberger, Hon. William S.....	Rochester, Pa.
Shaud, Mr. Miles M.....	Washington, D. C.
Silver, Mr. Edgar O.....	East Orange, N. J.
Slocum, President A. G., LL.D.....	Kalamazoo, Mich.
Snappe, John.....	Utica, N. Y.
Spalding, C. H., D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Stevenson, Mr. George K.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Stickney, W. W.....	Ludlow, Vt.
Stilwell, H. F., D.D.....	Cleveland, Ohio
Stoddard, Ira J., D.D.....	Plainfield, N. J.
Stott, W. T., D.D.....	Kingstown, Md.

Strong, President A. H., D.D., LL.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Strong, Professor J. H.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Sutphen, Mr. C. Edgar.....	Newark, N. J.
Thresher, Mr. E. M.....	Dayton, Ohio
Thresher, Mr. J. B.....	Dayton, Ohio
Tomlinson, Rev. E. T., Ph.D.....	Elizabeth, N. J.
Torrence, Hon. Francis J.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Tustin, Hon. Ernest L.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Waldbach, Rev. Wm. F.....	Chicago, Ill.
Welch, Mr. Pierce N.....	New Haven, Conn.
Wells, Mr. F. A.....	Chicago, Ill.
White, Mr. Edward D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Williams, Leighton, D.D.....	New York City
Wishart, Rev. A. W., Ph.D.....	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Woods, E. A., D.D.....	Somerville, N. J.
Woodward, Mr. S. W.....	Washington, D. C.

ANNUAL MEMBERS

Abbott, Mr. Augustus L.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Adams, George D., D.D.....	Baltimore, Md.
Ames, Prof. E. S., Ph.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Anderson, Professor F. L., D.D.....	Newton Center, Mass.
Ashworth, Rev. Robert A.....	Meriden, Conn.
Barry, Mr. Charles C.....	Melrose, Mass.
Bates, President Miner Lee.....	Hiram, Ohio
Betteridge, Professor W. R., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Bickmore, Professor A. S., LL.D.....	New York City
Blair, Rev. V. W.....	Greenfield, Ind.
Bonsall, Rev. A. J., Litt. D.....	Allegheny, Pa.
Bosworth, Rev. R. B.....	Rockford, Ill.
Boville, R. G., D.D.....	New York City
Bowman, E. M.....	Chicago, Ill.
Bradbury, Rev. Woodman.....	Cambridge, Mass.
Brockett, Hon. E. J.....	East Orange, N. J.
Bronk, Rev. Mitchell, Ph.D.....	Bayonne, N. J.
Brown, Professor Charles Rufus, D.D.....	Newton Center, Mass.
Brown, Rev. Charles S.....	Cincinnati, Ohio
Brown, Rev. John R.....	Providence, R. I.

Brown, T. Edwin, D.D.....	New Britain, Conn.
Bullen, George, D.D.....	Needham, Mass.
Burnham, Rev. F. W.....	Springfield, Ill.
Bustard, Rev. W. W.....	Boston, Mass.
Butler, Professor Nathaniel, D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Cant, Mr. Andrew.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
Carman, Rev. A. S.....	Granville, Ohio
Carpenter, Mr. I. W.....	Omaha, Neb.
Carroll, Professor Mitchell.....	Washington, D. C.
Carver, Professor W. O.....	Louisville, Ky.
Chard, Mr. James F.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
Clare, Rev. Daniel H.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Colby, Mr. Gardner.....	New York City
Cole, Rev. Arthur S.....	Manasquan, N. J.
Conant, Thos. O., LL.D.....	New York City
Conklin, Rev. J. C.....	Trenton, N. J.
Crossley, Mr. J. H.....	Bridgeport, Conn.
Davis, Mr. E. G.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Dayton, Mr. A. A.....	Albany, N. Y.
Delamater, N. B.....	Chicago, Ill.
DeWolf, Rev. D.....	Newark, N. J.
Dickerson, Mr. J. S.....	Chicago, Ill.
Dickinson, J. T., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Donovan, Professor W. N.....	Newton Center, Mass.
Drake, Mr. H. E.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Dunning, Mr. Amos W.....	Haverhill, Mass.
Durkee, Rev. J. Stanley, Ph.D.....	Roxbury, Mass.
Dussman, Rev. John.....	Gurzalla, India
Elliott, Mr. A. J.....	Peoria, Ill.
Elmer, Rev. F. D.....	Winsted, Conn.
Ennis, Mr. M. J.....	New York City
Fennell, Rev. W. G.....	Hartford, Conn.
Forbes, Professor G. M.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Fortune, Rev. A. W.....	Cincinnati, O.
Foster, Rev. Allyn K.....	Cornwall, Conn.
Fowler, Mr. B. F.....	Haddonfield, N. J.
Francis, Rev. J. A.....	Rye, N. Y.
Franklin, Rev. J. H.....	Colorado Springs, Colo.
Gallup, Mr. John.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Garrison, J. H., LL.D.....	St. Louis, Mo.

Garton, Rev. J. V.....	West Somerville, Mass.
Gill, Rev. Everett.....	Kent, Eng.
Glover, Mrs. H. R.....	Cambridge, Mass.
Grant, Mr. Schuyler.....	Detroit, Mich.
Greene, B. A., D.D.....	Evanston, Ill.
Greene, President J. P., D.D.....	Liberty, Mo.
Greene, S. H., D.D., LL.D.....	Washington, D. C.
Greul, Frederick B., D.D.....	Haverhill, Mass.
Grout, Mr. T. J.....	New York City
Hare, Rev. J. Madison.....	Jersey City, N. J.
Harris, President J. H., Ph.D., LL.D.....	Lewisburg, Pa.
Hartwell, Mr. F. W.....	Providence, R. I.
Haskell, Edward H.....	Boston, Mass.
Hatt, Mr. Samuel S.....	Albany, N. Y.
Hayden, Rev. W. L.....	Indianapolis, Ind.
Henderson, Professor C. R., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Henson, L. L., D.D.....	Lawrenceville, Ill.
Hoben, Professor Allan, Ph.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Holmes, Rev. H. C.....	Providence, R. I.
Holyoke, Edw. M., D.D.....	Providence, R. I.
Howe, Rev. T. C.....	Indianapolis, Ind.
Hoyt, Wayland, D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Huhns, Rev. F.....	Houston Heights, Tex.
Hull, Rev. R. C.....	Summit, N. J.
Jennings, Mr. A. E.....	Detroit, Mich.
Johnson, Professor Franklin, D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Jones, Mr. L. B.....	Wilmington, Del.
Jones, Philip L., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Kelley, Claude, D.D.....	Bellevue, Pa.
Knapp, Rev. E. E.....	Amsterdam, N. Y.
Knox, Superintendent George Platt.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Lawson, Professor George B.....	Saxton River, Vt.
L'Hommedieu, Rev. J. B.....	Greenwich, N. Y.
Leshner, Mr. A. L.....	New York City
Lindsley, Mr. Irenaeus.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Loxley, Mr. B. Ogden.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Lyell, John W., D.D.....	Camden, N. J.
Lynn, Rev. J. E.....	Warren, O.

Mabie, Professor Henry C., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
MacAlpine, Rev. C. A.....	Rochester, N. Y.
MacMurray, Rev. D. A.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
McGlothlin, Professor A. J.....	Louisville, Ky.
McLean, Rev. A.....	Cincinnati, Ohio
Magill, Rev. David T.....	Chicago, Ill.
Marble, Rev. F. E., Ph.D.....	Cambridge, Mass.
Mathews, Professor Shailer, D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Maxson, Rev. C. H.....	Marquette, Mich.
Merriam, E. F., D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Moody, Rev. Thomas.....	Matadi, Congo
Moore, Mr. Paul.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Mosely, Mr. John.....	Needham, Mass.
Moss, Rev. C. H.....	Malden, Mass.
Needham, President C. W.....	Washington, D. C.
Neubauer, Rev. Eugene.....	Bloomington, Ind.
Norton, Rev. F. W.....	Hiram, Ohio
Oeschger, Rev. Wm.....	Vincennes, Ind.
Osborne, Mr. G. P.....	Cincinnati, Ohio
Osborne, Mr. Thomas D.....	Louisville, Ky.
Owen, Rev. William Russell.....	Baltimore, Md.
Packer, Professor E. E.....	Albany, N. Y.
Parker, Rev. F. C. W.....	Washington
Partridge, Warren G., D.D.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Pattison, F. W.....	New Haven, Conn.
Pattison, Rev. Harold.....	St. Paul, Minn.
Peaver, Mr. Frank W.....	New York City
Penny, Rev. F. D.....	Burlington, Vt.
Phillips, J. W., Ph.D., D.D.....	Binghamton, N. Y.
Philputt, Rev. Allan B.....	Indianapolis, Ind.
Philputt, Rev. Jas. M., D.D.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Pinkham, Rev. Henry W.....	Denver, Colo.
Pollard, Professor E. B., Ph.D., D.D.....	Chester, Pa.
Powers, Frederick D., D.D.....	Washington, D. C.
Quay, George M., M.D.....	East Cleveland, Ohio
Reese, G. E., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Rhoades, W. C. P., D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Rice, Lee P. J.....	Minneapolis, Minn.

Richardson, Rev. W. S.....	New York City
Riggs, President J. D. S., Ph.D., L.H.D.....	Upper Alton, Ill.
Rowlison, Rev. C. C.....	Iowa City, Iowa
Sage, Mr. John D.....	Cincinnati, Ohio
Schwartz, Rev. Albert.....	Clinton, Ill.
Skevington, Rev. Samuel J.....	Newark, N. J.
Slater, Professor John R.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Sloper, Mr. A. J.....	New Britain, Conn.
Smith, Professor Gerald B.....	Chicago, Ill.
Smith, Prof. J. M. P.....	Chicago, Ill.
Stetson, H. L., D.D.....	Kalamazoo, Mich.
Stevens, Professor W. A., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Sweet, Rev. F. W.....	Adrian, Mich.
Swift, Mr. George H.....	Fulton, Mo.
Taylor, President J. M., LL.D.....	Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Thomson, Hon. D. E., K.C.....	Toronto, Canada
Thresher, Mr. Albert.....	Dayton, Ohio
Trout, Mr. W. H.....	Milwaukee, Wis.
Van Arsdale, Rev. G. B.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Vander Roest, Mr. William.....	Pelham, N. Y.
Van Kirk, Rev. J. M.....	Kinross, Iowa
Vosburgh, G. B., D.D.....	Denver, Colo.
Vose, Rev. Riley A.....	Owego, N. Y.
Waite, Rev. Claire L.....	Milwaukee, Wis.
Wallace, W. B., D.D.....	Cleveland, Ohio
Waterman, Professor L.....	Hillsdale, Mich.
Watson, Charles H., D.D.....	Arlington, Mass.
Whidden, Howard P., D.D.....	Dayton, Ohio
White, C. L., D.D.....	New York City
Whitman, B.L., D.D.....	Seattle, Wash.
Whitney, Geo. C.....	Worcester, Mass.
Willett, Herbert L., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Williams, Professor C. L.....	Granville, Ohio
Williams, Hannah J.....	Bridgeport, Conn.
Williams, Mr. Morney.....	New York City
Woods, Rev. F. C.....	Baltimore, Md.
Woods, Rev. J. R.....	Mason, Neb.
Wright, Rev. P. J.....	Minneapolis, Minn.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BAPTIST CONGRESS, 1908
FIRST DAY

Afternoon Session

MEMORIAL CHURCH OF CHRIST, CHICAGO, ILL.

Tuesday, November 10, 1908

2:30 o'clock P. M.

PROFESSOR HERBERT L. WILLETT, PH.D.; Will you turn to No. 822 in the Hymnal and sing a stanza or two of "My Faith Looks up to Thee"?

(The Congress then joined in song)

PROFESSOR WILLETT: *Members of the Congress*: In behalf of my colleague in the pastorate of this church, and the members of Memorial Church of Christ, and in behalf of the local committee, I can bid each of you a most cordial welcome to the sessions of the gathering.

I have pleasure in presenting to you the President of the Congress, Dr. John L. Jackson, of the Hyde Park Baptist Church, who will now preside.

REV. DR. JOHN L. JACKSON: I consider it a great honor to be invited to preside over the deliberations of this Congress. This is quite likely to be a historic assembly; at least, it is very significant that we have here the representatives of three denominations who have come together that they might know each other better, come into closer fellowship with each other and study together some of these fundamental problems of our common religion.

I can assure you that this programme which we have before us, which has been so carefully prepared by the committee, will afford you a rich feast of good things.

I will now call upon Brother A. B. Philputt, of Indianapolis, to lead us in prayer.

(PRAYER)

REV. ALLAN B. PHILPUTT: We thank thee, our Heavenly Father, for the great good fellowship of this hour and of this Congress, and we pray thee that with open minds we may face the problems that meet us in our daily life and work in the Master's cause. We pray thee that our hearts may have safe anchorage in Jesus Christ, our Savior, thy Son, who came to open the way of life for us and that we may dwell together here, not as brethren of separate communes, but as of one family of God.

We pray thee to bless all the churches represented here; we pray thee to bless thy church universal. May we with teachable hearts come to thy work, come daily to thy work and to the throne of grace for wisdom and for guidance. And we pray thee that thy people everywhere may come to see, eye to eye, in the great things that belong to the Kingdom of God.

We pray thee that sweetness and light may be the temper of our minds and of all Christian minds, that we may be patient with differences, and that we may seize the great essential things of unity which really do hold us all and by which we are one church, one people, striving for the bringing in of the reign of Jesus Christ on earth.

And we pray that brotherly love and the spirit of prayer and the spirit of earnest endeavor may mark us all now and always in our Christian service through Jesus Christ, our Lord. *Amen.*

PRESIDENT JACKSON: According to the custom of this Congress, at this time the Secretary reads the rules of order. We will hear from Dr. Gessler.

DR. THEO. A. K. GESSLER then read the Rules of Discussion, and added:

Being on the floor I avail myself of this moment for an announcement. It is desired that all persons present, interested in the discussion of the question of the continuance of joint sessions or of a closer drawing together of the religious bodies represented in this Congress at this session, shall meet in the lecture-room immediately after the close of the present session.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We are now prepared to take up the general topic presented to us for the afternoon. The theme is, "Does the New Testament Contemplate the Church as an Institution?" The first writer is Professor John H. Logan, Ph.D.,

Hamilton, New York. Will Mr. Logan please step forward and take the platform?

PROFESSOR JOHN H. LOGAN, PH.D. (Baptist), Hamilton, N. Y., then presented the following paper:

DOES THE NEW TESTAMENT CONTEMPLATE THE CHURCH AS AN INSTITUTION?

We are to discuss for twenty-five minutes the question, "Does the New Testament Contemplate the Church as an Institution?" Our first task will evidently be to interpret the question clearly. After some correspondence with the Secretary of the Congress on the subject, I have decided that the committee probably wished to have discussed the question, Was that body which was usually designated in the New Testament by the word *ἐκκλησία* consciously organized as an institution—i. e., did the founders intend that the organization called by this name should be a permanent thing, without essential changes in its character to go on forever? If this is not the meaning, there is not much meaning to the question, for, of course, there is such a thing recognized in the New Testament as a church. They were scattered all over Palestine and, in fact, all over the world before the end of New Testament times. Did those who established them intend them as a permanent order of things, or were they meant simply to meet the exigencies of the situation at that time? Our difficulty is not in finding the general use of the word, for that is perfectly clear; nor in knowing how much new meaning the apostles and New Testament writers attached to it; nor yet in determining what led the apostles to organize a distinctively Christian *ἐκκλησία*; but in deciding whether or not these men, in establishing an organization purely Christian, were consciously doing something that would entirely divorce them from Judaism and remain a distinct community, organized upon certain and unchangeable principles; for this is what we mean by the church as an institution. If we find an institution, it had a certain unity and rested upon certainly defined offices, institutions, laws, beliefs—for nothing else would be an institution.

The question looks easy enough to one who has not thought about it; to the New Testament scholar it proves to be very diffi-

cult, for it involves every great question of New Testament scholarship—history, exegesis, introduction, even textual criticism.

Without attempting a learned examination of the word itself—with a good lexicon, Greek, English, and Hebrew concordances, and the Bible, including Hebrew, Septuagint, and New Testament Greek, anyone can satisfy himself on this point—a few remarks will be necessary: (1) In the classics the word is a very democratic term. It means “an assembly of the citizens regularly summoned,” often “legislative assembly.” (2) It is used in the Septuagint to translate one or more Hebrew words which meant “congregation,” “assembly,” and in a restricted sense, the “congregation of Israel”—the whole congregation, which was the special people of God. The principal word for which our term stands may often be translated by “people of God.” (3) It comes into the New Testament, of course, through the Septuagint, and as it was the general term of the Septuagint for “the called of God,” i. e., for the assembly of God’s chosen people, it is naturally used in the New Testament to designate those whom the writers consider God’s chosen people, i. e., the Christians. Now it is used in the New Testament in all the senses in which it is known, either in classical Greek or the Septuagint (*vide* Concordance). As a term for our word church, it has the various meanings of a local body in a town or country, of the whole number of Christians of a country, of the “saved of God,” of “believers,” of “Christianity,” etc. It more frequently, perhaps, refers to local communities. But we very frequently attach a meaning to the word church that is not included in the New Testament term.

So far as Jesus is concerned, the concept of church, in our sense of the word, was entirely unknown to him. He neither founded it nor intended to found it, but it came as a natural result of his teachings. The one idea to which he directed his teaching was that of the Kingdom of God. John the Baptist’s message was: “The Kingdom of God is at hand,” by which he meant: “The long expected and desired political and religious revolution is a thing of the immediate future. The rulers of this world shall be dethroned and God’s chosen people shall receive the Kingdom.” The King would come immediately and establish it. Jesus began with the

same message. The Kingdom was at hand, and he was the King's son come to establish it on earth. But he preached as a son of Israel, and went about to save what could be saved of the national hopes and ideals. He is their Messiah. He went to John for baptism, which meant to him the sealing of his resolution to devote himself to a new sort of life. The temptation follows naturally upon this; it was a temptation to turn finally away from his determination to devote himself to the work of establishing the Kingdom of God and give himself to foolish attempts at political reform and greatness. Here he thought out the Sermon on the Mount, a sort of platform for his Kingdom campaign. In his Kingdom messages we have all that he thought about a church. The Kingdom of God cannot be scientifically defined; his ideas are not clear or harmonious enough for us to say he meant this or that. He left definition to the scribes, and contented himself by saying, "It is like." If we wanted to define Jesus' thought of the Kingdom we would have to say something like this: His mind was always especially full of the Psalms. His thought was set on the full establishing of that relation between God and his chosen people Israel which God had said should some day exist—when Israel should have no other thought than that of serving him. Jesus wanted to bring God and Israel together—to see realized in the nation all that God wanted his people to be. His whole heart was wrapped up with the thought that he was something to Israel that Israel deeply needed, that his Kingdom was the highest good. Just when his messianic consciousness began to develop, and just what it was, we cannot say for certain; it is probable that it was not always entirely clear to himself. Any attempt to explain it by saying that he was a child of his time, with all the notions then current, must fail, because it is far short of the whole truth. His messianic consciousness was unique, superhuman. His ideas were on the whole immeasurably higher than those of the most spiritual Jews of the age in which he lived. The Temptation story shows that at the very beginning he put under his feet for all time the ordinary current view of the Kingdom of God. Sometimes the Kingdom is looked upon as already present, at other times as deferred to the future; but it was always either present or im-

mediately at hand. One thing certain, however: after making due allowance for all the later interpretations that find expression in the gospels, we are forced to the conclusion that he considered himself as the Messiah and that he expected at the last to come on the clouds and set up the Kingdom of God and rule over it as its king. He neither knew the exact time, nor did he encourage the disciples to indulge their curiosity as to the time. His whole message was: "It's coming; be always ready." His whole thought was to be about his Father's business while it was day. He was always conscious of the immediate presence of God in his life, and he wanted his disciples to feel this nearness to God, this complete mastery of God over their whole life. This *was* the Kingdom of God: doing the will of God and living in fellowship with God. But this does not mean that the Kingdom was, in his mind, an indefinite, abstract concept; his parable teaching shows plainly that it was looked upon as a real, concrete thing, a thing that can be seen, a community, a nation, acting out the principles of God's righteousness and of loving fellowship and brotherhood—a redeemed and regenerated society. It was to come on earth, and men were to get into it and seek to make its principles universal. Nothing was more real. It was to have a king and laws—not in the sense of enactments, but laws in the sense of law of cause and effect, for example. In this sense two laws were prescribed by him: love and service. In his Kingdom these would be carried out perfectly, for the subjects of the Kingdom would be perfect. Was there any concept of church in all this? Matthew puts the word into his mouth twice, and it is not attributed to him elsewhere. It is difficult to say whether these were the words of Jesus or merely those of the writer who is reporting his discourse. Much can be said on both sides, but I take it that they belong to Jesus. The next difficulty lies in establishing their meaning. The only sound method of interpretation must seek to harmonize them with Jesus' constant and general thought. The first of these passages is Matt. 16:18, where, in answer to Peter's declaration of faith in Jesus as the Messiah, Jesus answered: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I shall build my church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail

against it." It is significant that in the same breath he uses that other expression which is so common in his mouth:

The author's MS omits the expression to which reference is made.

—SECRETARY

The close connection naturally suggests the question whether the two expressions were not identical. It seems to me that they were. (Thayer thinks that Jesus probably said *βασιλεία* instead of *εκκλησία*.) Jesus was simply comparing his future people to a building (a common but figurative use of *οικοδομέω*), and he declared that this building would be as strong as the gates of Hades—a great stronghold. From the very figure which he uses it was indicated that the future church was to be built according to some definite plan. The remainder of the passage bears this out. Now Jesus probably spoke Aramaic, in which case he used an Aramaic expression. This put him back a little nearer the Hebrew word *בֵּית*, which was translated in the Septuagint by *εκκλησία*. I can imagine him sitting there, with his eyes down in a thoughtful attitude, after Peter had declared him to be the Son of God, the Messiah, i. e., the leader and builder of the Kingdom of God as it had been foretold by the prophets of Israel. After a pause he looks up and says: "That's it, Peter. God has revealed the truth to you. Yes, I am the Messiah and I am going to build a new *בֵּית* of Israel; it shall incorporate my principles and include my new Israel, reformed and redeemed. I am going to build it upon you, and as you are a 'rock,' so shall my Kingdom be as strong as the stone gate of Hades. The old Israel shall be regenerated upon this great truth that you have uttered, and because you have seen it and expressed it, you shall be the foundation stone of the new Israel, of *my* Israel." As Jesus used the word, he had in mind not so much an institution, an organization—though this is possibly implied—as a community of brothers, bound together with the common tie of interest in and striving for the coming of the Kingdom—a brotherhood of the redeemed. He left it to the future to organize, to build an institution, if it should seem necessary. It was a poetic dream, a glorious vision not long before his earthly career was over; his church was to be the community, the brotherhood, of those who were to share in the work of bringing about what he taught them

to pray for in the Lord's prayer. Hence the term is here used in an abstract sense. (In all the English versions up to 1572—the revision of the "Bishop's Bible"—the word was translated "congregation.")

The reference in Matt., chap. 18, is in the same spirit, though an organized community is assumed. There is absolutely no objection to the theory that Jesus had in mind the Jewish "congregation," for the organization implied is completely in harmony with that of the Jewish congregation, but he meant the Jewish church of the future, the regenerated church, the church which should embody the principles of the Kingdom doctrines—i. e., of love and service, for the whole question here is as to the extent to which love serves an erring brother. That he had in mind a purely Jewish idea is clear from the context: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." There was a Jewish saying current at the time: "Where two are met and engaged in talking about the law (of God), God dwells with them." Further, that he was talking about his Kingdom is perfectly clear from the whole context. Of course, there is also no objection to taking the word here in its original sense and referring it then to the congregation of those who should confess Jesus as the Messiah, and this again would make it identical with the Kingdom: as soon as there are *two* who have the right attitude to him, there is the Kingdom, or the church, in the sense in which Jesus used the expression. Now this is in complete harmony with Paul's use of the terms Kingdom of God and Church of Christ. In the earlier epistles—Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Thessalonians—the prevailing use of *εκκλησία* is in reference to the local body; in Ephesians and Colossians, its use is that of "body of Christ," "universal brotherhood," etc., in which sense the word *βασιλεία* as used by Jesus might be appropriately used. It is true that Paul generally uses *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* for the future kingdom, but this, again, corresponds to Jesus' use of the term, in which the Kingdom is sometimes looked upon as present, at other times as future.

But while Jesus certainly did not organize a church in any sense, or indicate that such would be done in the future, his preaching made this step a necessity for the future. He did

organize, in a way, a little band, which he called his "flock," "sheep." He described in figures his relation to his "flock;" *he* was the vine, they the branches, the Father the vine-dresser. He did not, in general, limit his teachings to this band; others shared in them, and followed him (Acts 1:15, 21). This band, called the *μαθηταί*, remained with him, after the manner of John's disciples or Elijah's. He appointed them to a share in his work and privileges, and recognized them as his most intimate associates in all things, and he was untiring in his efforts to give them the specific preparation necessary for planting and spreading the work of the Kingdom. This band was the organized Kingdom; to it he gave the keys, and the Kingdom was to live in it. As to a church in anything like our sense, the Kingdom idea of Jesus was entirely too large to harmonize with it. The very work of the Kingdom implies the necessity for organization, but no plan of organization was included, much less details. He broke away from the Jewish church, and Matt. 16:18 may imply that he saw the necessity of a formal break with it; but in doing so he left nothing to take its place, except a brotherhood, a fellowship of men. He spoke of his "family"—those who do the will of God, but this excludes the idea of *doing* things prescribed by men, and represents only an inner attitude to God. What he really contributed was personality, undying words, and deeds. He fully believed that the end of the age was near, but his significance does not in any way depend upon this view, for his message was not primarily, "The end will soon be here, therefore be prepared," but, "Be always prepared;" and the preparation which he urged struck at the very heart and center of all true religion and ethics. It was a note of eternity, suited to all times and conditions. Jesus was far too iconoclastic in his attitude to customs, organizations, and even to the Jewish church, to set up a new church with laws, ordinances, etc., and any directions that he might have given for organizing, however simple, would have become in the hands of his disciples as absolute as the Jewish ceremonial law was for the Jews. In his Kingdom teaching there is an entire lack of laws, rules, ordinances, etc. We have only great moral principles, meant to reform individuals and raise them to fellowship with God. He meant that his little band should get hold

of the divine life and hold it fast, without laws to bind them down. He filled them so full of himself and of God that they were caught up by a holy enthusiasm and swayed by it for several generations, so that in spite of their limitations and misconceptions they laid eternal foundations. Thus in his simplicity was his greatness—no laws but only principles, and principles that poured into all life moral and religious values. It was his person and his mission that gave new values to life and raised him high above all mortals. He looms up grander and mightier with the decades and the centuries. His disciples thought that he was the Jewish Messiah and that he would soon return upon the clouds and assert his rights. He had left this impression upon them, for this remained his own view till the very end. He said to his judges: "You will see *me* again." When he saw a quick death before him, it was too late to form a definite plan for the future and all that he had to say was: "Wait till you hear from me; I will send the Spirit." And thus he left them, and thus he stood and stands as the everlasting rock, whose lofty summit is lifted high above the nights and the winters and the storms. He professed no new religion, but went down beneath the surface and deepened the meaning of the old. His constant charge against Pharisaism, which had monopolized the Jewish church, was: "You have miserably failed in your duty. You had the Kingdom, but it shall be taken from you;" but he tried to save Israel and preserve it in its possession of the Kingdom. In refusing to accept the scribal interpretations of the law, he struck a death-blow to Judaism. In Matt., chap. 5, he puts himself above Moses and all the teachers. The whole tenor of the Sermon on the Mount makes a final separation from Judaism necessary, for there was too much in it that could never be accepted by the leaders. There was no chance from the beginning for its acceptance; and if it was not to be lost, there must be a new organization for its preservation.

At the Ascension of Jesus two things were necessary before we have a church: the idea of a church, and its realization in an organization. Now at first, and for several years, there could be no idea of a church as a permanent institution, for the disciples had only one thought—the early appearing of their risen Lord.

But they were themselves the nucleus of a future church—nothing more. All that remained of Christianity were the impressions which were buried in their hearts, and the fact that Jesus was alive again. They had asked him when he appeared to them: "Dost Thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" They asked this question because it was uppermost in their minds and because it had been the burden of his conversation with them after the resurrection (Acts, chap. 1). They were altogether in the dark in regard to the future. They had no plans. He had none, so all he could say was: "Wait till the Spirit comes." "Wait for future developments." This is the meaning of Paul's claim, upon which he based his apostleship, that Christ appeared to him and that still later he had seen into the third heaven—Paul had received further instructions even after the baptism of the Spirit at Pentecost. So Christ's Spirit continued to guide the apostles as to what steps to take. Their proceeding before Pentecost was the same as after: they met every day for prayer and consultation, usually in a private house. All they were decided upon was that they were not going to give up. They proceeded to close up their broken lines by electing one to take the place of Judas. They were getting ready for business. Now comes Pentecost and the discourse of Peter to the multitude which had been attracted by the unusual scene. The little company of disciples receives large additions, and the new converts join in the work of spreading the good news. For several years their meetings continue to be held principally in private houses, and probably for the most part in secret; but they continue also to visit the temple and the synagogues, taking part in the worship, just as in Jesus' time; and, as in his case, an important part of their work was the healing of the sick and preaching to those attracted by their miracles. After a time the scribes became alarmed or annoyed that this little company was growing so rapidly, and some arrests were made, but no severe punishment was meted out to them. We know little as to what classes supplied the converts; there were said to be many priests, and there were certainly many poor, some rich, and some few men of prominence. The most that can be said of them was that they were a society, held together by their common hope, and living in

a spirit of the most self-sacrificing brotherly love. It was a family of believers. There seems to have been no effort to extend the Kingdom outside of Jerusalem until persecution drove many of the disciples from the city to their homes in neighboring provinces. Even then the apostles remained in Jerusalem for some time. Finally, hearing of successful work done in other parts by the dispersed believers, they sent Peter and John to oversee and assist in what was being done. There was a general period of prosperity wherever the good news was preached, and sometime during this period Saul was converted. Then comes the record of his mighty missionary activity which resulted during the next twenty or thirty years in the establishing of churches practically all over the world. To these churches and to his converts Paul wrote numerous letters from various places, almost until his death. What were these churches like? The first thing that strikes us in the Acts account is the comparative seldomness with which the word *ἐκκλησία* occurs, even in accounts of very important events. In most cases where it does occur, it is simply a word used by a writer at a much later date, when it was so common that he never takes the pains to tell us what he means by it. There is no hint that it was common in the period which he is describing, and he does not attribute its use to the early disciples themselves. If we look up the passages in which he uses it, we see at once that one of several other words might appropriately be substituted for it; e. g., its first occurrence in 1:11: "Great fear came upon the church"—no organization is referred to, and "brotherhood" would be more appropriate. The next reference, 8:1, 3, refers to the "believers"—a better word than church. This is clear from vs. 3: "Paul laid waste the whole church—entering *into every house*;" 9:31: "The church throughout all Judea, Galilee, and Samaria had peace,"—i. e., the "believers;" 11:22 refers to the local congregation in Jerusalem—it is the best word we could use here; 11:26: we must go back to the idea of "brotherhood" assembled; Paul and Barnabas met regularly with the disciples of Antioch, who, like those of Jerusalem in earlier times, were accustomed to meet for worship and who were consequently on such occasions an assembly of Christians; 12:1: "Herod put forth his hand to afflict certain of the church"—i. e.,

some prominent "believers"—nothing more. In 15:3, 4, "church" is out of place, "faithful," "brethren," were better; 20:28 refers to the "Christian cause," the church universal, as we would say. It is needless to go farther. The word is used for the most part in a very broad sense by the author, and in most cases another word—"believers," "faithful," "followers of Jesus," "gathering"—would be more appropriate. It occurs in only two chapters before the ninth chapter, and after the ninth chapter the word *ἀδελφοί* is used much more frequently to designate the same general concept (9:30; 10:23; 11:1, 12, 29; 12:17; 14:2; 15:1, 3, 22, 23; 16:2, 40; 17:6, 10, 18; 18:18, 29, etc.). *ἀδελφοί* is also used frequently by Paul in exactly the same sense in which he uses *ἐκκλησία* (but sometimes with this difference, that the one looks to the individuals, while the other refers to the community as a whole—in both Acts and Paul). The word *μαθηταί* also occurs frequently in Acts in the same sense as *ἐκκλησία* (6:1, 2, 7; 9:1, 19, 26, 38).

From all that has been said we must conclude that no constructive statement concerning the church of the apostles can be made that does not take into account two things: first, these men were Jews, striving to maintain all the important elements of Judaism; secondly, all they did was under the influence of the hope of the early reappearance of the Messiah (*παρουσία* was the coming—not second coming, for they did not think of a second coming). Their preaching was, with unimportant exceptions, to the Jews whom they hoped to convert. As many, including a considerable number of the priests, had been converted very early, their hope is easily understood. Failing in this and finding the synagogues well adapted to their needs—and knowing nothing else—they began slowly to establish a Christian synagogue. (The words, synagogue and church were often interchangeably used in the LXX, and in the Epistle of James the Christian assembly is called a synagogue.) In the course of a few years when they began to see that the great body of the people were not going to be converted they began to call their assembly the "Church of God," by which they set up the claim that they were the only true Israel. Their use of the Old Testament as their guide in all things shows that they had no notion of founding

anything new, they were merely the continuers of the old. God had clearly recognized this by raising Jesus from the dead. They continued to proclaim in the synagogues, when allowed to speak therein, "Brethren, we have a new light: Jesus the crucified is alive. He is the Messiah and he is coming soon to set up the long-promised Kingdom. In order to share in it you must become his disciples." In their little assemblies, patterned in every way after the synagogue (*vide* Schürer, s. v. "Synagogue"), they did not exclude the Jewish ceremonies, but a new something, a hero-worship, absorbed their attention. Now these assemblies date back to within a few years of Pentecost, and they may have been called "churches" from the very beginning, but if so the word meant no more than "meeting," "band," "fellowship"—not even "assembly" could properly be applied to it, for there was either no organization or, at most, a very imperfect one. They were a "society," but without constitution or by-laws. Three things characterize them: belief in Jesus the Messiah, baptism, the "breaking of bread." Without the intention of forming a church those who accepted Jesus had to separate themselves from the Jews and form societies of their own where they could find sympathy. And so wherever they found acceptance they set up the so-called churches in private houses. Baptism and the "breaking of bread" in no way imply an organization. John baptized but he did not organize a church. Baptism at first meant only that the believer was thus made a disciple. They met very often and broke bread every time they assembled, but it was no more than an expression of their brotherly love and common hope (a Jewish custom; *vide* Schürer).

So long as the expectation that Jesus was soon to appear was uppermost in their minds, there was neither need nor possibility of a church as an institution. This explains the slow and unconscious development of a church, as well as the entire absence from our authorities of a "doctrine" of a church. They had no doctrine, no ecclesiastical formulas. The fact that they had some organization—deacons, elders (the word "bishop" occurs only once in Acts and there Luke puts it in the mouth of Paul)—does not show that it was looked upon as a permanent thing. It was copied from the synagogue and the very confusion as to the

significance of these offices shows the lack of a definite plan of organization. This does not mean, of course, that everything was left to chance, but only to expediency and necessity. Not until long after the apostolic age did the church organization take anything like a permanent or final form, and had the apostles lived forty years longer it is impossible to tell what final form it would have taken under them.

Not until Paul do we have a *concept* of church. He was the real founder of the Christian church as an institution—not that he left it as such, but that he molded the sentiment for it and left a finished concept of it. Of course, we have to distinguish in his letters between the local assemblies, in regard to which he in no way departed from the other apostles, except perhaps by improving a little on the organization, without, however, drawing any permanent plan of organization, and the church as the universal brotherhood of believers. He begins to formulate a dogma of the church, due partly to the fact that the whole task of making Christianity acceptable to the gentiles, its future possessors, fell upon him, and partly to his christology. In preserving Christianity to the gentiles, he had to differentiate the church sharply from Judaism. There were, of course, numerous matters of organization, cult, etc., to be settled; hence in his earlier epistles, especially in I Cor., we have numerous references to them, but even here many important matters of organization are left untouched, due to the fact that he had no well-assembled ecclesiastical system. It is not even certain that he recognized any regular ministry (e. g., he uses the word *ἐπίσκοπος* only once and *πρεσβύτερος* not once in all his epistles to churches). However, baptism and the “breaking of bread” become fixed. The former is given a spiritual interpretation, the latter becomes a technical expression for the “Lord’s Supper.”

As to the church in general, he regards it, just as the apostles had regarded themselves, as the “True Israel,” in distinction from the “Israel after the Flesh” (I Cor. 10:18; Gal. 6:14). It has superseded the Jewish church as the vehicle of inspiration (Eph. 3:5). It is the only institution that can have direct communion with God. With Christ “all things have become new.” “Christ is the end of the law.” Hence we have completed that differentia-

tion between the old and the new that had gradually been going on from the time of John the Baptist. Paul sets up Christ in opposition to the law, above it, whereas the other apostles made him harmonize with the law in every point, which corresponds also with Jesus' way of thinking. With him Christianity is entirely distinct from and independent of Judaism; hence the church is also divorced from it and it rises to the dignity of a Christian institution. It is the body of Christ, the temple of God, the bride of Christ (II Cor. 11:2). These figures show that the church has an organic union with Christ and confirm the general conception of Paul that without the church there is no salvation. All the apostles believed that baptism was necessary to salvation. But we must get their view. Paul's general use of the word church makes it practically identical with our word Christianity, or perhaps better with Jesus' use of the term, "Kingdom of God." With the other apostles there was no such thing as the anomalous person who accepted Christ without at the same time becoming his disciple. The very fact of believing included baptism; belief, baptism, and the other Christian practices being so closely united in their minds that they could not think of them as being separate acts. The word "Church" in Ephesians and Colossians, especially, is exactly equal to the expression "belief in Christ."

Our authority for churches does not come alone from the New Testament. We who know Jesus Christ, the Savior of men and the King of heaven, have, aside from the New Testament, all the authority we need for any organization necessary to express our faith and accomplish our work. We need no other authority than the mind of Jesus which is in us, together with the need and the privilege. This is the only authority the apostles had, and they desired no more. On this authority they organized and established little self-governing bodies wherever they could find disciples, calling them churches. Paul did the same thing. Both he and the author of Acts tell us something about it, but we would know it even if they had said nothing as to organization, for it was but common-sense to organize those whom he had converted. Another thing: practically it makes not the slightest difference to us that the apostles looked for the early advent of Jesus to set up the Kingdom. They certainly intended

that their churches should exist till his coming, and this is exactly what we think about the church of today. We need not feel bound to have the same organization in detail that they had. Besides, this is impossible for we do not know enough about the internal organization even of the churches of Antioch and Corinth as to which we are best informed. What they wanted is what we want—that “the kingdom of the world” shall become “the Kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.”

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The second writer on this theme is Rev. A. W. Fortune, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Dr. Fortune will take the platform.

REV. A. W. FORTUNE (Disciple), Cincinnati, Ohio, read as follows:

DOES THE NEW TESTAMENT CONTEMPLATE THE CHURCH AS AN INSTITUTION?

Every Christian is vitally interested in the answer to this question, Did Jesus or the apostles organize the church as an institution? If they did found such an institution, did it have the definiteness which would indicate that they intended that it should remain, as they left it, for all time? Or did Jesus merely plant the germ, which developed under the guidance of the apostles as circumstances directed, and has continued to develop down to our own time?

For the study of a question, like this, which concerns our religious belief, there is need of an open and unprejudiced mind. Although some of the churches of today are widely different, yet they practically all claim to be conformed to the New Testament pattern. To get a correct picture of the New Testament church, we must abandon the thought that we are to find a church like our own. The one aim must be to find out what the New Testament actually teaches.

WHAT IS MEANT BY THE CHURCH AS AN INSTITUTION?

Ἐκκλησία is from *ἐκκλητος*, “called out,” and primarily means “a gathering of citizens called out from their homes into some public place,” or an assembly. Among the Greeks *ἐκκλησία* was used to mean an assembly of the people convened at the public

place of council for the purpose of deliberating. It is so used in Acts 19:39. In the Septuagint it is often equivalent to **עֲדָתָא** the assembly of the Israelites. It is used in this sense in Acts 7:38 and Heb. 2:12. This term, which was well known both to Jews and to Greeks, was used to designate the Christian community.

At the close of the second century the Christian *ἐκκλησία* had manifestly become institutionalized. There were orderly officials, who spake according to their office, and not as they were prompted by the spirit. Ordination was not a recognition of grace bestowed by God, but was itself a communication of grace. A single bishop was at the head of the church, and there were presbyters who were subordinate to him. Baptism and the Lord's Supper were church ordinances, and they were administered by the bishop or by those to whom he gave authority. To be in communion with God one must be in fellowship with the church. The church of the second century had its "rule of faith" which one must believe to become a member. Much stress was placed upon apostolic doctrine. The organization and creed of the church were believed to be apostolic and hence authoritative. One must be a part of the church to have the Spirit of God. "Where the church is," said Irenaeus, "there is the Spirit of God."¹ At the close of the second century Christianity was institutionalized. Does the New Testament contemplate the church as an institution in some such sense, or does it use the term *ἐκκλησία* in a loose sense, as designating those who are bound together by a common belief in Christ, and by a common purpose to win others to this belief?

In this paper no attempt will be made at a critical study of the documents. What is sought is a picture of the church as it is given in the New Testament as we have it. But really to understand what the New Testament church was, the study must, in a measure at least, be historical. Hence this paper will treat the subject under the following heads: the church in the teaching of Jesus; the church in the Book of Acts; the church in the writings of Paul; and the church in the other New Testament writings.

¹ Iren., III, chap. xxiv.

1. *The church in the teaching of Jesus.*—The word *ἐκκλησία* occurs only twice in the gospels. Once it refers to something that is future, and in the other instance there is reflected a very simple condition. The Fourth Gospel, which is a very late document, says nothing at all about the church. It places all emphasis on the Kingdom of God.

The first reference in the teaching of Jesus to the church is in Matt. 16:18. This was after the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi. In reply to this confession Jesus said: "And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." *ἐκκλησία* was a term that was well known to the Jews. It had been used to designate the assembly of the congregation of Israel. And while the disciples were upon this high peak of faith Jesus told them that he would be rejected from the assembly of Israel, and that he would establish a community of his own followers.

The other reference to the church in the teaching of Jesus is in Matt. 18:15-20. This is in regard to the treatment of an offending brother. The organization reflected in this passage is the simplest possible. It is a community of brethren without any official head. Discipline was the function of all the members of the community. In case of offense there was to be first a private conference. If that was of no avail there was to be another conference in the presence of two or three witnesses. If the guilty party did not respect their judgment the difficulty was to be presented to the whole community. If the offender still refused to acknowledge his fault, he was to be treated as a gentile and a publican. That is, he was to be self-excluded from their fellowship.

Jesus did not organize an *ἐκκλησία* as an institution. He called a number of personal followers about him. The name used to designate these followers was *μαθηταί*. These men who were gathered about him and traveled with him were his pupils. Early in his ministry Jesus called about him the Twelve. These were his immediate companions. He instructed them and they became his helpers. Later he sent out the Seventy. Jesus inspired his disciples with love and service, but he left them to

express their life as circumstances might lead them. Jesus organized no *ἐκκλησία*. He formulated no constitution, appointed no officers, prescribed no rules. He left the life to create its own ecclesiastical organization.

When Jesus called the first disciples the Christian community had its beginning. The terms of fellowship were simple. There was no doctrinal test. The personality of Jesus was the center around which the community was formed. The progress of the development of the Christian community under Jesus stopped with the calling of personal followers about him; with the vesting of the exercising of discipline in the whole community; and with the appointment of a custodian of the funds of the society. Jesus, however, did imply that his disciples should constitute themselves into a more definite *ἐκκλησία*. But he left no instructions as to its organization. Under the guidance of his spirit, his followers were to work out the details to meet the growing and changing wants of the community.

According to all the synoptists, as well as the apostle Paul, Jesus instituted a supper which his disciples were to keep in memory of him. And according to the great commission, Jesus told his disciples to administer the ordinance of baptism. Although the idea of fellowship is necessarily present in both of these ordinances, yet there is no indication that Jesus gave them as church ordinances. The one was simply a memorial which was to be kept in memory of him, and the other was the continuation of an ordinance which had been practiced since the days of John the Baptist, and was well known to the Jews even before his time.

2. *The church in the Book of Acts.*—We have found that the church did not exist as an institution in the time of Jesus. As we study the writings of the church Fathers from Cyprian back to the time of the apostles we observe a constant development. It would not be strange if the same development should have continued back to the time of Jesus himself. A careful study of the Book of Acts, which is a history of the early Christian community, reveals the fact that there was such a development in the apostolic *ἐκκλησία*.

Ἐκκλησία is used in Acts to designate the Christian community

in a particular place, like Jerusalem or Antioch. It is used in the plural to designate a number of churches in a province (16:5). It is also used in the singular to include all the believers (9:31).

The *ἐκκλησία* of the first part of Acts was evidently not an institution. It lacked all the elements of an institution. It was an inner group in the great Jewish *ἐκκλησία*. It had no organization. The first Christians were Jews and then Christians. They frequented the temple and the synagogues. They observed the Jewish hours of daily prayer, and the Jewish rite of circumcision. The early Christians met in private houses for fellowship and prayer and the Lord's Supper. The apostles had general oversight of everything.

The first notice of any organization within the local church is in the sixth chapter of Acts, when seven men were set apart to administer the charity of the community. No official title was given to these men and it is not known whether the office was continued and reproduced in other Christian communities. It has generally been held that this was the origin of the diaconate, but many scholars today question this view. Some even maintain that "the Seven" of the sixth chapter of Acts are the same as the "elders" of the eleventh chapter. This is not improbable, as the function of both seems to have been the same. As the church was confronted by new needs it developed to meet these needs, and it developed along lines with which the people were already familiar. The church was planted on Jewish soil, and as it took shape it was undoubtedly influenced by the organization and worship of the synagogue. In the selection of "the Seven" three elements are observed as regards the Christian community. It was under apostolic guidance. The community was independent. And a representative system of administration was suggested by the surroundings of the people. The apostles were the administrators of the Jerusalem community until it became so large that it took too much of their time. Then they decided to give themselves to the ministry of the Word, and to have seven men selected by the community to administer the temporal affairs. The number seven was undoubtedly suggested by the fact that the Jewish village was ruled by the council of the seven.

In Acts 11:30 we meet for the first time the elders of the church. They are mentioned in connection with the relief which was sent by the disciples of Antioch to the church in Jerusalem. The writer does not say anything about the origin of this office, or even of its function. He simply mentions the elders as being the ones in the Jerusalem church to whom relief was sent. Had the writer of the Book of Acts considered the elders a necessary part of the church, he would doubtless have been more explicit in his statements in regard to them. In the fourteenth chapter of Acts we are told that Paul and Barnabas returned through the cities where they had preached and appointed elders in every church. The picture of the church as given in Acts up to this point is very simple. It is under the supervision of the apostles and, in most cases at least, there are elders to govern the local communities. These elders were doubtless patterned after the rulers of the synagogues. Just as upon the mission fields today, the selection of these elders, in the new communities built up by Paul and Barnabas, was determined largely by them. There are many references to the Christian *ἐκκλησία* up to this point, but the institutional element plays a small part. They are communities of brethren.

In the fifteenth chapter of Acts there is the first reference to any general organization of the church, and this shows that there was a lack of organization. The community at Antioch was troubled about the rite of circumcision, and "the brethren appointed that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question. . . . And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church and the apostles and the elders." The apostles and elders gathered together to consider the matter. Peter, who was still the pillar apostle, expressed his opinion in regard to the matter under discussion. James, who, perhaps because of his relation to Jesus, was leader of the church at Jerusalem, expressed his conviction in regard to the best course to pursue. "Then it seemed good to the apostles and the elders, with the whole church, to choose men out of their company and send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas." With them they also sent a letter. But this letter was not the enactment of an

ecclesiastical body, binding upon the whole church. It was a letter of fellowship and advice to brethren who had appealed for guidance in the settlement of a perplexing problem. This appeal had been made because this was the original church and most of the apostles were there. This did not claim to be an ecclesiastical body acting for the whole church, and Paul, in the second chapter of Galatians, denies them any such authority.

According to the picture that is given in the Book of Acts, the aim of all preaching was to get men to accept Christ as Savior, rather than to get them to become members of an ecclesiastical body. But the believers became an *ἐκκλησία* where they had fellowship and received help from one another. Anyone who believed in Christ and was baptized was considered a part of the *ἐκκλησία*. All of these were under supervision of the apostles, or missionaries, who founded them, but there were elders who had oversight of the local communities. And in the church at Jerusalem there was one man who seemed to be at the head of the elders, and this church with its elders and apostles had such prominence that they sent out men to investigate reports from distant Antioch, and the brethren at Antioch later appealed to them for a decision on the question of circumcision. Salvation through Christ is the chief thing in the Book of Acts. Fellowship of the brethren is also prominent, but ecclesiasticism has little place. Men are commanded to be baptized, but not that they may have membership in the church. Surprisingly little is said about the Lord's Supper, and nothing that would designate it as a church ordinance.

3. *The church in the writings of Paul.*—Paul used the term *ἐκκλησία* in several different senses. He used it to designate the body of believers in some particular place (I Thess. 1:14; I Cor. 1:1, 2). He used it to include a number of congregations (I Cor. 16:19). He used it in the sense of the assembly of the local congregation (I Cor. 14:19, 35). He made use of it in the sense of the one universal church (Col. 1:18, 24; Eph. 1:22). And he also used it to mean the one universal church as being represented in the local church (Gal. 1:13).

Paul did not give explicit teaching on the organization of the church, and it is difficult from the many indirect references to

get a definite impression. In I Cor. 12:28 he said: "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers," etc. In Eph. 4:11 he says. "And he gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." But these were not officials in the local community. They were appointed by God, by the peculiar gifts they possessed, to labor in the church in the broad sense. Paul sends greetings to the bishops and deacons of the church at Philippi (1:1), and he admonishes the Christians of Thessalonica to esteem them that are set over them (I Thess. 5:13). No reference is made to official leaders in his letters to the Galatians and Corinthians. The omission of these official titles does not prove that the church did not have these officers, but it does indicate that they did not represent the churches. Paul speaks to the whole church, and calls upon the whole church to act. Yet a community like that at Corinth could not exist without officials, and these were undoubtedly the elders and perhaps deacons. This community was much like a little self-governing republic. It had charge of discipline and of fraternal relations between the community and other Christian communities. Letters seeking apostolic advice were prepared and dispatched in its name. The church had power to expel unworthy members and it had power to restore the penitent. Paul even urged the Corinthian Christians to settle their own difficulties and not go before courts of law. While Paul recognized the apostles and prophets and teachers as being the most important, yet there were those in this local community who had the gift of government, and these were undoubtedly the elders.

In the pastoral epistles are given the qualifications of the elders and deacons. The qualifications of the deacons indicate that their function is serving, and the qualifications of the elders or bishops indicate that their function is ruling. The terms elder and bishop seem to be used interchangeably, and perhaps the first describes the man, and the second his function. This interchange of terms by Paul is in harmony with the other New Testament writers. The same officers in the Church at Ephesus are alternately called presbyters and bishops in Acts 20:17, 28. In I Pet. 5:1, 2, presbyters are urged to teach the flock of God and

to fulfil the office of bishop. This interchange of terms continued after apostolic times. (See Epistle of Clement, ad Cor., 42, 44; also Didache, chap. 15.)

I Tim. 5:17, 18, would almost indicate that there were some of the elders who were giving all their time to teaching and were being supported by the church. And it might seem, because the term bishop is in the singular in Titus 1:7, that this indicates that there was one who had been raised above the rest. It, however, seems more probable that the article here is generic. With the exception of these directions in the pastoral epistles to Timothy and Titus, Paul has little to say about the organization of the church. Lindsay says: "The apostle Paul sends greeting to persons of different sexes and positions in life, but never to office-bearers as such. Nor among his many exhortations does he allude to the need of organization under hierarchical authority. Still less does he prescribe a form of organization which was to be uniform throughout the whole church of Christ."

Paul speaks of the church as being one, but not in the sense of a uniform ecclesiastical organization. It is one because it is united to Christ. The church is the body of Christ. The churches of Paul's time were not organized into an outward unity. The local congregations which composed the church were far apart and there was but little connection between many of them. There was no central government which extended over them all, or even over those comprised within a given district. The unity was inner and spiritual. They shared a common truth and a common life. They all partook of the same spiritual food and drank of the same spiritual drink. The Church of Paul's time had to struggle with some serious problems, but notwithstanding these, it maintained this unity of spirit.

Pfleiderer said: "An organization of the church in the sense of an ecclesiastical institution, was not merely not given by Paul, but not even contemplated by him, for the simple reason that he expected the *παρουσία* of Christ in the near future." While Paul did more than any other man to give form to the church, yet it is evident that Paul placed but little stress on the church as an institution. The thing that concerned him was not one's relation to the church, but one's relation to Christ. He nowhere

tells how to become a member of the church, but the very center of his message is the way to become justified with God. It is true that Paul recognized the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and placed considerable emphasis upon them, but he did not emphasize them as church ordinances. Baptism, with Paul, symbolizes the bestowal of divine grace through union with Christ. According to Paul we are baptized into Christ rather than into the church. According to Paul baptism symbolizes the moral renewal. It symbolizes death to sin and resurrection to newness of life. With Paul the idea of fellowship is in the Lord's Supper, but the important feature is the memorial. Paul condemns the Corinthians, not so much for lack of fellowship as for lack of discerning the Lord's body. He speaks of the cup as being a communion, but it is "a communion of the blood of Christ." The thing of supreme importance to Paul was the life consecrated to Christ, and the church and its organization were of value only as it helped in this. It was not an end, but only a means to an end.

4. *The church in the other New Testament writings.*—The other New Testament writers furnish but little additional material in regard to the church. As already pointed out, in I Pet. 5:1, 2, the elders are admonished to tend the flock of God exercising the oversight. In this connection Peter calls himself a fellow-elder. In James the Christian assembly is called *συναγωγή* rather than *ἐκκλησία* but the sick are instructed to call for the elders of the church who shall pray over them. The Second Epistle of John purports to have been written by "the elder unto the elect lady and her children," and at the close there are greetings from "the children of thine elect sister." It is possible that the elect lady is the church but by no means certain. The Third Epistle of John purports to have been written by "the elder unto Gaius the beloved." These writers have nothing to say about the prophets and teachers and evangelists of which Paul spoke. Neither is there any mention of the deacons in their writings. There is no reference to the fact that one man has been placed over the presbyters in the control of the churches, unless the angel of the seven churches in Asia be so regarded which is quite improbable.

In a careful reading of these general letters one must be impressed with the little that is said about the church. They are exhortations to right living in view of the greatness of our calling. Much is said about false teachers, but these are not denounced as not accepting the teachings of the church. They are denounced as denying the Master himself and walking after their own lusts.

SUMMARY

The church in the time of Jesus was not an institution. The thing of supreme importance with him was the Kingdom of God. This was the center of his teaching. It was this for which he taught his disciples to pray. And it was this for which he gave up his life. The followers of Jesus naturally formed a community, but this was a secondary thing. The thing of vital interest with Jesus was to get men in right relation with God. The church was not an institution in the early days of its history, but as time passed, it more and more approached the institutional. The Christian community at first was a band of brethren of spiritual equality, without much formal organization. It was like a family. They met in private houses. Both spiritual and material matters were discussed and decided in common. Some individuals, either because of age, or ability, or prominence, became leaders. These were finally called elders or bishops. As the churches increased in size matters were left less to the entire body, and the organization became more definite. The officers were elected and they exalted their office. There was perhaps no uniform church government in New Testament times. The churches were scattered and there was but little communication between some of them. The New Testament age covers considerable time and different conditions are described in early and later times. In the Pastoral Epistles there seems to be a somewhat fixed order of church government, but there is not a fixed order applying to all churches of the apostolic age.

It would perhaps be overstating it to say the New Testament writers had no interest in the church as an institution, but this certainly was a secondary interest. They emphasized the lordship of Jesus and the necessity of following the leading of his spirit. They took it for granted that those who were following Jesus

were a part of the church, and any organization they had was simply a means of helping these followers to best do Christ's will. When we get that conception of the church, Christian union will be easy and it will be inevitable. It will be easy because the extension of the Kingdom of God will be considered of more importance than the building up of our own denomination. It will be inevitable because it will be felt that the divided condition of the church is not the best organization for the bringing in of God's Kingdom. May the church of Christ so breathe in the spirit of Jesus and the apostles that it shall lose sight of ecclesiasticism and think only of the winning of the world to God.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We are now to listen to two appointed speakers upon this theme. The first is Rev. W. B. Wallace, Cleveland, Ohio. Will Mr. Wallace take the platform?

REV. WILLIAM B. WALLACE, D.D. (Baptist), of Cleveland, Ohio, spoke as follows:

DOES THE NEW TESTAMENT CONTEMPLATE THE CHURCH AS AN INSTITUTION?

If we are to answer this question, there must first be an understanding of terms. What do we mean by the "church"? the church universal, or the church individual? the church invisible, or visible? the church ideal, or actual?

In the old Grecian days, when a meeting was desired, the people were called to assemble together, and their assembly was known as the "ecclesia," or "called-out." This term came to be used to describe the assembled Christians. I shall assume that the local assembly of the "called-out" ones of Christ is what is meant by the term "church" in our theme.

What do we mean by "institution"? When Diogenes was looking for a man, he had his idea of manhood and then looked for someone to come up to his idea. Does the New Testament contemplate the church as an institution? We must first have an understanding as to what "institution" is, and then see if there be anything in the New Testament contemplation of the church that is parallel with that understanding.

There are many definitions of the term "institution." Among them I find this one in the *Century Dictionary*: "An institution is an organized society or body of persons usually with a fixed place of assemblage and operation, and devoted to a special pursuit or purpose." If we accept this definition, we notice that there are three distinct marks of an institution; namely, organization, localization, and specialization. It is our task to discover if the New Testament contemplates the church as bearing these distinctive marks.

I. ORGANIZATION

First, does the New Testament contemplate the church as marked by organization? Dr. Strong in his *Theology* quotes R. S. Storrs as saying: "When any truth becomes central and vital, then comes a desire to utter it." And Dr. Strong adds: "Not only in words, but in organization." Jesus Christ was possessed with a great idea; namely, that through faith in him the sons of men could be saved from sin, and the Kingdom of God be established on earth. To give expression to this idea, Jesus Christ called to his side disciples. In Mark 1:16-20, we read of his calling Simon, Andrew, James, and John to follow him. Then, too, in Mark 3:14 we have the account of the appointing of the Twelve—"that they might be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach." Day after day, by fellowship, example, and instruction, he filled them with his own purposes and plans. Luke tells us (Luke 10:1) that he appointed seventy others and sent them, two by two, before his face into every city and place whither he himself was about to go.

In the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* is this significant statement: "A society, to be plainly visible and unmistakable, requires some outward act or sign of distinction by which its members can be recognized." In the institutions of baptism and the Lord's Supper Jesus supplied this essential of an organization.

After the resurrection of Christ great growth marks organization in the church. When we turn to the Book of Acts, we find a clear-cut picture of an organized body of people at Jerusalem. As an organization, the church selects a successor to Judas (Acts 1:23-26). As an organization, the church has people added to

its membership (Acts 2:41). As an organization, the church continues in the apostles' teaching of fellowship and the breaking of bread and the prayers (Acts 2:42). As an organization, the church makes provision for needy brethren (Acts 11:29). As an organization, the church sends forth missionaries to the work (Acts 13:3). In the epistles, too, there is a conception of the church as an organized body. Letters of Paul, of Peter, of James, and of John are addressed to organized bodies of Christians. We find Paul using such figures as "God's building" (I Cor. 3:9) and "the body of Christ" (Eph. 1:23); which go to show that he conceived of the church as an organization.

Does the New Testament contemplate the church as an institution? If we understand organization to be one of the marks of an institution, we must give an affirmative answer. Jesus had an idea, and sought for organized effort to give it expression. That organized effort appears during his ministry, and in completer form after his resurrection.

II. LOCALIZATION

In our definition of an institution we note that "an institution has usually a fixed place of assemblage and operation;" that is, that it is marked by localization. Does the New Testament contemplate the church as localized? Emphatically, yes. In the early chapters of the Book of Acts, we have the church at Jerusalem, not dealing in "airy nothings," and having a "local habitation and a name." The church, at the first, meets in the house of a prominent member, as the house of Mark (Acts 12:12), or the house of James (Acts 21:18). As the membership of the church increases other houses are opened; thus it is we find letters addressed to the house congregations, as in Paul's letter to Philemon, and his letter to the Colossians. There seems to be a suggestion in James 2:2 of a larger meeting-place for the church than the individual houses.

After persecution came upon the church in Jerusalem, we read in Acts 8:4 that the disciples of Christ were scattered abroad and went about preaching the word. Grand pioneers they were. With God's "whisper" in their souls, they crossed hostile mountains and won new territory for the King of kings. As I read

the story of their achievement, I seem to be standing by a river, deep and broad and free, flowing with majestic movement toward the ocean, and I hear the song of the Chattahoochee:

But oh, not the hills of Habersham,
 And oh, not the valleys of Hall
 Avail: I am fain for to water the plain.
 Downward the voices of Duty call—
 Downward, to toil and be mixed with the main;
 The dry fields burn, and the mills are to turn,
 And a myriad flowers mortally yearn,
 And the lordly main from beyond the plain
 Calls o'er the hills of Habersham,
 Calls through the valleys of Hall.

Onward and outward they went, to "water the plain" and make the wilderness rejoice and blossom as the rose. Church after church came into being, until there was the church at Antioch, Gallacia, Ephesus, Thessalonica, Corinth, Rome. Now Paul may write his epistles to the churches therein addressed, and John may record the message of the Spirit to the seven churches of Asia.

III. SPECIALIZATION

Recalling our definition of an institution, we find that it is devoted "to a special pursuit or purpose." This certainly is a characteristic of the New Testament church. In Eph. 5:23 Paul speaks of Christ as the Head of the church, and of the church as his body. It is the function of the body to carry out the will of the head. One great purpose Christ had; namely, the establishment of the Kingdom of God. This desire appeared in his prayers, in his works, his teachings, and his commands.

George Frederick Watts has a famous picture entitled "Mammon." It presents a throned figure clad in richest robes, and with the face of a blind beast. Beneath his crushing hand is the figure of a woman; beneath his cruel foot, the figure of a man. In the background there is the smoke of sacrifice. When Jesus Christ came into this world he saw false gods sitting on the throne, and dedicated himself to the task of casting them down and establishing the rule of a king, who "shall come down like rain upon the mown grass, and as showers that water the earth."

The church as the body of Christ is specialized to carry out this desire of the Head of the church. She is here to establish the Kingdom of God. She is to do this intensively. "The Kingdom of God is within you." Many of the great sayings of Jesus and the great words of the apostle Paul are addressed to Christians to cleanse their own hearts and let Christ have supreme rule in their lives.

The New Testament conceives of the church, too, as building up the Kingdom of God extensively. "Ye shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and in the uttermost parts of the earth." The church is to keep working away until the kingdoms of this world shall be the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; "until every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Moreover, the New Testament contemplates the church as attaining this end in a definite manner, namely, by worship and by works.

I have read of a celebrated artist, who had upon his easel beautiful gems to tone up his sense of color. It would be a good thing if the modern church, in seeking to throw upon the canvas of our day and generation pictures that may honor God and bless mankind, would keep before her this New Testament conception of the church as a worshiping and a working church.

The early church continued steadfastly in the apostle's teaching and fellowship in the breaking of bread and the prayers. The New Testament expects the church to continue this custom: "Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking our own assembling together as the custom of some is, but consulting one another; and so much the more as you see the day drawing nigh" (Heb. 10:24, 25); "Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" (Eph. 5:19).

There is a tendency upon the part of some people in these days to emphasize works apart from the public worship in God's house. There are those who seem to feel that they can do God's will and carry out the purposes of Christ without assembling themselves in the sanctuary for praise and prayer. This tendency is a dangerous one. Says Dr. Forsyth in his *Positive Preaching*

and the Modern Mind, "We may feel that the love of humanity could not survive apart not only from our love of Christ, but also from the personal communion with Christ in the church, which feeds that love."

In *The Church and the Changing Order* Shailer Mathews remarks that the one supreme mission of the Church is religious: "However much a church may emphasize charitable organizations, amusements, employment bureaus, a consciousness of its spiritual mission must be its co-ordinating and unifying force." The church must remember the truth of Henry Van Dyke's parable, "The Source," and know that if she neglects the hour of worship in the sanctuary, the day will come when her name will be Ablis—forsaken; no more Salome—City of Peace.

But while the New Testament contemplates that the church should advance in the Kingdom of God through worship, it also conceives of the church as carrying on the same task by works. The New Testament church throbs with activity. The men that make up her membership feel that they are chosen witnesses of the grace of God. They meet to sing and pray, and then go forth to preach and serve.

While, as I have said, there is a tendency now-a-days on the part of some people to emphasize works and neglect worship, so, on the other hand, with some others there is a tendency to emphasize worship and neglect works. There are those whose religious life is largely sentimental. They admire Christ as one admires a great portrait in a gallery. They seem to forget that Christ is a person—not a mere painting; that he is here to establish his kingdom, and they are subjects to carry out his will. Wendell Phillips used to declare that Christianity is a battle—not a dream. He spoke of mummies hidden in the churches; metaphysicians dividing the truth according to the north or northwestern side of a hair. Said he, "They will never be crucified; never hear the Pharisees and Sadducees fretting that their time has come; never have the devils of their own age asking to be sent unto the swine."

Says F. B. Meyer: "If we insist that the supreme test of faith is works, and of love, brotherhood, we are as likely as not to be made to drink Christ's cup of rejection and be baptized with the

baptism of his sufferings." Surely the church needs to be reminded today that—

Only Love's great eyes inspire
Church, sect, creed to glow with fire.

Bishop Greer, the new bishop of New York, on returning from the Lambeth Conference is reported as saying that "the church is a world-force, concerned with the welfare of no one class or nation or race, but intent upon the salvation of the world. The church is to save the world by *serv*ing it. It must contribute in every possible way to the happiness and welfare of the human race, working through every kind of channel—social, civic, religious or of whatever nature—for the common good; *that it might minister, like its Master, to the manifold needs of man.*" This conception of the church is in harmony with the New Testament view. God haste the day when it shall be the universal conception of confessing Christians, and everyone shall be, like General Booth, "hungry for hell," that he may change hell to heaven.

Kipling has a very suggestive poem entitled, "Jubal and Tubal":

Jubal sang of the wrath of God
And the curse of thistle and thorn—
But Tubal got him a pointed rod,
And scrabbled the earth for corn.

Jubal sang of the new-found sea,
And the souls its waves divide—
But Tubal hollowed a fallen tree
And passed to the farther side.

Jubal sang of the golden years
When wars and wounds shall cease—
But Tubal fashioned the hand-flung spears
And showed his neighbors peace.

Jubal sang of the cliffs that bar
And the peaks that none may crown—
But Tubal clambered by jut and scar
And there he builded a town.

God be praised for the Jubals in the church—those who dream

and sing and speak ; but what is needed in our day is more of the Tubal spirit. Let the modern church study the New Testament church, and read the story of those early workers who were not disobedient to the heavenly vision ; who held their lives of no account that they might accomplish their course ; who shrank not from declaring the whole counsel of God, until it shall have become possessed with the holy determination to add works to worship, and by deeds make its dreams come true.

May the Lord give to the modern church more Tubals, who shall go forth to change deserts to gardens, to bridge all separating seas, and bring the "sullen sundered peoples to earth's remotest end around the hearthstone of their welcome and the home-light of their love," to hasten the fulfilment of the angelic prophecy, "Peace on earth, good-will to men;" and in spite of difficulties, and on top of them, to rear, stone by stone, in tangible form, the Kingdom of our God.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I would like to call the attention of the Congress to the provision made for a general discussion of these themes. After the second prepared speaker delivers his message there will be an opportunity for anyone to speak upon this theme. It will be necessary, however, for you to send up your card to the Secretary. There are pages here, and if you will lift your hand with your card, they will bring it forward to the Secretary, or you can bring it forward yourself. We hope that quite a number will avail themselves of this privilege and speak to us upon this theme this afternoon.

We will now listen to the second appointed speaker, Professor Shirley J. Case, of the University of Chicago.

PROFESSOR SHIRLEY J. CASE, PH.D. (Free Baptist) :

"If I were asked to answer this question that is before us, in a single word without further limiting the definition, my reply would be an emphatic affirmative. I should presuppose, to begin with, that we ought to find the church idea at least in the New Testament, for it is as old as the history of the human race. Man is instinctively religious, and in all ages and in all circumstances we find him expressing that religious instinct in association with his fellow-men.

The church idea strikes its roots deep into the soil of human history.

And I have another general reason: I should expect to find the church idea in the New Testament because it is the church that has given us our New Testament. It is the church that has preserved for us the words of the Master and the story of his life. How much less rich our New Testament literature would be had there never been a church at Thessalonica, or at Corinth, or at Rome, or elsewhere.

Then I find in the New Testament definite references which warrant me in believing that the New Testament contemplated the church. Here we find the church mentioned as we have already heard today. We find Paul living his whole life for the sake of the church. We find him traveling over seas, we find him journeying hither and thither, all in the interests of the church.

But, if the question were put more pointedly as it has been put by the speakers today, and I were asked just what the New Testament idea is in its exact form, I should be somewhat puzzled, puzzled because I do not find in the New Testament that the idea has been worked out in its full form; it is there in germ. If you turn to the life of those first believers as they were assembled in Jerusalem, you do not see them with an established ritual, but you do find them with a burning heart, with a soul that is full of the fire of love. You find them ready, after they have been touched by the spirit of their Master, to go forth in loving service for humanity. You find them there with a message of social salvation all ready to be delivered, to be worked out under the conditions which they shall meet here and there and elsewhere.

I need not say today that we are in difficulty when we turn to find the New Testament conception, from the fact that even the forms we do find do not always agree among the different churches. The church in Jerusalem was not at all like the church in gentile territory. You could call the Jewish church in its incipient stage scarcely more than a Jewish guild. The disciples who gathered in Jerusalem were Jews and loyal to the law of Moses, and they resented it very much indeed that the apostle

Paul does not require the gentile to accept the Mosaic dispensation. We do not find a uniformly worked-out system which we can apply as the New Testament pattern of the church, but we do find that the New Testament has a certain unity in its conception of the church's functions.

What is the mission of the church idea as contemplated by the New Testament? It has the divine sanction of service. It is required everywhere that the believers shall live for their Master and not for themselves, and that they shall put forth this bodiless spirit in a form which shall live and be powerful in the world. Now, it has always been recognized by all men that a disembodied spirit, while perhaps playing an important part in one's thought and one's life, for practical purposes is of very little use. Therefore, there is only one thing to do when a man in this age—or in that age—gets hold of the church idea, the germ, and that is for him to give expression in tangible form of that which was enthroned in his heart and in his life. Therefore we see the early disciples gathering together and using the ordinances of baptism as an initiatory rite, not as a magical rite, perhaps; yet attaching some special significance to it. We find them gathering together and eating a common meal in order that they may express their common fellowship. Do they attach any extraordinary value to this as an ordinance? Probably not, but it has for them a greater value in that it expresses something which is within their hearts, something that is deep down in their lives—the idea that they must live to minister the ends of the gospel.

Now, can it be said that the church today does conform to the New Testament conception in that general and undefined way? We sometimes hear people say, "Back to the primitive simplicity; away with the elaborate organizations of this day and generation." I have no sympathy with that sort of a cry. To me it seems that the New Testament church is no more the ideal church for this day than is Paul's method of crossing the ocean in an old Roman freight boat the ideal way for a modern missionary to reach a foreign land. The church of today will not live by imitating any form of church in the past, for imitation itself produces death. I remember reading in Dr. Horton's

Yale lectures an illustration in point. He says in the sculpture gallery in Rome one may see the busts of the emperors, complete or nearly complete, beginning with the early Caesars and coming down to the Gothic period. At first one's eye is greeted by the noble marbles of the early Caesars. He follows the decline of the art down until he comes to the period of the Gothic emperors, and art has disappeared, and one sees there just a caricature of a man; scarcely more than the wooden doll of a child, and he reflects upon it: he says, "The heir of all the ages, this last artist, produced this."

It is true always that imitation alone is deadly. It is only inner life that can give power and strength. And so it is in the church of God. While we revere and respect those early days when the disciples were working out, as best they could under the circumstances of their age, the ideas which they possessed, yet we recognize that the church of today stands on its own feet. It is an institution now, in very many senses different from what it was years ago. It is not today the same church that it was at the time when the Nicene creed was given forth institutionally; it is not the same church today in which our grandfathers worshipped. It is veritably an ancient institution but it is not an antiquated one, and may it never be! If it loses its ability to adapt itself to the changing needs of every age, if it forgets that its mission is primarily for the ends of the gospel and not for its own self-preservation, it will forfeit its right to exist and likewise its rights to be called the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of truth.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: Are there any cards to come forward from any who would choose to address us this afternoon? If not, perhaps it will be time for us to draw this session to a close.

DR. ALBERT G. LAWSON: Before we are dismissed I hope that the Secretary will be kind enough to give again the notice which he gave at the opening of the session.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: You are requested, Dr. Gessler, to give that notice which was given at the opening of the meeting.

SECRETARY GESSLER: There is to be this afternoon a meeting

of conference to which you are invited, and in this meeting the question of entering into a closer union of these denominations in congress work is to be discussed. I can hardly tell you what form that discussion will take because I do not know how the minds of the brethren are turned. The question is one of drawing together, either in other gatherings similar to this or in a more clearly united form. It may profit us to come together to discuss the difficulties and to find out what is keeping us apart and how we can get closer together.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I have also another announcement to make: Dr. Mathews, dean of the University of Chicago, would like to invite the visiting delegates to take lunch at the University Commons. All visiting delegates are invited to take lunch with the professors of the university tomorrow at half-past twelve. They would be glad to have you come at half-past eleven and someone will be present to show you about the university grounds and buildings. It will be necessary for us to know today or at the close of the session this evening how many are going to this luncheon. If you will give your names to Dr. Parker or to myself, we will be glad to welcome all who are here from a distance to the university tomorrow at noon.

I will again call attention to the session tonight and to the sessions on Wednesday and Thursday. I think this will probably close this part of our meeting.

I will ask Doctor Hunt, of Ohio, to step forward and lead us in prayer.

The closing prayer was offered by Dr. Emory W. Hunt, of Granville, Ohio, after which an adjournment was taken until 8 o'clock P. M.

FIRST DAY

Evening Session

November 10, 1908

8 o'clock P. M.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The hour has arrived for the evening session of this Congress. Let us sing two verses of Hymn No. 1,056, "The Church's One Foundation Is Jesus Christ, Her Lord."

At the conclusion of the hymn, Professor Errett Gates, of Chicago, invoked the divine blessing.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: At the opening of this session, you are to have an address of welcome, first by Harry Pratt Judson, president of the University of Chicago, and the president of our Northern Baptist Convention. He represents the municipality.

ADDRESSES OF WELCOME

PRESIDENT HARRY PRATT JUDSON, LL.D., THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO:

Members of the Congress, Mr. President, Ladies, and Gentlemen: I am asked to extend a welcome to this Congress on behalf of this municipality, not because I have the honor to be connected with the city government; I have never been a mayor or an alderman or anything of that sort, I am glad to say; but, I suppose, because I am a citizen of Chicago and every citizen of Chicago is a member of the municipality; and the citizens of Chicago, proud of their city, are intensely jealous of anything that makes for its higher life and intensely pained by everything that tends toward the lower life of this great mass of people. And, in that sense, I am sure that I represent the municipality in its better sense in welcoming to our city this Congress with its great themes of thought to be freely discussed in this presence.

I am glad to welcome the Congress because it is a Baptist congress, if you please. I understand there are various kinds of Baptists who are gathered here tonight. A good friend of mine was saying the other day that he has learned of late that among different Christian bodies there are possibly ninety-five points in common and five points of diversity, and if that is true I fancy the difference between the old times and our times is this: that in the times long past we spent the most of our attention on the five points of diversity and now we are learning to concentrate our minds on the ninety-five points of unity, which occurs to me, as a layman, Mr. President, as being a very rational and sensible proposition.

However these different kinds of Baptists may differ, I fancy they are alike in some essentials which make a congress a

very proper thing to gather in their name. A congress is not a legislative body. We are so accustomed to speak of our Congress at Washington as the national legislature that we forget that the real sense of a congress is by no means a body empowered to make laws, and there is no body of men on God's earth that can make laws for a Baptist, that is, ecclesiastically speaking.

As I understand it, the Baptist is essentially one who believes that there should be no creed, no ecclesiastic organization between his soul and his Maker. He is bound always to liberty of conscience, to liberty of doctrine for himself. Again, he is one who believes that between his Church and his Maker there should be no creed binding him and no ecclesiastical authority controlling him, and so there is no body recognized by Baptists which will make laws that bind him or his church. And, the Northern Baptist Convention, which I have the honor to represent, is not a legislative body; it is simply a body which is the agent of the Baptist churches in this country in carrying on their common purposes more efficiently. It takes orders, it does not give them; it is the servant of the churches and the people, it is not their master; and whatever particular form of Baptist you are, I fancy you will find that you are that kind of a Baptist.

We welcome you then here because you are not a law-making body, making rules to control the consciences or the intellects of the people who form your constituency, but you are a congress in the proper sense of that term, i. e., a deliberative body; and we welcome you to Chicago because our city welcomes to its borders all who come with thoughts worthy of discussion.

And in this presence, one of the most important things in our churches is to be able to have a forum where we may meet and freely discuss the different subjects that engage our thoughts. We do not need as a result of that discussion to adopt resolutions; we do not need as a result of that discussion to make rules; we do not need as a result of that discussion to formulate creeds, but the air is always cleared by free discussion face to face. I have often found that people and groups of people grievously misunderstand one another and get into mutual dislike and ill-will, owing in a great number of cases to a mere lack of understand-

ing; and the best way for a mutual understanding is to come together and look one another in the face and say freely out what is in the heart, and nine out of ten people who mean the right thing, when they do that, will clear away the clouds of misconception and find that after all they are looking eye to eye toward the same glorious view.

And for that reason, then, we welcome this forum of free discussion of the great facts that engage the thoughts of all the people and all these kinds of Baptists. For all these reasons, then, Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen, on behalf of the citizenship of Chicago, I extend to this Congress a cordial welcome, a cordial greeting, and the good wishes of our citizens interested in the higher life and the higher things of this life, with the sincere hope that in these papers and discussions here presented we may reach nearer and nearer to truth, because after all truth lies at the basis of the life of our nation.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will listen now to an address of welcome by Bishop Fallows, who is not only a bishop of the Reformed Episcopal church, but the bishop of all of us; he is the bishop of this Christian community and therefore he represents this community in these words of welcome.

RIGHT REV. SAMUEL FALLOWS, D.D., LL.D.:

Mr. President, and Brethren of the Congress, and Ladies and Gentlemen: I am very much obliged for these gracious words which have fallen from the lips of your President, and I need not say how highly honored I feel in being the bishop of such a glorious body of men and women as I see before me this evening.

Now, there is one point in common between the Episcopalian—of the right kind, I mean (laughter)—and the Baptists, so far as regards former days. We both had to experience rather drastic treatment at the hands of the Puritans in the days of old. You know something about how it was with the one who was the champion of Baptist principles; and in a Boston newspaper, when Bishop Seabury had been consecrated the Bishop of Connecticut, there came this declaration: "The most wonderful thing beneath the sun! The Stamp Act in Boston and an Episcopal bishop in

Connecticut"—and we were not received with very much favor.

An eminent divine of the Church of England once said, "Plato is but the rudiment of an Adam and Aristotle the rubbish of Paradise." An eminent American clergyman said later, "Adam was but a raw possibility."

Chicago is the embodiment of all excellences in the view of some; in the view of others, like slavery, she is the sum of all villainies.

"Are you sanctified?" was asked by the good Bishop Hamline of the Methodist Episcopal church when the witty and brave proven preacher, Peter Cartwright, was indulging in some pleasantries at a session of the Illinois Conference. "Yes, Bishop," was the prompt reply of Cartwright, "in spots."

Chicago is sanctified in spots. She is not yet by any means perfect, but she is going on by degrees to perfection. And I can safely aver that she is sanctified in as many spots as any other city on the globe.

Over against our cardinal crimes, put our colossal charities; over against the repellent, yet needed, features of our stockyards, put our art museums; over against our seven thousand saloons, put our one thousand churches; over against the discordant cries of our streets, put the entrancing symphonies of our orchestral hall; over against the pull of our dives to draw our children down, put the pull of our common and parochial schools to draw them up; over against the materialistic tendency, of our Board of Trade, our manufactories, our dealings in stocks and bonds, our day-books and ledgers, put the idealistic and elevating teachings of our noble universities, diffusing continually "sweetness and light;" over against all the tendencies to ignorance and littleness of thought put our magnificent libraries with their garnered wealth of knowledge and the gracious and broadening influence of the elect leaders of mankind.

Thus while the forces of evil are astir the forces of good are not asleep. There are men in the ministry and in the laity who are armed *cap-à-pie* in the struggle for righteousness. They do not fight in intrenchments, but seek out the enemy and give him battle. The victory is not always theirs for the millennium has not yet come. But they never know when they are beaten,

but again and again and again re-form their lines and renew the onset. They know the battle is the Lord's and the issue in the end cannot be doubtful.

Christian Chicago realizes that the whole world is at its doors. Every language under heaven is uttered in its ears. Every church is a missionary church. The fields are already white unto the harvest. The devout petition of every pastor is, "Lord send forth more laborers into thy harvest."

I need not say that we all of every faith fully recognize the great work the Baptist churches are doing for the welfare of the city. They are among the foremost in every movement to establish and enlarge the one kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. They are true to the gospel teachings and heroic life of Roger Williams. They ring out his war cry, "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." They echo the words of Wayland Hoyt, "I am a Christian first and a Baptist next."

And what is true of the Baptists is also true of the Disciples of Christ in their supreme loyalty to the great Head of the church. No king's pen-knife for them has cut out any leaves from the Book of God and the Book of man. An un mutilated Bible is in their hands. They stand foursquare to all the world in proclaiming their belief in the one indivisible word from Genesis to Revelation. They have set the pace for us all in their earnest and triumphant evangelism. Alexander Campbell with his passion for souls is yet preaching in their pulpits. And

The old time religion
Is good enough for me,

is the rapturous song of its incoming multitudes, as,

Exults the rising soul
Disburdened of its load
And swells unutterably full
Of glory and of God.

Therefore, brethren praying fervently for the Spirit of the living God to lead you into all truth, I now with all my heart, and yet voicing but too feebly the sentiments of the entire Christian community of Chicago, give you a most hearty welcome to our hospitable city.

REV. JOHN L. JACKSON, D.D.:

It becomes my duty and my pleasure to thank these gentlemen for these gracious words of welcome with which they have greeted the Congress. Chicago has a well-earned reputation for hospitality—for hospitality to persons and hospitality to ideas. I am sure that she will not fail to show herself at her best on this occasion.

I have known something about this Congress for some years, about the Baptist side of this Congress, at least, and all I know is to its honor. It is true that sometimes it comes into a city and stirs up the churches, the pastors and the community, but it does all this in the most charming way possible and with the very loftiest of purposes. It always proceeds with the presupposition that there is something more to learn and something better to do, and then it tries, in a humble way, to join forces with all those powers that are making for enlightenment and for inspiration.

This I think is true, that when this Congress closes its sessions, generally, and I may say always, it carries with it the good will of the community and the city where it has built its broad platform. We do not mean that all accept its opinion, but we mean this: That those who come to listen are interested and profited, and go away with kinder sympathies and with a broader vision. I am sure that every great denomination requires just such a broad and free platform as we have here. Certainly Baptists and Disciples do, for we believe in liberty of opinion and we demand the right to express our opinion. There are many questions, religious, ethical, social, and civic, which we cannot bring to our state and national conventions, which we can most fittingly discuss on a platform like this. And I am satisfied that even the birth of our new Northern Baptist Convention will not take away from this Congress its peculiar function, its great prerogative.

Not only does every denomination need a platform of this character, but it is helpful to every community occasionally to have a gathering of this kind. I think I can safely say that into whatsoever city this Congress has ever come it has always inspired the minds of the citizens with high and lofty thinking. It certainly serves a great purpose, if it leads men to forget for

a time their pursuit of wealth and of pleasure and to center their attention upon the great problems of religion and of social obligation. Everywhere and always this Congress has done that.

I remember, eleven years ago, when we welcomed this Congress to Chicago, that after the closing of its sessions those themes lingered in our hearts and on our lips for many, many days. We discussed them in our ministers' conferences. We preached them from our pulpits. We talked about them in our prayer meetings. I am sure that taken all in all the influence of that gathering was most beneficent. Hence these brethren may well welcome again this noble organization to this city and to the Northwest.

As you all know, the unique feature of this Congress is that we have gathered here as representatives of three great denominations. We have come together in all seriousness to ask ourselves if we cannot come into closer fellowship. First of all, we must come to know each other, and where else can we begin this friendship more satisfactorily than in this Congress? Where else could we meet more fittingly than in this building where I think we have the first illustration of the union of two great churches in these two denominations? We call it the Memorial Church, and it may be a memorial for these denominations for many years to come. We have come here honestly and fairly to discuss this question, and we wish to hear both sides of it, for there are two sides to it.

I attended our Baptist state convention a few days ago and I heard some earnest words of protest against this union. There are some things to be said on that side, but many things can be said in favor of putting aside as soon as possible these differences and coming together in the fellowship of a common service.

I remember to have read of a woman who attended an auction. Crowded into one corner she saw a piece of furniture offered for sale which she wanted. She bid two dollars. Somebody off in another corner bid two dollars and a half. She bid three dollars; three and a half, was bid on the other side. She thought that all it was worth, and shook her head. The auctioneer said, "Going, going, gone. Knocked down to Mr. Jonathan Jones." The woman cried out, "Jonathan Jones! Why, he is my husband."

Then she turned and said, "Why, you old fool, you have been bidding against your wife!" (laughter).

Now, I think, brethren, we have been bidding against each other long enough. Let us strike hands and march forward under the banner of the Lord of Hosts.

We are to hear now a short report from the treasurer of the Congress, Dr. Matteson.

Dr. Matteson then briefly presented the financial needs of the Congress. An offering was received.

BISHOP FALLOWS: I wish to state to the audience that I should like to stay and hear the rest of these important proceedings, but I am due at another important Baptist convention on the West Side this evening.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will sing once more before we commence with the next part of the programme. Let us rise and sing Hymn No. 654, the first, second, and fifth stanzas.

(The Congress arose and sang the hymn)

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We are now prepared to proceed with the discussion of the theme of the evening, "What Are the Legitimate Limits of Free Speech in a Republic?" The first writer is Hon. Wallace Heckman of this city.

HON. WALLACE HECKMAN (Free Baptist), Chicago, Ill., read the following paper:

WHAT ARE THE LEGITIMATE LIMITS OF FREE SPEECH IN A REPUBLIC?

It might be replied in brief that its limit is at slander and libel, treasonable, immoral utterances, and such as incite to crime.

Speech, the expression of opinion or the communication of thought, is so obviously a part of the simple act of living, the natural exercise of the faculties, that its fullest and freest use outside of obviously essential limitations seems to be a primary right, such as that of self-preservation. In its exercise the highest pleasure is participated in by multitudes and enthusiasms created which remain happy inspirations to high purpose and noble action. Such was Henry's consuming appeal to the Virginians, Washington's poised far-seeing farewell address, Webs-

ter's overwhelming reply to Hayne, Lincoln's unanswerable arraignment of the right of men to buy and sell other men. A foremost dynamic force, it makes up a large part of daily life, and more and more so as intelligence and advantages of culture extend until the supreme joy is reached in conversation between congenial spirits, each enriching the other with new thoughts and fresh inspirations. Is it not astonishing that in large communities this natural and supreme right—the right of speech—is regarded as a gift from the sovereign and limited to the terms of the grant? One may there speak what he has been granted permission to say and on topics which he has granted permission to speak about. In art, in music, in literature, in all that goes to make up civilized life, the better part of the Russian people are advanced to a high degree of culture, but if we were under Russian law half of us would by tomorrow be trudging wearily toward inhospitable Alaska for recalling to each other the delights of speech and defending the natural right to its enjoyment. In progressive Germany they did not, until Maximilian Harden set the example last week, discuss the government or emperor.

In a republic the fullest freedom is afforded as a check on the conduct of the men in office, limited only against injury to others or the public. Law is public opinion enacted into statute; the limitation of public utterance is a limitation founded in public opinion.

Here comment, criticism, censure, praise of public men and public affairs are part of the daily thoughts of the intelligent citizen, which give to life its freshness and variety. The citizen has a clear right freely to discuss the principles and form of government, to arraign with fair argument the officers, executives, and magistrates, but not to libel them or hold them up to indiscriminate contempt. This right has been painfully guarded and its product is free government in which it is bedded as a cornerstone.

The federal constitution provides (Art. 1) that "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press," and the constitution of Illinois, that "every person may freely speak, write and publish on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that liberty. . . . And in all trials for libel,

both civil and criminal, the truth when published with good motives and for justifiable ends shall be a sufficient defense." Government by the people would be impossible without this freedom, and yet a no less distinguished jurist than David Dudley Field asserted that "if a constitutional provision on the subject of the press is needed at all it is for its restraint instead of its protection" (*International Review*, July-August, 1876). In the course of an article on this subject Mr. Field said:

The condition of the newspaper press of this country is a subject of constant observation and constant complaint. Nobody defends it. The newspapers themselves deplore it. . . . Jefferson said in his time that the press was putrid. It has since become putrescence putrified. The first effect is to make cowards of nine-tenths of our public men. . . . Our law of libel, it must be confessed, is imperfect and our administration of it still more so. It is generally assumed that the truth of a story is a sufficient reason for publishing it. The assumption is wrong. . . . There are many cases where the truth should not be published. Everywhere else in the world reputation is protected. It is only here that it has lost all protection. The practical result of a civil trial for libel nowadays is a reversal of positions and a trial of the plaintiff upon his general character instead of a trial of the defendant for libel.

Jefferson had reason to know something of the treatment accorded by newspapers of his time, for it was on the charge of libeling him that *Croswell* was indicted. *Croswell* published in the *Wasp*, a Federal newspaper, in 1802, that Jefferson paid Callender for calling Washington a traitor, a robber, and a perjurer; for calling Adams a hoary-headed incendiary; and for most grossly slandering the private character of men whom he knew to be virtuous. In this celebrated case Alexander Hamilton, jealous of the right of free speech, volunteered as counsel for the defendant, and, though defeated, conducted the case with consummate skill.

According to President Cleveland, conditions had not improved in 1885. He said (*Keppler letter*, December 12, 1885):

I have just received your letter with the newspaper clipping which caused you so much annoyance. I do not think there ever was a time when newspaper writing was so general and so mean as at present, and there never was a country under the sun where it flourished as it does

in this. The falsehoods daily brought before the people in our newspapers, while they are proofs of the mental ingenuity of those engaged in newspaper work, are insults to the American love for decency and fair play, of which we boast.

Again at Harvard (November 8, 1886) he said:

This trait of our national character would not encourage, if their extent and tendency were fully appreciated, the silly, mean and cowardly lies that every day are found in the columns of certain newspapers which violate every instinct of American manliness and with ghoulish glee desecrate every sacred relation of private life.

In fostering liberty of the press perhaps we have forgotten or are forgetting necessary vitally essential limitations. Its abuses are astounding. To such proportions have the evils of newspaper sensationalism grown that a national libel law is advocated and federal postal control invoked. The evil does not stop at individuals. The public, the children, and that large fraction of the members of society who are in a sense the wards of the strong, are its innocent victims. As a modern critic has recently said:

The sensational newspapers have done many things which our ancestors would have thought impossible. They have enormously increased the number of those who know crime in all its forms by putting before children the faces of murderers and of fallen women, by vivid presentations of the rooms in which crimes have been committed, by graphic portrayals of nude bodies, decapitated legs, fragments of legs and arms; by blood stains on walls, tools of burglary; bludgeons and pistols with which men have been put to death. These journals rapidly train children to speak the language and understand the methods of criminals of all sorts. It means a great increase of criminals in the future and a bumper harvest for these same criminal journals.

Under the provision of this clause of the Constitution the government itself is assailed and its extinguishment boldly advocated. This right, like other natural rights, is bounded by those "restrictions on the actions of each individual which the supreme power of the state enforces in order that all of its members may follow their occupations with greater security." Its history is interesting. In the defense of Thomas Paine, Lord Erskine said, "There is one country [meaning England] where man can fairly exercise

his reason on the most important concerns of society, where he can boldly publish his judgment on the acts of the puissant and most powerful tyrants." "The liberty of the press," exclaimed Curran, "that sacred palladium which no influence, which no power, no minister, no government, which nothing but the depravity, or folly, or corruption of a jury can ever destroy."

Speech [said Charles James Fox] ought to be completely free. The press ought to be completely free. When any man may write and print what he pleases, though he is liable to be punished if he abused that freedom, this is perfect freedom. . . . I have never heard of any danger arising to a free state from the freedom of the press or freedom of speech. So far from it, I am perfectly clear that a free state cannot exist without both. It is not a law that is to be found in books that constitutes, that has constituted, the true principles of freedom in any country at any time. No, it is the energy, the boldness of a man's mind which permits him to speak not in private, but in large and popular assemblies, that constitutes, that creates in a state the spirit of freedom.

Give me but the liberty of the press [said Sheridan] and I will give to the minister a venal house of peers. I will give him a corrupt and servile house of commons. I will give him the full swing of the patronage of office and of ministerial influence. I will give him all the power that place can confer upon him to purchase by submission and overawe resistance, and yet, armed with the liberty of the press, I will go forth to meet him undismayed. I will attack the mighty fabric he has raised with that mightier engine. I will shake down from its height corruption and bury it beneath the ruins of the abuses it was meant to shelter.

In a free country [said Patterson] the rule should be that each citizen shall have all but the widest scope and encouragement to make his country's business his own, to communicate his opinion on every detail of its multifarious affairs, and of the officers in charge of it, as well as to know where his freedom in this particular ends and where the firm hand of irresistible authority commands silence.

No hard and fast rule has been found to define the full right of the individual, or the precise language which he may use in a particular instance, or which may on the other hand produce injurious results. The law has reposed injuries the province of judging what, in a particular instance, is an infraction of the law, and on the other hand charges a defendant with that knowledge which the average citizen possesses of that just line where right

ceases and the wrong begins. Thus, the calm, deliberate, public opinion is the measure of the right. The judgment of the average citizen determines the law.

As Wedderburn declared, "Libel is founded entirely upon public opinion. There is no other standard by which it can be measured or ascertained. Who then so proper as the people to determine the point?" (16 *Parl. Hist.*, 1294). And Camden, "Who shall have the care of the liberty of the press—the judges or the people of England? The jury are the people of England" (29 *Parl. Hist.*).

Libels are often judged by their effect rather than the language, and stirring men's passions and leading them to violent courses of conduct is sometimes deemed the gist of the offense (22 St.—357). As an eminent English authority said:

The difficulty of defining seditious libels, the law restraining them, the law that teaches how to foresee and avoid them, would often be inscrutable if it were not that in all cases it rests with the jury, that is to say, with a certain number of fellow-citizens of the accused fairly selected and capable of judging the dangers of too great liberty, and of tyranny on the other hand, to decide not only what is the fact, but what is the law. No man can be found guilty of exceeding the limit of free speech without this judgment of his community in some form.

In England, as Lord Erskine observed since Fox's Act, "Nothing is punished criminally as libel unless in the opinion of twelve honest, independent, and intelligent men it is mischievous and ought to be punished. . . . Speaking to a jury is in a manner speaking to a nation at large and flying for sanctuary to its universal justice."

The trial of Hone in 1818 was an example of the power of juries in the adjustment of common law and circumstances. Hone was tried three times in succession for "blasphemous libels." The judges told the jury in plain terms that they were blasphemous libels, but the defendant, without any assistance of counsel, persuaded the jury that the object was not profane, but political, and each of the juries in succession, after retiring, gave a verdict of not guilty.

So strictly is this doctrine held to that injunctions against libel, asked for on the ground of property being injured, have

been refused for the reason that juries only, and not courts, can decide whether a statement is libelous.

The departures from this rule of the final judgments of juries upon questions of libel and sedition are limited to, first, the line of decisions corrected by Fox's Act; second, the Act of Parliament of March, 1817, known as "The Seditious Meeting Act," limited in its operation for the period of a single year; third, "The Seditious Act" from December 24, 1819, for five years (Bentham, Vol. II, p.—); fourth, "The Sedition Act," passed by Congress April 30, 1790, to be in force to March 4, 1801.

Modern instances are not lacking of the adjustment of the rule to circumstances. During the rebellion, even in the most orderly part of the North, public opinion found one way or another of suppressing unpatriotic utterances. Over-confident freedom of the press both North and South was made to feel the power of this control in the demolition of printing plants or their military occupation, as in the case of the *Chicago Times* in the winter of 1862.

Some libels are excused for the reason that they are committed in the course of some lawful occupation which ranks higher in the general estimation by being a benefit to greater numbers than the injury done, which is usually confined to one person only.

Lord Ellenborough, chief justice, said:

Every person who publishes a book commits himself to the judgment of the public and any one may comment on his performance. Ridicule and contempt may be awarded without limit, but imputation of fraud, immorality, or corruption, bordering on crime, make the critic amenable to an action of libel. . . . There are privileged occasions and privileged communications. An attack made upon another's reputation by one who is not at the time engaged in any business of his own which the law protects is libel.

The candidate for public office invites investigation of his life and character. The Municipal Voters' League of this city was organized some twenty years ago. It had no special authority. At first by the selection from each ward of representative citizens who should take the initiative in looking after municipal matters, and later consisting of an executive committee which selects year

after year their own successors, it took upon itself the task of breaking up the organized corruption in the common council of the city, then notoriously corrupt, impudently purchasable, hilariously indifferent to charges of corruption. The league assumed the duty of gathering information as to the character, occupation, means of livelihood, sources of revenue, and real purposes and ambitions of aldermanic candidates. The vast task of making this investigation of some four hundred members of the community each year, having the information so verified that it was safe to make assertions which frequently caused candidates to withdraw their names, and others to menace the members of our committee with lawsuits for large sums, has been for many years bravely assumed and assiduously and insistently and thoroughly performed, and that too by men who are not indifferent to their financial risks, and some of whom have been men of reasonably substantial fortunes. They rely on, first, the truthfulness of their reports, on which they spare no time or labor to make complete and just; second, that no purpose shall exist in their work except to give the public accurate information concerning the characters of candidates for this responsible public office; third, the fairness of the public press, the justice and honesty of the average citizen who might ultimately be called on the jury to pass upon their conduct, the adequate public purpose which they seek to serve and the efficiency, industry, and impartiality with which they serve it. In its early history the committee of the league trenched consciously close upon the limit of their legal privilege in these public utterances and damage suits piled up by angry plaintiffs, but no one flinched and no judgment was ever gotten.

In contrast with this and the resultant public service rendered by the league will be noted the riotous ebullitions in 1882 of the men who pretended to espouse the cause of labor, the men who invoked and brought on the riots of 1877. The Haymarket murders were the natural and logical outgrowth of these utterances. The friends of Parsons, Spies, Schwab, Fielden, and the rest have always endeavored to carry the impression that these men were simply exercising the right of free speech, that their prosecution was for a species of political crime. Neither asser-

tion has any foundation in fact. This case deserves special attention in this connection. The defendants through their speeches and newspapers were engaged in the advocacy of a propaganda. Note some examples of their utterances:—

[March 2, 1885] That thing [that happened in Philadelphia] could not have happened in Chicago without placing on exhibition on the telegraph wires and cornices of houses a dozen cadavers of policemen in pieces for each broken skull of a workman. This is due solely to the revolutionary propaganda carried on here.

[March 23] Each working-man ought to have been armed long ago. Daggers and revolvers can easily be obtained. Hand grenades are cheaply produced. Explosives too can be obtained. . . . [April 8] A number of strikers in Quincy yesterday fired upon their bosses and not upon the scabs. This is recommended most emphatically for imitation. The working-men ought to take aim at every member of the militia. . . . Working-men arm yourselves! [May 7] Before you lies this blissful Eden, the road to which leads over the smoking ruins of the old world. Your passport to it is that banner which calls to you in flaming letters—the word “Anarchy.” [June 20] . . . To this end we must be wolves and as such we need sharp teeth. Working-men arm yourselves! [October 5, 1885] No day should pass without a report heard from one place or another of the finding of a carcass of one of the Pinkertons. [January 23, 1886] Therefore, comrades, aim to the death. [May 2, 1886] The order-scoundrels beamed yesterday in their full glory. Who wants to attack capitalism in earnest must overthrow the bodyguards about it. [November 29, 1884] Nothing but an uprising of the people and the bursting open of all stores and storehouses to the free access of the public and the free application of dynamite to everyone who opposes will relieve the world of this infernal nightmare of property and wages. [November 29, 1884] Parson’s Resolutions. The Black Flag. . . . Resolved that no man shall pay for anything or receive pay for anything or deprive himself of what he may desire that he finds out of use or vacant. . . . None can eat more than he ought under any system, or wear more than one suit of clothes at a time, or occupy more than one house. . . . As this system cannot be introduced against existing ignorance, selfishness, and distrust without the force of arms and strong explosives, therefore, be it resolved that when all stores, storehouses, vacant tenements and transporting property are thrown open and held open to the free access of the general public, the good of mankind and the saving of people requires that all forcible opposition should be dealt with summarily. [January 13, 1885] It is clearly more

humane to blow ten men into eternity than to make ten men starve to death. [February 21, 1885] Dynamite—of all the good stuff this is the stuff. Stuff several pounds of this sublime stuff into an inch pipe, block up both ends, insert a cap with a fuse, place this in the immediate neighborhood of a lot of rich loafers who live on the sweat of other people's brows and light the fuse. . . . A pound of this good stuff beats a bushel of ballots. [April 18, 1885] The present government must be destroyed. . . . No government can exist without a head and by assassinating the head just as fast as a government head appears, the government can be destroyed, and by this same process all other government can be kept out of existence. . . . He alone is free who submits to no government. All governments are domineering powers and any domineering power is a natural enemy to all mankind. . . . Assassinations will remove the evil from the face of the earth. . . . Assassination properly applied is wise, just, humane, and brave. For freedom all things are just. [April 26, 1886] Schwab: For every working-man who has died through the pistol of a deputy sheriff let ten of these executioners fall. Arm yourselves! [October 11, 1885] Spies: To make the movement in which they are engaged a successful one it must be a revolutionary one. [February 26, 1885] Parsons: I say to you, Arise one and all and let us exterminate them all. Woe to the police or the militia whom they send against us! [March 29, 1885] Fielden: A few explosives in the city of Chicago would help the cause considerably. [February 1886] Engel: Save up \$3.00 or \$4.00 to buy a revolver that is good enough for shooting a policeman down.

Following these and other like utterances by the defendants Mathias J. Degan was killed in the Haymarket by the explosion of a bomb. After a careful trial, in which the defendants were most ably represented, they were found guilty and the Appellate and Supreme Courts, after great deliberation and careful study and examination of the evidence, confirmed the judgment. Since the abolishment of the distinction between an accessory before the fact and principal, these were plain cases of murder by the oldest, most accepted definition. Sad as their supreme sentence was and always must be to the humane, public opinion has almost unanimously recognized that so long as the death penalty is inflicted for any crime the existence of law and order required it here; and yet annually there are gathered at the graves of these misguided unfortunates a company of men and women who allege that they were hanged unjustly and for a political crime and that

their execution was a violation of the guaranty of the constitution of the right of free speech. They ignore the condition of the guaranty of the Illinois constitution, that "every person may freely speak, write, and publish on all subjects, *being responsible for the abuse of that liberty.*" Similar groups are even now urging like extreme and revolutionary doctrine and propaganda in this and other cities. Not long ago the writer was invited to address an assembly of men and women whom he found to be the true descendants of propagandists of the 80's, preserving with the zeal of vestal virgins the smoldering fires of this their religion of disorder, utter denial of property right or the necessity or desirability of the maintenance of what they term the mere conventionality of marriage. I do not know that there is any menace to the peace and order of society in it, but in all this riotous freedom some lines are beginning to make themselves seen. There is an awakened realization of the importance in the community of an enlightened public opinion; a discovery that moral and religious education which formerly accompanied scientific, literary, and artistic culture under the direction of religion, when education was more or less the province of the church and churchmen, as in England, and as formerly was the case even in this country, has now ceased. By the progress, and it is real progress, that has been made education is practically under the control of the state from the graded to the high school and from the normal school to the university. Provisions deemed essential to the preservation of our form of government have prescribed religious education in the schools and up to now the moral education formerly developed under the co-operation of the churches and the churchmen has found no equivalent or adequate substitute. The generation which is coming up under this changed condition is an experiment. The children of one of our public schools not long ago defied discipline by well-organized strike methods. These boys and girls will shortly direct and constitute the public opinion which shall gauge the moral atmosphere of the future, compose the juries that shall sit in judgment on these questions, and constitute that calm opinion which shall determine the law and measure relatively the moral standards of this in comparison with other nations. This new time imposes on the churches obli-

gations of the gravest nature and raises the question whether it does not require co-operation between all the churches in some such manner as that in which you are here assembled. It was precisely along this line which that great, farsighted educator, President Harper, reasoned when he formulated with others the organization of the Religious Education Association. It was to meet this special need, it was to take advantage of sound co-operation of these great influences and vastly multiply their efficiency by joint action. This inspiration of his was timely and farsighted and ought to be fruitful of advantage to the nation, comparable with that of Charles Eliot Norton at the crisis of the war—that striking instance of the power of the press upon opinion and its wise use. In 1861, when defeats were disheartening the North and Union apathy weighed heavily on the heart of the great President, Professor Norton conceived the plan of conserving and increasing patriotic sentiment and courage. A phenomenal master himself in the command of English and attached to the Union with an ardent devotion, he sought a medium of communication with those like-minded. He organized the Loyal Publication Society of America. It consisted of Professor Norton, director; John Murray Forbes (who so long stood for Chicago in Boston and for Boston in Chicago), fund finder; and Miss Thayer, secretary and office editor. They subscribed for and took all the daily and weekly papers in the United States. With a staff of readers they read them through and selected and reprinted, with acknowledgment of the sources, every loyal ringing courageous editorial. These they mailed free in broadside form (convenient copy for the country editors) to every paper. Accompanying it was the offer of the material for free use in the columns of the receiving paper and the whole was each week reinforced by a special editorial, usually Mr. Norton's own. Presently these editorials began to be republished by the other newspapers throughout the land and so the expression of the loyal opinion of the nation was encouraged and multiplied to an extent no man can measure. "We had one controlling principle," Professor Norton said. "We stood by Lincoln through thick and thin." This simple plan of work persisted in stout-heartedly, with unflagging courage throughout the varying fortunes of that

great controversy, with patient good judgment and unwearied zeal, touched and opened the very fountains of national hope and courage.

No period has made a more urgent call upon the churches, the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, the sodalities, Christian leagues in schools and universities, church men's clubs and social unions, to supplement the education of the schools. Measure, if you are able to, the full development of education in the West within the lifetime of our university, the developed efficiency of the state universities, and all the graded, high, and normal schools that lead up to them and their progressive correlation, beside the equal growth of private schools. How shall this scientific propaganda be infused with spiritual and moral energy, and how shall our religious life avail itself of the advantages of all this educational and cultural development and scientific growth?

Practical means are being found to curb the evils that attend free speech. The government is scrutinizing with greater care, and will, and should increasingly, the newspapers which are admitted to the mails. The evil, the ignorant, the degenerate should find a boundary where they may not offend public morals. Vicious greed, even in the form of a great newspaper, should be denied any profitable use of the postal service which renders that service offensive to decency. The newspaper which advocates violence or disorder should be held responsible for the act which follows the advice. It is manifestly unfair, as it is illogical, to permit papers to encourage violence and incendiarism and then, when the mob has burned millions of dollars of property as here in the riots of the 70's and 80's, compel the city and the citizens in general to bear the loss. The state guarantees freedom of speech and imposes responsibility for its exercise. Advancing intelligence will require, as Mr. David Dudley Field advocated, that the name of a responsible individual appear for every newspaper registered, and that the name of the writer be put at the foot of every article in which reflection is cast on the character of any person. Its responsibility, penal and financial, are the basis of its right and power. On this responsibility reposes its legal right.

The penalties and influence of the community outside the statute are considerable. As President Hadley recently observed,

The modern newspaper has supplemented the political meeting, the lecture platform, the courts of law, and other institutions as the agent in forming public opinion and the means of educating the average man. . . . We cannot [he well concludes] have responsible and rational government unless we secure a responsible, sober press, and we cannot have such a press unless the readers learn to demand those qualities and resent dishonesty, deception, and unfairness in the newspapers they patronize.

It rests with the community, the men in the pulpit and the patrons of the press to give direction and require control of those multitudinous issues increasingly spread broadcast and out of which comes at last public opinion and the law. By exclusions from the mails, enforcement of severe responsibilities, financial and penal, the enlightenment of public opinion, and discriminating patronage, fit limit is laid down consistent with the advantages of free speech.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The next writer on this theme is Professor James Q. Dealey, of Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island. Will Mr. Dealey please take the platform?

PROFESSOR JAMES Q. DEALEY, PH.D., Rhode Island, presented the following paper:

WHAT ARE THE LEGITIMATE LIMITS OF FREE SPEECH IN A REPUBLIC?

In these days it is not necessary to vindicate, as a principle, the right of free speech. Our forefathers fought out that battle so well that the citizens of every nation enjoying liberty have the right to express their thought freely within reasonable bounds. This freedom implies not simply the right to speak in public and private but also the right to use the press and the mails for the broader dissemination of thought.

Naturally there are variations in the amount of liberty granted in different parts of the world, but this variation is not determined by the form of government but by local conditions, since there are monarchies freer than some republics. The term republic,

however, as used in the question before us, implies a government of comparatively liberal institution like our own, with a trend in the direction of larger freedom.

Our constitutions, national and local, expressly guarantee to us freedom of speech, and what few limitations there are may be found embodied in acts and statutes in respect to libel, slander, and conspiracy. The courts in their decisions distinguish between liberty and license, and hold to the principle that no citizen through his freedom has the right to injure his fellow, or to disturb the public peace. The presumption is always in favor of freedom, so that even when a citizen is nearer license than liberty he is assumed to be innocent of evil intent, and is given the benefit of nine points in the law. Juries hesitate to convict even in gross forms of license, such as incitement to violence and the circulation of obscene literature. Though such offenses are unlawful and against the peace and good morals of the state, they are more usually left to be dealt with by public opinion, in preference to fine or imprisonment. This latitude of course finds further expression in our legal recognition of privileged persons and places, as, for instance, the greater freedom of speech permissible in halls of legislation and justice, and to a less extent in political campaigns. Using this principle of the law as a basis for comparison, we can now consider whether it also holds true in that large sphere of social life not covered by the law. The principle, it will be remembered, assumes freedom of speech, with few limitations, these limitations being neutralized in the case of privileged persons and places, and rarely enforced against others.

This principle of freedom, it should be said, is in quite full accord with sociological teaching. In rude civilization there are numerous prohibitions on individual conduct, and these are enforced by stern punishment. As civilization advances, these *tabus* of all sorts give place to regulations, and these grow less detailed as progress is made. In higher civilizations regulations are generalized, and attention devoted to the development of a type of personality that will need neither prohibition nor regulation. In a free republic, as all men are by theory capable of comprehending their rights and obligations, prohibitions and

regulations of speech almost reach the vanishing point, for free men should have free speech. Even though a few unused to freedom should misuse their privilege, we deem it wiser to let them do so, than to place irksome restrictions on the many who use their freedom with moderation. As a general proposition it is deemed wiser to allow men to voice their grievances than to suppress them. Some men are like some women; the more freely they are allowed to talk of their griefs, the happier they become.

Although our political fathers, under the influence of the idealism of the eighteenth century, wisely placed this principle of freedom in the constitution, it is somewhat doubtful whether even yet public opinion is prepared to apply it to all aspects of life, except in purely academic questions. Suppose, for example, that a person should learnedly argue that neither Shakspeare nor Bacon, but Queen Elizabeth, wrote the Shaksperian plays, the literary world would be interested, possibly amused, but the writer of the new theory would run no risk of being asked to resign. If, by contrast, a man avows a belief in economic heresies, shall we say "free silver" for example, let him beware; even a college president can hardly do that with impunity. Can a man openly confess himself to be in politics an anarchist or a socialist, and maintain his place in what we may euphemistically call "respectable society"? Does not an atheist suffer in social estimation because of his belief? May a person hold "advanced views" in respect to marriage and divorce, or advocate moderate drinking, and maintain a reputation for religion and morality? Yet presumably a man might hold all of these or similar heresies, and remain a good man, an excellent citizen, and be religious at heart.

Now the reason for the failure to apply the principle of free speech to those aspects of life not covered by the law seems clear enough, when one takes into account the economic conditions of life and the natural inertia of the human mind. If a man is hired by a corporation, he is not supposed to exercise his freedom of speech by criticizing its methods or working against its interests. He has that privilege if he will first resign. By analogy this hired-man theory is made to apply to other occupations also. Any

person who receives compensation for services is a hired man. A politician therefore must not criticize the party that gives him office; the minister or theological teacher must work for his denomination; the editor must not voice his own opinions but those of the management; the college teacher must not express any views that may hinder endowments or deprive the institution of patronage. No one of these must acknowledge that the goods sold over the counter of the opposition, are to be compared in quality with the excellent "embalmed beef" he is hired to sell. Presumably a certain amount of this sort of thing is inevitable and necessary. In a transitional age of civilization like this, when the old and the new exist side by side, each may well insist on its right to survive and take proper precautions to that end. Furthermore many persons are well satisfied to be hired on such conditions. Life is a constant struggle at best, and an assured pay-day deadens radicalism and heresy. If, therefore, a person is plainly hired to teach a set of teachings, or to advocate a certain policy as against rival systems, he should do so or resign. By contract he surrendered his right to free thought, and he has no business to claim that and his salary besides. Free speech and hire are incompatible, and a man must choose which he wants.

But the human mind readily adjusts itself to beliefs allied with financial returns; a person who desires his wage and the appearance of freedom too should try to persuade himself that he is holding great principles taught by better and wiser men in the past. The shibboleth of party platform, historic creed, and accepted truth, is always a popular test of capacity, and a man can get a greater reputation for intellectuality by teaching the old than by advocating the new. A person in fact can do this sort of thing without conscious deception. The mind often seems to be free when it is really a slave to environment. If a person is trained to routine and fixed beliefs, and his mentality molded to what may be found in print or in commonly accepted customs and traditions, his thought is mere repetition, his mind works in grooves, and cannot get out of its accustomed ruts. Yet he seems to think, he thinks he is thinking, and he probably supposes that he has thought out his conclusions, which singularly enough harmonize with those of other great men he has studied

about. But why cast stones? Perhaps we all live in glass houses and the subject had better be changed.

Yet it seems a pity that this hired-man theory should be made applicable to the intellectual life at least. Admit that in the present stress and strain of economic life through sheer necessity men must frequently forget their freedom, and like soldiers serve without hesitation or question. Does it follow that the same compulsion is to hold in higher occupations? Should a responsible political officer be a slave to his constituency and to his party's platform? Is a minister *hired* by a church, and is he bound to preach denominational teachings only? Should a teacher assume that he is paid merely to teach conventional knowledge, or what an executive board may hint that he should teach? Should a judge in his decisions aim to please either trades unions or capitalistic interests by a squinting construction of the law? Should an editor of a great daily favor a man he despises, and advocate a policy he believes to be wrong? Is there such a thing as mental prostitution, worthy of greater condemnation under the principle of *noblesse oblige*? Certainly if the hired-man theory is to hold in these occupations, limitations innumerable will be placed on freedom of speech and the leaders of public opinion will be proclaiming "peace, peace, when there is no peace." Perhaps, however, our real anxiety should arise not from the case of the petty man who works for hire, nor from the great thinker whose opinions carry weight whenever expressed, but rather in respect to those who are too great to be petty and yet must fight for the right of freedom against those who consider them to be hired men. Their names do not carry a prestige that would win ultimate support against temporary loss, and when they become radical or heretical, it is difficult for an institution to be generous, since there is a tangible loss to balance against a problematical gain. Undoubtedly in many such cases the speaker is suppressed; he is quietly warned that his views are obnoxious, and that he better re-examine his arguments before he again announces his conclusions. Should he refuse to be amenable to suggestion, his salary may be reduced as a hint, he may be charged with a desire for notoriety, or his resignation may be demanded. These measures are usually effective. As a rule the

thinker is not great enough to rise above the storm he has made and he sinks into insignificance, broken and defeated. Shall we say that truth has been vindicated or the reverse? Unquestionably all such suppression is *prima facie* unjust. Not simply is the victim suppressed but scores of others, also, who fear to take the consequences of a stand like his. Peace has been secured, but at the price of liberty, established truth and institutionalism have been safeguarded, but at the expense of ultimate larger truth and a purified institutional life.

Yet as against a freedom limited by economic considerations there is a real freedom. Arrayed against the mercenary and the time-server is the man who is free because his speech is free. In economic life he works for the firm with his thought and conscience, and has the right within the business to protest against dishonest methods. In political office he serves his country, not his party; in the pulpit, his God, not a church; in the editor's or teacher's chair he proclaims the truth as he understands it, even though it may not harmonize with local or other interests. Such men may suffer reproach or hardship, or may seriously damage and even destroy a business, or a party's prospects, or the prosperity of a church or a college, but what of it? The occasional wreck and ruin of a petty interest, or the martyrdom of an individual, is amply atoned for by the idealism and thought contributed to society by men who are really free. It is far better to maintain freedom in life, even at the risk of monetary loss or human suffering. Freedom must be purchased with blood and anguish but it is worth the cost.

Surely in the mental world, when men receive compensation for services, there should be no suspicion of slavery in the contract. Free thought is too precious a heritage to weigh against dollars and cents. An institution or church that purchases its existence at the cost of freedom might better die for liberty and let thought be free. This should be true, even though we know that every thinker in his conclusions will present a mingled mass of truth, half truth, and error. Oh that men, when they think, would think truth only! But even though liberty may seem to become license, it is far better to adopt the practice of the law and not be too eager to bring railing accusations. Our prophets

and martyrs have always been put to death by the established order in the name of liberty and religion, and it may be that those we are most sure are wrong will be listed as great men when we are forgotten. Christ who would not call down fire from heaven on the village that had refused to receive him, and Gamaliel who advised against persecution lest they prove to be fighting against God, both believed that truth is its own best defender and needs no fallible censor who would burn wheat with the tares. If error is expressed, resist it with a larger truth, but never with threat and insinuation and excommunication. We, at least, citizens of the United States and members of bodies that believe in the freedom of the individual conscience, should be more afraid of an *index expurgatorius* than of "modernism."

But even if one were to grant the largest liberty to thinkers, there are still some natural limitations. The crank in due time goes to his own place, ignorance may grow wiser with age, and if greater men should utter teachings that to some or to many might seem immoral, untrue, and subversive of social order, the remedy lies not in a threat to withdraw economic support, but in the pressure of public opinion. Every man desires the approval of his class; the theologian desires the approval of his brethren, the scientist, of his fellows, and the philosopher, of other thinkers. Whatever others may think, he desires that these at least approve him. He might even be pleased at other opposition, provided his professional brothers approved his stand, if not his views. Rarely will a man run counter to his natural allies and defy public opinion *en masse*; but if he does, if he stands up before the world on platform or in pulpit or professional chair, and challenges the very foundations of belief and morality, let us not gnash at him with our teeth, for he speaks in a privileged place and is a privileged person. Whether he be fool or prophet we may not know, but if arraigned at all, he should be arraigned before the bar of reason, and not before executive committee or ecclesiastical council.

It is possible that questions of this sort would never arise if thinkers and institutions would adopt the scientific attitude of mind. In science all truth is relative, and a law or principle accepted today may be rejected tomorrow. Each scientist holds

his views subject to amendment or revision when necessity arises, nor has he a single teaching the truth of which may not be called in question. Under such conditions every new theory arouses interest; its reasonableness is looked at from many points of view, it may be attacked with acrimony and resisted by despairing men who see their pet theories threatened. It is, however, a battle of reason and facts, the best argument wins, and the loser himself advocates the winning hypothesis and starts over again in his search for truth.

By contrast, when a person assumes the perfection of law and government, or of family, church, or party, and argues that everything in opposition to the existing system is immoral, wicked, and subversive of the truth, he naturally prefers that there be some limitations on that kind of free speech, that seems to threaten the stability of his theoretically perfect system. Limitations on free speech are unnecessary when truth is in question. The need for new and better truth today is so clear that it is safer to give complete freedom, insisting merely that the discussion be free from vituperation, and that the participants have open minds; even when the newer teaching seems by implication to be immoral, it is better to prove it to be so than to indulge in denunciation; for newer truths often seem immoral to defenders of the old, who fail to see that a good may be opposed by a better.

The real remedy for license is not suppression, nor the multiplicity of limitation and regulation, but a generous policy of freedom, a love for truth wherever it may lead, and vigorous attempts to develop a type of personality, whose beliefs will not depend so much on distorted intellectualism or emotionalism, as on sterling character, trained intellect, and spiritual insight.

It is likely that we need to work away from the hired-man theory in our churches more than anywhere else. The college world has won for itself a fair amount of freedom; men like our President Roosevelt and Governor Hughes are not uncommon in political life; judges on the bench maintain as a whole a reputation for fairness in their decisions; and there is a free press, as well as a mercenary and a "yellow" journalism.

But in churches conditions are too often different. The ethics of church management is based on a theory of competition, not co-

operation and essential unity. There are so many churches that competition for membership and support is keen. There is a struggle for existence, and each in place of considering itself as an instrument for the attainment of larger ends, assumes that it is an end of itself, often to the neglect of more important needs. It therefore insists that its minister should work for its interests irrespective of larger demands, even though, as in Roman legend, it is often better to kill than to save, if a nobler purpose is thereby attained. The minister, accordingly, must devote himself to the task of building up the material interests of his church, and he expects promotion in proportion to his capacity to increase membership and income. This competitive struggle may to an extent be necessary, but the intensity of it belittles religious ideals and leads to expurgated teachings, since the more one tries to please the many, the more platitudinal must be his thought. Am I rash in saying that our highest and freest thought in the main comes today from sources other than the churches? Admitting as one should the useful work performed by the churches in teaching conventional morals and religion, is there not truth in the charge that the mass of the religious world views with suspicion its great leaders in thought, and casts out from its fellowship the newer movements in religion? If this be true, is it not because the average minister himself fails to think or to teach the larger thought of the times? "Like priest, like people": on one side his church urges him to consider local interests, on the other his religious leaders whip him into line for denominational interests, and if, perchance, he strays into other denominational pastures and finds the grass as good as the blue grass of Kentucky, his brethren shake their heads sadly and ask whether he studied theology at Union or Chicago.

Is not after all the demand for limitations on free speech in matters of religious belief due to the fact that ecclesiasticism and denominationalism have dethroned religion and set the form above the spirit? It is said that the last years of Sankey's noble life were embittered through the feelings aroused by his change of denomination. Like many others he had come to believe that the name of the regiment made small difference as long as it carried the national flag. Far better would it be if we could forget

during the remainder of the century all of our denominational differences, and, as idealists, exalt instead the great fundamental truths of a world religion that would ultimately bind in vital union the best spiritual life of the Orient and the Occident. I strongly suspect that if our churches for the next hundred years neglected to teach dogmatism and fixed systems of theology, and preferably federated themselves for the Christianizing of social conditions throughout the world, the gates of St. Peter would swing open just as widely and as often as now, and our children's children would be freed from an incubus that deadens Christian energy, and makes each church an arena for competitive struggle with kindred yet rival organizations.

In conclusion, may it not be that in order to save denominationalism we have placed too many limitations on religious liberty; and that even the body that through Roger Williams proclaimed on this hemisphere the doctrine of liberty, is not over-zealous in behalf of its offspring? When a brainy young man considers in these confusing times the claims of the ministry he hesitates long at the prospect. Our seminaries are more noted for their orthodoxy than for their breadth, and three years spent in such an atmosphere is not attractive; nor is the thought of the ordination council and its demands any more cheering; nor recognition services, fellowships, and the "approval of the brethren," so often negatively expressed by the shrug and the insinuation of unsoundness in the faith. Is it strange that men with a message and a vision turn aside for other ways, and leave the beaten path so often to the hired man? Stand by the principle of freedom, lessen rather than increase limitations, and while there may be some license mixed with liberty, there will also be wisdom and prophecy.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We are now to listen to two appointed speakers: first, Rev. Bayard Craig, D.D., of Denver, Colo.

REV. BAYARD CRAIG, D.D. (Disciple), Denver, Colorado:

Not being a lawyer it will be impossible for me to discuss this question in a technical way. In this matter I am a layman. I am looking at the question from the standpoint of the citizen, and will talk about it in a common-sense way rather than as a lawyer. (Laughter.)

The question, "What are the legitimate limits of free speech in a republic?" has but little to do with free speech in a religious convention or among students in university life, but in a republic as large as this, twice as large as this, with a great mass of ignorant people, with a great mass of criminal people, unrestrained speech of the evil-minded may work widespread devastation.

In a republic or under any form of government, individual freedom must be restricted; it must be held within the bounds of good citizenship. Our Constitution declares that no law shall be passed restraining the right of freedom of speech or of the press; nevertheless in this republic we have found it necessary to provide limitations. We do not permit the free man in the republic the unrestrained use of his property: he may not make his property a nuisance; he may not interfere with the rights of his neighbor; he may not use his property in a way to disturb the common peace of the common welfare. We do not permit him the unlimited use of his own person: he may not steal, he may not go naked in the streets, he may not commit an indecency.

For like reasons we restrain his freedom of speech. All weapons are in the hands of the orator. All the resources of men may be commanded by the orator for evil as well as for good, and we justly put limitations on the use of his great power.

It has been said here tonight that the Fathers had fought out this question. I think not. It is one thing to provide a republican form of government for a few millions of people burning with patriotism, and under the inspiration of that patriotism seeking to promote the common good. It is quite another thing to provide a democratic government for 80,000,000 or 100,000,000 people no longer purified by a flaming patriotism, when all evil passions assert themselves and where the very leaders of the people, led by lust of gold into a debased commercialism, lead the people by evil example into wrong paths. No, there are problems that we will have to fight out in this, our day.

We ought to remember also that a republic is peculiarly indulgent to the right of free speech. Lovers of liberty devised the republic to promote individual freedom. Through a thousand

years they fought hopelessly against the autocrat and the privileged classes, but their love for liberty was so relentless that a thousand years of defeat could not daunt them; they went on for another thousand years until they achieved the republic. When it was achieved, they realized that the weapon by which they had won was free speech and a free press. It is not strange then that the right of free speech should become the pet child of the republic; not strange that it should have a foremost place in the Bill of Rights for every would-be free man; and as free speech made the birth of the republic possible, we have learned by experience that free speech is also essential to its continued life and progress.

No republic is born perfect; it must learn to amend its constitution and improve its laws by the wisdom of experience, and free speech is necessary to a wholesome discussion that will lead to the discovery of wise remedies for the difficulties that may have developed and for the solution of new problems that rise to vex the people. As the right of free speech is thus found necessary to the birth and continued life of the republic it will be cherished and guarded with peculiar care. The republic is much more likely to be too indulgent in the matter of free speech than too strict in the matter of limitations.

Lawyers and lawmakers must formulate laws restrictive of free speech. I have some land out in the Rocky Mountains; I want to fence it. A part of it is fenced naturally by precipices of rock; in other places there are passes that must be carefully guarded. I do not expect to build the fence; I expect to give only general directions and let somebody else attend to the details. In this difficult subject it is enough to point out in a general way where limitations are needed as suggested by the history of the republic.

The government in its structure, its laws, and in the person of its representatives needs protection from the destructive speech of its own bad citizens. Any individual has the right to protect his own life; how much greater the right of a government to protect itself when the welfare of so many millions are involved in its stability!

The unrestrained speech of the anarchist and dangerous

fanatic has again and again caused riot and bloodshed in America, dire results that might have been averted by adequate and prompt legal restraint. We passed some stringent laws after the assassination of President McKinley and we had learned at an earlier date to apply limitations in the case of the Chicago anarchists. Our people are well satisfied that these limitations came none too soon and wise students of the situation anticipate still more stringent limitations to help control our ever-increasing criminal and dangerous people.

If Absalom's freedom of speech had been checked in time the kingdom of David might have been spared the revolution and Absalom have saved his own reckless life.

The government should be protected in the person of its representatives at home and abroad. Our courts are safe from the abuse of free speech that would destroy their standing and efficiency. Something of the same protection should be extended to all high government officers not to protect them from just criticism but, from the insults and abuse of the malicious and evil-minded.

The individual should be protected. The individual in the republic must give up much because his individual right is subordinate to the common good; but he has certain rights that should be carefully protected by the republic. The Englishman has made his house his castle. A citizen can claim no less in a republic. He ought to be protected in his home and private life; it ought to be free from invasion, even from the American enterprising newspaper reporter. I am not blaming the reporter nor am I blaming the editor that under the conditions of his times seeks to build up his paper as the laws and public sentiment permit. I am thinking of an ideal republic, and in that ideal republic I do not believe my fellow-citizen should have the privilege of laying in a stock of white paper, putting in a printing press and then, in order that he might sell that paper to the greatest possible advantage, send a reporter into my home to exploit private affairs in the life of myself or my family that are within the bounds of law, that do not concern the public, that would not benefit the public by publicity, but only add to the pain or humiliation or annoyance of the family circle invaded.

I know it is claimed the newspaper must have "news." We need a carefully considered definition of that technical term, "news," or it is likely soon to rival the word "liberty" as a shield for wrong. Commercial greed has no right to seize on a neighbor's private property in some sacred family incident because it can be converted into a good story and satisfy prurient curiosity.

A limitation is also needed to protect the people from the poison in the tongue of the bad citizen who would abuse the right of free speech. Back of the form of government is the great throbbing mass of humanity with their passions, their appetites, desires, activities and all that goes to make up their varied life. This great mass of people generate that potent thing we know as public sentiment. Public sentiment is the controlling power in a republic. It formulates the written laws and regulates by its unwritten laws. It is a great stream fed by a thousand rivulets and springs. The stream may be clear and wholesome or polluted and poisonous. The sources that feed the stream are the home, the school, the college, the church, the theater, the fraternal lodge-room, and above all in effect—the newspapers.

The health of the republic depends on the purity of public sentiment. To keep that sentiment pure its sources should be guarded. Free speech and a free press have a controlling influence in generating public sentiment; abused, they may lower the tone and destroy the high ideals essential to the life and welfare of the community. How can we maintain right ideals concerning the home and good morals if the theater makes a heroine of the prostitute?

Can good citizens in an ideal republic afford to be careless as to the effect the playhouse and the newspaper and these other sources that I have spoken of have on the formation of a right public sentiment? If they are poisoning public sentiment, there is a demand for some sort of a corrective. Whether that corrective shall be found by putting up the truth against the error, or whether it be found in formulated laws is not so important, so protection is accomplished.

How can we hope to maintain high ideals of life and living on the part of people, if the editors of our papers are permitted to rake the muck heaps of the world and supply their findings

for the daily mental bread of the people? How can we hope to maintain a correct and high public sentiment when the people's minds are filled with suggestions of evil in their daily readings of the scandals, vices, and crimes of the world?

I know the answer! It is said the people get just the newspaper that they want, just the plays that they ask for. Wouldn't it be truer to say that perverted appetite grows by what it feeds upon? The dealer in cigarettes creates the appetite that demands cigarettes; the dealer in drugs—morphine and cocaine and all other pernicious drugs—creates the appetite that he finally feeds. In old Rome they fed the people with the slaughter of the arena and the people learned to love the taste of blood and demanded that sort of entertainment. If we feed the people on the things that are mean and scandalous and vile and criminal, we create an appetite that demands that kind of food. Proper limitations would prevent the stream of public sentiment from thus becoming perverted to the injury of public morals and the structure of society.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We have just one more address to-night, and I am sure you will make a mistake if you go away before you hear the thoughtful and eloquent young pastor from Buffalo. I ask you to keep your seats if you will and listen for the few moments to be occupied in his address.

REV. CARL D. CASE, PH.D. (Baptist), Buffalo, N. Y.:

It is peculiarly fitting that the subject assigned should be discussed in a Baptist Congress. Nowhere else in the denomination is there such opportunity for unlimited free speech as here. As was said in the joint conference this afternoon, nothing is too sacred for us to consider. This privilege has, indeed, been the heritage of the past into which all three denominations represented here, the Disciples, Free Baptists, and Baptists, have entered. John Locke—to make a familiar quotation—has declared that “Baptists were the first and only expounders of absolute liberty, just and true liberty, equal and impartial liberty.” And it was Milton who said: “Give me liberty to know, to utter, to argue freely according to conscience, above all other liberties;” and this was said in his fight against the efforts of the Star

Chamber at press restriction. At the beginning of his *Areopagitica* he quotes from Euripides to say:

This is true liberty, when free-born men
 Having to advise the public may speak free,
 Which he who can, and will, deserves high praise;
 Who neither can nor will may hold his peace,
 What can be juster in a state than this?

There are certain implications in the statement of the subject. The first is that there is a contrast between free speech and a free press. Mr. Heckman's treatment this evening of the necessary limitations of a free press has given great assistance in the answer of the question before us. The newspaper is supposed to be able to print what the private individual could not promulgate. But technically, before the law, there is no such distinction, except that action may be taken on written words without special proof of damage done and written words are treated with special rigor. There is a greater power in the press than in mere speech, and free speech derives its greatest effectiveness in a free press. The limitations, therefore, of the press may in general be applied to speech.

The second implication in the statement of the subject is that free speech is a source of danger. Both repression and expression are dangerous, and the question is how to keep from the one extreme of slander and treason and the other of ignorance and slavery. Yet all freedom is dangerous. It is, in fact, dangerous to live. We must resolutely find the proper limits of speech and such limits are called "legitimate." This does not mean of necessity legal, but it does not mean equitable. President Roosevelt's comparison in one of his campaign letters between law and equity is illuminating. Business men are needed who will do more than to conduct their business according to the strict interpretation of the law. Equity is always higher than law. The limits of free speech which are legitimate may not be set by statute but may nevertheless be as morally binding, and may be as effectively enforced, as Professor Dealey tonight has so well shown, by public sentiment and opinion.

The third implication of the topic is that the subject of free speech has a special relevancy in a republic. This is especially

true in a republic like ours in which we have a mixed population and such heterogeneous elements. But this condition which need not be a permanent one, is not of the essence of democracy. There is also the party system of America which may or may not be essential to a republic. There are three important characteristics of a republic which have special reference to the topic: that the will of the people is absolute, that public officials are public servants, and that the will of the majority is right. The tremendous assumption is in the third statement which practically means that *vox populi* is *vox dei*. But all of these characteristics demand at least some free speech. The will of the people needs to be based upon intelligence, the deeds of the public official must be discussed, the individual who helps to form the majority must be trained.

Agreeing thoroughly with the last speaker that there must theoretically be the limitations which he proposes, I should object to any enforcement of such rigid ideals lest more harm than good result. Let the people cease buying yellow journals and yellow journals will cease to exist. At the beginning of my study, I felt strongly that the necessary limits should be emphatically presented. I am more inclined now to treat the subject from the side of an unlimited free speech, except in so far as such free speech is immoral, slanderous, and treasonable. I have four reasons to present.

First, unlimited free speech is an essential to the education of the individual citizen. A political campaign sends the whole nation to college. Every store and office becomes a seminar of political science. Of course there are dangers in too great liberty of speech. There is the danger that the man of wrong motives may confuse the mind of the voter. There is also the danger that in the midst of opposing opinions, the mind shall be bewildered. But the remedy for these evils is not less but more free speech. There is also the danger of what Mr. James Bryce calls the "fatalism of the multitude," which leads to the "tyranny of the majority." There is a loss of individualism. There is a feeling that the majority must be right. Perhaps Mr. Bryce would not make the same statement today as when he wrote the *American Commonwealth*. Certainly the custom of splitting the ticket,

of changing party for special issues, of selecting men irrespective of party, is growing. Never was this more pronounced, and especially in my own state of New York, than in the last election. The French representative with our army at Santiago said that the characteristic of the American soldier was his initiative. It is the development of the individual initiative that will keep the American people more and more from voting a certain ticket simply to be with the majority.

Free speech is educative and looks to the future. It presupposes a progressive government, and a republic must either be progressive or die. The difference between an absolute monarchy and a republic is the difference between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. The one faces the past and yields to the authority of yesterday. The other faces the future and is waiting for the new light of tomorrow. The principle of Protestantism is not an infallible book over against an infallible church but the principle of absolute individual independence in the investigation of truth and its immediate and practical application to life. Therefore Protestantism must progress. Our own republic has advanced rapidly in the last eight years, not because alone we had a vigorous president, but because freedom of speech has illuminated the public mind and the public voice has given its approval. The only way in a republic by which new problems secure speedy solution, and new principles become either living law or dead issues in one campaign, is by free speech. Free speech is the emery wheel to grind off the alloy from the gem of truth; it is the chemical reagent to precipitate convictions in the fluid thought of the public; it is the telescope to aid us in seeing the star of hope.

Second, unlimited free speech is a necessity to the mutual understanding and sympathy of various classes of the government. Legislators must be equable. Labor and capital must be better acquainted. North and South must get together. The Disciples and Baptists must meet in such assemblies as this. The remedy for misunderstandings, even when caused by speech, is not less but more free speech.

Third, free speech is essential as the only permanent antitoxin against tyranny. Napoleon muzzled free speech. The Czar, a

few years ago, gave a list of topics in which he commanded all Russian editors to be silent. Cromwell said, "My government is not worth preservation if it cannot stand against paper shot;" and yet twice, of his tyranny, he sent a satirist to court to be tried as a libeler. There is a constant tendency of those in power to hold this position at all hazards. There is danger both of blinded vision and blunted conscience. Free speech means watchfulness on the part of the people and fearfulness on the part of the rulers. It means information requested and information discussed, and information judged.

Fourth, unlimited free speech is essential to allay social unrest. There is indeed a grave danger here that free speech may arouse social unrest and create mistrust and suspicion. It is proper to comment on matters of public concern, but "slander, meanest spawn of hell," as Tennyson puts it, makes reputation a plaything. The imputation of base motives is degrading. We feel that Napoleon was right in saying: "A printing-house is a powder magazine into which every fool must not be allowed to enter." There is often such gross misrepresentation, such poisoning of the public mind. And there is no real redress. No retraction can undo the damage done. The suspicion remains, and many do not hear of the retraction, and still, even this misuse of free speech can only be met effectively by free speech. Let others also speak, and the comparison of vituperation with sober judgment will be as black to white. If government is right, it will bear investigation. If it objects to free speech, the presumption is that something is wrong. Anarchy is generally due to a policy of repression, as instance Russia in comparison with England. Anarchy is not indigenous to a republic.

In a republic, the man who discusses a lost issue is laughed at. In a repressive monarchy he might be a martyr. It is a great stock in trade that Eugene Debs has been in prison. In this morning's paper, President Gompers, of the American Federation of Labor, is reported as presenting to his organization a full account of certain injunction proceedings, although the court had forbidden him to refer to it either in writing or spoken words.

He says that he may be at once cited for contempt of court. Nothing could be better for Mr. Gompers' cause. To be arrested

would be a stronger argument for his contention than any verbal statement he could make. But such arrest would be a serious mistake for the cause of truth. Mr. Bryce in his *American Commonwealth* puts this idea into the following words:

Under a repressive government, the sense of grievance and injustice fans the flame of resistance in a persecuted minority. But in a country like this, where the freedom of the press, the right of public meeting, and the right of association and agitation have been legally extended and are daily exerted more widely than anywhere else in the world, there is nothing to awaken that sense. He whom the multitude condemns or ignores has no further court of appeal to look to. Rome has spoken. His cause has been heard and judgment has gone against him.

Here are two examples to illustrate the truth of this contention. Dario Papa of Italy, who had been an ardent admirer of republicanism, though a converted Republican, chiefly through influence from America, was to make a speech to the assembled people in one of the theaters of Milan. A telegram came from Crispi's government to the local authorities not to permit the meeting. The authorities replied that it would make less trouble to let the meeting go on; that the people wanted to hear Papa. The reply came that though he should be allowed to speak, the censor must sit on the platform and stop him if he said anything against the monarchy. Papa described in detail the sufferings of the people and at last said: "And all this we owe to the house of Savoy!" The censor went across the stage and touched the speaker's arm warningly; but Papa continued: "And you all see that I am forbidden by this representative of the house of Savoy to say that all this we owe to the house of Savoy." No one can be blind to the fact that the cause of the government would have been served far better if no censor had been at the meeting.

The other illustration is from our own country. John Turner, an immigrant, was arrested in 1903, and imprisoned at Ellis Island on the charge of being an anarchist. Not that he had advocated violence. All he had said in a hall in New York City was that he advised a general strike. But he was called an anarchist because he belonged to an association of anarchists, and the law describes an anarchist as one "who disbelieves in or who is opposed to all organized government, or who is a member of

or affiliated with any organization entertaining or teaching such belief in opposition to all government." At once a great mass-meeting was held in New York and able leaders and speakers took part. Ernest Crosby, in an article in the *North American Review*, compared Turner with Peter Kropatkin, Henrik Ibsen, and Leo Tolstoy as theoretical anarchists, and John Turner, whom otherwise few would have noticed, at once became a public martyr and hero whose name was on the lips of all.

Such are the claims of an unlimited free speech. What about securing those limits which all acknowledge are legitimate, not by law, but by public opinion? The English audiences are quick at expressing their disapproval in a public meeting when the discourse is not intelligent or the speaking descends to mere party glorification; and they know how to hiss as well as applaud. After all, there are no limits to free speech except as immoral or treasonable, and then only as manifestly so. The limit to free speech must be free speech. The antidote to a free speech of license is a free speech of sanity. Let all be free to speak, and all be free to dissent. What we want is the quick expression of the moral forces of the nation. Where money and political preferment do not induce free speech, let patriotism and the love of righteousness.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I have now the pleasure of introducing to you the second Vice-President of this Congress, who will lead us in the closing prayer, President Joseph W. Mauck, LL.D., of Hillsdale, Mich.

Prayer having been offered, the Congress adjourned to reconvene on Wednesday, November 11, 1908, at 2:30 o'clock P. M.

SECOND DAY

Afternoon Session

November 11, 1908

2:30 o'clock, P. M.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The hour has arrived for opening this afternoon session. Let us sing three verses of Hymn No. 459, the first, fifth, and sixth stanzas: "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name."

(The Congress rose and joined in singing the hymn)

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will be led in prayer by Dr. Greene, of Evanston.

(Dr. B. A. Greene, of Evanston, Ill., led the Congress in prayer)

PRESIDENT JACKSON: Our theme for study this afternoon is "The Doctrine of Atonement in Terms of Modern Thought." The first writer is Rev. B. A. Jenkins, D.D., Kansas City, Mo. Will Mr. Jenkins please step forward and occupy the platform?

REV. B. A. JENKINS, D.D. (Disciple), Kansas City, Mo., submitted the following paper:

THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT IN TERMS OF MODERN THOUGHT

Dr. George Gordon says that the age is without a definite and systematized theology. And I think most of us will agree that he is right. Old things have passed away, and all things have not yet become new. Time was when a theological student could choose his system: calvinistic, Armenian, what not, and have it all lined out for him, ready-made and complete. It was a case of pay your money and take your choice. That day has passed. The professor's chair no longer declares: "This is the doctrine. All other views are false." Instead, it says: "We are feeling our way along this line. It is in this general direction that the truth lies, we think." Indeed there is no such thing as the New Theology. It is not yet born. The age is in travail with it still.

So it is, in my judgment, with this question of the atonement. The old conceptions, so neatly and systematically sawn, planed, jointed, so easy of statement and of comprehension, are no longer capable of containing the modern mind. Its free-winged spirit scorns in such scant borders to be spanned. We have not yet solved this problem. Probably we never shall, completely. One element of religion lies in mystery. But certainly the older theories have become inadequate, and the age is feeling its way after some more rational, if tentative, statement.

As soon as Christian thought, in the earliest centuries, began to formulate doctrines in a more expanded shape than the simple words of Scripture, it reached the conclusion, upon this question of the atonement, that Christ was delivered as a ransom to Satan to purchase man's immunity from sin and from its consequences. Men were the real possessions of Satan, and God bought their freedom with the person of Christ. For the first ten centuries, roughly stating, this was the accepted doctrine of the church. In some quarters it has even been accepted ten centuries later.

It was in the eleventh century that Anselm modified the doctrine, and mollified it, to this extent, that the ransom was paid by Jesus not to Satan but to God. He considered that satisfaction was due to God from man, before man could be relieved of the consequences of his sin. In view of the enormity of man's guilt, and in view of the greatness of God, no sum could be paid that was not equal to the dignity and power of God himself. As none was the equal of God, he himself became man that he might, in his infinite mercy offer to himself a fitting discharge of the debt.

At the time of the Reformation, a still further modification was presented. As Anselm's view was couched in terms of commercial law, so the Reformers' was declared in terms of criminal law. The satisfaction owed to God was punishment. Suffering, penal suffering, must be endured by someone to satisfy the outraged justice of God. Christ undertook to endure it; and he bore the penalty for all sins of all men, in all time, even, as some of them held, the sufferings of hell.

A later view that has even been taught within the past generation in one great New England Seminary that I know of, is the governmental view that the majesty of God's law must needs

be maintained, that it had been outraged by man's sin, and that Jesus took upon himself to suffer the vindication of the law, in behalf of man.

Of these various mechanical, legal, commercial, hard-and-fast views, Horace Bushnell long ago said: "The lean kine of judicial satisfaction have devoured the good kine of God's regenerative bounty." And elsewhere he remarks the difficulty that those who maintain the judicial, legislative, or substitutionary theories have to maintain themselves within their doctrine. They *will* get beyond it, and revel occasionally in such texts as "The love of Christ constraineth us;" "Christ liveth in me;" "God commendeth his love toward us in that while we are sinners," etc., etc. So, though they hold to the fierce anger of God, inextinguishable except by a victim, their hearts are better.

Bushnell, by the way, is an instance of those thinkers who, now and then, since the Middle Ages, in reaction from the mechanical theories current in their day, have swung to what may be called the moral influence theory, viz., that Christ's work was a revelation of God's heart of goodness, purity, and love, intended not to appease God himself, since he did not need it, nor to buy off Satan since his ownership was at least limited, but to win man to repentance and to love for God.

Bushnell adds: "No doctrine of the atoning or reconciling work of Christ has ever yet been developed that can be said to have received the consent of the Christian world." And he believes that the final doctrine will emerge at the point of "the moral view," and be concluded there.

I am not at all sure but that this moral view, this purely ethical theory of the atoning work of Christ, would find more votaries among the men of today who are imbued with the modern spirit, than would any more theological conception. I am not sure but that the reaction has been so great from the old legalistic conceptions that we have swung to the other extreme of a purely prophetic and ethical mission for the great Teacher of Nazareth. We have so changed our view of God from governor and king; we have so revolted at the conception of "Sinners in the hand of an angry God;" we have so altered our interpretation of the Hebrew phrase: "The Lord our God is a jealous God visiting

the sins of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation;" we have so turned and tied to the interpretation of God as to that of Father and loving Lord, that we can no longer accept the governmental theories. And yet no doctrine has been evolved which meets acceptance at the hands of the time-spirit. We have, furthermore, so altered our view of Scripture, under the modern criticism, and under the new method of biblical theology, that we no longer expect a uniform view of the work of Christ among all the New Testament writers, but rather diversified views from different writers who ponder upon the same facts. Our danger therefore is, is it not, that we shall be left without any view other than that Christ's work was like that of any great and good teacher who rebelling against the abuses of his time, is bound sooner or later to pay for his protest with his life.

No doubt the next great solution of this problem is to be somewhere along this line. But is the solution reached when the analogy of Christ's life and work to that of other great martyrs is traced? We all believe in these days, I think it is safe to say, that Christ died to save man from man, not man from God—social redemption; that Christ died to save man from self, not man from Satan—individual redemption; that Christ died to save man from sin, not man from hell—immediate redemption; but is it safe to say that the age is to be content with the statement that he died, or, for that matter, lived, for these ends, only as Huss, Savonarola, Socrates, or Daniel lived and died for man's redemption?

No, there is something greater here, and more mysterious; greater as the degree of difference between him and them amounted to a difference in kind; more mysterious as the express revelation of God in him, the hatred of immaculate purity for sin, the suffering of untainted goodness in an atmosphere of taint and stain, all are more or less mysterious to the contaminated vision of sinful men.

The present attempt at a constructive statement upon the subject of the atonement—and it cannot be too often emphasized that it is only an attempt that has so far been made—must begin, it seems to me, somewhere near a point like the following, which has become so familiar in the scientific statements of the day:

All life and all progress in the world is at the expense of sacrifice and death on the part of some one or many. Mere physical existence can only be begun and maintained as the result of rapid, repeated, widespread death. Not only we, but all creatures rise on stepping-stones of others' dead selves to higher things. The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now, in giving birth to the next day and the next generation, and the next era. To put it ever on the lowest plane, it is not merely certain rudimentary forms of life that make their culminating act the act of reproduction, and with this climax of their careers pass off the stage of the living forever; but even the highest type of life—man—in giving life to his kind that are to follow him, in nurturing them, guarding them, rearing them, voluntarily embraces decay and death, if gradual, yet no less sure.

This sacrifice of life that other life may follow—higher, better life or else the universe is all out of gear—is partly involuntary and partly voluntary. The struggle for life has its fail in the struggle for the life of others. The pouring out of blood for the sustenance of the beasts that prey has its opposite motive in the pouring out of their hearts' rich tide by the mothers of the race that prays. The awful war of extermination that rages in the thick jungles of the tiniest grass-blades as well as in the greatest forests and mountain fastnesses claims not more victims than the altars of voluntary vicarious sacrifice upon which the parents of all men and many creatures willingly and gladly lay down their lives.

The same principle applies, does it not, in matters higher than mere physical existence. There is no advancement in human thought, no growth of any great telling movement among men except at the cost of life. Advance comes by friction, opposition, battle; and these waste life. The scholar burns out his life with his midnight oil. The preacher—if he be really a preacher—dies just so much upon the cross, every time he ascends his pulpit. The statesman—if he be one, and not a mere politician—gives his life for great ideas just as really through his toil as the soldier in his marches and his battles. The man of affairs, that deserts may be watered and conquered, roads built, the earth peopled and prospered, gives his life whatever the motive, either in midnight

journeys, or meetings, or wastes it in the confinement of a cell-like office. The world of thought grows, develops, but at what tremendous cost of human life!

In the same fashion, may it be, is it not true that in the world of spirit, growth comes only in the train of death? That souls may be uplifted, cleansed, exalted, redeemed, someone or many must die. Indeed we have seen many die in the ages past for just this purpose. A moral vicarious sacrifice needs little illustration beside our own memories of a long and heroic history. So far we can understand. But is it not possible that just at this point enters the larger sacrifice which we cannot understand—a mysterious sacrifice, a death demanded in the very nature of things spiritual, that higher life, eternal life, sin-free life might be the portion of the race? The necessity for such a sacrifice is no more mysterious, no more awful, than the necessity for the wholesale slaughter and the multitudinous self-immolation that is going on every hour in the world.

With this general hint, then, as to how the process of redemption is likely to appear to the modern mind, we may attempt to trace its course.

Here is the fact of sin in the world—the one universal problem that man had ever grappled with. Everywhere and in all times men had struggled with it. They had sacrificed lamb after lamb, bullock after bullock, hecatomb after hecatomb, till their temples had run red with blood, and yet, like Lady Macbeth, they had never been able to wash out the foul stain upon their hands. They had a consciousness of their God or their God's hatred of sin, and yet though they had erected priesthoods to intercede with him, they had never been able to arrive certainly at a sense of forgiveness which was, and perhaps still is, the end and aim of all religious service. For one thing, they were uncertain as to the character of their God, and his attitude toward rebellious children.

Such being the state of affairs, and God seeing it, felt the need of a solution for man, of this tragic question; and as a means to this end, of a full revelation to man of his own heart—its hatred toward and horror of sin, its love for and pity toward man. So, when the fulness of time had come, when man had reached

such maturity as would comprehend, in some measure, his self-revelation, the incarnation followed. God chose to reveal his qualities not in a book, not in the words of prophets and teachers, not in a system of theological statements, not in the works of nature. He had already shadowily revealed himself in all these ways; and to individual minds, here and there, these revelations had been intelligible. But to the great multitude of men there is but one book legible and comprehensible, and that is man. Everybody could read a man's life, everybody would read a man's life—so interesting, so fascinating is man to humanity. Hence, when God would send his final message to humanity he must write in this final and universal language of mankind—a man. He did so. He said to the world: "This man is myself. What he is I am. He does always the things that please me. He and I are one. He that hath seen him hath seen me."

Having thus revealed himself fully to men, he proceeded to show through this human medium, his attitude toward sin. Never in all the world has there been such rebuke of sin as in the mere presence of Jesus Christ upon the earth. Not the broken tables of the law, not the fiery serpents in the wilderness, not the deluge, nor the ashes of Gomorrah have ever carried the conviction of God's unalterable and inappeasable hostility to guilt as has the quiet, gentle, calm dignity of Jesus' sinlessness. The word of God is here heard most convincingly not in the earthquake, not in the fire and tempest, but in the still small voice of the incarnate God. His presence, like that of the Holy Spirit, nay which is identical with that of the Holy Spirit, convicts the world of sin and judgment.

And yet, along with this message of hatred toward sin comes the major strain, the dominant theme, in the symphony of Jesus' life, of God's overflowing, inextinguishable love for man—the sinner. Individuals heard the strain—Oh, so clearly—the rich young ruler, the woman of Samaria, Zaccheus, the publican, Simon Peter, the traitor, the poor drab in the Temple—these and scores besides heard the new note, the song of love and forgiveness: "Neither do I condemn thee, go and sin no more." Here was no consuming fire of wrath, here was no freezing ice of impenetrable sinlessness, lofty, stark, and aloof. Here was gentle-

ness, long-suffering, mercy, love. This was the heart of God. Individuals caught the message, the nation caught it, and slowly the nations catch it, too.

But this goodness, this tenderness, this sinlessness, this embodied mercy, must suffer in the presence of sinfulness. The very word long-suffering shows that we have felt some inkling of the pains of God. We have suffered, too, have we not, in some feeble attempts at a purely moral redemption. We have wrestled in soul with an erring brother in the bonds of his sin, with a wilful and headstrong child, with a criminal wretch struggling to be free of the shackles of long habit. We, now and then, have made vicarious atonement, at least in its elements, so far as the simple moral motive extends. But we are not God. We did not make man. We are not responsible for his well-being, his ongoing, in short his redemption. We, therefore, cannot understand the full agony of creative grief at the moral maladjustment of the creature.

We do not know, we cannot tell,
The pain he had to bear.

If we suffer in the throes of a rebirth for some friend, parishioner, or relative, struggling loose from a wicked past, what must have been the agonies of Gethsemane, and of the hours upon the cross?

I would not be misunderstood as implying that this sympathetic moral passion is all there was to the atonement. It is about all that we can understand. But at the outset I tried to say that, in my judgment, mystery is a legitimate part of religion; and because we cannot understand more than this is no reason why we should affirm that there is no more. Indeed we cannot understand why there should be pain and passion in mere physical birth, in intellectual birth, in moral birth. Why then is it a thing incredible that we cannot analyze, systematize, theologize plainly, mathematically, dogmatically, this mysterious process of redemption?

The time has gone by, in my judgment, when theologians presume God to scan, when they employ with smug certitude the phrases, "scheme of redemption," "plan of salvation," and

the like. We have come to feel that the scheme, if there is one, is too stellar in its scope, the plan, if there is one, is too nearly like the Pleiades in proportions for us to outline with a geometrical exactness, in the size of a printed page.

That "God hath his mysteries of grace, ways that we cannot tell," I, for one, firmly believe. That he has thus dealt in the profundity of his wisdom, with the problem of sin, I have no doubt. That somehow the sufferings of Christ were necessary to accomplish his gigantic purpose is altogether in line with the best scientific thought of today. That those sufferings fulfilled something more than the purpose of erecting a beautiful moral ideal of self-forgetfulness, heroism, courage, renunciation, is, I believe, the conviction of this present age and of the best thought of the age just coming on. What that purpose was we can, no doubt, do little more than hint; but that hint, in harmony with the ascent of man, finds its analogue in the struggle for the life of others which is one of the leading themes in the natural science, social science, political science of the time.

Poets sometimes reach truer conclusions than philosophers, as hearts sometimes are more nearly infallible than heads; and it is a modern American, the editor of one of our leading magazines, who writes:

Subtlest thought shall fail and learning falter,
Churches change, forms perish, systems go;
But our deep human needs they will not alter,
Christ no after age shall ere outgrow.
Yea, amen, O changeless one, thou only
Art life's guide and spiritual goal,
Thou the light across the dark vale lonely,
Thou the eternal haven of the soul.

I do not feel that I have done much more than preach about this theme—and a little preachment, at that. I fear that the academic philosophers who are here will think it woefully inadequate as a theological statement. And yet, if I have done anything at all, in my half-hour, it is to give the impression that I consider this much more of a theme for preaching than for philosophizing; for, when you philosophers shall fail in stating it, we preachers shall succeed in singing it, such an easy and such a

winged song it is, so mysteriously beautiful and so beautifully mysterious, into its resting-place in the aching, sin-scarred hearts of men. I cannot state it in scientific fashion, nor do I believe that you can, but I can preach it, after a certain fashion, and by God's grace I intend to go on preaching it, till this poor lisping stammering tongue lies silent in the grave; and then I expect to hear it both stated and preached in triumphant voices on the plains of God.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The second paper on this theme is by Rev. Frederick Lent, New Haven, Conn. Mr. Lent will take the platform.

REV. FREDERICK LENT, PH.D. (Baptist), of New Haven, Conn., presented the following paper:

THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT IN TERMS OF MODERN THOUGHT

There is only one thing fundamental in a man's theology, and that is his thought of God. This determines his view of atonement, and every other article of his creed. Anselm's notion of God, which corresponded to the feudal ideas of the age, demanded a sufficient reparation for the insult done the honor of God. With the transition from feudalism to modern forms of government, came the thought of God who must maintain the sanctity of his moral government. The theory of penal satisfaction is based on the conception of a God who must punish sin. The theories of Anselm, Grotius, and the Protestant reformers are passing away, because their conceptions of God are outgrown. We are not better logicians than they, but we start from different premises. We are revolted by the lines of Watts (quoted by Canon Farrar in *The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought*, London, 1900, p. 37):

Rich were the drops of Jesus' blood
That calmed God's frowning face,
That sprinkled o'er the burning throne
And turned the wrath to grace.

Foreign to our thinking are Spurgeon's words: "Christ took the cup in both hands, and at one tremendous draught of love

drank damnation dry." We believe in God the Father as he is revealed in the teaching, life, and character of Jesus. It is this conception of God as Father which shapes the modern view of atonement. The thought of Christ being punished in our stead or dying to satisfy the claims of justice is out of harmony with Jesus' teaching concerning God. The God of Jesus is forgiving, generous, and good even to the wicked and ungrateful. Mercy is his primary attribute. The whole gospel is given in the parable of the Prodigal Son. It says nothing concerning eternal decrees, it has no word about God's offended honor, or violated law and its satisfaction. The parable does not deal with things, but with personal relations between Father and Son. It sets forth the Father's pitying, longing love, which awaits the sinful child's return in repentance. It shows how God forgives freely, restoring the penitent to favor and fellowship. Jesus taught that we must be merciful because God is. "Then came Peter and said to him, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? Until seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, until seven times but until seventy times seven" (Matt. 18: 21-23). Why? Because this is the law of the kingdom of heaven; that is, it is God's way. St. Paul had the same conception of God when he said "Be ye kind to one another, tender-hearted, forgiving each other, as God in Christ forgave you. . . . Be ye therefore imitators of God, as beloved children" (Eph. 4:32-5:1). We must forgive freely, without exacting penalty for injuries, because God thus forgives. In Jesus' teaching, the only condition of forgiveness is repentance. "It is inconceivable that God should forgive the impenitent, and equally inconceivable that he should not forgive the penitent. The object of all of God's dealings is to win us to himself. The penitent sinner is eagerly welcomed. However seriously one injures you, however just and keen your resentment, you cannot cherish anger when he comes crushed, groveling at your feet, and doing all he can to compensate.

Who is not with repentance satisfied,
Is not of heaven or earth.

To cherish resentment and withhold forgiveness in such a case is fatuous and devilish. True penitence is, in short, irresistible.

It is the real solvent of past discord" (Marcus Dods, *The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought*, p. 182).

Jesus' attitude toward sinners shows how God deals with them. He simply said to the penitent, "Thy sins are forgiven." The sinful and stained found in him a ready friend. It would never occur to one that Jesus required to be propitiated before he could pardon. But Jesus was the revelation of God, and what is true of him is true of God. The old soldier of Plymouth made the mistake of sending to woo Priscilla for him one whom she could love as she could not love the grim warrior who sent him. Did God make the mistake of sending Jesus, loving, tender, forgiving, merciful, so that men find in Christ what is not in the Father? Nay, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," he said. He came with God's own passion for men, to seek the lost, and call sinners to repentance. So by his life and character he showed that God is satisfied, not with the punishment of sin, but with the recovery of the sinner. Salvation must be more than mere remission of the penalty of sin. It must be the moral union of the repentant sinner with God. The work of Jesus looks toward a genuine atonement, at-one-ment.

Jesus as the revealer of God the Father is the final authority for our thought of atonement. We cannot go to the Bible as a unit of which any text has equal value with every other text. The Bible is a record of religious progress. It contains the history of the doctrine of atonement in its development from the pagan to the Christian point of view. We cannot expect, nor do we find, one view only, consistently set forth from first to last. Modern historical study of biblical theology finds in the Bible different conceptions of the nature of sin, of sacrifice, and of the ground of forgiveness. It traces the different teachings to their sources in the various periods of time, and finds widely variant views current in the same period. It does find, however, that in the Old Testament vicarious satisfaction or penal substitution is not a characteristic teaching, but rather, incidental and subordinate. Even in the Levitical code, sacrifice is efficacious only as it expresses the heart and mind of the worshiper. The prophetic teaching is that of Jesus, free pardon for sin conditioned on repentance. It is not unfair to say that Ps. 51 contains the

most characteristic teaching of the Old Testament concerning sin, sacrifice, and forgiveness.

The New Testament writers are for the most part in their interpretation of Christ's work in accord with his own thought. Yet, if the outlook on our problem be from the narrow opening of some single texts, we may arrive at conclusions wholly at variance with the teaching of Jesus and the general trend of New Testament thought. Our doctrine of atonement must not be formulated by a mere systematization of proof texts, but by reference to Christ as the ultimate and final authority, in teaching, life, and character.

But did Jesus give an adequate and complete teaching concerning the forgiveness of sins and the meaning of salvation? It would be strange if he did not, when his mission was the redemption of men. To whom shall we go for the words of eternal life if not to Jesus? The parable of the prodigal son contains all that Jesus regarded as essential in setting forth the Father's forgiveness and acceptance of the repentant Son. Is it not true that our theology must be a return to the gospel of Jesus? We are not to find elsewhere supplementary corrective teaching. Jesus gave a whole gospel. His work was to reveal the Father, and this he accomplished, in what he said, and was, and did.

It is not certain that Jesus regarded his death as a necessary part of his career from the very beginning of his ministry. As a result of the hostility which gathered head against him, his pondering on the Scriptures and his deep insight into the heart of the Father, his unique religious consciousness led him to the conviction that death was the inevitable end of his way. He had come to devote his life absolutely without stint to the service of men, even to death, if need be, to set them free from the bondage of sin. As time went on, he saw that to be true to his mission he must die. But there is no hint that he ever thought of his suffering and death as the vicarious endurance of penalty. It was vicarious suffering indeed, but he did not base the forgiveness of sins upon it. He regarded his death as the culmination of a career, such that it would secure the end he sought, the exemplification of that relation to God and men which God approves. His death as revealing the will of God, and the ideal of life,

becomes redemptive for those who accept the truth thus revealed, (Compare Burton, "Biblical Doctrine of Atonement," *Biblical World*, June, July, 1908.)

If we ask how men obtained forgiveness of sin before Jesus died, we find that the prophets and Psalmist describe an experience in no way different from the religious experience of today. They came directly to God, and found mercy, being penitent. Isaiah, Micah, Amos, all write in the strongest condemnation of the idea that sacrifice is needed to placate God. God asks repentance, and only repentance. Ezekiel is equally emphatic in declaring that remission of sins follows repentance. The Psalmist stained with bloodguiltiness found pardon, according unto the multitude of God's tender mercies, because he acknowledged his transgressions. He offered no sacrifice but that of a broken and contrite spirit, because God is pleased with no other. In other words, the death of Christ made no change in God. The Psalmist knew that God is "good, ready to forgive, and abundant in loving kindness to all who call upon him." Jesus suffered, not to purchase the pardon of God for men, but to reveal that which was eternally in the heart of God. If, before Jesus, men could trust God's merciful love, how much more may we, who look back upon the cross! Surely, if Christ's death had been necessary to the pardon of sins, he would have come earlier in the history of the world. It is out of the question to suppose that prior to his death God exercised forgiveness in anticipation of Calvary's payment of the human debt of sin. There is no hint of it in Scripture. If he did, then the prophets and the Psalmist trusted a mercy which did not exist, and God was other than he seemed to them, who believed in the forgiveness of sins solely because of his loving kindness. But we cannot entertain such a thought. Rather, we see in the cross of Christ the full light of revelation of God's eternal love, which sent its foregleams through all the ages, until in the fulness of time, God sent forth his son. Viewed as a sacrifice to appease God, the cross came woefully late. Seen as a revelation of eternal atonement, it stand fittingly related to all the past and coming ages.

The full disclosure of God the Father could be made only through the cross, and in this, as well as in the historical circum-

stances, lies the necessity for the death of Jesus. He must die if he would save men. The cross is the only adequate expression of that which is fundamental in God, his suffering love in his relation to men. Jesus came preaching the "kingdom of heaven." How often the phrase was on his lips! But does he ever call God "king?" Not once. Is God, as Jesus taught of him, less mighty, less kingly? No, but the king is Father. The Kingdom of God, and the kingship of God are expressed in terms of fatherhood. The parable of the Prodigal Son shows the king as first of all Father. The joy at the return of the lost indicates the sorrow that love felt while he was away. Jesus' reply to Zebedee's son's request for royal office shows what he regarded as primary in the kingdom of heaven, that is, in God himself. "Ye know that they who are accounted to rule over the gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it shall not be so among you. But whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister and whosoever would be first among you shall be servant of all. For the Son of man also came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mark 10: 42-45). The principle of service, of devotion even to death, is the law of God's nature. "Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it brings forth fruit." This Jesus saw as the law at the center of God's universe, of God's being. It is a law of the moral world as truly as gravitation is a law of the physical. Bushnell was interpreting Jesus when he grounded vicarious sacrifice in principles of universal obligations. So if Jesus revealed the Father in his essential nature, he must go to the cross, a voluntary sacrifice for the sins of men. Anything less would have left the revelation, not merely partial, but totally inadequate, since that which is most characteristic of the king, his suffering love, could not have been disclosed. The cross revealed to what lengths love can go in seeking the redemption of men. It was not a brief transaction, a spectacle of suffering whose purpose was to appease an angry God. It was rather God's self-disclosure, showing that the cross was in his heart eternally, long before it stood on Calvary.

Thus the cross reveals that which is at the center of God's

universe. It shows God eternally seeking to win men to fellowship and moral oneness with him; sparing no cost to accomplish this. It reveals the upward way of God with man, and the sacrifice back of the moral progress of the race. God's world is not blasted, but growing. The "Fall" is not the explanation of the incarnation. The work of Christ is not an interpolation, but the crowning act in the revelation of God's eternal process of human redemption, in labor, passion, and sacrifice. The incarnation must have taken place, if there had been no sin, because of God's eternal purpose to perfect man into union with himself. Given the fact of sin, then God's attitude toward men must result in the death of the incarnate one, to give full expression to God.

The cross revealed the perfect experience of sonship in a human life, and was the manifestation of God's purpose. The cross has cosmic significance. It shows the unwearied self-sacrifice of God in his work for the final perfecting of all things. When John was on Patmos, he saw the throne of the Almighty God the King. The sovereign purpose and work of God was to be revealed. Only the lion of the tribe of Judah was able to unloose the seals of the book, and make known God's kingly acts. John looked to see the lion, but saw, standing in the midst of the throne, a lamb, as it had been slain (Rev., chap. 5). The symbolism is plain. The throne means sovereignty, the slain lamb, suffering love; it is "in the midst of the throne," that is, eternally at the heart of God's being and power; it "is in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and of the elders;" that is, the cross is the visible center of God's universe, the secret at the very core of all things. Only the cross could fully reveal God.

Because the cross reveals the self-sacrificing love of God, it makes plain his righteousness, and exhibits his estimate of the sin of men. Here it is seen that God grudges no sacrifice by which righteousness can be promoted and how low love will stoop to rescue us from the thralldom of sin. Righteousness is seen to be his supreme interest. He is not indifferent to sin. The only adequate repentance for sin must be made in the light of the cross, which alone shows the infinite sorrow of God, and the

pangs he suffers until it be exterminated, and we are wholly cleansed from it.

After a study of atonement in the great literatures of all times and lands, Dinsmore finds that the conviction of the world is this :

If there is a disposition on the part of the injured one to forgive, and genuine repentance in the heart of the wrongdoer, there is no obstacle to complete pardon, provided the mercy is so granted and accepted that the true nature of the wrong is understood by both parties and the sanctities of moral obligation receive no weakening.¹

It has been said that Christ must die bearing our punishment for sin, that God's righteousness might be demonstrated, by showing that he is not indifferent to sin. But could God not show his hatred of sin, and make us feel his righteousness, except by the infliction of penalty? How does a child know his mother's estimate of his sin? By the punishment she inflicts upon him, or on an innocent person who suffers in his stead? Does he not see the heinousness of his wrong because of the suffering it causes her? If anything will beget repentance in his heart, it is not infliction of the punishment he knows is due, but an appreciation of the anguish she endures. God's hatred of sin could not be adequately expressed except by his own suffering. Only infinite love could reveal the righteousness of God, and the unspeakable awfulness of sin. One cannot stand at the cross and think lightly of sin. The acceptance of free pardon there cannot weaken, but must rather strengthen the sanctities of moral obligation. For such forgiveness at the cross can come only by the repudiation of sin which is condemned in the cross. Such repentance is the return to moral oneness with God. It is faith which God reckons as righteousness, because it is incipient righteousness, the attitude of obedience and love. It is union with Christ, and being thus reconciled to God by the death of his son, we are saved through his life. Well said Alexander MacLaren: "A Christianity without a dying Christ is a dying Christianity." "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."

¹ Dinsmore, *Atonement in Literature and Life*, p. 164.

The conception of God as Father determines also the modern view of sin, its nature, its penalty, and the atonement it requires. John said, "Sin is lawlessness." It is either a single act expressive of a sinful disposition, or it is the sinful character itself. It is not infraction of statute law. It is rather the opposite of love, a state of character unlike the divine character. It is alienation from the Father. It is not merely something negative, the absence of goodness. It is self-affirmation; it is a fixed moral preference; it is banishment from the Father's love and fellowship. The penalty of sin is therefore in itself. It is guilt, which results in moral deterioration, and if persisted in, in eternal separation from God. Our idea of God forbids us to think that he can have any other end in punishment than the discipline and recovery of the sinner. God's law of action with men is not "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." We cannot admit that he requires so much punishment for so much sin. And on the other hand, the nature of sin's penalty is such that it is impossible to transfer it. No one can become guilty in my stead. There is no place for penal substitution in the moral constitution of things. Penalty can be removed only by the removal of sin itself. Atonement cannot be the suffering of penalty viewed as inflicted by God for the vindication of law. If sin were merely a debt, or insult to a sovereign, then we might think of reparation. Crime against statutory law can be visited with statutory punishment. But since sin is character, and its penalty is in terms of character, Christ cannot take our place in bearing our punishment. Redemption must be, not remission of penalty, but emancipation from the thralldom of sin itself. This is the work which Jesus does in the career by which he revealed God, by life, teaching, character, and the crowning act, the death on the cross, issuing in the resurrection and ascended life. Jesus could not take upon him our sin, as character, but he could enter into our wretched condition, by strong sympathy, and die, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. A careful study of the New Testament will show that Jesus and all the writers regard his death, not as the bearing of penalty, but as suffered for the sake of cleansing us from sin and reconciling us to God.

Be the expiatory expressions of Paul and Hebrews what they may,

they are from the thought world of late Judaism, but the exposition by both writers, of the actual realization of salvation is a transcript of moral experience, and is presented in terms expressive of moral participation in the inner life of Jesus, the reproduction in the believer of the representative humanity of Christ.²

If sin is character, then salvation must be in terms of character. God must be satisfied in the death of Christ, not because it is the vindication of broken law, but because it is the crowning act in that work which recovers the sinful from sin, and brings the prodigal back to fellowship with the Father. "Unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood; and he made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto his God and Father; to him be the glory and dominion for ever and ever. *Amen.*"

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will now listen to the appointed speakers in the discussion of the theme of this afternoon. Professor Leroy Waterman, of Hillsdale, Mich., will please step forward.

PROFESSOR LEROY WATERMAN, PH.D (Free Baptist), Hillsdale, Mich., addressed the Congress as follows:

Mr. President: There are two general ways of apprehending this subject according as we regard it from the *de facto* or the *de jure* standpoint, as a static or a kinetic. We may call the one formally constructive, the other inductively reconstructive.

Under the former we should confine ourselves to a collation of statements of the doctrine of atonement that belong exclusively to modern times; according to the latter we should endeavor to state the essentials for a formulated doctrine of atonement basing them upon what is assured as valid for us in modern thought-development. I take it for granted that the practical interest which brings this body together assures the latter as the intent of the theme.

This practical interest is in fact dominant in our subject, for admittedly there is no statement of the atonement in terms of modern thought that is generally recognized among the Protestant churches. And yet here is a teaching respecting which we may venture to assert that it has never ceased to form the key-

² Stevens, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 374.

stone in the arch of Christian doctrine, but everyone is aware that the force and intelligibility of any doctrine, to the average individual, depends upon its being clearly stated in the language of the day. It would seem therefore that as Protestants we have kept this important doctrine in the language of the Middle Ages much as the Catholics have kept their ritual in the language of antiquity, but with far less reason or consistency on our part. That is, this is so unless there is something in the infallibility of the Middle Ages which forbids any change. But while the generally accepted statements of the doctrine hail from the Middle Ages, yet it could scarcely be said that Protestantism has ever agreed on any generally recognized formula of the atonement. There seems to be no reason therefore from that quarter to think that we have had any final statement of the doctrine.

The only other authority that could make our task obsolete is the Bible itself. So far as the word is concerned, in the New Testament we no longer in the Revised Version have to deal with "atonement" but have in its stead the less formidable word "reconciliation," and that only in the Pauline epistles. Other writers speak of propitiation. Christ himself uses neither one. The New Testament contains no authorized or fixed statement of atonement. The several writers vary among themselves both as to terminology and view-point. We are thus biblically directed either to discriminate between the New Testament writers, a choice hard indeed to justify, or to formulate our own statement, if we would have one; at the same time it is a factor in our undertaking not to be overlooked that before the Middle Ages the church had already devised a form of the doctrine which we could not possibly accept, viz., that Christ's death was a price paid to the Evil One. We are thus true to the Bible, to history, and to our own need when we attempt a restatement of the atonement in terms of modern thought.

But, of course, if we are expected to formulate something here upon which we ourselves and our several constituencies shall speedily agree, as in the ancient councils of the church, someone must be delegated with unlimited powers for the excommunication of the heretics. Fortunately, however, such unanimity is not necessary for the justification of this discussion, for, having

gotten about as far apart as possible in days that are past on many matters, the chances are now all in our favor that every reasonable and intelligent effort we make will somehow bring us a little nearer together.

To formulate the elements for a modern statement of atonement bids us make two inquiries: first, What is the essential meaning in the idea of atonement? and secondly, What is it that distinguishes the thought of this age from that of all other periods?

With respect to the first question the term atonement etymologically signifies at-one-ment, i. e., the act or the result of the act that brings about agreement and harmony between parties previously at variance. Historically, the word has been applied as an equivalent to כָּבַד, καταλλαγή, ἰλασμός, *satisfactio*, and *substitutio*. Now it is impossible to equate such words as *satisfactio* and καταλλαγή, or כָּבַד and *substitutio*. Indeed these words contain mutually contradictory elements, but on the other hand, all these terms, in the result each is supposed to accomplish, do find agreement in the word atonement, i. e., at-one-ment, so that we may say that the historical range of the word confirms the etymological significance as its true meaning. But this meaning gives no prestige to any statement of the doctrine that has ever been made. It is equally indifferent and unchanged whether the resistance to be overcome in the act of atonement was due to God's unwillingness or his inability, or whether it came entirely from man's perversity and sinfulness or perchance were there hindrances in the way on both sides. The doctrine merely asserts that the great obstacle in the way of the at-one-ment of God and man, whatever it was, was overcome through Jesus Christ.

And what would be lost if no one insisted upon anything further than this? Christ is given a unique and necessary place in the process of redemption. The sinner may thereby be reconciled to God and to a godly life. Historically this is exactly what has taken place. But what has the church gained by insisting upon going beyond this as a condition of communion? Chiefly numerical increase of sects, the weakness of a divided house, a shameful spectacle before the world, and a confusion in men's minds as to there being any vital or necessary truth in

the doctrine. This, however, in no sense deters us from seeking a statement of the doctrine in terms of modern thought, but in some respects makes it imperative.

We come thus to our second query, What is it that distinguishes the thought of today from that of other periods? There are those who will point out that there is much of shallowness and perversity in present-day thought. But, if true, that cannot be claimed as a peculiarity of this age. There has been too much of that kind of thinking in every age.

The age has been characterized by many as materialistic, and no one would deny that this has been strongly emphasized in modern thought, but at the same time idealism has never been more strongly emphasized than in this age. Some might characterize modern thinking by its antinomies, but these are always prominent in periods of great thought advancement.

But, I think, we might agree that modern thought has been characterized by the purposeful endeavor to see things as nearly as possible as they really are, regardless of personal interest or authority, and that this has been true of this age to an extent known by no other. In the range of thought this has vastly extended the realm and the significance of law. With reference to the past it has developed the historical sense and the historical method. In the realm of personal relations it has clarified and enlarged the ethical sphere including both human and divine relations. So that with respect to God it has declared God wholly ethical; so ethical that he could not do wrong even to be just; so ethical that it declares any attempt on God's part to pay himself a debt makes *satisfactio* a mere brazen symbol; so ethical that propitiation is a word no longer applicable to God, for if one desired of God what was truly ethical God himself is so ethical that it, by very virtue of that fact, is bound to be one of God's strong desires and so propitiation could have no place. It is absurd to propitiate God to do what he already strongly wishes to do. But if we desired of God what was not truly ethical, no propitiation that could be conceived could ever accomplish its object with God.

If God is angry with us it must be for something morally indefensible on our part, and nothing can ever restore his favor

but the resolute putting away of such conduct. But when it has been so put away, God is ethical enough so that the cause of his displeasure being removed his anger also must cease, and nothing else could ever make it cease; no attempted substitution by a blameless person of conduct due from another can even make God feel differently toward the one from whom it is still due.

God is so ethical and has the highest ethical welfare of the universe so at heart that it is impossible adequately to express his relations to his creatures by any transaction of the market or forensic formula of the courts. But having formed the universe with the ethical as its highest object, having planned it with that end in view, and having worked consistently for that end through all the ages wherever a creature steps out wholeheartedly with that end in view, God is with him by virtue of his very nature and without any previous canceling of debts or balancing of merit.

The obstacles to at-one-ment between God and man are therefore not at all to be found in God; they are consequently wholly in man. They were great enough to take the life of the innocent Son of God, great enough to make the missionary of his message a cross-bearer in every age, great enough to take nineteen hundred years for his professed followers to begin to see dimly what it might mean to have a truly Christian state.

The atonement therefore, in terms of modern thought as the work wrought by Christ, was not an effect wrought on God, but the overcoming of the obstacles to the conciliation of God and man, which obstacles were wholly in man.

In mechanical terms, the work of Christ was the overcoming of the inertia of human personalities which arose from his seeking to give them a new and unwonted motive and direction. In terms of elemental affinity, Christ's work is the energy of the crucible which is able to free the radium of the human spirit from the uranium residues wherein it is lost and so render its purified energy available for the service of God and of mankind. In terms of living organism, the atoning death of Christ stands as the violent reaction due to the infusion of his healing life into the diseased organism of humanity, whereby health once more becomes possible. In terms of personality, the atoning death of

Christ is the eager and complete self-sacrifice of that other Elder Brother who freely gave the last breath of his matchless life to seek out and recover that other Prodigal who was in so far unable to come to himself and arise, in that he no longer knew that he had a Father of unlimited resources who loved only his highest welfare. The passion of Christ's life was not to make God ready, or to empower him, to forgive men's sins; but to make men ready to be forgiven of a Father. For God so loved the world.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We have but one more appointed speaker and after that there will be discussion by volunteers. It will be necessary for you to send your card to the Secretary before the other speaker ends. We will now listen to Professor Allan Hoben, of Chicago.

PROFESSOR ALLAN HOBEN, PH.D., (Baptist), Chicago, Ill., addressed the Congress as follows:

Mr. President, and Friends: It is a matter worthy of note that in the discussion of this general topic, "The Doctrine of Atonement in Terms of Modern Thought," practically everything that has been said should relate to Jesus Christ. It is a tribute which we all unconsciously pay, I think, to the position which he has taken for himself as Lord and Savior. The subject, however, as stated in the programme, is a thoroughly general one, a consideration of the universal fact of atonement; which fact is of course most evident in the experience of Jesus.

I suppose that these theological terms of ours and attempts at statements are the outgrowth always of practical necessity; they may not always be notable for their philosophical consistency, but they are always related to some practical issue. Atonement, therefore, has been variously set forth, both in ethnic religions, in Old Testament religion, and in the religion of the New Testament. It is a naïve supposition of ours that there ever was any agreement, either in scriptural times or at any time since atonement began to engage man's thought, and probably the supposition that we could now reach agreement is equally naïve. The process which is going on in our minds today is the old effort which man's mind makes when confronted with a vast truth. No

one statement, as has been suggested this afternoon, is adequate; no single definition can cover all the items in atonement.

We feel the charm of the ocean; we sit beside it in wonder; we perhaps ride across its billows, but when we take a cupful of water from it to our home and attempt to say, "This is the ocean," then our definition fails.

Now, to turn to the items, the counts of various elements of modern thought in which we would hope to describe in part at least this great fact of atonement, there are some things which may be noticed. The first general feature is the growth of *orderliness*, a scientific method, the progress from cause to effect; the substitution of a process which is demonstrable in human thought for any mystical statement which gets its strength from symbolism and type. Modern thought is characterized by an endeavor to make truth demonstrable by orderly process.

A second item under this general head in modern thought is, I suppose, *the historical method*. We find the thought of atonement in the Old Testament, and we find side by side with its priestly exhibition a party who took very little pleasure in the priestly interpretation of the idea of atonement.

Christianity today, if I understand the historical connections, relates itself more definitely to this prophetic element than to the priestly. We find that the priestly party, in their idea of atonement, give large place to ceremonial significance, and that the operation of this idea is most clearly applied to the restoration of one to ceremonial standing before God. On the other hand, the prophetic party cries out that "the sacrifices of God are a broken and a contrite spirit."

The two elements have come over, I suppose, into the New Testament, Jesus being more closely allied to the prophetic spirit, and perhaps some of those who were subsequent to him dabbling unfortunately in the priestly mechanical thought. But we may venture to say that the ceremonial element which was allied with atonement in the Old Testament would have been forgotten by this time had it not been for its transposition into Christianity and the interpretation which Christianity made of the life of Jesus in terms of that ancient ceremonial. For the followers of Jesus beheld him upon the cross, and while Christ's own inter-

pretation of suffering was different from that of current Judaism and not regarded as penalty inflicted by God, the temptation was almost irresistible for the early Christians to take the spectacle which confronted the Christian mind in that first century and to make it, by the finest piece of strategy that was conceivable, a glorious interpretation in terms of the ancient ritual. Paul did this and so significant was his interpretation that the church to the present day cannot shake itself free from his very terminology. By that act of Christian strategy he was able to overcome the stumbling-block of the cross, to make it the central figure, and to gather about it truths which are imperishable. He indeed so revels in the thought that he rises to higher and more vital conceptions than those contained in ancient sacrifice.

According to the historical method, then, the approach to the atonement is not from the eternal counsels of God, is not theological, but it is an approach based upon our knowledge, however limited or extended, of certain transactions here upon the earth; and modern thought begins, not with any proposition as to what God would likely do or should have done, but with a certain study of what is known to have transpired.

One other count in modern thought is *psychology*, and if there shall be any modern statement of the atonement, it must have reference to psychology which is coming in more and more. Psychology is about to have its day. Now, there was in that old ceremonial the idea of deliverance. There was in the Old Testament, and, I think, in places in the New Testament, the idea of substitution. In the Old Testament time there were goats of the day of Atonement; one was slain and the other had the sins of the people laid upon him. After they had been thus expiated he carried them away into the desert. Psychology drops a suggestion here which is true for a certain stage of culture. The power of suggestion in that spectacle meant much for the attainment of the moral state desired. We are saying today that to be convinced of a thing, to enter into it as a fact, is three-quarters of its accomplishment. The thought is allied to exorcism which works today not so much with adults as with children and people of a low stage of culture. When the parent denounces the imaginary naughty child and drives it from the house with considerable

flourish, the better self of the real child returns and reigns in smiling triumph. Suggestion, the sense of otherness, transmission and so renunciation of the naughtiness—that is the process which, I doubt not, many of us have found effective. It is an ingredient but not an ultimate in the thought of atonement. So that the psychological import of one being free from his state of sinfulness is at a certain stage of human development a valuable thing, but Paul breaks through and above this into a higher territory of unexploited power. Whatever you have to say about Paul's doctrine of atonement, he is always in a realm that is fraught with power; it is always vital.

Another term in modern thought is *biology*. Now, biology may qualify the antithesis out of which Paul and those who followed him got some of their strongest arguments in the matter of atonement, for biology perhaps does not credit the Hebrew account of a fall; but is looking at a process which is more determinable and more capable of being traced than the accounts in the early chapters of Genesis. That will affect the statement. Further, biology tells us, as has been stated this afternoon, of the great vicarious principle to which the atonement in modern statement will certainly be related. It tells us of suffering; it does not venture to tell us anything as to equivalents in suffering, but it tells us the great fact that parenthood in the physical realm, parenthood in the mental realm, parenthood in the production of character—that is in the ethical realm—all of this is a vicarious process. Thus biology is related to the New Testament term, travail, the *sine qua non* of advance, the cost of aggressive goodness in the progress of God's cause upon this imperfect earth.

Another point of view in modern thought is that of *sociology* which will reinterpret the old solidarity argument; will, by a study of man as effecting and affected by association, give to us new values for such great words as those which enter into the study of atonement: faith, showing its social source, showing that we have no faith of our own, but we have a faith which is partly our labor and largely the product of a community life. It will reinterpret sin which in the old terms was the wrong-doing of this malefactor who was antisocial, who was against the best things, and who himself broke the laws of God. It will interpret sin in

terms of social surroundings and in terms of common obligation that bind together the supposedly righteous in society to that part of society that has gone wrong. It will interpret salvation in new terms. Salvation will become, not plucking brands from the burning, but giving some attention to the conflagration itself.

It will tell us of a glorious process in which we must have fellowship with Jesus rather than of eschatology. We will look back still with a thrill of devout admiration to the enthusiasm which possessed the first Christians and then we will bend down in labor to bring in that which they thought would come upon the clouds and suddenly from heaven. Atonement will say in terms of sociology, "What leaven do you put into the mass, the mass out of which alone any given life can make its growth? What do you put into it? The atonement must have its social interpretation."

Down in South Chicago a few years ago a devout minister began his labor in that treeless and smoky section of our great city; and with him, his wife, who gave herself to the work without counting the cost. After a few years of visitation and faithful labor among those people, mostly foreigners, she was worn out and died. Then the minister lost his reason. Well, they were paying a ransom. Did they pay it to Satan? Modern thought is not so sure about Satan. They paid it to the Moloch of modern commerce. They paid it to the principle which every child of God has to meet today in society, that mammon is greater than manhood, and there you get the touch of sociology, upon the eternal fact of atonement. Oh, brethren, if Paul should burst upon our times with all of his former passion for Jesus and for man's redemption, do you suppose that his attempt to describe that matchless love would be without reference to these modern economic facts?

But the hardest thing of all in the modern count, the thing that will be most difficult in restatement, is the ethical, the strictly ethical content. As has been said this afternoon, and in a way which I could not even hope to approach, God practices no deception; never puts any colored glasses on his eyes, so he can look at people and say they are not what they are but they are what they seem to be. There is no magic that could possibly be exer-

cised by anyone, much less by him whom we honor as the Son of God, to make the slightest deviation in the thought of God to see things as they really are. That has been emphasized and ethics will take account of that. The father, when the prodigal son came home, did not have to find anyone to beat. There has grown up in Protestantism because of a mean idea of substitution that has nothing of the laying down of one's own life, which the apostle Paul had taught—if indeed he spoke of substitution—a habit of thought which promotes within the Protestant church and the evangelical wing of the Protestant church a shifting of responsibility; a pauperism of manliness; a sloppy morality; a hiding behind someone else who you hope will be hit instead of you.

Our churches have more weak brothers who cause ministers trouble and who cause business men great anxiety in their dealings with them, standing behind the proposition that it is not morality and not the quality of character that constitute salvation, but "a Jesus who stands there to be smitten in my stead." Brethren, modern ethics says it is not moral; that is what it says. You cannot transfer morality. Why, you cannot transfer education, friends, much less morality! I cannot take a young man out to the University of Chicago and put a gown on him and say he is clothed in the robe of education, meaning by that that he has thus been educated. That is all form and ceremony; that is not education. We cannot take a man and say, "You are unreliable; you are mean; you say unkind things to your wife; you cheat in business; but I am going to put the cloak of righteousness on you." It must be an achievement for him. By all that morality can ever be he must achieve it; he has got to win it. Now, in his winning of that I know no one whom I would set before him but Jesus Christ. There is the play of his inspiration, the influence, the invitation—ah, yes, the transformation of the personality by Jesus, but all in accord with the man's willing response, his effort, his quest. There is no mechanical transfer; substitution in this formal view of it is a snare and a delusion.

Jesus sought to unite all men to God as he himself was. Jesus was the unparalleled leader in that which should characterize every Christian. That is his own point of view. Jesus was in

the n -th power that which every true Christian must be in some power.

Another count in modern thought is *practical efficiency*, pragmatism. Does it work, and how much does it work? That is all. "By their fruits ye shall know them," and our reinterpretation must needs spring from our experience in saving effort born of the love of Christ and humanity.

Atonement then, I do not say the atonement of Jesus, I cannot compass that, I say atonement, this principle which is illustrated in the n -th power in Jesus Christ, is service for mankind undertaken as obedience to God in the spirit of love and faith, involving suffering because of the imperfect condition of humanity, and aiming to bring every member of society into such union with God and his fellows as will eventuate in a like service until the kingdom of God is fully come.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I am very happy in having five cards here from five gentlemen who desire to speak, and I am sure you will be very glad to hear the first one, Professor Foster, of the University of Chicago.

PROFESSOR G. B. FOSTER, D.D., The University of Chicago:

I came here with my mind quite made up simply to listen to discussions and such interesting matters. But I have been pretty strongly urged to take some small part in your discussion, much as it seems to me that the illuminating and really edifying addresses to which we have listened are pretty nearly all, perhaps, that we can say upon the subject in the present state of reflection; unless indeed it be a single point at which in a moment or two I might possibly find myself able to arrive. The point which I shall mention, not because I think it is the most important, but almost because I fear if I do not speak of it it won't be spoken of at all (laughter), is: the atonement in terms of modern thought. Which atonement? Rather, it is the doctrine of the atonement in terms of modern thought. Which doctrine? There are a dozen, I suppose, with all those compromises between them and insensible gradations of one into another, so that we have left a roving commission here to pick out which one we want to state in terms of modern thought.

In the second place, which modern thought? Is it the radical dualism of the Ritchlians? Is it some form of modern monism? I am at a loss to tell. Then again, when I am to express it in terms of modern thought, is it simply that I am to take one of these doctrines of the atonement in its self-identical content and talk about it with modern words? Is that all? Is it then a doctrine of atonement which is for substance fixed and final, only to translate that content into the jargon of modern thought? Is that all? If it is, the whole business does not amount to much.

Again, is it the doctrine of the atonement at all, or is it the fact of atonement, that we are interested in? I take it that the reality is not doctrine but fact, the fact of the atonement. Very well, then, if it be fact, what is the condition of knowing what the fact is? It is not biblical criticism primarily. It is not a philological inquiry and I suspect that even archaeology can lend little assistance in understanding if it is the fact of the atonement that we wish to understand.

Brethren, here, as well as everywhere else, action precedes knowledge. Here as everywhere else, if we are to understand the atonement theoretically we must first *be* it practically. But we are living precisely in a time when pain hurts us; we do not like suffering. We wish to be insulated from it, and aside from the secret certificate-of-deposit-God, we want a doctor for our God who will give us and keep us in such a meritorious condition that we won't suffer much. And so long as that is the case, psychologically and sociologically and ethically, as my young friend has been telling you, we are not in a position to talk about the doctrine of the atonement very fully.

We must get back again and lash down close to the great suffering humanity about us until we become bone of its bone and flesh of its flesh once more; then, and not until then, shall we understand the atonement.

But having said that, what then is the fact of the atonement? We think of Jesus and that is the one to think of first of all; and thinking of him—and this is the point that I rose to say, which, if I do not say, I am afraid won't be said—thinking of Jesus, what made him suffer? How did he come to suffer? He suffered in this way: The moral-order-Jesus is the source of the real

agony of the moral-progress-Jesus. The atonement at bottom is the pain which the moral order of the world inflicts upon the moral progress of the world, and he is the full illustration of that. It was a terrible thing for Jesus, in a lonely moment, to have the moral order say to him, "Why, Jesus, you are wrong in what you are doing." That was the great suffering. "You are upsetting things that are good," the best men of his time said to him, and there were moments when the moral-order-Jesus, identical with the moral order outside of Jesus, took sides against the moral-progress-Jesus, and there was the keenest anguish which it is possible for a good man to suffer. It belongs to the very order of the world itself that the bearer of progress, of the higher ideal, should fall a victim to order, to the vulgar reality about him. But both moral order and moral progress are in God. Once more with the Fathers you must carry up the atonement as having its essential condition in Deity himself. God suffers. It is God the moral order that requires the atonement; but God the moral progress that makes it.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will hear from Professor Franklin Johnson.

PROFESSOR FRANKLIN JOHNSON, D.D., Chicago, Ill.:

So far as I know, the New Testament seldom gives any theory of the atonement; it always speaks of the atonement simply as a fact, with one exception, and I am going to point out that exception presently. Equally certain is it that the New Testament nearly always regards the atonement as substitutionary. Now, it takes a vast amount of learning to put the fact of substitution out of the New Testament (laughter), and I have been edified and pleased somewhat to find some of my brethren avoiding that difficulty and saying that perhaps the writers of the New Testament did not know everything about it. Some of them might have been off their base a little when they were talking about that very immoral theory of substitution, or rather fact of substitution.

There is one passage, however, in which the apostle Paul broaches a theory, the only passage in the New Testament that does broach a theory, so far as I know; that is in the third chapter of Romans, at the twenty-fourth verse: "Being justified freely

by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God sent forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done beforetime in the forbearance of God, for the showing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season that he might himself be just and a justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus."

That is a somewhat complicated sentence, and I am very happy to avail myself of the exposition of it given by Dr. E. D. Burton of the Divinity School, in a series of numbered paragraphs of which I will read seven only :

1. In the ages before the coming of Christ, God passed over sins of men; i. e., he suffered them in part to go unpunished.

2. This passing over of sins was an act of forbearance on God's part; i. e., these sins deserved and might justly have received a punishment which they did not receive.

3. As a consequence of this passing over of sins in forbearance the righteousness of God came under suspicion; i. e., because God did not punish sin to the full, the impression was created in men's minds that God was indifferent to sin, was not pained by it, was not indignant at it.

4. Under these circumstances, accordingly, God's righteousness having been brought under suspicion by his forbearing to punish sin to the full, God made a public manifestation which had for its object the removal of this suspicion and the demonstration to men that he was righteous, that he was not indifferent to sin.

5. This public manifestation consisted in a setting forth of Jesus in his blood, i. e., in his death before the eyes of all the world. It need scarcely be said that not the visible spectacle of Jesus on the cross, but the fact viewed in its moral and historical significance is what is chiefly referred to.

6. That which this public setting forth of Jesus shedding his blood proved is something which was already true, but which having become obscured was in this event made manifest. This is implied in the choice of the words "set forth" and "showing," the latter made emphatic by its repetition. The death of Christ is in the view of our present passage a demonstration. God presents him to the view of men dying, not puts him to death. And this presentation demonstrates God's righteousness, not creates or satisfies it. God had not failed to be righteous, he had only failed, through forbearance, to convince men that he was righteous. The death of Jesus is a demonstration to the world that what seems true of God is not true, but that so far from being

indifferent to sin it is on the contrary a perpetual pain to him, that he perpetually disapproves it, is angry with it. At the same time the expression "that he might be righteous" implies that a perpetual "passing over" without "demonstration" would not only seem but be unrighteous.

7. In Jesus thus set forth in his blood, thus demonstrating God's righteousness, showing that God is not indifferent to sin, God provides himself a propitiation, i. e., makes it possible for him to show mercy toward those toward whom otherwise he would have been compelled to show wrath.

That is the first doctrine of the atonement ever announced. It comes by revelation at the very dawn of Christian history, and it is the last doctrine; it is distinctively the modern doctrine of the atonement which Spurgeon preached, which the Wesleys preached, which the New England theologians took hold of and presented with such cogency. It has its life in the very life of God, and it has its life in the very life of man.

It has been said that there are two great scandals in the administration of God; one is, that he allows sin, passes over sin; the other is that he forgives sin, and to avoid the misconstruction and the real unrighteousness which this might involve on his part, he himself suffers. He takes upon himself the agony and bears it to the full. That is my modern theory of the atonement.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will hear from Professor G. B. Smith, of the University of Chicago.

PROFESSOR GERALD B. SMITH, Chicago, Ill.:

I am really here as an illustration of the fact that vicariousness in one form is not out of date, for my name was sent up by another. (Laughter.) However, I think all of us have certain profound convictions on this theme and I, too, have mine, although many of them have been already voiced in much better fashion than I could put the matter myself.

Not long ago I was taking lunch with two of my college classmates. One of them, a young lawyer of remarkably clean and upright life, who never drinks, smokes, or indulges in any of the personal vices, who is generous-hearted and open-minded and sympathetic to all that is good, said to me that when a few

years ago one of his fraternity men in college was through the seminary and was about to go into the ministry, he asked him what he was going to preach. The zealous reply was, "I am going to preach Christ and him crucified, and that alone." And this young lawyer said, "Oh, for pity's sake, don't do that."

Now, that is one type of modern mind. I asked him what was his objection to his friend's programme. He said, "If religion is going to help us today, you have got to talk to us in language that we understand. If you try to preach Christ crucified, you have to explain it to us by introducing a lot of New Testament exposition discussing the meaning of strange words, elucidating the significance of sacrifice, and all the rest. Now by the time you have done all this, Christianity seems unreal to us." I am not prepared to say how widely prevalent that particular type of modern thought is, but at any rate nothing could be more foreign to the New Testament ideal than to have the doctrine of the atonement so presented that it should make the Christian religion unreal to men.

Let us ask in what ways may it become unreal to men today? The doctrine of the atonement involves two primary conceptions—sin and God. What does sin mean to the modern man? It certainly does not mean what our systematic theologians define it to mean. Sin for the modern man grows out of the actual, social situation in which he finds himself. Sin is not thought of so much as an offense against God as it is an offense against men who deserve something better than to know oppression and greed. I suppose the most powerful book on sin which has appeared in the past few months has been written, not by a theologian at all, but by a man who is rather indifferent to theology. I refer to Professor Ross's *Sin and Society*. In that book the author sets forth in real and vivid language precisely the social sins which make our blood boil today. He has voiced modern thought on the subject.

Now, I think that the first step toward a modern statement of the doctrine of the atonement is to bring home to us comfortable professing Christians and church members something which turns out, strangely enough, to be quite parallel to the old doctrine of original sin. When you and I discover that by frequenting

bargain counters, by seeking investments for our money which shall bring quick returns, we have all unconsciously and thoughtlessly been sharing in a social sin which brings suffering and death to helpless men and women and children, there ought to lie upon our souls a burden which will lead us to cry out for redemption. That for one thing. We are coming into a new consciousness of sin. But it is not the theological sin. It is not the sin against an angry God, but the sin against humanity, mankind.

And then what about God? I suppose modern thought has very vague and far-away notions of the God who needed to be propitiated in the old sense. Modern thought thinks of our world and of the human race in terms of the doctrine of evolution. Modern thought must find its God not apart from the universe, watching over it, but in its very structure living out his life as his world grows and matures.

Now, the older theologians were very much afraid of what they called "patrippassionism." It was thought essential to the immutability of God that he should not be permitted to suffer. Christ suffered; but not God. And yet even the doctrine of the immutability of God could not keep out of sight the religious certainty that if God is to be our God he must share the life of his children. Now, the God of modern thought is the immanent God, the God who is to work out his will and his purpose in this world. When we discover that we have been inflicting upon this growing world of humanity an irreparable wrong in our selfishness and our thoughtlessness, then we know that the God whose life is expressing itself in the life of his children must take upon himself the burden of our sin, and our atonement with him is purchased at tremendous cost.

Forgiveness, then, from the modern point of view, is going to seem like a more costly thing than from the old point of view. It demands the infinite sacrifice of the infinite God constantly. And we can know the meaning of that atonement only as—and this is Paul's thought—in union with the atoning God we ourselves shall take upon ourselves that work and feel the atoning power which can come only through—shall I say substitutionary suffering?—let us say vicarious suffering with redemptive power.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We have but two more of these short addresses, and I hope that all will remain. We have heard from three university men. We are now going to hear from a brother from Indianapolis, a Disciple; Rev. W. L. Hayden will please step to the platform.

REV. W. L. HAYDEN (Disciple), Indianapolis, Ind.:

It would be quite impossible for me to listen to so many most admirable addresses upon this most vital subject of the gospel and not feel inclined to say something. Unfortunately I made this remark and somebody sent up my name; that is why I am here. (Laughter.)

But now I want to say that I have been greatly delighted with the different phases of the subject that have been presented; many things I would like to say in emphasizing some parts of it, my time will not allow, and perhaps it is presumptuous in a man of my age, born perhaps the other side of the line that separates between the ancient and the modern thought (laughter) to attempt to translate anything in the Bible into modern thought. (Renewed laughter.) I think I would prefer to follow a little, and I am relieved from my embarrassment by the speaker who spoke next to the last one, who ventured to get somewhere near the divine thought in the matter.

It seems to me that in a great theme like this, while it is well for us to speak in such English that people can understand us, it is well enough that we get our thought as near to the divine expression as possible. Now, it is true that there is something said in the Bible that gives some basis for the different theories of atonement, but I was glad to hear the fact emphasized that it is in fact and not in theory that the achievement lies in the inspired word. I used to try to theorize about it when I began to preach. I could not do it very well. I learned some words from my professor; I couldn't use them very satisfactorily. (Laughter.) And I could not very well frame a theory that would fit all parts of it so it would be satisfactory to my own mind, so I concluded to confine myself to stating the facts about it in the Bible and in as plain English as I could and with as much heart

in it as I could, and so get the people to come under the power of the atonement of Christ.

I heard an old man say (he was old when he said it, and it was thirty years ago when I heard it) that there are but three facts in theology: the first is the greatness of God, the second is the wretchedness of man, and the third is the atonement in Christ. I think I may properly say *the* atonement. (Laughter.) I question a little about different atonements. And, if we can only understand that Christ is the great medium between God and men through which his power to reach and save our fallen race has to come to us, we need not in our thought limit the fact of the atonement of Christ to his death upon the cross—it means more than that. It means God's reaching us through his son in all the ways in which he touched humanity, and I suppose the greatest demonstration of his life and power was in the death of Jesus Christ upon the cross. Whether I can explain how that stands related to the law of God or not, has nothing to do with the question. We do understand that it stands in a very close relation to bringing a sinner to repentance, and I am inclined more and more, if I am going to limit it to any one part of it, to the moral influence of the atonement rather than to any other theory I have ever heard.

But now I want to say as I close, I have a thought about it; I think it is a modern thought. (Laughter.) Some time ago I knew a man who had a son he loved dearly who was just starting in a downward course. He had warned him and admonished him, and he was taken sick. The father was upon his bed of sickness for some time with a fever, and while he was sick he heard that this boy had been away in some place of dissipation. When the word came to him, his heart was almost broken. He said, "I wish you would go out and bring me in a rod." They brought it in and put it up in a corner near his bed. "I wish you would tell Charles to come in." He came in, and then he talked to him. "I understand you have been so and so, and so and so?" "Yes." "Didn't I tell you not to go?" "Yes." "Why did you go?" Well, he couldn't explain it very well. "Well," he said, "Charles, there is the rod. Take it, throw back the cover and lay it upon me until you are satisfied. If I have not suffered enough from you, put

it upon me until I do." Charles broke down and said he would not go any more.

I think when the Father was suffering, if God does suffer, it was in this way, to know that his son—shall I so speak? I believe that is the language of modern thought—had gone from him so far that he had to come down to him in the person of his only begotten Son and let men see what it caused him to suffer because of our lost race, and if that does not win men back to God, I do not think there is much hope for them.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will listen now to the closing remarks by Rev. Samuel Batten, of Lincoln, Neb.

REV. SAMUEL ZANE BATTEN, Lincoln, Neb.:

Mr. President, and Brethren: There are some things that it seems are made very plain by the discussion this afternoon: First, that there is such a thing as the modern child. And another thing is that the older conception of the atonement, the older theories of the atonement, probably I had better say, have gone and have gone forever. They are simply unbelievable, they are simply unpreachable today. That being the case we are driven then to form some interpretation of that great fact, if we believe it is a fact, and we seek also some interpretation of it, and I want to say, brethren, that I believe that it will be a sad day for the church of Jesus Christ when doctrine is radical. What we need in our time is a great deal more theological thinking than we have now. It will be a sad time for the church when we no longer think in theological terms.

Now, I believe I come last on the programme this afternoon, and I suppose this is the time to sum up the discussions, and I am going to be presumptuous enough to sum up two or three of the things. Assuming that there is a modern child, assuming that there are certain terms in our modern thought, what are some of those elements?

First, that God is Father, that fatherhood defines the fundamental and the final relation between God and man.

Another thing is that Jesus Christ is the interpretation, you may say, of the very father-heart of God. Not only that, but it is in Jesus Christ that all things have been created, the life that

we have is life from him, and it is life in him. Not only so, but Jesus Christ reveals that which is essential and eternal in the life of God. He has not come to save us from God. He has not come to change God's attitude toward the human race. He has come, rather, to express that which is eternal in him, and we must say that every impulse of love and compassion that throbs in the heart of Jesus Christ throbs from eternity in the heart of God.

Then another thing that I think has been made plain here this afternoon is, that sin is breaking relations, or, looking at it from the other side in its personal aspect, we may say that sin is selfishness; it is the desire of the individual to make himself supreme, to break away from God, if he will break away from his fellows, to injure men, to care nothing for them.

And then one other thing: righteousness is a matter of right relations. If God is a righteous God, that means that God must be in certain relations with every creature of his, and they must be right relations. Now, if God is love, by the very essence of the term, God must love someone. We talk about love as though it were something in the air, some vague, some indefinite thing, but that is an impossible situation. If a man loves, he loves someone, and if God is love, God loves someone, and if God is to be a righteous God, he must remain in loving relations with his creatures.

Now, that is one side of it. What is the work, then, that Jesus Christ comes to do? What is the very essence, you may say, of the atonement? Assuming that the word means reconciliation, what is the work that Jesus Christ comes to do? For one thing, to reveal and interpret God to the world.

The devil had been slandering God. He had been saying to all mankind, as he said to our first parents, "Why has God forbidden you to eat at that tree? I will tell you why. God knows that if you eat of that tree you shall be as he is. Now, he is jealous of you. He lives for himself; he wants to keep you down. Now, the way for you to be like God is to assert yourself, to be free."

Jesus Christ has come to nail that lie of the devil, that God lives for himself; he has come to destroy that work of the devil.

Not only so, but he has come to reveal that very father-heart of God, God loving men, God seeking men, God suffering with men, God suffering for men. And we cannot think of a good God that did not suffer with his children if those children are in travail; we cannot conceive of a good God that did not give himself for them even unto death if that were necessary.

And then just one word with respect to sacrifice: What do we mean by it, brethren? It seems to me that the final thought is this: that self-sacrifice wherever you find it, whether in God or in man, is not merely refusing to do something that is pleasant to ourselves; that is only a very small part of it. It is the denial of our own self; it is the refusal to live for ourselves, in our choice of others, in our decision to live for all. And God is the God of self-sacrifice because God refuses to live in himself and for himself and chooses rather to live in and for and with his children.

Now, what is the work then that Jesus does, you say? He reveals God as he is; makes us know God's attitude toward us; makes us know that which is fundamental and final in God's being, and so he convicts us of sin. He makes us see that we have broken relations. We are not living as children ought to live before the Father. He makes us see that we are living in sin because when the Son came into the world we refused him and chose rather a murderer in his place, and, brethren, we never should have known what sin is in this universe but for the suffering and the death of Jesus Christ. We did not know that sin was such a dreadful thing as that. We had supposed it was simply pride, or some innocent thing like that. But sin was a blow at God. Man would have killed God if man could have reached him as men sold his Son in selfishness. In our determination to have our way, in our refusal of the life of God we were willing to send Jesus Christ to the cross.

Now, Jesus Christ, for one thing, then, convicts the world of sin. He makes us know what a dreadful thing sin is. And, brethren, I believe the church is right when the church has always said that there could be for man no salvation without the coming and the death and the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Not that it was necessary for God to be placated, but without that revelation of

God in Jesus Christ, man would never have known God as he is. Man would never have known sin as it is. Man would never have been persuaded to put away his sin and come back to the Father. And so it was necessary, it could not have been otherwise in God's universe, that there must be such a revelation of God and such a revelation also of man that it is possible for God to forgive sin because it has been possible for man to repent of this sin.

And just one word more, brethren, which is this: What is the very essence of salvation? Going behind all terms now, what is the final thing? Just two statements: The possession of the mind of Christ is salvation; and the only salvation, my brother, that you can conceive of here or anywhere is the possession of the mind of Christ, and the man that has that has the real thing—the man that has the spirit of Christ, the man that is in harmony with God, the man that is in right relations with his fellows. And then it comes back to that other thought that righteousness is a matter of right relation and Jesus Christ has come to adjust the relations between man and God and between man and his brother.

Just one word, which is the word written by Livingston in Africa only a day or two possibly before his translation: "What is the atonement of Christ but himself? His own life and death and character revealing the infinite love of God for all his children, and drawing all men to himself, not by fear but by goodness."

PRESIDENT JACKSON: This evening at eight o'clock we come together again, and our theme for discussion is: "What Definite Steps Should Be Immediately Taken in the Organic Union of Baptists, Free Baptists, and Disciples of Christ?"

Let us rise and be dismissed with prayer by Dr. Van Doren.

The closing prayer having been uttered by Dr. Van Doren, an adjournment was taken until 8 o'clock P. M.

SECOND DAY

Evening Session

November 11, 1908

8 o'clock P. M.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The time has arrived for the opening of the evening services. Let us rise and sing together Hymn No. 95.

(The Congress rose and joined in singing Hymn No. 95)

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will be led in prayer by Dr. Stockdale.

(The opening prayer was offered by Dr. Stockdale)

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We come together in this session of our Congress to discuss a question of deep interest to all of us: "What Definite Steps Should Be Immediately Taken in the Organic Union of Baptists, Free Baptists, and Disciples of Christ?" The first writer is Rev. I. J. Spencer, of Lexington, Ky. Will Mr. Spencer step forward and take the platform?

REV. I. J. SPENCER, LL.D., Lexington, Ky., read the following paper:

WHAT DEFINITE STEPS SHOULD BE IMMEDIATELY
TAKEN TOWARD THE ORGANIC UNION OF
BAPTISTS, FREE BAPTISTS, AND DISCIPLES OF
CHRIST?

Mr. President: I esteem it a great privilege to make a plea for Christian union, especially as the religious bodies here represented are coming more and more to regard such a union as practicable. I am not responsible for the statement of my subject; but accepted it with the mental reservation that I would indicate the immediate spiritual, rather than mechanical, steps that ought to be taken.

I wish to be understood, however, as advocating organic union when we are ready for it. But as I believe in a change of heart before baptism, so I think the spirit of unity should be so cherished that it will easily find channels in which to flow. We do not want organic ecclesiasticism. Local church independency amounts to a "thus saith the Lord," with us.

I would take every step that can be taken wisely toward organic union, but I believe the forcing process should be applied inwardly rather than outwardly. The Christian plant is an endogen and not an exogen; it grows from within outward and not from without inward. If there be ice in the river and bitter winter in the air, it is useless to employ men to cut the ice for steamboat traffic. Before the sun in his journeying reaches his summer solstice the ice will melt and disappear. As Daniel Webster said of eloquence, so may we speak of Christian union: "It will come, if it come at all, like the outbursting of a fountain, with spontaneous, original, native force." Its springs are in heaven waiting for conduits in human hearts through which to flow down in blessing upon the world. Christian union, like Jacob's ladder, the New Jerusalem and every good gift, comes down from above. Everything is beautiful in its time. And there is a season for every purpose under heaven.

Having married a couple on a certain occasion, I was asked by the bride how I liked the groom. When I had answered, she said: "The reason I ask is because I never met him myself until Tuesday." You will not be surprised to hear that they separated.

The only proper way to approach this theme is in the *spirit of prayer*. We cannot advance except upon our knees. The failure of unions made prematurely and unwisely admonish us. Jesus himself approached it thus. He prayed to the Father. He did not argue with the apostles. The same love that brought him to the cross brought him to that prayer. It was a peculiar spiritual oneness for which he offered his petition. It was not union in any *thing*, but union in him personally and in the Father. The spiritual union, however, was to be so tangible, visible, spectacular, and uncontradictable; so simple, commendable, impressive, magnetic, and gracious, that even the wicked world, seeing it, would be won to Christ its divine center.

The plea of the apostle Paul to the brethren in Ephesus to "keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace" immediately and logically followed the record of his wonderful prayer to the Father that they might be strengthened by the Holy Spirit and be filled with all the fulness of God. We know that the spirit desires union; and to be led of the spirit is not to be forced apart

from, but tenderly drawn toward, the brethren. We must not wait for union to come like "irresistible grace." We must devoutly seek it.

The next step I would suggest is to create a profound and universal conviction of the sin of divisions in the church of God. The writer of the Epistles to the Corinthians idealizes his brethren as "sanctified," "called to be saints," but yet really "carnal" or unspiritual and only "babes" in Christ, because they were contentious. Some said they were of Paul, some of Peter, and others of Apollos. He asks, even as the heathen are asking over our sectarian divisions, "Is Christ divided?" "Was Paul crucified for you?" Will anyone dare to exalt a doctrine, a person, or a name—even the name of an apostle—instead of the Crucified? "Were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" Baptism, brethren, is nothing except for the name of Christ. Therefore the apostle was glad that he had baptized none of the Corinthians, save only a few, lest any should say they had been baptized in the name of Paul. Then this spiritual physician seeing that as yet they were only babes in grace, and suffering from that children's disease, division, from which strong men in Christ are immune, prescribed the very milk of the gospel: "Christ crucified . . . the power of God and the wisdom of God." He further declares that he had determined not to know *anything* among them save Jesus crucified. As Saint Paul wrote, in another epistle, that he counted all things as refuse for Christ, so should every denominational leader in Christendom today. I said recently, to the astonishment of some of my friends, that the only hindrance to union and co-operation between Baptists and Disciples is ignorance or sin. I give as authority the third chapter of First Corinthians. The sin of "carnality"—or the ignorance of spiritual babyhood caused the trouble. The knowledge of Christ and his sole exaltation was the remedy in Corinth and will be in America. This, along with the removal of misunderstandings among the brethren here represented, would lead to such an affectionate co-operation as would convince the world that there is a new power in Christianity. I think the masses of our people are profoundly ignorant of the doctrinal views one of the other. I cannot think the trouble is perversity. This leads me to advocate another essen-

tial step, namely, religious *education* of the masses. There are a million Disciples of Christ not yet enlisted in our general missionary movement. I suppose there are three million Baptists not yet co-operating with their great missionary enterprises. It should be an education not only in the great truths of Christianity, but in the organization, mission, motive, and universal progress of the church abroad and at home. The Roman Catholics are far ahead of us in teaching their religion. Our children are in the Bible school one hour a week. Theirs are taught their religion six days out of seven. Perhaps nothing is so strategic and pivotal in all our churches as religious education such as I have named.

If it were voted in a great national convention of the three bodies here represented to join forces, how long would it be until the remote districts would get the news and get it straight? It took a hundred years of mistaken instruction to get and keep us apart. God grant that within less than ten years the teaching of Christ and the cry of the heathen may bring us together. Nevertheless let us not be impatient or grow weary in well-doing.

Take two illustrations of misconception on the part of Baptists and Free Baptists concerning doctrinal points in the teaching of the Disciples. One is the design of baptism, and the other the operation of the Holy Spirit. It has been said that from the Baptist standpoint these are the chief doctrinal differences between them and the Disciples. Now of course no one person, nor even ten thousand persons, can speak authoritatively as to what Baptists, Free Baptists, or Disciples do actually believe. But so far as I know the position of the Disciples on these two subjects I will here state it, in order to a better understanding of the same.

In connection with faith and repentance baptism is a divinely appointed condition of membership in the church, the body of Christ in whom alone we have the remission of sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and eternal life. We do not believe in baptismal regeneration, but in spiritual regeneration through Christ symbolized in baptism. We do not preach, "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins;" but, "Repent and be baptized *into the name of Jesus Christ* unto the remission of sins." It is not baptism that saves, but the *name of Christ* only. There is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we may be saved.

Ananias did not say to Saul at Damascus, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins;" but, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins calling *upon the name of the Lord.*" For it is written, "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved;" not, whosoever is baptized shall be saved. The name of the Lord is the essential, meritorious, and effectual consideration in connection with baptism and the remission of sins. That fact was the reason why the apostle Paul was glad he had baptized so few in Corinth lest any should say he had baptized in his own name. If Paul had believed in so-called "baptismal regeneration" he would never have so said.

And concerning the Ho'y Spirit we believe that he was sent to convict the world of sin, righteousness, and the judgment; that he testifies not of himself but of Christ and reveals his will. He dwells in the believer, and, if permitted, will abide with him in exceeding fulness; helping his infirmities and making intercession for him according to the will of God. He enlightens, quickens, regenerates, leads, comforts, teaches, strengthens the believer with might in the inner man; works in him to will and to do the divine pleasure; seals sanctifies, and keeps him in living union with Christ. No greater gift can be granted to any man than the gift of the Spirit of God. Although he uses the word of God in conversion and sanctification we believe he also works through prayer, through Providence and godly persons; and we would in no wise limit his operations to the word or to methods which we can analyze and comprehend.

I am sure I express the essential conviction of the great majority of my brethren, the Disciples, in the foregoing statements of doctrine, although many of them might use different verbiage and come closer to the full teaching of Scripture on the subject than I have done. I shall not venture or presume to state the views of my Baptist brethren on these points for comparison.

As Dr. Charles H. Dodd suggests, the story of two passengers in an old-fashioned stage-coach, having entered at different stations and traveling together as strangers in the night, but who discovered in the morning that they were brothers, illustrates the fact that we, too, have been riding side by side over the long,

sad night-ways; but the daybreak reveals the truth that we are brethren.

Another step to real and abiding union in Christ is *lowliness*. Without it men will not learn nor be advanced. The spirit of docility, humility, and willingness to serve is strategic. When the oft-recurring query arose in the little group of apostles as to who should be the greatest, Jesus made a little child reprove them for their pride and self-seeking. On the night of his agony in the Garden, just preceding his prayer for his disciples and their union in him, he taught the most picturesque and beautiful lesson of humility. Simon Peter never forgot it and, years afterward, writing to his brethren of the dispersion, he said: "All of you gird yourselves with humility to serve one another; for God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble."

Let us remember that it was only through the most obedient humiliation that Jesus came to his exaltation, to the name above every name, and the worship above every worship. His church can reach its glory and its sphere among the nations only as it girds itself with humility and is willing to serve. Joseph Cook declared truly that "the church of the future is the church willing to wash the feet of the lowliest saints." Still another essential, without which organic union would fail, is *the love of God*. This love is the best proof of a regenerate church membership. Would it not indicate more love for the three bodies mentioned to join ranks than to remain separate? Does the world think that any custom, history, tradition, or any mere segment of doctrine is worthy of a place as exalted as Christ? Have any of us been baptized into any name but the name of Christ? If so I am sure it was "alien immersion," without the promise of the Holy Spirit, and such a subject needs not a *re-baptism* but a *real* baptism into the name of Christ. Did not our Lord inquire, when he made Simon Peter a shepherd, as well as a fisherman, concerning this greatest thing in the world, a regnant love for the personal Christ?

Soon after the Chicago fire I saw a large mass of steel tools, iron instruments, and implements that had been melted together in the heat of that fierce conflagration. The peculiar character of each could be recognized, but the individual parts could not be separated. So when the love of God shall have melted our hearts

they will cohere in Christ and no doctrine nor doctor of divinity can force them apart. As illustrating the fact that love represents the manhood of the church and the Christian, Paul says: "When I was a child I spake as a child; I thought as a child. But when I became a man I put away childish things." When love is wanting "we see through a glass darkly," but when it prevails "we see face to face." Is our manhood still delaying?

Another step in the process of the right kind of getting together is superlative *loyalty to Christ*. As the spokes of a wheel approach each other as they approach the hub, so do we as we draw near in loyalty to our Lord. It means his absolute and exclusive supremacy. Elijah and Moses must disappear from the vision and Jesus only abide. You cannot serve God and denomination. You cannot be suffered even to bid farewell to sectarian leaders that are in the rear. You cannot in safety go back to bury your own history, traditions, and shibboleths. Let the dead bury their dead. If any man hate not his father's creed and his mother's sect he is not worthy of his Lord. Except a man forsake all that he hath he cannot be Jesus' disciple. Except he sell all, he cannot buy the priceless pearl.

But one says: "I cannot conscientiously sacrifice my principles for the sake of union." Brethren, if any man's principles stand between him and Christian union then the sooner he adopts a new set of principles the better. Whatever is my own I may give away. My ignorance, prejudice, bigotry, jealousy, idolatry, or pride, I may freely and legitimately surrender. But the glorious gospel, given me in trust, I must sacredly administer. Jesus himself was never loyal to any mere thing. He never centered himself and his disciples about any point or segment of truth. He was loyal to the Father. All authority is his and where he speaks we speak; and where he is silent we are silent.

Still another imperative step is Christian *liberty*. I imagine I hear some persons say: "We are Baptists, Free Baptists, and Disciples of Christ and were never in bondage to any man. Liberty is one of the foremost principles of our religion." But if ye were free ye would not resist his will, obstruct the answer to his prayer, and put him to shame before the world. Whom God hath set free is free indeed and none can bind; and whom he hath

bound none can set free. That may sound like Calvinism; but it was not so intended. Certain it is that the best freemen in Christ have been his best bond-servants from the days of Paul until now. In speaking of the providential meaning of the present movement toward unity, Dr. Dodd of Baltimore quotes Prince Albert as saying: "Young men, find out God's plan in your generation and fall in with it." And then he adds: "We are caught in nothing less than the flood-tide of the Holy Spirit's fulfilling will. . . . I see nothing half so supernatural in this day of ours as this impulse toward fraternity and solidarity. It is impossible to resist it. I look upon it as the spiritual miracle of the times."

From India, China, and Japan comes the pathetic cry: "We would see Jesus!" and the Master, pleased, said the hour had come that he should be glorified. But instead of presenting Christ, who makes free, men lift up their denominational standards that obscure the view. The orientals want unity in the faith and get division. But as someone has said: "We cannot export what we do not import." The Japanese say: "We are poor and cannot afford your American luxury of division. We want a united church of Christ in Japan."

The man of Macedonia still stands across the sounding seas and calls for help. "Give us loaves!" the heathen cry, and we answer: "Trouble me not. The door is now shut and my denominational children are with me in bed. I cannot rise and give thee." But the importunate cry sounds on and waxes louder and louder. It haunts our dreams. It troubles our conscience. Let us, in God's name arise and give them "as many as they need." How suggestive is the determination of the apostles and elders and the whole church in Jerusalem—this erstwhile narrow and bigoted church—to send fraternal delegates to Antioch to carry a lowly, loving, loyal, and liberty-breathing message: "It seemeth good to the Holy Spirit, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things." And how the whole church at Antioch "rejoiced for the consolation." Let us deal likewise one with another.

Briefly I would suggest the following recommendations:

1. Let us heed the missionaries' pleading that the denomina-

tions of the West shall not be bound upon the East. Let us encourage our missionary boards to promote union in every place where it shall seem wise and commendable.

2. Let us confirm all those who have gone forward to Christian union, and rejoice in the moral and spiritual transformations resulting from such union. In western Canada, for example, confirmed skeptics have been converted through it and are now teaching in Sunday schools.

3. Let us inaugurate a great campaign of education among our people—an exchange of pulpits, of Bible-school literature, of fraternal delegations to all our missionary gatherings; an exchange of writers for the pages of our religious journals; an exchange of cheering missionary tidings, and a free exchange of our religious editors.

4. Let us resolve to be courteous always, and to practice the whole of the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, item by item.

Let us send to each other whole baskets of the delicious, beautiful, and wholesome fruits of the Spirit and determine that never again will we misrepresent one another. And let us remember that no writer has any authority to speak or act for the Baptists, Free Baptists, or Disciples, and that we should not hold the entire body to account for what one of its members does or says. It is not scientific. It is not legal. It is not scriptural. It is not fair. Rather, do as some of us used to do down in Kentucky: hold each man personally responsible for himself only.

5. I rejoice with you all at the overtures of the Baptists and Free Baptists, which they made after the adjournment yesterday, to the Disciples to join their Congress on equal terms, in every way, and thus to make it both ours and theirs.

I am happy, too, at the hearty, prompt, and unanimous acceptance on the part of the Disciples present—both sides voting unanimously to recommend the coalition to all who are absent but have a voice in the management of either institution.

So may it be that, whether Baptists, Free Baptists, or Disciples, “all are yours and ye are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s.” He that heareth these sayings of Christ concerning union and doeth them is wise and is building upon the Rock.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The next speaker, Rev. Carter E. Cate, of Providence, R. I., is absent, I understand. There is some explanation, I believe, which the Secretary will make.

THE SECRETARY: It is very unfortunate that we should ever have a failure in the Congress programme. It happens very seldom, I am proud to say. It is exceedingly unfortunate that one of the three men, each of whom was appointed to represent his own denomination, has failed. The following letter was received after my arrival in this city:

158 Elmwood avenue, PROVIDENCE, R. I.
November 7, 1908

Theo. A. R. Gessler, D.D., Landing, N. J.:

DEAR BROTHER: I regret exceedingly that on account of sickness I shall not be able to attend the Congress in Chicago next week.

Cordially yours,

CARTER E. CATE

PRESIDENT JACKSON: Before the address of Brother Crandall, we will have a word from Doctor Gates.

PROFESSOR ERRETT GATES:

I have been asked by the treasurer of the Baptist committee to take his place in a brief statement to you regarding the financial needs of the Congress committee. I suppose I am asked to do this in his place because a new broom sweeps a little cleaner, and out of this splendid audience tonight it seems to me that we ought to receive an abundance, a superabundance of help to put the Executive Committee of the Baptist Congress squarely upon its feet in this matter.

Do you know that every good and great thing costs something? Everything that is desirable and worth while to you, you pay for; and the cheapest thing, the least expensive thing in all your life, you will bear me witness, is your religion. Everything else costs more, the house you live in, the clothes you wear, the splendid dinners you give, the theaters you go to; everything else costs you more than your religion. It has cost something to bring these splendid representatives from the various denominations to this platform. We have concentrated here and boiled down the selected intelligence and piety of three denominations: the finest

collection of speakers and thinkers I think I have ever been in the presence of upon a Christian platform. What is it costing you? Your car fare down here? It ought to cost you more than that.

And then it is worth something also to get the testimony which we Disciples have been seeking from you Baptists that you are not afraid of us. It was a supreme and a sublime act of confidence in the Disciples on the part of your Baptists that you threw open your arms and the splendid programme of this Congress, and said, "Come in and say anything you want to say. Tell your story about baptism and the operation of the Holy Spirit. Come in. If you have anything distinctive and peculiar in your doctrines to state, we Baptists will give you a chance to state them." And, I think, this good Baptist brotherhood has demonstrated that they are no longer afraid of us. They were afraid of us seventy-five or one hundred years ago. They closed church doors on us then, but we are now entering upon a new epoch. The Baptists are now *opening* church doors, and bigger doors than the church doors; they are opening *congress* doors, which represent many churches.

And, as a Disciple of Christ, this occasion is a kind of confirmation of long-deferred hopes—an answer to prayers that have been ascending from my heart for many years, and I am willing to help pay for it all. It is worth something, this demonstration, this testimony that has been given us by our Baptist brethren.

And now, if the ushers will come forward and will wait upon the audience, I feel sure that your response will be equal to the speech I have made. (Laughter.)

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We have a provision in our rules of order for voluntary speakers; and in case anyone would like to address the meeting upon the theme of the meeting, it will be necessary for him to send his name to the Secretary and when he speaks for him to come to the platform. I hope that while the next speaker is addressing us, several will send their cards forward. I will ask Dr. Johnson on this side of the house and Dr. Gates on the other side of the house to walk down the aisle and bring a little moral and physical suasion to bear upon these friends to address us at the close of Dr. Crandall's address.

You will now listen to Dr. Crandall, who was at one time pastor of this church and who is now at Minneapolis.

REV. L. A. CRANDALL, D.D. (Baptist), Minneapolis, Minn.:

With the indulgence of this flint-hearted Secretary who looks at his watch before I begin, I want to say some thing before I begin, and I will say it, not to the Congress but to such members of the Memorial Church of Christ and Baptists and Disciples as may be present here tonight.

I had the honor to be pastor of some of these people for twelve years. I cannot stand on this platform tonight without feelings of the profoundest emotion. I saw these walls rise, brick by brick. I built my life into the life of some of these people for long years and I have a word that I want to say in order that all conjecture concerning my own attitude toward this union may be put at rest. It is this: If in the providence of God I should be seized by those fatal ministerial diseases, sore throat and a swollen bank account, so that I should be compelled to give up the continuance of the Christian ministry and move to Chicago, I should take great delight in putting my letter into this church.

I believe in the organization. I love many of the men and women whom I have known through many years; and I should love all the rest, I am sure, if I only had a chance, and I hold in respect and hold in the warmest place in my heart the honored pastors of this organization.

Having said this much, I proceed to the discussion of the question before us. If anybody has any doubt as to my attitude in the matter, I will relieve their minds at the close if they will approach me personally.

WHAT IMMEDIATE STEPS CAN BE TAKEN TOWARD ORGANIC UNION BETWEEN BAPTISTS, FREE BAPTISTS, AND DISCIPLES?

The only relief afforded to the unhappy victim who, in a moment of weakness, has consented to write upon this subject, lies in the suggestion implicit in that word "steps." This little monosyllable indicates that the framers of the question simply desire to know how the task of bringing three distinct ecclesiastical bodies into organic unity may be begun. They have fixed

no time limit, neither do they specify how many steps may be taken; for all of which one reader, at least, is profoundly grateful.

It is not difficult to point out the evils arising from the divisions of Christendom. No abnormal degree of perspicuity is required to recognize the weakness and inefficiency directly traceable to sectarianism. The beauty of fraternalism, the strength that comes from unity, the undying pathos of our Lord's plea that his disciples should be one—all this has been set forth in eloquent speech and repeatedly. To every plea for the unity of Christendom we devoutly say "Amen and Amen!"

But it is one thing to fill the soul with entrancing visions and quite another to realize them. The question as to desirability is easily settled, but that of possibility still remains to perplex us. The Ways and Means Committee never lacks something to do. When the orator has finished his impassioned plea leaving the hearts of his hearers glowing with desire, the little word, "how?" thrusts itself to the front to dampen ardor and compel thoughtfulness. The question before us is not to be answered by rhetoric, however brilliant. It is cold and merciless, summoning us out of the realm of imagination and dreams to the calm, passionless consideration of facts.

Organic union is a life process. Bodies may be one in law and two in fact. We are all familiar with the process of grafting by which two living forms are made to share a common life, and we have also seen the Christmas evergreen bearing oranges. In one case the union was vital, in the other mechanical. Legislation cannot produce organic union. Ecclesiastical bodies generated and developed by antagonistic convictions, bodies which hold to interpretations of the teaching of Jesus that differ fundamentally, cannot become one in fact, no matter what is decided by ecclesiastical vote. All growth is from within. Any real progress in the unification of Christendom must follow this law.

This is not saying that all Christians must think alike and believe alike before Christ's prayer for unity can be answered. Absolute uniformity means deadly monotony. Paul was not a replica of Peter and James and John; brothers in the flesh as well as in the gospel of the Son of God differed sharply in personal characteristics. Each leaf of the tree has its individuality differ-

entiating it from every other leaf, but they are all organically united. When two brethren agree exactly on every point of doctrine it is safe to assume that one of them is more chameleon than man. It is as foolish to seek exact duplicates in the Kingdom of God as in nature. The unity which we seek is not of identity but in diversity.

Having said this, we are only at the beginning of our troubles. How much and how vital diversity may coexist with real unity? What are the fundamentals upon which there must be agreement? To pass from the general to the specific, is there such agreement among the denominations named in the question before us as admits of organic unity? The answer that comes back is a mixture of negatives and affirmatives, and it may take a "rising vote" to determine which party is in the majority. It will not do to assume that all who vote in the negative are pugnacious irreconcilables. Such there are in every denomination; men who worship God by abusing their brethren, to whom mote-pulling is the supreme business of life and whose confidence in their own omniscience never faileth. But there are many of kindly disposition, lovers of their brethren, fair-minded, manly men, who sincerely believe that the differences between us are so radical that organic union is impossible. No real organic union can ever be brought about until the great majority of each body is convinced that we are already essentially one in our interpretation of Christian truth.

So far as this question concerns Baptists and Free Baptists it is now being answered. State organizations in each denomination have already voted or will soon vote upon a proposition which contemplates the unification of the missionary operations of the two bodies. If the vote be favorable, we may expect the prompt consolidation of denominational agencies in home and foreign missionary operations. When this has been accomplished union of local bodies will follow as a matter of course. Should union in missionary operations not be effected at the present time, organic union of the two bodies would be delayed but not permanently defeated. Ecclesiastical unity must, sooner or later, grow out of essential unity. That such essential unity now exists

between the two denominations named is the profound conviction of the great majority in each body.

At but two points have Baptists and Free Baptists ever disagreed. We must not forget the views of Benjamin Randall, founder of the Free Baptist denomination, views which made him *persona non grata* to his Baptist brethren of the latter half of the eighteenth century, had become very generally accepted by Baptists by the middle of the nineteenth century. This is no unauthorized guess, but the testimony of our most trusted historians. Benedict, writing in 1848, says, "We must bear in mind that all were set down as Arminians who did not come up to the highest point of hyper-Calvinism. Our old ministers in this region, half a century since, would have denounced as unsound in the faith, the great mass of our community of the present day, both in Europe and America, Fuller and Hall among the rest." This same Baptist historian points to hyper-Calvinism as one of "the three great evils among Baptists," and says that it "has been the bane of the denomination for about two centuries past." The original cause of division exists only as a memory. The dogma which consigned non-elect infants dying in infancy to endless torments is found now only in museums for theological antiquities.

The only other question over which these denominations have contended concerns the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. Here also time has done its work. Fifty years ago the "communion question" was a live issue, but it is such no longer. In spite of the fundamental Baptist doctrine of "soul-liberty," and our insistence upon the autonomy of the local church, the hand of fellowship was withdrawn from churches that practiced open-communion, and when George F. Pentecost administered the sacred emblems to the kindly Quakeress, Sarah Smiley, he was left in no doubt as to the desirability of changing his ecclesiastical relations. But yesterday is not today. Slowly but surely Baptists have come to practice what they have all the time professed, and to leave to each church the conduct of its own affairs and to the individual his right of private judgment.

Turning now to the consideration of organic union between the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ, we find ourselves confronted with serious difficulties in attempting to determine the

likeness or unlikeness of these two bodies. Neither denomination has an authoritative confession of faith. Each insists that the Bible is the only "rule of faith and practice." We may not lay the creed of one alongside the creed of another and arrive at our conclusions by comparative study, for neither body confesses to the ownership of any such article. Creeds have been made for Baptists, but Baptists as a denomination have not made any creed. In our quest for information as to that which differentiates Baptists or Disciples from other communions or from each other we must trust to individual expressions in literature or conversation; expressions that may or may not be representative.

Passing by, as unimportant, minor differences in church procedure, let us come directly to the consideration of the chief obstacle in the way of organic union of these two denominations. In writing to Rev. J. H. Shakespeare of London, secretary of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, but a few weeks ago, I ventured to ask his opinion of the wisdom of inviting the Disciples of Christ to join in the meeting of the Baptist World Alliance to be held in this country in 1911. In reply he said that if the Disciples in America hold to baptismal regeneration, as do the Disciples of Great Britain, English Baptists would not favor such invitation. The assertion that English Disciples believe in baptismal regeneration is his assertion, not mine.

Frank statement has ever characterized the utterances made on the platform of this Congress, and the settlement of the question before us is not to be brought about by the suppression of real issues or by mere billing and cooing. The whole history of Baptists has been a protest against sacramentarianism, and Baptists of today are even more settled in their opposition than were their fathers. Nothing is more repugnant to the profoundest convictions of Baptists than the assumption that the regeneration of a human soul is produced by a physical substance or an outward ceremony. Personally, I have no doubt that the great majority, if not all, of our Disciple brethren share in this hostility. The men in the Disciple ministry who have honored me with their friendship seem to lay as much stress upon the necessity of spiritual renewal as do Baptists. But declarations born of the heat of doctrinal controversies are on record which seem to

commit this or that Disciple leader and teacher to views regarding the efficiency of baptism in which Baptists could not share. The writer in preparing this paper took occasion to ask a Disciple friend this question: "Do Disciples believe in baptismal regeneration?" The answer was "No; but some of our people have used expressions which come pretty close to it."

After this not altogether purposeless meandering, let us come directly to the question under discussion.

1. As a practical illustration of that which may be done and is now being done toward organic union of the bodies under consideration, permit me to call attention to action taken at the recent meeting of the Minnesota Baptist State Convention. After voting unanimously to approve of the proposed consolidation of the work being done by the national home and foreign mission societies of Baptists and Free Baptists, this body adopted, with but one dissenting vote, the following resolutions:

First, differences, if still existing, may be left where the New Testament leaves them, to the teaching of the Scriptures under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Second, it is recommended that the constitution of the Minnesota Baptist State Convention be so amended as to admit to membership Free Baptists on the same terms as Baptists.

Third, that the Missionary work of the Minnesota Free Baptist Meeting be adopted and carried on by the Minnesota Baptist State Convention, as the missionary agent of the two bodies thus united.

It was also provided that this union shall go into effect January 1, 1909, or as soon afterward as ratified by both of the parties concerned. It will be seen by this action that so far as the Baptists and Free Baptists of Minnesota are concerned, organic union is likely to change from a theory to a condition in the immediate future.

Not quite content with this step toward union, the Minnesota convention adopted the following minute regarding relations with the Disciples of Christ:

Recognizing the growing sense of unity quite generally manifest between Baptists and Disciples of Christ, and believing that this sentiment, so in harmony with the spirit and purpose of our Lord, and so essential to the complete evangelization of the world, should be fostered

and encouraged in every possible way; therefore, we representatives of the two bodies named, in the state of Minnesota, do hereby propose the following resolutions, as indicating a program of possible co-operation and affiliation:

1. That in the future we avoid the duplication of churches in towns and villages where there is not a manifest need for two churches, and that in locating churches in the larger cities we each have regard for the territory previously occupied by the other body.

2. That in places where both bodies are represented by organized churches, and where it is evident that one could do the work better than two, we encourage their union upon some basis to be mutually agreed upon by the local congregations, in conference with chosen representatives of each state body, and that we pledge our hearty support to all such undertakings.

3. That in places where one body has a church and the other has none, each encourage unaffiliated members to unite with the local church, with the full understanding that they have the right to hold individual judgments regarding matters of opinion and practice wherein the two bodies may seem to differ.

4. That we encourage also every movement looking toward the closer mutual acquaintance of the two bodies by holding union services whenever and wherever expedient, by frequent exchange of pulpits, by fraternal greetings extended through chosen representatives of each body in the general state gatherings of the other body, by open and platform discussion of the questions involved in the union of the two, and by all other means calculated to promote the cause for which our Lord so earnestly prayed.

It will be seen that this does not propose immediate organic union, but it seeks a state of affairs definitely better than those now existing. It is needless to say that two immersionist bodies cannot occupy the same place at the same time without resultant friction. They appeal to the same constituency, and they are so much alike that each wonders at the obtuseness or obstinacy of the other. Both are eager and aggressive, and clashing is inevitable. We of Minnesota are undertaking to declare a truce from warfare. We propose to try to understand each other better with the distinct hope in our hearts that we shall learn in the near future that no valid reasons exist why we should live apart.

2. If we would put on the three-league boots of progress toward organic unity, let us be kindly in our judgments. We are

brethren, not ecclesiastical Irishmen armed with shillalaha, exercising ourselves at a Donnybrook Fair. Let us assume the best about each rather than the worst. Why take it for granted that nothing good can possibly come out of the Baptist or of the Disciple Nazareth? If a Disciple church and a Baptist church find that they are in practical accord and decide that the interests of Christ's kingdom can be served by their union, why not await the result of the experiment in a spirit of kindness and good-will, instead of calling them harsh names and clubbing them over the head with ecclesiastical bludgeons? You cannot convert a soul from the error of its ways with an axe. It is quite possible, also, that events may abundantly justify the union, and we shall be found fighting against God. Is it not conceivable that while union between Baptists and Free Baptists begins with the general organizations and proceeds toward the local church, union between Baptists and Disciples may commence at the other end of the line?

Nothing will so surely and so rapidly promote organic unity as the growth, in all of our hearts, of the mind which was in Christ Jesus. When we come to be like him in all things we shall be like each other. Then will the high-priestly prayer be answered, and the unity of life will reveal itself in unity of organization. For the speedy coming of that hour let us hope and pray and labor.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I am very glad to say that I have the names of six gentlemen here and perhaps that is as many as we can hear from tonight; that is, gentlemen who are willing to address us upon this theme, and they are all leaders of their denominations. First I will ask Dr. Joseph William Mauck, who is president of the general conference of the Free Baptists and Vice-president of this Congress, to address you.

DR. JOSEPH W. MAUCK, LL.D., Hillsdale, Mich.;

No one can regret more than myself the absence of Dr. Cate who was appointed to represent in a formal way the Free Baptists upon this discussion. With the sincere hope that the illness reported is not serious, I will venture to make the suggestion that it may be providential that the Free Baptists are shut out from the argument here because they have been so very ably represented in the discussion. Because yesterday our good friend from

Kentucky who had the first paper of the evening was kind enough to say that he got his first instruction in Greek from a Free Baptist college; and I believe there is a brother editor among the colleges who has suggested recently that Dr. Crandall was at one time a Free Baptist and had not altogether gotten over it. Dr. Crandall, whom I knew so intimately in college, when he was a Free Baptist, full-fledged, not only by profession but by birth, has so ably presented the matter that I feel the Free Baptists have been treated very fairly indeed.

I told the Doctor this evening I would not do anything more than to say I had known him intimately in college and I would not go any farther than that, nor rehearse against him the sins of his youth. (Laughter.)

It was about one year ago in a beautiful church and before a great audience in the city of Baltimore that I had the honor of reading a paper upon this very theme. Had I known that Dr. Cate was to have been absent, I would have been tempted perhaps to telegraph for the manuscript and spring that upon you tonight in his stead, but you will be mercifully spared.

As to what the next step should be, I am admonished by what was said about a year ago tonight, that the steps that were then suggested have in some measure already been taken and that we stand tonight regarding this question upon advanced ground as compared with one year ago. I should think, then, in the first place, that the next step should be more of the same kind.

A matter of history which will apply to our good Disciple brethren is now recalled as arising in the deliberations of the Committee of Twelve from the Free Baptist and the Disciples in conference in the city of Brooklyn three years ago, when two members of the Free Baptist committee had believed that the line of least resistance on the matter of denominational union would be with them, that they themselves, after a conference, graciously agreed that the Free Baptists should discontinue for a time their deliberations with them and try out the question with the Baptists first. Why was it? It was primarily because there was not between the two bodies that personal acquaintance, the members of one with the members of the other, which is after all the prime condition of any union in my judgment. That was the unanimous

conclusion, I believe, of twenty-four men who had been appointed by their respective national bodies.

Taking that as a suggestion, I would say that one of the next steps is to have another congress like this. With all due regard to the editors of papers and addresses without papers which have been presented here, I venture the assertion that more progress has been made on the matter of the union of these three bodies back in the lobbies and in these halls and at the hotels, and in our homes, since yesterday morning than even by the programme itself, because there we find enriched and liberalized the personal acquaintance without which there can be no organic union. Since coming into this meeting this afternoon I have been exceedingly gratified by what I believe is a public notice that the Disciple brethren have accepted the invitation, if it has been given, for the other two bodies to be united in this Baptist Congress. I believe it was some broad-minded liberal Baptist that suggested there might be a change in the organization and possibly in the name of the Baptist Congress, in order that we might here all three be represented. I devoutly hoped and expressed the hope that such would not be the case. Certainly one of the most fruitful sources of division and of a continuance of division has been a pride in name. "Oh, we love the old name so much." It is so difficult for us in effecting any organization to decide upon that one thing which after all is only incidental. When we can, as Disciple and Free Baptist, without a change of name, come in and work under another name, a name of our older and larger brethren, we will have given a concrete example of what it means to push to the rear the mere matter of name.

We all talk about it on the platform, but so far as I am concerned, I hope in these future congresses, Mr. President, we shall have the privilege of discussing this matter in the Baptist Congress.

I may say again that in that union, to which Dr. Crandall has referred, which gives promise of early fruitage between the Baptists and the Free Baptists, when the Free Baptists come in to you brethren to become a part of you, they expect to be known as Baptists. They expect that that distinguishing word, which formerly was "Free Will," one syllable of which was cut

off some years ago on the part of a good many of us, will possibly be elided and we shall be known as Baptists.

If there shall come a time when the other people should come in and not be called Baptists, and we then—we Baptists, as we will all be then, we two Baptists—if we see fit then to change the name, that is a matter for the future. Upon that I am entirely indifferent myself.

A rather startling suggestion was made to me just before I came into the building, that, in suggesting steps to be taken hereafter, I should undertake to enlighten some of the people here as to the nature of the proposed union between the Free Baptists and the Baptists, as being a starting-point for a clearer understanding of the situation as it is between those two bodies, because this brother said he knew of a number, probably fifteen clergymen, who had no idea as to the character of the proposed basis of union between the two bodies upon which the Baptist conventions and the constituent bodies of the Free Baptists' general conference are now taking action.

Briefly, in about three minutes, I will say as a result of the conferences that have been held between the representatives, on the one side, of the three great bodies, the Baptist societies, home mission, foreign mission, and publication, and on the other side, the one organized general conference of Free Baptists, which itself is an incorporated body, there was proposed last March a basis of union or co-operation in mission work, as Dr. Crandall has very fitly called it, and from that basis of union I propose to make a few very brief quotations. And first, for a reason which I need not state, the largest part, probably four-fifths of the printed form in that basis of union, is composed of a historic and documental statement which I shall not attempt to read, but this gives a historic statement as to what divided the people, what had been their history meanwhile, and their present state, and that present state has been expressed very nicely in what a good many of us know to this day as the Brooklyn Declaration, made by the joint committees in the city of Brooklyn three years ago this month. That statement is this:

Resolved, that the Baptists and Free Baptists are so closely related by a history which long was common, and has always been kindred,

that they enjoy closer fellowship and a greater similarity in genius and spirit than are common between two Christian bodies. It is recognized as a fact that the original occasion and cause of separation between our two bodies have practically disappeared, and that in all the essentials of Christian doctrine as well as of church administration and polity we are substantially one.

To that was added by the joint committees in Boston last March this statement:

"Differences, if still existing, may be left, where the New Testament leads them, to the teaching of the Scriptures under the guidance of the Holy Spirit," which we all agree to be pretty good authority.

Now, having made that statement we are now voting upon the question of a proposed union in our missionary work upon the following basis:

1. It is recommended that the constitutions of the American Baptist Missionary Union, the American Baptist Home Mission Society, and the American Baptist Publication Society, be so changed as to admit to membership Free Baptists on the same terms as Baptists.

That looks like the Free Baptist going into the Baptist Society.

2. That the general missionary work of the Free Baptists be adopted and carried on by the American Baptist Missionary Union, the American Baptist Home Mission Society, the American Baptist Publication Society, as the missionary agencies of the bodies thus united.

3. That the churches of the united bodies will be expected to contribute to general missions through the above agencies and the representatives of these agencies shall have equal standing in all the churches.

4. That all the missionaries and pastors of the united bodies shall be recognized as on the same footing in all denominational activities.

5. That this union shall go into effect January 1, 1909, provided that previous to that time the Free Baptists shall have approved it and three-fourths of the Baptist state conventions, where there are yearly meetings or associations of Free Baptists, shall have approved it.

6. It is suggested that in states where the Free Baptists equal 25 per cent. of the Baptists, or more, the two organizations be consolidated into one new society to be called "The United Baptist Convention of the State of ———," and as a subtitle "Union of Baptist and Free Baptist Societies."

That is a proposed basis of union between the two bodies, for co-operation in mission work under Baptist auspices. I have already expressed my dissent from the sentiment which would seem to ask us to be called with them the United Baptists. Personally, I hope we shall never have Baptists, Free Baptists, and United Baptists—in other words, not have three names where we should have but one and where we are attempting to reduce the number.

Mr. Chairman, I simply state this: my time is up and I will not attempt to elaborate it further than to say that I believe, with two exceptions, the constituent bodies of our general conference which have acted upon this at all have approved it; and as I stated tonight I believe all the Baptist state conventions but one, which I believe deferred it for a year, have already approved it. I believe, Mr. Chairman, one of the next best steps is to keep stepping forward on the present basis of union between the two with the prayerful hope that something similar shall take in the Disciple brethren if they do not meanwhile decide to take us all in themselves.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I now have great pleasure in calling upon Dr. Willett, who is minister of this church.

DR. HERBERT L. WILLETT:

Mr. President, and Members of the Congress: I am not sure that I can make a contribution to the thought of the evening more concretely or informingly than by speaking a single word with reference to the method by which the union of the two bodies of Disciples and Baptists has been accomplished in the case of Memorial Church.

I want to say to you and I can speak, I am sure, for my colleague, Dr. Van Doren, and for all the members of Memorial Church, that it is a great satisfaction to us to welcome this Congress to this church. It has been a great pleasure to us tonight to have Dr. Crandall upon this platform. Dr. Crandall is most dear to this people. We cannot wish him any of those forms of ill fortune of which he has spoken, but if anything should take him away from Minneapolis we might wish indeed that it would bring him to Chicago and we should welcome him anew with the

greatest possible heartiness into the fellowship of this church. I am not quite sure but that Dr. Van Doren and myself might have grave misgivings if Dr. Crandall should return. Perhaps there would have to be a change in the ministerial order, or perhaps a third minister instead of two. (Laughter.)

That situation which we face today has come upon us in most gradual and wonderful fashion. I do not think that a year ago anybody could possibly have prophesied that we should be today one united church. It came about, as it seems to us, and we cannot but look upon it with a kind of solemn and humble joy, as if it were the movement of the Divine Spirit. We had been thinking of building a new church, those of us who were of the Disciple brotherhood. For that new church we looked about to find a suitable location. The more we thought of the different groups of our own membership, the more this particular location seemed to us the best place. As we came to think over the problem of a definite location, there came to us one day a suggestion from a member of this congregation that we have a union service here, and that the minister of the First Christian Church should preach. The suggestion was rather facetiously given at first, and the answer was, "Why, certainly the minister can preach here and bring his congregation along." And that which was almost laughingly mentioned came to be a matter of serious concern presently, and before we knew it, there had been definite steps taken for the union of the two bodies of people.

It was very interesting to watch that process of union. A group of twelve men was chosen from each of the two churches. These were not churches that were declining; they each had large purposes for the future; one possessed a building, the other did not. It seemed not less than pathetic that two churches so closely united in the great essentials of Christian life should organize two different plants within speaking distance of each other. It seemed to us as if it would be one of the tragedies of latter-day Christianity, and as we met together for conference over the question, we were prepared to consider the differences most likely to interfere with union.

We came, Baptists and Disciples, with lists of those things to which we were prepared to hold with tenacity and with no

possible compromise on either side. When we had faced that list from both sides, we discovered that there were only three things that needed to be discussed, or at the most four; three that were essential from the point of view of doctrine, and one from that of administration. The first was the question of a name. We both agreed we did not wish to adopt a name in which the denominational significance of either of the former bodies should be emphasized. The Disciples said, "We must not have a name in which the word 'Baptist' is used, because that is not a New Testament term." The Baptists said, "We do not wish a name in which the term 'Christian Church' occurs because that is not a New Testament epithet." And the Disciples came with a sudden sense of surprise to discover that this was perfectly true. And so we thought the situation over. Here was a memorial church, a memorial of no individual, but of a great and earnest struggle, of most memorable sacrifice. We thought that a very admirable local name for the church, and all the churches are churches of Christ. Some of us thought that possibly the word Union Church might be wise, but at last we decided upon "Memorial Church of Christ;" that means everything that any of us have in mind, and that was almost instantly approved.

The second point was the question of the admission of members to the church. Our Baptist friends were very insistent, and rightly insistent, I think, upon the fact that they wanted to stand definitely for a regenerated church membership. The Disciples said, "Not less do we. We should not think of anything else than this." But the Baptists said, "Possibly your method of admitting members simply by asking them to confess their faith in Jesus and to be baptized might give the suggestion that there was some indifference to that question of regenerated church membership. Would you be willing to have the question of every member who presents a letter or who presents his confession of faith submitted to the official body of the church? Not to put him under the test of a Christian experience, but to make sure of his motive in coming into the church and his conviction of Christian obligation?" The Disciples said they would be very glad to do that. That precisely voices our own conception of the legiti-

macy and the necessity for close inquiry with reference to the motives and purposes of all who enter the church.

The third point concerned the communion service; the Disciples said, "We should like to have a weekly communion service. We have been accustomed to celebrate the Lord's Supper every Lord's Day." One after another of the Baptists, I think to the number of three in the group of twelve, arose and said, "We come from Baptist churches that celebrate the Lord's Supper every week. There is no question, so far as we are concerned, upon that point." It is not an obligatory matter; it never has been among the Disciples. Therefore upon that question, all agreed without dissent.

The fourth point concerned the administration of the church, especially as to the missionary offerings. What kind of a church is this to be? Is it to be a Baptist church? Is it to be a Disciple church? What is to be its order and life? We said from the very start, "This church is not to be a separate institution. We do not propose under any circumstances to make here the beginning of a third denomination. What we propose is that this church shall be absolutely in line with all the great missionary and philanthropic interests of both these peoples." This church, therefore, stands always and everywhere for the great Baptist interests; its missionary associations, its philanthropic enterprises, its benevolences of all kinds. These are a part of the budget and the purpose of this church. Equally do we stand by those great enterprises that belong to the Disciples of Christ. In all things that concern the larger work of these two bodies of people, this church is in perfect accord with them, and we have found it a very comforting thing to observe how easily adjustable that matter is. This church finds itself, therefore, not divorced from either of these brotherhoods, only possessed of a new set of associations. We are all of us here in this church in closest relationship with a great brotherhood on this side or that, which we did not know before, whose interests have become suddenly ours. In this experiment, only a few months old as yet, and still moving on with great simplicity and beauty, frictionless in its operation thus far, and bidding fair to settle itself into ever more admirable working order, in this experiment we have no desire to pose as an example

to others. None the less, we do have a very deep and earnest wish that this might be a contribution to that unity of the people of God, between at least these two great bodies, and that what we have tried to do here, and are doing, might become in some manner exemplary in those communities where it is possible, upon such simple and obvious terms as we have here adopted, to take up the task of uniting these two bodies of Christians which ought so much to be one.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: There is no one who can better represent the great Baptist brotherhood than Dr. A. G. Lawson who will be the next speaker.

DR. ALBERT G. LAWSON (New York City):

Mr. President: It hardly seems gracious to say that I did not write my own name, and yet I am only too glad to speak tonight a few moments upon this question. I have a peculiar kind of fitting in urging Christian unity. My mother was trained in the Episcopal church, my father in the Reformed Dutch church, while I went to the Methodist Sunday school in the morning and to the Presbyterian in the afternoon. (Laughter.) I am now a member of the Memorial Church of Christ of New York City, of which Dr. Edward Judson is pastor. It does not use the word "Baptist" and has its communion service every Lord's Day.

Some years ago in New York, when our Episcopalian friends were discussing the question of high church and low church, a bright young rector having charge of their Seaman's Bethel work said nothing until he was called up, and then he said, "With me it is entirely a matter of tide: when it is high tide, I am high church; when it is low tide, I am low church." (Laughter.)

Now, if by the grace of God we get into our hearts a recognition of the genuine meaning of what is called the infilling of the spirit of God, with the desires, with the hopes, with the convictions that many of us cherish tonight, the tide will come steadily up and up and up, until the waters rise over obstructions that may seem tonight most formidable, and they will be put out of the way.

There are difficulties, and we cannot quite do as a Scotch minister who, commenting on a certain passage, said, "Brethren,

the passage is full of difficulties. We will boldly face the difficulties and pass on." (Laughter.) We must meet them frankly and try to get them out of the way. The brethren who have read tonight are right; we cannot afford to make believe that there are no hindrances, no difficulties, no misapprehensions. There are cantankerous men on both sides, and we must discount all this in advance. We need a clear vision in recognition of the fact that our Lord is leading in the direction of unity, and a clear recognition of the fact that we as his followers need a deeper passion for him in his leadership for the things which are choice to him. With the vision and the passion as clearly and as steadily as is possible for honest men who have conviction, we must move in the direction the vision and the passion inspire us to go. We are so near together that for us, more than for other bodies who talk about union, it is a sad shame, in the presence of a heathen world, that we should not be one. We are so alike in our clear consciousness that there is nothing in heaven or on earth that has a right to stand between the intelligent soul and the wonderful God who gave Jesus Christ for the redemption of that soul. We are so clearly at one upon those things that are most vital and most clearly apprehended by our people, it is indeed sad that we should so long have kept apart. We can afford to say as to the Free Baptist position, that we, who call ourselves Baptists, have come to the place where Benjamin Randall stood. With open eyes and warm hearts, with earnest and honest convictions, we are standing there today, and we thank God for it.

Let us recognize, and hesitate not to say it freely and clearly, the things about which we are agreed are more and more important than those about which we differ. Now, because we love him, let us face toward that which we know to be right and move as intelligently and as promptly as possible to emphasize our unity in Christ.

Dr. Crandall has shown us the action of our brethren in Minnesota. May every one of our state conventions take like action.

Brethren, the millions of the heathen, if figures can be trusted, are increasing, not decreasing. The overmastering power of sectarianism, as manifested in this country by two great denominations, is increasing, not decreasing. There has been no generation

when it seemed so absolutely necessary that those who see clearly their God, and who so tenaciously hold themselves as accountable only to God, should clasp hands together in missionary work on the foreign field, on the home field, in the state, and in the city in every way possible, and in every kind of opportunity possible, to seek each the other's good and rejoice whenever there may be such a blessed fellowship as has been secured and revealed before us in these two churches tonight.

May I live long enough to see the fulfilling of all this in our own land, and, whatever the name may be—I am not concerned about names, but I am concerned that God shall keep us in the unity of the Spirit with His Son. Having the Spirit of Christ we may be assured that we are his and that he will keep us.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will now hear from Dr. Henry M. Ford, D.D., corresponding secretary of the General Conference of Free Baptists.

DR. HENRY M. FORD:

I am as surprised and delighted as you are over the fraternal spirit and brotherly feeling in this meeting. It amounts to almost a revelation. I supposed that Free Baptists were ahead in liberality and fraternity and brotherhood, but I did not know that the Free Baptists will have to give the palm to the Disciples and Baptists.

I am reminded of the story of the Englishman that went out hunting foxes and the dogs scared up a fox, and they disappeared over the hill. The Englishman lumbered on after them and finally came upon a countryman to whom he said, "Did you see a fox and a dog going along here?" "Yes, I did," was the reply. "Well, how did it go?" "Well, it was about neck and neck but I guess the dog was a little ahead." (Laughter.) I do not know but the Disciples and the Baptists are a little ahead in this spirit of liberality and union.

But the Free Baptists have voted on this basis of union and we have the requisite votes and now we are waiting to hear the Bridegroom's voice. We hope our Baptist brethren will not do like the young man I heard of not long since—I do not believe they will—who asked his girl to have him and she said, "Yes." "Well," he

said, "I will look around and if I do not see anybody I like any better I will let you know." (Laughter.) We do not believe our Baptist brethren will do that. We are as Free Baptists in the attitude of the little Scotch maid. Abraham met her one morning and said, "Betsy, the Lord has revealed it unto me that it is his will that I should marry thee." And she meekly folded her hands and said, "Abraham, the will of the Lord be done." (Laughter.)

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will now listen to Dr. J. H. Garrison, editor of the *Christian Evangelist*, St. Louis.

DR. J. H. GARRISON:

Mr. President: I must say with some of the other brethren that I have been drafted and have not volunteered for this service, pleasant and delightful as it is. I may say, however, that I feel quite at home in an assembly of this kind, an assembly of Baptists, Free Baptists, and Disciples. The fact is, I got my start as a Baptist. I was, in my boyhood days, a loyal member of the Baptist church, and my father and mother, and, as far as I know, the generations back, were of that faith, so that you see I am feeling quite at home tonight in the company of Baptists.

I might say, with Paul, "When I was a child, I spake as a child," and so forth. (Laughter.)

I was struck with the quotation which one of the brethren made from Dr. Shakespeare of England, and I wondered if he was in any way related to the poet Shakspeare, and drew from his imagination. If I had not been a resident of England myself, and a pastor of a church for two years in that country, I might have thought that he had done so; but I fear there is some ground for the remark which he made. You will understand that, when I tell you that I myself, loyal Disciple as I am, was not permitted to sit at the Communion Table with these brethren that called themselves by the same name, in England, and I suppose it must be those brethren to whom he refers whose extreme exclusiveness might cause them to be misunderstood upon that subject. There is an ocean between us, and they have gotten very far away from the teaching of the great body of their brethren in this country.

I would like to say, in this connection, that I indorse Brother

Spencer's address from beginning to end. I have been forty years—young a man as I am—editing a paper among the Disciples of Christ and I think I know the sentiment of the people. That is a representative statement of our position which he has given you.

One of the brethren made a very wise remark tonight when he said that we should not take too seriously statements of individuals; and that is especially true, brethren, if we go back to the period of religious debates, for you know we used to do a good deal of that. If you go back to the literature of those days, when we used to discuss questions as this: "The church to which I, John Brown, belong, is a true church of Jesus Christ." A Baptist would affirm that of himself, and a Disciple would affirm that the church to which he belonged was a church of Christ, and each of them would deny that the church to which the other belonged was a church of Christ! Now, if you go back to that period and read our literature you will find very extreme statements in the newspapers of both religious bodies. I suggest that we ought to come down to this side of the War period, therefore, when we begin to quote from each other as authority for each other's position.

Now, brethren, on this subject of union, I cannot tell you how deeply I feel. It has been a hobby of mine for a long, long while. I have told you that I was a member of the Baptists. Do you know what won me to my present position? It was the simple plea for the union of God's people upon the broad basis of simple New Testament Christianity in order that we might make a united opposition to the evil forces of the world. That is what won me—the plea for union—and now, when I come into a meeting like this and see that the spirit of union is among all the people, and when I go to a meeting like that which I attended in New York City, three years ago, and find that the spirit of union is dominating all our Protestantism today, I thank God that I have lived through these years to see this better day.

I have no sort of doubt at all, though Brother Crandall and I may not live to see the time, that this union shall be consummated. Brethren, it is coming, just as sure as you and I are here tonight, it is coming. It cannot be otherwise. It is going to take place under the law of spiritual gravitation; "And I, if I be lifted up,

will draw all men to me." Is not Jesus Christ drawing us all nearer to him, and is it possible for us to get nearer to him, without getting nearer to each other?

The fact is, I have said for years, concerning Baptists and Disciples, that there is no way for progress in either religious body except through approximation to each other. Every other line of progress is shut off. To go forward along right lines is to come nearer to each other and into closer fellowship with each other. The very law of our growth then means growing unity. It cannot be otherwise. It is a law of God in his universe. There are two forces that are making for unity; the one internal and the other external: The internal, as I have said, is that law of affinity and growth toward Jesus Christ, growing more like him and more like each other as the days go by.

Now, that process is one that we cannot control. As long as we cultivate our religious life, and grow in grace and the knowledge of the truth, that process will go on and we shall go along converging lines until we shall feel our elbows touch in our march to the City of God.

The other force is the great need of the world. Oh, the greatness of that pressure! Who has ever caught a vision of the abominations of heathenism; who has ever borne upon his heart the burden of sorrow and agony of the heathen world; who has ever looked upon it, seen it, and felt it, and then has turned to our own country and seen the evils that are entrenched in our own civilization and has not felt the imperative need for a united church to confront these united forces of evil? I believe, therefore, that under the operation of these two mighty forces Jesus Christ is drawing us together in Him, and we who are here tonight, many of us, I believe, shall live to see these three bodies marching forward to the sweet music of the church to bring in the universal reign of Jesus Christ.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: One more short address and we will be dismissed. The next speaker hails from Boston. We must know what Boston says before we can do anything else. Let us hear from Rev. J. Stanley Durkee, who is a Free Baptist.

REV. J. STANLEY DURKEE, PH.D., Boston:

Mr. President: Standing before a great audience of ministers and laymen a few days ago in Massachusetts, a gentleman who wished to defer the matter of union said, "Why, Free Baptist stands for the sovereignty of the human will. We cannot unite with them." The marvelous upheaval of the gray matter that produced that sentence!

Dr. Crandall is rather crowing over Minnesota. You know the country was saved over there where there is a granite shaft going up into the heavens marking the spot that we love to call Bunker Hill. Massachusetts has been leading Minnesota; I did not dare to stand up when he called for volunteers. Let me tell you how: First, let me say that the Baptist and Free Baptist state conferences in New England and throughout the West have voted so far that Baptists and Free Baptists tonight can say the union is assured on the basis laid down; and on January 1, 1909, the two denominations move on to the one platform of union for missionary work, both foreign and home work. And the last of those declarations shall be fulfilled in states where Free Baptists represent 25 per cent. of the Baptists. It shall be a union with another name. We are glad that in very few states that is accomplished. I am a Baptist and I do not want another name or another adjective added on, either before or after.

Three weeks ago the Massachusetts Free Baptist Association voted that a committee consisting of thirty-six be appointed to meet a similar committee of thirty-six appointed by the Baptists of that state to bring about the union of the two doctrines in 1909. The Baptists, two weeks ago, by a tremendous cheer, followed by the old song, "Blessed Be the Tie that Binds," carried it on their side; and tonight over in Boston, next to that graveyard that Professor Matthews spoke about, that literary graveyard, they are just simply waiting for the appointment of the committees and 1909 to come, to bring about that last union.

Massachusetts reaches her hands, not across the seas, but over the lakes, not over the ferry at Detroit, but through the new tunnel, to shake hands with Minnesota on the great union of our two denominations.

I have always been interested in the strange development of

people. We were driven apart by an overdose of Calvinism and an overdose of Arminianism. The Baptists said, "We do not believe that everybody is called of God or that God loves everybody," but they acted just as if they did believe it; and they have grown to represent five millions in this country. The Free Baptists said, "We do believe that God loves everybody and calls everybody, and every man must decide for himself," but they acted as if they did not believe it. And they have been a small denomination, but they have been the yeast in the meal, and the whole is leavened, as Dr. Lawson has so sweetly and wonderfully told you out of his heart.

Now, the day is here, and 1909 is very close. Free Baptists and Baptists stand on the threshold of union. Jesus prayed for it. Doctrinal unitizing is invited, business sagacity demands it, lonely pastors on lonely fields implore it, and prophecy has a voice in this matter which says, "Now is the accepted time. Behold now is the day of consolidation."

PRESIDENT JACKSON: This will close our very interesting session. I will ask Dr. Lawson to close the convention in prayer.

Dr. Albert G. Lawson offered the closing prayer and the Congress adjourned to reconvene at 10 o'clock A. M., Thursday, November 12, 1908.

THIRD DAY

Morning Session

November 12, 1908

10:00 o'clock A. M.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The hour has arrived for the beginning of this morning session. We will be led in prayer by Brother Curry of Omaha.

REV. E. R. CURRY, of Omaha, offered the opening prayer.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will now proceed immediately to the discussion of the theme before us this morning, which is: "Is Psycho-Therapeutics a Function of the Church?" The first writer is Robert MacDonald, of Brooklyn.

REV. ROBERT MACDONALD, D.D. (Baptist), read the following paper:

IS PSYCHO-THERAPEUTICS A FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH?

The church evidently thinks so, if widespread interest among the churches can be taken as an indication. It is safe to say that more series of sermons are being preached just now upon psycho-therapeutics than upon any other adaptation of the Gospel as solvent for the world's ills. Reports have come from one source and another of such declarations from many states, in fact as far west as Oregon and California, and as far south as Florida and Texas, while in many New England cities and towns appreciative sermons have been preached or are announced for the coming winter. In Boston and vicinity, for instance, according to a periodical that has surveyed the field, a full two dozen churches, including Episcopalian, Congregational, Baptist, Unitarian, and Universalist, are promised Sabbath or week-night discussions of psycho-therapeutics.

Then quite a little personal work is being done in the application of these remedial principles. One of the older and most con-

servative of our ministers writes of remarkable results in treating a woman who had not swallowed solid food for fourteen years. His full word is, "There is great reason for religious rejoicing in these new discoveries and their implications. I find inspiration, health, and joy in the whole thing as it appears to me. Of course it changes nothing theological or, at least, I so think, but it enriches experience wonderfully." Another clergyman, possibly the most prominent in the denomination, writes that he rejoices in this coming-in of scientific Christianity, and that he has for a year or more privately held a clinic in his church study an hour a day for all who chose to come. One of the younger clergy said a few weeks ago: "I have preached these principles and offered to apply them to whoever felt the need of such remedy. And would you believe that in four weeks I have got into closer touch with my people than during the entire four years of my pastorate."

I have now coming to my home a young clergyman, of another denomination and another city, to be freed of an evil habit, because he said, "I have the conviction that my Christian influence will be immensely increased in putting these principles into my church, but I want them first put into me—I want to be benefited that I may benefit others."

Psycho-therapeutics increase ministerial efficiency in opening the way to a congregation's confidence, as no other application of the gospel can. A friendly critic, when recently told that each person treated was prayed with, and that suggestions of Christian truth were offered, said: "Why, then, the new name, Emmanuel Movement? Why not the old gospel of Christ, for that is what it is." My answer was, "The new name advertises the old cure." It surely does, in enabling the minister to get at the people. How unsatisfactory is much of our pastoral visitation, to ourselves at least, and at times doubtless to our people, just because we seldom gain their confidence. They will not disclose their ills, bad habits, shortcomings, because the minister does not represent to them positive, practical, remedial helpfulness. But let it be known he has a remedy for their ills and can relieve their worries, nervousness, bad habits, and they cease to talk of the weather, the fashions, their neighbors, and their

busy social, domestic, or mercantile life, and are communicative of their ills instead. The meaningless term "pastor" becomes meaningful to them. They see him as a confidant, a father confessor, a friend.

It even presents a welcome substitute for so-called pastoral visitation. Instead of the minister going the rounds of perfunctory calling, often finding his parishoners not in, or engaged in other things, and if visible, in no frame of mind to talk upon the deep things of life, the parishoner now calls on him if there be a crying need to be satisfied. All ministers know how vast the difference between seeking a person and striving for an opening to get at his difficulty, and the being sought for by that person that religious aid be had. We all know the value of a heart to heart talk with one who can enter into our grief sympathetically. It relaxes and rests us. The old restrictions become unloosed. We experience ease and a sense of freedom. And if the person to whom we confide the secret of our discontent has the ability to help us out of our misery, our very confidence in him has curative force.

But will the people come? Yes! They will, and if you are known as one who through this new "God with us" remedy can be consulted on all possible troubles, people will come in greater numbers than you can take care of. They will come though they never saw you before, and even though they have pastors of their own. But frequently the request is, "Do not tell my minister about this. I would not have him know for the world that I have this trouble or that I came to see you." "Why not?" "Because he, having no remedy to offer, does not invite my confidence and therefore cannot share my secret."

I had most significant evidence of this recently. A gentleman of the legal profession asked for a conference. He came at the appointed time, and for two hours poured out his heart to a stranger, revealing that he was a Sunday-school teacher and a church officer. He told me of domestic trouble, of business worries, of nervousness, and of sleeplessness. But he also said, "I could not tell this to my own minister, for though a learned man he is cold and cynical and unsympathetic." I found he was seriously contemplating Christian Science because his friends

in that faith had a buoyancy of spirit, a joy of heart and of face that he had not. "I am worried," he explained, "and distracted and sick, and while it would be terrible to leave the old church I will be forced to unless I can get help." He never would have come those thirty miles into a strange city and given his confidence to a strange man had he read of that man being a gospel preacher, however eloquent. What brought him was the report that over in Brooklyn was a minister who could dispel his despondency and cure his miserable, dyspeptic, sleepless condition.

Hear the case of an inebriate that illustrates the same idea. Five conferences changed him from a shambling-gaited, bleary-eyed, devil-haunted wretch into a strong man. In ten days he was changed from a living disgrace to his church and his Christian profession to an honor to his church, his Lord, and his own humanity. He has been restored to his church, attends the services each Sabbath morning, and on Sabbath evenings the church of the man who put him on his feet.

Scores of similar remedies in behalf of all conceivable ailments and bad habits could be mentioned, no one of which would have sought out church or minister because he could give them the simple gospel of the Son of God, but for the practical curative ability the church and ministry embodied to their thought.

If psycho-therapeutics is not a legitimate church function, it ought to be made so, and that quickly, to enable the minister to become more effective and indispensable, the sick soul more useful, and the church more attractive and helpful.

Such is the immediate gain, all along the line, to the minister, to the troubled soul, to the church, which is made in reality what it was intended by its apostolic founders to be, namely, the world's most humanitarian institution.

The beneficial influence upon the minister cannot well be estimated. It imparts a knowledge of men to which he was before a stranger, and it gives him a *hold* upon himself and the community amazing to contemplate. In short, no other mental or religious exercise can, in so brief a time, impart so liberal an education.

A further reason for it to be made a function of the church is because it makes for the reintroduction of the mystical element

into religion. A momentous little book has recently been published by Dr. Newman Smyth entitled, *The Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism*, in which, among other weighty causes given to explain the decadence of the church, are these: That the contact is broken between the current of thought in the church and the general mental activity of the day. Also that much religion is withdrawing from the churches. Upon this latter point his sad confession is:

In almost any community there may be found considerable numbers of people who are not in their habit of mind irreligious, nor without faith in their hearts, but they belong to no church, confess no creed and rarely attend public worship. There is a kind of religious literature, not generally known among our church membership, seldom recognized by theologians, but to be found in the book stores and having large sales, a literature that is somewhat mystical, quietistic, and spiritual, but neither churchly nor very distinctively Christian. The spread of this kind of literature outside the church is a noteworthy phenomena. The older mysticism, the former quietism flourished within the church. Now it springs up outside the churches and beyond their creeds.

Now what do we mean by that mysticism that used to flourish inside the church and which we desire to see recognized by the church as being a legitimate factor in religion? Well, it takes us back to the years between the fifth and eleventh centuries when mysticism reigned supreme. The mystic strove to know God directly through contemplation. He saw the fulness of life to be in God, therefore the fruition of all ecstatic experience to be in suffusing the soul with contemplation of God. He brought the object of worship into the present, and conceived of religion as a life rather than a dogma. Scholasticism, which had its use in the eleventh century, saw religion to be a dogma, not a life. The scholastic tried to demonstrate God's existence. The mystic sought to know God. The immediacy of religious experience, the filling of the soul with the presence of God was his endeavor. Schleiermacher, at the beginning of the last century, whom Zeller, the historian of Greek philosophy, called the greatest theologian of the Protestant church since the Reformation, was the great mystic, due to his early Moravian training. To him religion was a feeling—the feeling of absolute dependence on

God. It fused and tempered all his scholasticism, inherited in terms of vigorism from Immanuel Kant, in terms of romanticism from Goethe, in terms of aestheticism from Schlegel and Schiller, and made him the greatest court preacher in Europe. It tempered his scholasticism, I say, as did mysticism temper the scholasticism of the years between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries. But the trouble with the ancient mysticism, as with the modern as embodied in the Christian Science, New Thought, and faith-cure movements, was that it was too purely ascetic. Having a higher and more immediate means of access to God than through knowledge, scholarship, and institution, it made intellectual and institutional approach unnecessary. Thus it never concerned itself with a philosophic basis for its belief. It constructed no system of doctrine. It was indifferent to civic responsibility and the duties of social life. It, in the olden days, meant complete intellectual stagnation. No wonder scholasticism came in as a correction of mysticism. Today we have the same dilemma to confront. Christian Science has, however, builded an institution, its only ecclesiastical achievement. New Thought, numbering over one and a half million disciples in the United States, seven-eighths of whom were formerly communicants of the conservative evangelical denominations, is ascetic through and through. Its advocates are each year withdrawing in large numbers from Christian church to become mystics. They have wearied of ecclesiasticism, dogmatism, formal and often mechanical modes of worship, but alas, also of missions, of extended charities, of relations of brotherhood, of necessary organization for the perpetuation of the religious institution. All are thrown over for a quietistic, meditative, aspirational approach to God, satisfying spiritual hunger, inspiring and warming the intellectual life, and to some extent remedying bodily ills.

Now if psycho-therapeutics is not a church function, it is high time it was so, for its religious side is as necessary to its efficiency in reconstructing life as is its mental. Henry Drummond once said, "No reconciliation is needed between evolution and Christianity, as they are the two sides of the same cosmic reality, having the same author, the same end, the same spirit." So of psychology and Christianity. They are by nature related, inas-

much as both have to do with the physic side of life. The tendency today is toward the reinvesting of the individual with greater significance than he was ever before conscious of meriting. We have passed through the biological stage of adjustment with no inconsiderable gain to all concerned. We have thrashed over the sociological problem with its egoistic and altruistic extremes and with large advantage to the other man in the network of social relationships. The coming decade will witness the complete swinging of the life pendulum, from the biological upward, and from the sociological inward, toward the individual, toward his divine possibilities of power and his imperial rights as a child of God. The scientific medium of this consideration will be psychology. It is already occupying the field with the world's eyes riveted upon its investigations and findings. Its companion in the research will be Christianity. They are by nature related as both have to do with the psychic side of life. Revelation will furnish the rich content to the psychologic form. Psychology uncovers the potential depths of being in the human sphere. Christianity imparts to those depths infinite meaning. Psychology reveals the mental forces that shall be instrumental in the reconstruction of the life personal. Christianity shows those forces to be of divine origin. Psychology discovers the limitless subconscious human capacity. Christianity draws the curtain still farther aside and reveals that realm of the individual limitless to be the finite manifestation of the universal life that is creative and remedial unto all the universe, including man. Psychology, because interested in all psychic conditions, asks for evidence of personal immortality the other side of death. Christianity has for near two thousand years had acquaintance with the unseen world and waits to lay its evidence before every inquiring mind and bring its assurances of the divine friendliness to every lonely troubled heart.

But only now is the church awaking to the remedial power within its reach. Under what has become known as the Emmanuel Movement the remedial work goes on. It is a distinctively practical movement for the curing of our ills. Here for the first time psychology and Christianity openly join hands and demonstrate their willingness to work together in a God-inten-

tioned unit. For the first time physician and priest combine in psycho-therapeutics against the ravages of disease.

In close connection with this emphasis upon the mystical side of religion reintroduced into the church is the demand that the church give practical, tangible help to the entire life of man as did Jesus of Nazareth in the old Galilean days. Dr. Worchester exclaims :

A large and ever increasing number of intelligent people feel that the church has outgrown or is outgrowing her usefulness, because the church is no longer indispensable to men. Unquestionably one of the great motives of all human belief is the practical motive, believing because it is good and useful to believe. The good religion has done the world and is still doing is one of the chief reasons man believes in religion, and the more good any particular religion or church is able to do the more men will believe in it, and the less visible good the church does, the less men will believe in it!

This practical, remedial measure, so richly operative when Jesus walked the earth, is the lost something we are trying to reclaim, that Christianity may be a more highly prized factor in life. That lost something is that Christianity has a redeeming power for the cure of the body as truly as for the cure of the soul. Preparation for living as a disembodied spirit the other side of the grave is a weak, vague appeal to a man who cares only for living on this side. The proclamation of cure for a spiritual nature he is not conscious of possessing is wasted energy compared with the cure of a body whose maladies hold him in painful bondage every hour of the day—the body looks so much bigger and more important to the majority of mortals than does the spirit that spiritual appeal falls often on deaf ears. The church must present a motive as compelling as does the world with its appeals of pleasure and sense gratification. Its opportunity is in the assurance of health, present, temperate, physical health. That strikes hard; it awakens his interest and his response. Yes, but he must become whole in spirit first. Well, he will pay the price and submit to the spiritual treatment if it bear practical tangible fruitage in the achieving of health.

That is how the church meets the demand of the hour, in

possessing a more substantial content and meaning for the man of the world.

It is surprising how much the New Testament says about the cure of the body. Christ puts it in the very forefront of his ministry, giving it such prominence that, did we not know better, we might infer it was his chief concern. In only one or two cases of hundreds examined in the Gospel of St. Matthew does our Lord forgive sins first. When he sends out his twelve disciples his charge to them reads thus: "He gave them power over unclean spirits to cast them out, to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of diseases." And when he bids them preach that the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand he continues: "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils." When John sent his messengers to determine if he were the Messiah, he answers: "Tell John what I see and hear. The blind receive their sight, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the poor have the gospel preached to them." He thus puts the healing of the body in the very forefront of his ministry and he bids his disciples put it in the very forefront of theirs, making it their first concern. He, moreover, shows such anxiety to banish disease that he pauses not to require faith on the sufferer's part. Nor does he seem to transmit his curative power through a healthy mind to a cleansed soul. In many cases there is no telling how many he heals involuntarily. In the case of the diseased women the hem of his garment is touched. On another occasion we read, "they brought all that were diseased that they might touch the hem of his garment and as many as touched were made whole."

We must not, however, conclude that the health of the body was Christ's supreme concern, nor must it for an instant be the church's chief care. It must be made incidental—a single feature in a score of other, all important, concerns. While the church should emphasize the influence of religions upon health, it should exercise extreme caution and great moderation lest religion degenerate into a health cult, and the church become an infirmary for nerve-sick bodies instead of a sanitarium for sin-sick souls. Never forget that the supreme object of piety is of infinitely greater importance than to cure physical ailments. The probe of Christianity must go deeper than the flesh. To be physically

well is not necessarily to be righteous. Christianity has a vastly more important contract on its hands than the cure of pains and aches. All therapeutic work must be introductory to a complete emancipation of personality from sin unto the full stature of that divine manhood embodied in Jesus Christ. Its ambition must be nothing more radical than the opening-up to the church of an additional field of usefulness, to bridge what Dr. Jefferson, of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York, calls the world-wide phenomena of an ever-deepening estrangement between the church and large classes of our population, and to help make what Dr. Parkhurst, of the Madison Square Presbyterian Church, calls the need for the church to make men comfortable, decent, righteous citizens of the world that now is, instead of continuing to be excessively addicted to the work of preparing them to live in heaven. The step, he exclaims, that is obligatory upon the church is to enter more appreciatively and sympathetically into the material, intellectual, and spiritual necessities of the people in this present life. We may depend upon it, he continues, that people will love the church as much as the church loves the people.

A last reason for psycho-therapeutics to be considered a church function is that in dealing with the subconscious mind we are dealing with the soul, and if it is not the church's function to deal with man's soul, it ought to be.

This is undoubtedly the great discovery science has given the world without knowing or conceding it. The term subconscious mind, we must remember, is a psychological definition of everything that is attributable to the soul. It is the residential realm below the threshold of consciousness, full of limitless power, so that Dr. Schofield, of the British Medical Association, exclaimed that doubtless it has limits but they have never been discovered. The psychologist tells us that this subconscious mind is not friendly to inductive processes, that it never investigates nor scrutinizes nor reasons, but is always susceptible to deductive processes following a clue, taking a hint or suggestion that an inferior or superior intelligence forces upon it for its self-assertion; then working logically, unerringly, and often swiftly toward the desired end. The psychologist further tells us that it has con-

trol of every involuntary function and organ of the body. Thus it makes or breaks a life in proportion as good influences or bad are brought to bear upon it; for they all take root there and grow, producing permanent conditions in keeping with those commands and inducements.

Is not this why it has such limitless power? It is the individual manifestation of the universal, the God-mind that is omnipotent and omnipresent. That soul-nature would also share in the divine omniscience did not a finite intelligence interfere, inducing the soul or subconscious mind, which cannot guide itself, to become the prey of poor advice, wrong suggestion, superstition, selfish precept, sinful influences. But if evil habit, or diseased, obsessed personality is there, it is necessary to thrust aside the person's finite intelligence and intrude a superior intelligence that has a helpful remedial suggestion to offer for the soul's guidance.

The world's troubled ones see psycho-therapeutics to be a churchly function inasmuch as they are never weary of searching out the minister of Christ to unburden their hearts, and ask of him, as of no other man in existence, a remedy for their ills.

What rich content, then, has the psychologist unwittingly revealed as belonging to the soul; what startling therapeutic power to reconstruct the manifold functional working of the life over which it has control, and what possibilities of enrichment it can realize unto the life plastic enough to receive its rich truths! But who so well equipped as the minister of Christ to assume the precious responsibility of wielding the truth, that will make over the life that appeals for help?

In conclusion, then, remember two things: First, that the diseases remedied by the Emmanuel Movement are diseases of personality. They may be fitly designated as psychic ailments. See if it be not so. There is hysteria which manifests itself in exaggerated emotional displays, such as intense craving of sympathy or admiration, or in unconscious simulation of various diseases, the fruit of an ill-balanced though by no means organically diseased brain; hypochondria, or the fixed but groundless belief that a person is suffering from some particular disease; neurasthenia, which covers a vast variety of nerve weaknesses, from mild depression to extreme prostration, which cases a prom-

inent nerve specialist states numbered 50,000 a generation ago, but have increased to 250,000, although a prominent physician recently told me that every man and woman in the United States was a neurasthenic—had some form of nerve weakness. Then there is psychasthenia in which the person has a sense of incompleteness, or strangeness of things in general, and is the subject of abnormal fears and all kinds of impracticalities. Then there are alcoholism, morphinism, cocainism, which end in intellectual and moral degeneration and insomnia, one of the most terrible curses of modern life, and religious mania and melancholia in which the sufferer imagines himself to have committed the unpardonable sin and that God has abandoned him; fits of anger, of hate, of groundless suspicion, which the person is powerless to conquer; and finally, suicidal impulses, springing sometimes from deep depression, utter despair, or a sense of shame and disgust. Of course you recognize every one of these ailments to be diseases of personality, resulting from such causes as breakdown of religious faith, the growing artificiality of our social system; the mad rush for wealth; mental idleness and frivolity; the use of stimulants and narcotics, lack of self-control from overwork, or culpable self-indulgence, producing a neurotic or disordered system.

Now who will say it is not a function of the church to look after and redeem human personalities—and if the church have a nobler function, pray tell me what that function is. That is our first concluding thought. Our second is that the curative suggestion in the hands of a Christian minister can be filled full of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Whosoever objects to the introduction of psychology into the church, let me say to him that we are introducing only psychologic terms. Subconscious mind, suggestion, psycho-therapeutics mean nothing more alarming than the soul, good advice, health of spirit. And what does the church stand for if not to represent the soul and to embody good advice, and to conserve the health of the spirit? It is simply using modern terms of true scientific character to help the modern man, but to help him with very ancient truth, truth as old as eternity. It is, in its last analysis, that splendid Pauline attempt

of becoming all to all men that we may win some who might otherwise be lost.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The next writer on this theme is Rev. J. Stanley Durkee, of Boston.

REV. J. STANLEY DURKEE, PH.D. (Free Baptist), Boston, Mass., submitted the following paper:

IS PSYCHO-THERAPY A FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH?

The ministry of Jesus Christ was divided between the sick and the well. His gospel was the same for both, but differently administered. To the well, he spoke as a well, strong man. The legends of the Bedouin tribes in Palestine picture him as the noblest of noble men physically, with sandy hair, large blue eyes, and a striking, commanding appearance.

We draw our conception of his weakness and emaciation from Isa., chap. 53, where we so wrongly interpret those words, "When we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him." The prophet had in mind the first-born son, the athletic pugilist of great muscle, powerful frame, and swaggering pride. Among the Bedouins even of today, such a one is called "the beauty." Goliath is a prominent example of "the beauty" in Old Testament history, as well as Saul, afterward king of Israel.

When Isaiah wrote "there is no beauty that we should desire him," he meant simply to say, "He shall not win by sheer muscle or brute force; he shall win by gentler, more potent methods." The reference is not to the great Servant's personal presence, save to declare that he would not be the prince of pugilists.

We never read of Jesus Christ being sick. He is reported to have been weary, exhausted, hungry, thirsty, sleepy, but never sick. The gospels teem with touches of awe that his very physical presence produced. He was well and strong! He spoke to the well and strong. He called strong, rugged, sea-stained fishermen to follow him. They came. They gladly followed. Wherever his strength has been revealed it has always attracted strength. Had it not been for the mistaken reading of Isaiah and the mood of those artists who have painted his face in such distress, he

would long ago have become our standard of physical development, as he is our standard of character. Hofmann's face of the boy Christ among the doctors, is, to my mind, the only true conception of his strength and beauty. Give that face twenty years of the life Jesus led, and the result would be a God-like form and face worthy the God-like character he lived.

As the strong, perfect man, he also ministered to the sick. He healed their diseases, and their gratitude opened their hearts to hear his words and to believe. I have often wondered how many of those five hundred brethren to whom Christ appeared after his resurrection were followers he had won to himself by first healing their sickness. The gratitude of those restored to health by a physician is one of the deep sources of joy to the physician, especially if he does not attempt to collect his fees.

It will be very instructive to glance at the commission Christ gave the Seventy as he sent them out two by two through Palestine, preparing the way for his coming. Matthew tells us the command was, "Go preach, saying, The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out demons." All further instructions related to their personal conduct (Matt. 10:5-15). *Mark* tells us that Jesus sent them forth, and that "he gave them power over unclean spirits, . . . and they went out, and preached that men should repent. And they cast out many demons, and anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them" (Mark 6:7-13). *Luke* writes the Master's words thus, "heal the sick . . . and say unto them, the Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you" (Luke 10:1-11). We notice that in every report the command is, "heal the sick."

When we turn to the new church at work, as recorded in the Book of Acts, preaching the word and healing the sick are still *the* Christian duties. In chap. 2 we read of the baptism by fire, followed by Peter's great sermon and the conversion of three thousand souls. Chap. 3 opens with an account of Peter's healing ministry. All through those years the ministry of preaching and healing went side by side.

The apostle James gives us very clear instructions. "Is any among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of

the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up" (James 5:14).

Jesus ministered to the sick, and then sent his followers out with the command to do as he had done. When was the command abrogated? When did he say to his followers, "Cease your ministries to the sick and confine them to the well"? Gradually, as the medical fraternity advanced, the healing ministries of the church receded, until it came about that the church let go all healing ministry and the medical fraternity took all—that is, all it could. It has never taken all. It never can take all. There are cases of sickness that only those who know Jesus Christ face to face can heal. When the complete separation between medicine and ministry had taken place, then up sprang these health-cults, teaching, under crude psychology and cruder philosophy or a proud ignorance of both, the healing of the body through faith in a formula. How rapidly some of these cults have grown!

Preachers and physicians united to laugh at them, scorn them, anathematize them; but yet they grew, and yet they grow. As the ministry and medicine separated, medical schools became more and more materialistic—even atheistic. The doctor or the surgeon could find nothing but the body, therefore his drugs or his scalpel must cure or kill. How alarming became the condition to a thoughtful Christian, few realize. The new health-cults flung their challenge to the medical fraternity. "The mind has greater healing power than your drugs." The doctors laughed, but began to question. Honest physicians said to each other, we have scores of cases in our practice where medicine does more harm than good, yet we are helpless.

Meanwhile psychology was pressing its newer revelations. Men discovered that in that vast area of every individual, called the subconscious or dissociated self, lay marvelous therapeutic powers. Lull to rest the conscious self, the active, thinking, choosing self, and there lies, fully open, that great deep of the subconscious. It has no power of choice. It takes into itself whatever is sufficiently impressed there, and later returns it to consciousness as a positive fact.

With a firm, strong voice, colored with faith and vibrant with confidence, let the preacher-physician speak into that open sub-

consciousness of his patient truths of health, ambition, faith, love, those truths are somehow taken up by the nervous system, by the inner life, the subconscious, and result in restoration to health, new ambition, new faith in God.

Hypnotism, the hypnagogic state, suggestion, and autosuggestion have found their scientific places and, properly controlled and directed, have produced results in health, hope, and faith to thousands, such results that the seeming fairy stories of the health-cults have been far outdone. I should like to give you, out of my own records, experiences in individual cases where cures have been wrought of such a nature as to stagger my own belief. In these cures, faith in God, quotations from his word, and conversation with him, are found to be of the greatest therapeutic value. Whatever the psychologically trained physician is doing in the great clinics of London and Paris and Berlin, the fact remains that a psychologically trained preacher and Christian worker can bring about equal results and at the same time multiply his possibilities a thousand fold, of winning the patients to Jesus Christ.

The modern disciple can take in a scientific form what seemingly those early disciples took in a direct form from their Master and go forth to preach the gospel and heal the sick as did they. They blindly believed, and impressed men with the fact of their power in belief. Cures were effected by this power. The modern disciple may scientifically believe and employ all the forces of the Master in effecting cures.

To recapitulate: Jesus Christ spent a large part of his recorded ministry in healing the sick. He sent his disciples forth to do as he had done. When the new church was established, following his ascension, they continued the practice. Modern discoveries in psychology have brought to the modern disciple a scientific basis upon which to work, taking the cure of diseases out of the realm of the miraculous. All this is in line with man's advance in knowledge.

Now, because the cure of the sick was the practice and command of Christ; because a similar power may now be used in a scientific manner corresponding to the spirit of the age; because there are multitudes susceptible to the gospel only through this

agency; because the practice of this healing power brings the modern disciple into closest spiritual relations with those whom he would reach, and could not otherwise approach; because it restores the preacher to his old position of genuine spiritual adviser; because vast human suffering may be relieved and many more be won to our Lord Jesus Christ; because, notwithstanding the marvelous advance in medical and surgical skill, there yet remains to the human heart an inborn faith in the divine power for healing, available to the priests of God; therefore we declare that psycho-therapy is a function of the church.

But to what extent is it a function of the church? Music is a function of the church, and education and art! Shall the church become teachers in such schools? The specialization of these into great professional departments has answered the question. The church is vitally concerned in the development of these departments, but cannot now, as formerly, take them under her own control. Shall there be an exception in the great department of healing ministry? This department, too, has become an independent science. Shall every church establish a clinic for the treatment of functional disorders? Shall every pastor become a physician, spending the major part of his strength in clinical work, and every church become a hospital? This, I take it, is the real significance of the question under discussion, and to this I now address myself.

That the church has a healing mission no one will dispute. That very few pastors have the qualifications to keep them balanced in such a work, is beyond question. Therefore, my first recommendation is this: let our divinity schools establish strong courses of study in psycho-therapy, and furnish their students opportunity to practice the Christian art of healing, as well as the Christian art of preaching. This will enable those schools to bring about a much-needed reform in pastor training; will teach the students how to become personal soul-winners because of their Christian conversation with the sick as they seek to cure them; will bring the student to a true realization of the grandeur and dignity of his position, as a chosen servant of God, sending him to his pastorate clothed with knowledge and power—an ambassador from Jehovah. The sight to make angels weep is the

helplessness of most divinity-school graduates in their first parishes.

My next recommendation is the grouping of churches for the healing ministry in functional disorders. Such a recommendation comes from physicians themselves. Such a recommendation is forced upon us, by the marvelous spreading of these numerous health-cults, that have attained to such numbers and power in the name of the Christian religion. Every doctor awake to this new, yet old, duty of the church acknowledges that he has scores of patients which pastors alone can cure, through psycho-therapy as an agent of religion.

Pastors of the grouping churches should serve allotted times in the clinics. Even though physicians do become skilful in psycho-therapy, as indications now declare that they will, yet that fact will not set aside the same need of trained pastors for such work. Not a separate building or hospital, in which such clinics will be held, is needed, but modern churches built for the daily service of the community, rather than churches built to be closed six days in the week that they may gain a holy smell for the seventh day.

I group the churches rather than the denominations, because every finger of the twentieth century points to our fearful weakness in Protestantism, and every voice calls for federation and organic union. In calling for such action in the treatment of *functional* disorders, I am not overlooking the care of *organic* diseases. We have wasted so much human grain ripened for the harvest, because of our failure just here. We all know the blind faith of the sick in the power of a godly pastor. They submit to the ministrations of the surgeon or doctor, and then turn to the man of God, saying, "Pray for me!" That inborn faith has a firm hold in human hearts! Why? Because back of all human skill we instinctively seek the skill of the Great Physician. Is it not shameful how the church has given over the care of the sick to others, and betrayed such faith in her God-given powers? As Christianity triumphs in the future, not chaplains of greater or less efficiency shall minister in those hospitals wholly under the control of outside forces, but pastors, awake, active, godly pastors, shall minister by turn in the hospitals of their section, as minis-

tered the priests, by course, in the temple at Jerusalem. Each pastor, trained for this healing ministry, will be alert to use his powers wherever in his own parish and work he goes. His children will become to him a greater personal care. His young people can be awakened and trained to far greater efficiency. His whole ministry will be enriched by the new personal contact with his people. By this method of grouping churches for healing ministrations, the pastor will not be led away from his first modern function—that of *preaching*. Anything that will rob him of his pulpit preparation and power will be a calamity of the direst sort. To preach was he called. He must preach. Preaching has been the pillar of the Protestant world. It hath pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save millions. Every other activity of a pastor's life must be tributary to his preaching.

The clergyman's life embraces three offices, that of prophet who foretells the things of God; that of physician who heals the body and the self; that of preacher, who interprets to his generation the will and deeds of God in his generation, and urges a personal surrender to him. And now abide prophet, physician, and preacher, these three, but the greatest of these is the preacher.

But what is the place of the medical fraternity in this new alignment of forces? Can civilization dispense with such a profession? I was in conversation with one of New England's greatest specialists in anaesthesia, a physician with an enormous practice. He said, "If the religion of Jesus Christ could find its way down into the heart of every man, woman, and child, and have its rightful sway there, lawyers and doctors could go to farming."

Until we reach that glad day, what place shall the doctors hold in the healing ministry of the church? I have already revealed his exalted place. The minister cannot train himself as a diagnostician. The doctor must do that. The minister, therefore, must work only after the specialist has discovered the disease and revealed its functional depredations. Let the minister be equipped psychologically and psycho-therapeutically, working hand in hand with skilful physicians, and the marvelous results thus far attained are but glimmers before the coming day. Why, this new grip of Christian truth applied psychologically will revolutionize the study

of medicine and eventually bring to the Christian faith, as its mightiest ally, the whole medical fraternity. If ministers can be trained, after proper diagnosis by a disease specialist, how to bring faith and personal communion with our Lord Jesus Christ to bear upon the health of that rapidly increasing multitude of people, bitterly suffering from functional disorders, and if they can vastly allay the sufferings of those cursed with organic diseases, then our Christian religion will find a mighty increment of power in winning this world to itself.

As in every forward movement, there is danger from the crank, the quack, the religiously insane. Yet the healing ministry must go forward, physician and pastor hand in hand.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will now proceed to hear the appointed speakers. The first is Rev. Allan B. Philputt, of Indianapolis.

REV. ALLAN B. PHILPUTT (Disciple), Indianapolis, Ind., addressed the Congress as follows:

SHOULD PSYCHO-THERAPEUTICS BE PRACTICED BY THE CHURCHES?

In the last few years we have been thrown into a sort of hysteria by the rapid progress of Christian Science. Both the churches and the medical profession have shared in the surprise at the ease with which many intelligent and well-meaning people seem to have been drawn away from their old-time ideas and swept onward in a movement which, though they could not explain it, seemed to meet a need; and the explanation of the rapid growth of this cult is doubtless due in large part to the fact, first, that it had, though with many absurd incrustations, gotten hold of the real principle of healing and helping; and second, because it came upon a time when the church was not meeting the everyday needs of the people. We were not using, by any manner of means, the full spiritual power of the gospel to help and bless the lives of the people.

The onset of this new cult in many communities has been so vigorous and sudden that numbers of people have been swept off their feet and have come to the conclusion that the old science and

the old theology were alike giving way before a blind working principle which cannot be rationally accounted for. As a matter of fact, we have vastly overrated the influence which Christian Science and the new movements generally have attained, and have quite failed to recognize the fact, which any sensible person must have seen from the beginning, that in the forms in which they have come to us their influence must in large measure be ephemeral; either they must greatly revise and modify their claims and rationale or they must speedily wane when the sober second thought of the people has time to assert itself. The truth is that in any community of which I have any knowledge, where four or five years have elapsed since the coming, in any popular way, of these new views, the tide is already arrested, if not on the wane. In the community in which I live, which may be, I think, representative, there has not been any very convincing evidence that the claims of Christian Science have justified themselves by results. This is not to say that people have not occasionally been helped; that some diseases have not been cured; and that many religious derelicts—the flotsam and jetsam of the church membership—have not found anchorage and interest in the new theories. I would not deny this movement any real good that it has done. Indeed, it has taught us some lessons we needed to learn, but it has not cured disease in the way in which its adherents claim. Its votaries when really sick have generally gone back to the old programme of resorting to the medical profession; and the percentage of sickness and death among them is practically on a par with that among any other class of people similarly situated. They, however, have been the pioneers in a movement which is destined in other ways and by other channels to affect modern thought to no inconsiderable extent. That there is a healing power in the mind no one can successfully deny.

Psycho-therapy is a science and not a religion. By the more or less intelligent use of its principles cures have been wrought alike by Christian Science healers, by faith and mental healers, by Roman Catholic relics, by Buddhist and Mohammedan priests and by evangelical churchmen.

What has been accomplished under the claims of a particular religious dogma has been accomplished even more satisfactorily

in the quiet and unostentatious way of science by those who profess to make no use of religion at all, such as, for instance, Drs. DuBois, Jenet, Berrilon, and Tuckey. These cures, when they are successful at all, are made by powers which reside in the mind, and are not dependent on any special form of religious faith. This is not to say that religious faith may not be a key to unlock the secret powers, or a most helpful adjunct in the healing process. If, however, we consider it with the notion that we are dealing with a religious principle instead of a purely scientific problem, we shall start wrong and never get right. I believe that in the course of human progress it was divinely intended that the healing art should be differentiated from spiritual leadership. The great scientific knowledge that has come to us through the medical profession has certainly justified its existence as a special calling. Any setting of the mind-cure principle that professes to deny the results of biological and physiological investigation, and the laws of chemistry and the general results of laboratory and scientific study, as these pertain to the human body, its structure, its growth, and its decay, to the causes of disease and of contagion, to proper sanitation and all that, is doomed to be relegated to the limbo of the fantastic and the absurd. The general results of science will stand. The principle of cause and effect and the material laws as well as the psychical which govern the human body must ever be acknowledged. No healing by blind faith, by so-called divine power upon the part of the healer, can long be regarded with confidence.

As to the question whether the churches should undertake the practice of psycho-therapy, I am hardly prepared to say. There is a very general feeling that we must meet and stem this tide which has set upon us from strange and unexpected sources. But as I have already intimated, this particular tide will soon run its course. The thing for us to do is to recognize and use, as far as possible, the really sound principle beneath all the rubbish of error and fanaticism; but it occurs to me that this is largely to be done by the medical profession. They at least should add to their equipment a knowledge of the psychic laws which influence bodily health and be prepared to use them when opportunity offers. In fact, I think this will be the next great development in medi-

ciné. It has long been vaguely known and partially practiced. The new thought has simply thrown the emphasis here and the development of modern psychology has revealed to us the fact that the mind has great powers of which we were but dimly aware. Mental therapeutics is bound to receive increased attention both in health and disease. The application of the psychic element should not be left to bungling experimenters nor to healers ignorant of the anatomical structure of the human body.

I can see here also a very considerable development in the ministry. They too should understand the psychic forces with which they have to deal, and this more often for the sake of those who are not sick than for those who are. The number of people at any given time who are really sick is inconsiderable; and the number who might be amenable to psychic influence is still smaller. The minister of the gospel cannot, it seems to me, forsake the larger duties of his calling and devote himself in any special manner to these few. They may come under his influence as a part of his general parish work, and when he enters the sick-room or deals with a suffering patient, it well becomes him to know how to do so in the most intelligent and sympathetic way. If, however, he should give himself in a special degree to this matter, I can see several dangers ahead. Were he unusually successful in his treatment of the sick and the nervous, finding this to be his long suit, he would naturally throw himself into it to the exclusion of other and larger duties. He might become so engrossed in it that he would ultimately be curing people who were not sick and other parts of his work would suffer. Then if the churches generally should undertake the practice of psycho-therapy, in the wake of those really ill would come a horde of freaks and fanatics who would divert its energies from sober tasks to all sorts of occultism, thus bringing the church into disfavor with the more sane and sensible people.

I make no criticism of those churches which have taken hold of this work and have given a demonstration. They have been exceptionally equipped with men for the task, and they have done well to show not only the need but the practicability of the use of mental suggestion in certain forms of disorders. Given at any time an ideal situation, a minister well born, amply trained, of fine

personality, and of magnetic presence, I should say the doors that opened to him in this direction were the call of God to service.

I believe, too, in the very great wisdom of the Emmanuel Movement in that it places at the threshold of such experiments a capable physician to give his diagnosis and to advise as to further treatment. Where, therefore, you have the ideal minister and the ideal physician, one willing to give up even an affluent patient to the gentler measures of mental suggestion instead of a course in materia medica, the opportunity offers for such a combination. In great centers where many people are oppressed by the very bigness of outward things and the struggle of life, where the hopeless, the nervous, and the visionary congregate and live, there might be with great propriety such enterprises as those which have come in the wake of the Emmanuel Movement. I should say, upon the whole, let the minister do what he can, and let the ministerial student of the future be trained in psychology and all things pertaining thereto. But suddenly to engraft upon our present-day church organization a sort of psychic dispensary, would be a matter of doubtful wisdom.

I see in this movement something that is going to bless the world. When that glorious early church burst forth resplendent upon mankind, it was an avalanche of spiritual power; it had a gift for everyone, there was healing and joy in it; it sanctified the people, body, soul, and spirit; it healed their bodies and saved their souls. Today the evangelical churches have not seemed to have as distinct a message as they once had. People go to church mostly to make pleasant social acquaintances; it never occurs to them that there is a power there to save their souls, or that they need any such saving. "The soul," they say, "what is that? I know nothing about it." The Christian Scientists say, "Come with us, we will cure your diseases and heal your body." That is definite; it may be fraud, but it seems to be something here and now, and in the first impulse there is a prompting to many to test the new theory and see if there be not something worth while in it. So that the church of the future will, in my judgment, pay less attention to dogma and speculative creed and more to helping the everyday needs of men and women. This church will help the sick, but it will do more than that; mental suggestion

may be used upon the well. The great masses of people, while enjoying health of body, are stupid, indifferent, and callous about the great things of life. We talk of our system of education; it has its merits, but it does not educate. When school days are over, and from that very hour, people tend to lapse back to ignorance, narrowness, and selfishness. Very few are alive or awake in more than a tithe of their powers. Knowledge in all its higher ranges has little interest for the vast multitudes. They live in prejudice and self-content. Life is dull to them because its interests are few.

I can see in the minister of the gospel, who may acquire the art of touching and bringing into strength the hidden and quiescent forces and powers of men and women, kindling their best and holiest desires to know and to feel, the true physician of the soul. That the multitudes should be drawn out of their stupor and enlivened with the great thoughts that men have set forth and the great deeds they have accomplished, is of more importance even than that the sick should be made well.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The last of the appointed speakers is Dr. R. P. Johnston, of New York City.

REV. R. P. JOHNSTON, D.D. (Baptist), New York City, addressed the Congress as follows:

IS PSYCHO-THERAPEUTICS A FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH?

Mr. President: Notwithstanding the somewhat hazy and uncertain boundaries of the realms designated by the terms "psychic" and "therapeutic," the question before us is one of definite and specific limitations. In the discussion we are to essay neither a feat of aviation nor an excursion into the fascinating realm of the occult, but standing firmly upon solid ground we are to consider a practical problem in the light of common-sense.

Please notice the question. It is not, Is there such a thing as psychics? not, Is there such a thing as therapeutics? not even, Is there such a thing as psycho-therapeutics?—we freely admit at the very outset that there are such things. But the question is, Shall the church, in addition to her other manifold forms of

ministry, adopt psycho-therapy as a definite, public, organic function?

But "the church" is composed of "churches," and as these local bodies do the work of "the church," the question really becomes, Shall the individual church adopt psychic healing as one of its specific and publicly recognized functions?

It is quite conceivable that the churches may be in heartiest sympathy with every sane and legitimate effort to minimize disease and suffering; they may contribute to hospitals and training schools; may support the most scientific medical training and research in their universities; may foster special institutions of research and co-operate in sanitary movements and efforts in general, without feeling that it is wise for them to adopt the healing of disease as their direct, personal function. It may be the duty of members of a church or even of the pastor to practice psycho-therapeutics or other systems of therapeutics, and the church may wish them God-speed in their ministry without feeling at all obligated to take up the practice of any system of therapeutics as her public, institutional function.

It is not, therefore, a question of the church's sympathy and co-operation in the battle against disease and suffering. This has been heartily given through all the centuries. It is a question of the method of manifesting her sympathy and co-operation. Is the church, as an institution, fitted and equipped to enter upon the direct, personal practice of a system of healing? Is it the wisest and sanest policy for her to adopt?

But should the church conclude that the practice of therapeutics is her function, why should she deliberately limit herself to this one branch of therapeutics? Why should she discriminate against other reputable phases of the healing science and art? Is it because this form of healing is more scientific or less? Is it more important or less? Is skill more necessary or less? Is it more easily acquired or less? Does the church specially select this field of healing because she possesses special insight, authority, and power in this realm? Is it because diseases of the body—organic diseases—are less important or more? Are they less frequent, malignant, stubborn, and fatal, or more? Why draw a line through the field of disease and say this portion we leave to

the scientific practice of medicine and surgery, the other portion we claim as the domain of the church? Is all this an effort to be sane and scientific or is it the survival and pietistic recrudescence of an age-long tendency to associate religion with the occult? Is it an effort to commit the church anew to the fascinating philosophy and practice of occultism? I am not here formulating a theory; I am merely seeking for light.

Against the too hasty and general adoption by the church of psycho-therapeutics as her special field and her definite organic function, I am persuaded that a word or two of caution would not be amiss.

The first is, can the church afford, just yet, to put her sanction upon, and commit herself to, any one of the philosophies underlying this whole movement? The church has not always been too careful of her science and she has suffered many times from having been compelled to abandon her position and to readjust herself to the results of scientific investigations and discoveries. Her past experience should at least render her a bit cautious in committing herself.

It is not a display of bitter opposition and narrow conservatism to ask for more light. Investigators in the psychic realm are by no means of one mind in their conclusions. Weighty authorities are placed over against weighty authorities. Some speak confidently of the science of psycho-therapeutics, while others as strenuously deny that it has attained to the dignity of a science. Certain well-attested phenomena have emerged from the unsounded and uncharted psychic sea. They are flashes out of unknown deeps. But there is no general unanimity in the explanation and systematization of these strange phenomena. To be sure there are rival theories, each laying claim to the dignity of a science, but as yet there is no well-attested and reasoned science. There may be one some day, but just now there is only chaos. The babel of "Christian Science," "Faith Healing," "Mind Healing," "New-Thought Therapeutics," "the Emmanuel Movement," and other not less vociferous claimants of therapeutic power may render it *probable* that we are on the verge of an unexplored continent in man, they also render it *certain* that as yet we are fairly ignorant of its nature and extent. It is not altogether

certain that these modern movements are not rather a new emphasis and exaggeration of what has long been known, rather than the discovery of things hitherto unknown. It is also a question if the attempt to make this new system of healing a function of the church is not an attempt to confine to the church a ministry which has hitherto been much broader and much more general than the present movement contemplates.

Men talk today most fascinatingly and learnedly about the marvelous subconscious or supraconscious mind. But what is this new wonder? Is it a new entity or a new label? Is the subconscious or supraconscious man a distinct being from the conscious man, or is he the product of the reflex action of the conscious man? Have we not always contended that man was a body indwelt by a soul, that he is more than the sum total of his visible, ponderable constituents? Have we not always spoken of latent powers, mysterious capacities, wonderful characteristics? Does calling these mysterious things by a new name add a great deal to our actual stock of knowledge concerning their ultimate essence and modes of operation?

We also hear learned discussions of the power of mind over matter. But have we not for a long time been aware of that potent fact? Has not every invention for the utilization of nature's forces and laws been a triumph of mind over matter; the steam engine not less than psycho-therapeutics? But have we not also been all too conscious of the limitations of the power of mind over matter in many directions? Has not the mountain refused to move, even though Mohammed or Mrs. Eddy command it? Has not cancer refused to cease its gnawings at the heart-strings, even though some psycho-therapist has demanded it?

We are further inducted by awesome whispers into the sanctum of the strange power of suggestion and of his twin brother, or psychic echo, auto-suggestion. But what are they? Are they phases of that other over-worked mystery, hypnotism? But what is hypnotism? Is it a force radiating from personality, by virtue of which a strong or intelligent personality can subdue in a psychic way a weak or ignorant one? Is auto-suggestion the power of a strong, subconscious self over a weak, conscious self? If so, have we not always preached or practiced it—not as an

organic function of the church, but as a wider human ministry? Have we not long known the influence of mind over mind, of will over will? Have we not always appealed to men of weak wills and strong lusts and appetites to call into power the latent elements of their manhood and thus overcome the evil, and have they not done so in numberless cases? We have not called it suggestion, or auto-suggestion, but we have all practiced it and have not thought of limiting it to the narrower function of the church. It is a broad, human ministry.

But we are told that certain nervous diseases can be cured by suggestion—that courage, purpose, hope may be induced instead of fear, confusion, and despair. But from the beginning of social life among men has not friend been performing that ministry for friend, counselor for client, physician for patient, and minister for a perfect host of discouraged, bewildered, baffled, and beaten souls? Has not the ministry and the whole moral teaching force of society sought to arouse, inspire, lead back into the right path, and put heart and courage and hope into men? They have not called it suggestion, but have their efforts been less efficient under another name? Why limit and emphasize as a special function of the church ministries which the church and all other friendly institutions and forces of society have always performed?

But we are told that many marvelous cures have been wrought by psycho-therapeutics, and we do not doubt the assertion for a moment. So have wonderful cures been wrought by surgery and medical therapeutics. Shall the church therefore adopt surgery and medicine as her organic and personal function? But it is insisted that cures have been wrought by psycho-therapy in the realm of nervous diseases, when surgery and materia medica were powerless. So have cures in this realm been wrought by bread pills, by bones of saints, by relics of apostles, by holy coats, by miraculous springs, by the incantations of Indian medicine men, by the grunts and contortions of howling dervishes, by amulets and charms, ikons and images, and by hosts of other artifices for working upon a morbid, distempered imagination or for directing the currents of the mind and will along some less ego-tistic channels. Shall the church take up all this, lay in a supply of bones, go into the business of dispensing holy water, amulets,

and charms, acquire a wardrobe of holy coats, because, forsooth, certain neurasthenics have been cured by these means?

But what is the healing agency in all these cases? It is time that we achieve some rational light on this point. As a matter of fact they have very largely been associated with religion. Are we justly to infer from this that the curative agent is divine power? If so, then as one surveys the field he is bound to say that the Almighty has worked through strange instruments and has chosen strange company. In an old book we are told that the secrets of the Lord are with them that fear him. But there are some modern schools of psycho-therapy which deny the very existence of God, and yet they accomplish feats of healing. No faith in God is required and yet we are told that without faith it is impossible to please him. History bears strong testimony to the fact that no integrity of character, no special intelligence, no seasoned knowledge of the laws of being are necessary to effect cures in this realm. A stock of presumption and a few meaningless phrases seem to go much farther than upright character, faith in God, or an intelligent knowledge of the laws of life. Is that the way God works?

But if the healing agency be divine power, then why limit it to the field of nervous and functional disorders? Is God powerless in other spheres? Has he command of the nerves only, or is he partial to neurotics? As a matter of fact, many believers in psychic healing have claimed, and do yet claim, to perform their cures by divine power—they boldly assert direct divine intervention and draw no limits. But the new movement is more cautious and timid. It is not so sure that the remedial agency is divine, or that organic diseases ought to be admitted to its sphere of operation. Christian Science is false in its premises but consistent in its conclusions. The Emmanuel Movement is half true in its premises but inconsistent in its conclusions. Sometimes it almost claims that it heals by direct divine power. It speaks of God's limitless might. But there it draws back and begins to talk of a general law of life underlying all its cures of healing. But its position is not happy in either case. For if the healing is due to direct divine intervention, then it is inconsistent to limit God to one class of ailments. But if a general psychic law underlies all

these cures of healing, one can hardly escape the conclusion that the sensible course to pursue would be to seek by patient investigation and experiment to learn the nature of this law and the methods of its operation. The whole subject ought, in that case, to be approached and investigated in a scientific, rational spirit. It needs to be lifted out of the regions of religious mysticism and superstitious occultism.

The point I make is that the law of psychics is just as divine as, and no more so than, the law of gravitation. Why then seek to invest it with a kind of religious sanctity? Why not say it has no special religious significance; why not do away with all the ignorance that prevails concerning it? Why seek to make it a function of the church? If any man in the church or out of it can heal by it, let him do so. It is a species of deception for which the church sooner or later must suffer, for her representations to claim to do in the name of and by virtue of the power of religion that which can be done just as effectively without any appeal to or relation with religion. Let us be done with double dealing and not follow the policy of priest and medicine man, by claiming to possess some peculiar, divine power. To my thinking it would be infinitely wiser and saner for the church to exert her influence toward an intelligent and scientific investigation of the great law involved in all forms of psychic healing, that whatever of therapeutic value it possesses may be discovered and utilized. It is not honest and worthy of her to adopt as one of her special functions the practice of hypnotism, word jugglery, and the calling up of spirits from the vast deeps of subconsciousness for the purpose of impressing morbid imaginations and working on distempered nerves under the assumption that because she is the church she possesses special divine power and prerogatives in a world of law.

This leads in the next place to the question, if the pressing of psycho-therapy to the fore, the overemphasis resulting from exalting it into a recognized function of the church, the rendering of it so conspicuous in the thought and life of the community, would not, by the very law of suggestion which it invokes, tend to create and pander to an unsane, unsound mental and nervous condition. Would it not breed more neurotics than it would

cure? For diseases which can be healed by suggestion can be produced by suggestion. Such an action on the part of the church would be regarded by many as a justification to indulge in morbid imaginings and as a sanction of divine authority upon the rock-bottomed reality of all nervous vagaries, hallucinations, and hypochondrias.

Such an exaltation of the practice of this art into a function of the church would catch the imagination and awaken the lively interest of persons with unsane tendencies. They would flock to the church. The press would give special prominence to this phase of church activity, and other saner but not less necessary phases of ministry would fall into the background and in many cases entirely disappear. Would not the inevitable consequence be an unsaneness of mind and spirit and a paralysis of sound judgment and discrimination?

Apart from the question of the effect upon the soundness of mind in the community, there arises another question of the effect of such action on the part of the church upon the support of hospitals and sanatoria. The leaders of the movement may at present draw a line between functional and organic diseases, but will their followers preserve this line? The question already arises, why draw a line at all? And with all due deference to the leaders in this art of healing, no satisfactory answer has yet been forthcoming. The question will grow more persistent, not less; and the very fountains of supplies for our hospitals and other necessary equipment in the scientific battle against disease will be threatened. Who can measure the calamity and the unspeakable pathos of such an effect, not only upon the myriad sick, but upon the sound and healthy as well?

Then, too, there is another phase of the question that is of deepest importance. Beyond question, the element of hypnotism enters to a greater or less degree into all such systems of therapeutics, whether it be so labeled or not. But what is hypnotism? A scientific definition is not attempted, but practically it is the dominance of one will over another. It is a species of depersonalization. What effect does it have on the will and character of the subject? Many who have most thoroughly gone into this matter are of the opinion that hypnotism weakens the will and exerts

a deleterious influence upon the character. Many of the most scientific and conscientious physicians utterly refuse to employ it. It is quite conceivable that a nervous or imaginary disease may be cured at too great a cost to personality. To depersonalize the patient in order to heal a nervous disease would be to drive out one devil only to give a place for seven worse devils. At any rate, the church ought to study the matter carefully and exhaustively before she plunges into a policy that would minister to unsaneness of mind, that would tend to sap the support of the scientific equipment for the battle against disease, or that might leave any portion of society without power to act from the impulses of normal personality. Again I venture to suggest that the adoption of the practice of psycho-therapy as a function of the church would open wide doors of opportunity for conscienceless fakirism to exploit itself and wax fat upon the credulity and superstition of the masses; it would encourage unskilled clumsiness to work havoc amid the finer mechanisms of the human mind and spirit, and would lead to the subtlest temptations and in many cases to shameless immoralities, all under the sacred sanction of religion.

Let it freely and gladly be granted that the vast majority of ministers in this field would be conscientious, faithful, and above reproach. But we cannot for that reason shut our eyes to facts clear as day and old as the race.

The church has never been free from quacks and fakirs. Despite all efforts to discourage and curb them, they have continued to thrive. Now make psycho-therapy a function of the church and you practically dissolve the injunction against them and multiply opportunities for them to enter into fruitful fields. There would be developed in and out of the church a horde of fakirs more hurtful than the great throng of patent-medicine venders, nostrum hawkers, and poison dispensers who now afflict society and fatten off the ills and ignorance of humanity. Legitimate practitioners have always frowned upon quackery, but it flourishes nevertheless, and under the sanction of the church fakirism in the psychic art would thrive more abundantly.

In addition, every minister who, for lack of fitness or application, finds the ordinary ministries of the pastorate irksome, or his

congregations diminishing, would turn to this psychic refuge with a sigh of relief—never mind if he be utterly ignorant of psychics or of therapeutics; never mind if he be unskilled and without fitness for this ministry; he must have a congregation in order to hold his place. True, society, guided by experience, demands that a man shall make careful and scientific preparation to practice medicine. But the church is a divine institution, the minister holds his diploma from the Almighty and cannot think of submitting to such inferior practical laws and safeguards. And thus, however unfitted, he goes forth with the imprimatur of the church upon him, to fumble among the delicate springs of a human soul. The proverbial bull in the china closet would be the very superlative of fitness in comparison.

Then again the temptations arising from such a course would be inevitable and subtle beyond measure. Keep in mind always that this is the function of the church, that hypnotism is one of its chief assets and abnormality its field of operation, and it is left to your sane judgment and sober common-sense to compute the probabilities and weigh the results. And the church, the bride of Christ, whose honor and purity are her life, the church is to put her sanction upon it all.

Once more I dare affirm that for the church to adopt psychotherapeutics as her function would be for her to reverse the age-long policy in pursuit of which she has attained such notable progress and such noble triumphs. It would be a step backward and not forward, downward and not upward.

A glance at history is sufficient to reveal the fact that man has progressed just in proportion as the rational element and the scientific method have superseded the irrational and unscientific. Twentieth-century civilization is the product of the application of rational and scientific principles. The law that applies to society in general applies nowhere more forcefully than in the realms of religion and medicine. Their territories border upon the realm of the occult. These two sister sciences have been overrun, harassed, impeded, dishonored, by irrationalism and superstition as scarcely no other science has. What struggles have they not had to wage against ignorance and credulity, against magic and necromancy, against false prophets and conjurers, against charms

and superstitions, against occultism in all its myriad guises. But slowly they have fought their way through fog and fen, through marsh and morass, to the solid ground of common-sense, reasonableness, and law. Many of the worst foes of medicine have cloaked themselves under the mantle of religion, and many of the bitterest foes of religion have stolen and worn the garb of medicine. But the two sisters—healers of the hurts of soul and body—have risen together, Godlike and free. They have alike become more intelligent, more wise, more scientific. They have learned that the universe is one of law; that cause and effect are always related, and that man, physical, mental, and spiritual, is a creature under law. Magic has slowly been driven back and uncrowned, quackery has been discredited. Problems are to be solved only by patient investigation and experiment. If there is a therapeutic value in psychics, then it too must be differentiated, searched out, and applied in the spirit of science, and in the name of God and humanity. But the church as an institution has no special authority, fitness, or equipment to make herself the custodian of this art of healing. But someone will say, Did not Jesus so heal men, and the apostles? But I do not read that they confined themselves to functional derangements. If you claim that it is the will of Jesus that the church still heal, then show your authority by causing an eye that has been taken out to grow back; cause a limb that has been lost to replace itself; raise a few dead people to life. Do something that requires a specific intervention of divine power if you are the custodians of Christ's healing power, and do not confine yourself to a field where men who do not believe in God or in Jesus can duplicate your cures. Do not claim that you perform certain acts by virtue of certain religious faiths when men with no religious faith can do the same thing. Let your rod swallow the rods of the other magicians.

I am not affirming that psycho-therapeutics is in itself pure superstition. I do not so believe. I regard it as a perfectly legitimate field of investigation and practice. I hope to see the day when its entire therapeutic efficiency will be scientifically and intelligently used against disease. But what I do affirm is that the church is unprepared, unfitted, and by the very nature of the case is not the proper body to attempt the practice of this art.

For her to arrogate to herself this function would be to take a long step back toward the slough of magic, fakirism, miracle-working quackery and superstition, out of which she has so painfully struggled.

Just a word more. A mere glance at the history of the progress of religion shows that under different names and philosophies there have always been practicers of the psychic art. They have generally flourished when the life of the church was at a low ebb, her vision uncertain, her mission indistinct, and her faith wavering. Such a period were the centuries before and after the coming of Christ, when a belief in magic was almost universal. Such a period was the Middle Ages when great pilgrimages to famous shrines resulted in marvelous cures. In periods, however, when the life of the church is virile, her vision clear, her activities and purposes definite, her spirit militant, these sicklier forces fall into the shadows of the background.

In modern times the widespread adoption of the evolutionary philosophy, the results of historic and literary criticism of the sources of our faith, a wider, truer knowledge of the phenomena of religious history in general, together with new social problems born out of modern conditions, have compelled the church to readjust her theology and philosophy, and to rearrange her plans and methods. For a time she has been hesitant, bewildered, confused. She has been seeking to get her bearings and to work out anew her way to the goal of her mission. In these moments of perplexity and hesitancy, out of the shadows have emerged hosts of would-be-guides, saying to the church, follow us, we will be your guide. Many individuals have listened to their claims and pleas and have gone after them into the swamp and fog of metaphysics and unreason. And now psycho-therapy comes and says, "Follow me, I have enough power to cure hysteria; it is not much, but it will do. I dare not be consistent in my conclusions, but 'consistency is the bugbear of little minds.' True, other men who do not believe in God can do quite as much as we, but if we will only call it a divine power and make it a function of the church we can keep a few people a long time in darkness. For people love to associate religion and occultism."

For myself, Mr. President, I hesitate to believe that the

leaders in the church, men of sane judgment, will consent to abandon the star by which the church has journeyed for centuries, to follow after the flickering will-o'-the-wisps which emerge from the unexplored regions of subconsciousness, which are themselves the sickly products of decay, and which burn with the strange fires of hypnotism, occultism, and superstition. The function of the church is saner, deeper, and higher than that of playing the part of the high-priestess of exorcism in the unsane realm of neurotics.

DISCUSSION

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I have great pleasure now in introducing Bishop Fallows, of Chicago.

RIGHT REV. SAMUEL FALLOWS, D.D., LL.D.:

Mr. President, and Brethren: I should like nothing better than to have in cold print before me the eloquent and discursive address of my honored brother who has just preceded me. I would like exceedingly to have him as a patient in my church clinic. I think, perhaps, when I had gone through with the review of the address and with a personal interview, that he would not differ on any essential point, essential point, understand, any more than Dr. MacDonald and Dr. Durkee would differ. I recognize fully the thorough need of the scientific understanding of all that relates to this great question of psychical healing, and therefore I have linked myself with many of the leading neurologists of the world in setting forth, on the purely scientific and educational side, the great subject of psycho-therapeutics.

This somewhat formidable word is only about fifteen or sixteen years old. For the past fifteen years I have had the privilege of lecturing in a prominent medical college in this city on mental physiology and psycho-therapeutics. I think this was the first chair of the kind ever established in any medical institution in the world. And so the term psycho-therapeutics has, as you can clearly see, no terrors for me.

I may briefly answer one point raised by the last speaker, with regard to the healing power of the Christian ministry. Rev. Dr. A. J. Gordon, of sainted memory, answered it some time ago. He said in substance to his ministerial brethren: "You are com-

missioned and it is irrefutably commanded by your Divine Master to 'teach and preach and heal.' Who has taught you that your function is not to heal as well as to teach and preach? You say that you cannot perform the wonders which the Lord Jesus Christ and the apostles performed. You cannot heal all cases of sickness, and, therefore, you are not to attempt to heal at all. But you recognize fully that you are commissioned to preach the gospel to every creature and baptize them in the name of the Lord Jesus. You know that your business is to save souls and to bring them into the kingdom. Do you save all the souls to whom you preach? How many in your congregation have you brought to your Master's feet? Because you have not been the means of converting all to whom you have ministered, will you, therefore, abandon the ministerial work?"

The first two papers which were read, when fairly considered, are, in my judgment, perfectly unanswerable, if you take them in the full scope of their meaning. When I was consecrated bishop, and by your kindness, Mr. President, you know that in your graceful introductory remarks of yesterday, you made me a bishop of all the ministers in the city of Chicago, one of the specific injunctions given me in a most solemn manner was, "Heal the sick." And this injunction is given to every bishop of every church of the Episcopal character. I realized after a great many years of experience that as a bishop of the church, I had been quite neglectful of that fundamental injunction given me. I woke up some time ago to the fact that, after teaching five hundred graduate physicians, who are now practicing all over the country, the fundamental principles of psycho-therapeutics, in which were included the power of religious as well as mental influence, that I had been instructing others in the principles which I had not been specifically practicing myself. I had thought that want of time had not afforded me the opportunity. I was put in the position of one of Shakspeare's characters, who said, "I can better teach twenty what were good to be done than to be one of the twenty to follow mine own teaching."

Now, in the midst of a busy life, I have found both the time and the opportunity to help hundreds of persons in face to face interviews who have been suffering from depression, melancholia,

religious delusions, want of confidence, worry, and a number of other mental and spiritual ailments. A king's ransom could not purchase the joy and exquisite satisfaction I have experienced. I have had a genuine revival of religion going on all the time.

I pray every Sunday, as my church commands me to pray, "for all who are in any ways afflicted or distressed in mind, body, or estate." And just as far as possible, I have been answering this prayer, made as a general supplication, by bringing the eternal laws of God and of his Son, Jesus Christ, to bear upon those who are thus afflicted and suffering.

Do you think there can be any more danger connected with the sane, scientific and scriptural method of personal application of these great forces which my brethren and myself are making, than that inherently belongs to the ministerial life in general? What is the keynote of evangelism today? Personal work. Not merely official work, not work in the mass, but personal work. We have found that our parishoners and others have unburdened their souls to us, the accredited ministers of the historic Christ, as they have not done even to the most skilled physicians whom they have consulted. These skilled physicians and neurologists have sent me, on their own accord, patient after patient who they knew needed just the religious therapeutical help that I from my ministerial training and position could give.

With here and there an exception the progressive physicians and neurologists are recognizing the fact that we are carrying out in a legitimate manner the work they themselves are doing. There is no quackery or wild fire in it. They do not need any clergyman or layman to come to their aid against us as supposed intruders in their domain.

We must remember that persuasion is the main element in this personal treatment. Suggestion leashed upon the appeal to the reason is subsidiary to it. This pertinent and powerful agent every minister is continually employing. Suggestion he nearly as often uses. He appeals to reason and conscience through the conscious nature. These appeals sink into the subconscious part of the one undivided self and do their allotted work.

And now in conclusion: A well-known cult with scarcely a single scientific man or woman in it, led by a Chicago Board of

Trade man, who was once a member of my congregation, along with others having no better previous preparation for healing and lecturing, has come to the front for its alleged cures in the psychical realm. It has used suggestion although denying it and calling it by a pseudo-name to accomplish its results.

I look into your faces, so many of you college graduates, trained men in "the cure of souls," the best prepared men in the world to deal with the deepest questions of the human heart. I ask myself and I ask you, can there be any doubt as to your competency to minister to mind diseased, to inspire confidence in God and Christ and self, to bring hope and peace and joy to doubting and disordered souls, by pressing home the simple truth of an unfailing faith in the power of God and of his divine human Son to save them to the uttermost?

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I have great pleasure in inviting Prof. Geo. B. Foster to the platform to address us at this time.

PROFESSOR GEO. B. FOSTER:

My name was given to the chairman before Dr. Johnston made his address or I would not have allowed it to appear at all, for he made my speech, and all that is left for me to do, if I avoid repetition at all, is to take up in a rather optimistic way a chore or two that perhaps need to be done, very commonplace items, indeed.

In the first place, as a historic fact, have we as a church and as a people first gone to the Bible and found out what we ought to want, or have we first wanted it and then afterward gone to the Bible for it? Did we first go to the Bible and find out that it would allow slavery and then afterward practice slavery, or did we really want to hold slaves and then afterward go to the Bible for authority for it? And did we first go to the Bible and find out that nerves could be cured by supernatural materialism, and then secondly want our nerves cured that way? Did we first want to obey Jesus by imitating his cures and then get at it; or did we get at it and then go to him for authority on the subject? Which was it? And when we went to him for authority on the subject, did we have faith enough to go the whole length of it, or did we just have that faith which was coincident with the experiences that we had already achieved in the matter?

And then did we think of another thing, that historical science greatly abbreviates the healing ministry of Jesus as a fact? And secondly, that the aggregation and indication of a vast amount of this work on his part was supplied to his nobler ministry by his later followers who did not rise to his fine level, but dropped back again to materialistic materialism, which expected the bodies to be healed and made very nice and fine and sound so that they could enjoy the good things of this world?

At all events, is the thing that made the future, and that will continue to make the future, to be derived from the healings of Christ, from his work upon others in this regard, or is it to be derived from that in him on account of which he was crucified in an agony of pain? Which is it?

This whole business is an apostasy from Christ; not a heresy, an apostasy. This whole business is sub-Christian, men, pre-Christian. It was first physics, and then it is psycho-physics, but if we don't get out of the physical and the psychological, we have not got in sight of Christ, the real Christ. What Christ came to do was not primarily to relieve the world of pain, but to make the world equal to doing something, no matter how much pain it cost. Think what a stupid world it would be, what a monotonous thing it would be if everybody was therapeutically well! (Laughter.)

And besides that, if you are going to follow Christ, the way that he would heal the nerves of our people today with his fine ethical work would be like this: "Men of wealth, this child labor now will make neurotics by and by. You scoundrels! Stop this child labor! Millionaires, with your secret certificates of deposit, you are underpaying poor women. Give them fair wage and fewer hours. Treat them like brothers, and they won't be neurotics." That is what Christ would say to them. And the church that turns aside from them to psycho-therapeutics is falling below the mind of the Master, and it is entirely too easy, entirely too easy.

Besides, is it such an awful thing to be sick? There is John L. Sullivan, the slugger, and there was Elizabeth Barrett Browning in her invalid's chair, singing her enthusiastic song for Christ. Can John L. Sullivan's perfect health keep him from being a sinner? Can it keep his hands out of other men's pockets?

Will the neurotic Elizabeth Barrett Browning have unholy fire of lust flashing from her eyes? Oh, my friends, when you rise up to the ethical standpoint and see that it is the achievement of moral personality that is the great thing, it is not impossible that bad nerves shall contribute to it; not impossible.

What Jesus Christ came to do was not to help us get rid of pain and of suffering; what he came to do was to make us strong enough to rise to summits of morality not yet achieved, no matter how much pain and suffering it cost us, even if the doing of that required us to enter into situations where nerves would be racked and would go to pieces.

And as for the church entering upon this matter, the physicians have settled that; for the element of good in it all is simply this: It has reminded the physicians that man is more than the material; that man is also a psychical being, and they will, as they are already doing, steal the thunder of this whole business and possibly retire the distinguished and educated clergy from the job. That is what the physicians will do, and when the clergy come along and say, "But now we are practically out of a job; this gospel of ethico-spiritual religion is too hard for this soft age, we want you to take us into the boat," why, they won't let them in. The only good of it all is once more to call back the thought of the physician to the fact that man has mind to be taken into account and diseases and other things, and as fast as the physicians do this, as they are already doing it, and as it is their office to do, the ministry will have to come back to that harder job of morality and religion or else abdicate.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: Dr. Craig, of Denver, will now address us.

DR. BAYARD CRAIG:

Mr. President, Members of the Congress: When I consented to send up my name on this subject I did not know that such giants were to speak this morning. After hearing the last of the appointed speakers I was reminded of a story I heard out West the other day. A minister went to see a man who recently had an experience with a tornado and who had come out safe. As he told the story to the pastor, the pastor patted him on the back

and said, "The Lord must have been with you yesterday, my brother." "Well," he said, "if the Lord was with me yesterday, he was going some!" (Laughter.)

I felt that we were going some in listening to that speech. I could not but think, however, that the speaker was using something of hypnotism or something of mental suggestion when he won such applause to a whirlwind that was creating a cloud of dust around a question that I believe is one of the most important in the religious world of today. I would not attempt to speak upon it, but I feel its vast importance and dare not decline because there should be a last favorable word on this question.

I wish very much that Dr. MacDonald had my time that he might help to present in such a beautiful and convincing way the great truths of this subject. Brethren, it is not a question of bringing psycho-therapeutics as a function into our churches; it is already there. Psycho-therapeutics is not only a question of making the sick well, but also of keeping the well from getting sick. When the Lord Jesus Christ came into our troubled world and saw men with the lines of grief and sorrow upon their faces; saw the lack of peace that was within their hearts; saw them lost and bewildered and saw them afraid of the forces of nature and afraid of their fellow-men and afraid of their gods, when he came into this troubled world and said to men, "When you pray say, 'Our Father, Who art in Heaven'"—that was psycho-therapeutics. To teach the secret of peace and fearlessness to the soul of troubled man. He came that we might have peace, and any man or any woman in Chicago or in all the world today that knows how to say "Our Father! O thou lover of men, oh, thou friend and relentless benefactor; every moment of my life thou art caring for me and protecting me. What need I fear? Thou art with me." Every man and every woman that walks in the consciousness of that truth has received a large benefit of psycho-therapeutics.

Fear has been driven away, anxiety has been driven away, the pulses of life are throbbing in his veins and health is coming in, although he may oppose the statements in regard to faith healing as vigorously as Dr. Johnston. Consciously he is opposed to

faith healing, unconsciously he is enjoying its benefits by living a joyous Christian life.

Jesus healed. He healed all who had faith. I do not say that those who had no faith could not be healed, but all who had faith were healed. Has humanity changed from that day to this? When Jesus said, "According to your faith be it unto you," did he speak to men that had within them different potentialities from you and me today? Is Christ the same yesterday, today, and forever? Is human nature the same today that it was then? Then who shall forbid my belief in the perpetuity of that law, "According to your faith be it unto you"? And with all deference to this learned professor who has addressed you just before I came to the platform, and with all deference to the argument made by the vigorous doctor in his opposition to it, why should a thing which Jesus taught by precept and example be called "apostate"? I believe they condemned Jesus of Nazareth himself by their arguments. Magic and wonder-working were rampant in the world when Jesus came! How came it then that he took such a disreputable thing as miracles of healing and made them a function of his life, of his ministry, of his church?

DR. JOHNSTON: Mr. President, I did not say that.

DR. CRAIG: I thought that was very clearly implied. I do not wish to misrepresent you; indeed, I am not saying a word in controversy. If my voice takes on that tinge I don't mean it should; I simply say: "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear," and the point of view is so clear and plain to me that I have no possible argument about it at all.

Jesus healed by faith. He will heal by faith today. Science comes to tell us that we have in our body, in the white corpuscles of the blood, a constabulary that under proper generalship is sufficient for the protection of the body and for the healing of diseases; and in the last analysis the reason that Christianity has made a civilization that dominates the world is because it came into the world to fill up the sources of faith and hope and courage in the human heart. And wherever faith and hope and courage have been generated by the Christ and by his teaching there is

man strong to resist disease, and there is man strong to resist sin, and there is man at his best.

I only beg for sympathy and for the open mind in a great question like this for if the truth be in it or half the truth that is claimed, it means, not a new fad or a new fashion, but reclaiming to the church its Christlike and apostolic function, a function to convince the world that we do have the commission from Almighty God to go out with a message of salvation to man in mind and soul and body.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We have but two more addresses and our session this afternoon begins at three o'clock, so we have plenty of time to hear these brethren. We will listen now to Rev. Thomas Moody from Matadi, Congo, Africa.

REV. THOMAS MOODY:

Mr. President: Some friend made a mistake by sending up my name, and I suppose it is because I represent the foreign field. But I believe today in psycho-therapeutics. I believe also in Jesus' commission to preach and to teach and to heal, and I think perhaps nine-tenths of all the foreign missionaries that go out into the field have something of that thing to do. I can only give an illustration or two in a brief way of what we have had to do out in Congo in that way.

I believe today personally that about nine-tenths of the people that say they are sick only think they are sick; and if psycho-therapeutics or mental healing or science, or any of those things have come in and done things to help people, why, I claim it is about time that the church took up her part in the doing of that work.

I remember once when I was going around preaching the gospel and teaching the people, and along with that, of course, we had the healing of the sick—it comes in continuously, you cannot get away from it, the people come to you with all kinds of sicknesses, and they imagine you can heal all kinds diseases—I remember once coming to a town where there was a man, one of our preachers, and he had been sick about three weeks when I came there. He looked to be almost a skeleton and I was really afraid for him. I asked him what he had been eating

and he said, "Why, I haven't eaten anything for two weeks," and that accounted for it. I asked him in regard to what medicine he had taken and he told me he had not taken any medicine. Well, I got hold of that man in that condition, and I examined him as thoroughly as I could, and finally I took one of my fowls and had his wife cook it and I had him eat it, and then I took some of my medicine that I had and gave it to him, and left some more with him, and to the surprise of my life, two days after, that man walked into the station thirty miles away. Now, it was not really the stuff I gave him so much as the soul, as it were, that was put into the man. He had something to eat, he had some medicine, and then he had some faith, as we will say. I think it is Professor Huxley that says it is a question of faith whether a man is healed. It is a question of faith, and why? It is not a question of whether a thing is true or not true, but it is a question of faith, whether a man believes it. And it seems to me that the question with Christian Science is whether the person believes it. If he believes it, he is healed, although I believe it is a lie.

Well, that man was healed. I remember another case when we were going around, and my wife was with me, and the people came to see us in quite large numbers, and quite a number were sick. They were given medicine; and by and by somebody came along and said, "This man's wife at the other town is very sick," and so we walked over there, a two-hours' journey, up and down hill and dale, until we arrived at that town. There we saw a tremendous crowd of people and the witch doctor was there carrying on his native incantations. Well, my wife went up there and she said, "I am *engonga*"—that is, she had been doing medical work—and so she went in and the witch doctor went out. She went over the case and saw the condition that woman was in, as far as we could judge by the books we had read and the practice we had had, and we decided that it was acute pneumonia. That woman was given something, she was spoken to, and medicine with proper directions was left with her, and she was healed.

So, I say, friends, I believe in psycho-therapeutics. I believe Jesus commissioned us to preach and teach and heal, and I believe also that a lot of the things that you are talking about that the

church ought to do, and the way to reach the masses, and a whole lot of those things, the missionaries are doing all the time on the foreign fields. Why? Because we are carrying out practically every injunction of our Lord Jesus Christ.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The closing address will be delivered by Doctor Case, of Buffalo.

DR. CARL D. CASE:

I want to make a couple of distinctions only, and only speak three or four minutes, and the first is this: That as Jesus gave his command to teach and to preach and to heal, we understand by the gifts of the spirit in Paul's epistles that these gifts were varied and that one man had the gift of teaching and another man had the gift of healing.

I call your attention to the fact that there is a previous question to the one we have been discussing, and that is: What is the church? We have practically discussed that question before in this Congress; as to whether the New Testament teaches that the church is to be considered as an institution. Jesus gave his command to individuals and every doctor today who is healing the sick is fulfilling that command and we do not feel that psycho-therapeutics is the only method of healing the sick in obedience to Christ's command.

Now, the other thing I want to call your attention to is this: Professor Graham Taylor of Chicago Commons in this city was once asked what he regarded to be the function of the church and he said the function of the church was a threefold one: First, it must present the ideal of exalted life; second, the power of a self-sacrificing life; third, it furnishes the initiative for new social movements. I want you to notice the third phrase which is after all the question for consideration. The church has always furnished that initiative. You must remember that the kingdom of God is the end; that the church is but the means to the end. That there are these three great institutions, i. e., the family, the state, and the church, that are working toward that same goal.

In the early period of church history education seemed to be a function of the church. The monks were the teachers, but as history proceeded the state necessarily took up the function of

education, until today the church as a church assumes very little of its burden. Similarly in the line of healing, the church originally did all the hospital work and a part of the business of the church leaders was to visit the sick and render them necessary aid. But as the community has been more Christianized, this function has been turned over to other agencies, until today very few churches or Christian institutions do hospital work.

May it not be the same in the field of psycho-therapeutics? Some agency is needed to take the initiative. But, when the public have understood the necessity of psycho-therapeutics, then the church may turn aside from this function to other new fields of Christian endeavor.

We know that in the biological evolution of animals certain organs are atrophied by disuse and certain functions pass away on account of the change of environment. It is so with the church. The first two things mentioned by Professor Taylor are the permanent function of the church, to furnish a high ideal of Christian living, and the power of self-sacrificing devotion. As history proceeds and new environment will ever reach fresh duties, each temporary function will be succeeded by a new temporary function as the church leads civilization along Christian lines.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: This will close our session. I hope you will not forget we come together again at three o'clock this afternoon for the closing session. The general theme is "Christ's Prayer for Unity."

Closing prayer having been offered by Doctor Ames, an adjournment was taken until three o'clock P. M.

THIRD DAY

Afternoon Session

November 12, 1908

3 o'clock P. M.

DR. WILLET: Will the Congress be in order? We will sing two or three stanzas of Hymn No. 1,003.

(The Congress joined in song.)

DR. WILLETT: Prayer will be offered by Dr. Earle of the Belden Avenue Baptist Church.

(Dr. Earle offered prayer.)

DR. WILLETT: We have come to the final session of this Congress and no theme could be more appropriate for this occasion than "Christ's Prayer for Unity." The first speaker upon this theme, representing the Free Baptist Church, is Rev. A. W. Jefferson, of Portland, Maine, who will now address you.

REV. A. W. JEFFERSON (Free Baptist), of Portland, Me., presented the following paper:

CHRIST'S PRAYER FOR UNITY

In considering this great prayer of our Lord's one can appreciate the reverence shown by the German pietist, Spencer, who never chose a text from the seventeenth chapter of John because the passage best lends itself to devotional meditation. But if we understand the true nature of this prayer, it is the self-revelation of the mind of the Master, and must be reverently studied as a source of supreme authority. Christ's prayer life was, for the most part, spent in private devotion, yet there are a few critical moments when his pent-up spirit breaks the bonds of retirement and reveals the secrets of his fathomless nature. Such moments stand solitary in their sublimity. Our Master's previous discourse with his disciples concludes by passing up into communion with his God. With a vision, prophetic in its scope, and a love, divine in its embrace, he pleads that the ever-widening circle of believers may be bound with a triple bond, to himself, to each other, and to the world. His oneness with the Father furnished the type, his will and purpose, expressed in prayer, the motive, and the redemption of the world the grand result. In spite of crude conceptions, false interpretations, and serious errors in administration, the church has never entirely lost sight of this great ideal which the Master lifted before the discordant world.

As early as the time of the writing of the Didache, or not later than the middle of the second century, unity was a burning question demanding special prayer. In the ritual for the celebration of the Lord's Supper appear these significant petitions:

As this broken bread was scattered on the face of the mountains, and, gathered together, became one, even so may thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom. . . . Remember, Lord, thy church, to deliver it from all evil, and to perfect it in thy love, and gather it together from the four winds.

As prayers grow out of conscious needs, these petitions, embodied, as they were, in an established ritual, indicate an imminent peril confronting the infant church.

The ancient Catholic church was easily satisfied with a mere formal and external unity. It grew up in the midst of a great imperial empire, and almost unconsciously absorbed the political ideals which that empire lost in its decay. The old forms of tyranny survived in an ecclesiastical despotism which held the church to its papal center. Caesar had established a political imperialism which Charlemagne sought to perpetuate through his conquests, and Huldebrand in his dream of a Holy Roman empire. For centuries a mere form of unity secured by the Roman hierarchy satisfied Christendom. As a result of the Protestant Reformation the old artificial bonds of union were forever shattered. But the intense individualism which ran riot through the reformed churches was not suited to the work of reconstructing a united church. The points of emphasis fell on two phases of current thought, neither of which was vital enough to strike the discordant elements into even the semblance of harmony. Men began to think for themselves, and when men think for themselves they think about governing themselves and democracy is the result. The impulse which the Reformation gave to civil liberty expressed itself in the theocracy which John Calvin established in Geneva, and tended to raise mere matters of church administration to positions of major importance. In the free, plastic life of the apostolic church, adapting itself to new problems, customs, and races, the controversialist found the germ of almost any form of polity he chose to champion. These heated discussions introduced slight differences in church government as valid excuses for furthering the work of disruption.

The recognition of the right of private interpretation of the Scriptures sent the scholars back to their books, to study, criticize, and reconstruct the doctrines of the church. The Greek Fathers

had established the principles of religious philosophy; the Latin Fathers had outlined the great systems of doctrine; the Reformers made themselves masters of the art of creed making, but all too soon became the slaves of their own craft. Whatever virtues lie in the great historic creeds, and they are many, history clearly teaches that they are not foundations upon which to build a united church. No man or council of men have either the right or authority to fix the beliefs of a divine institution which, like the church, was founded for the purpose of giving free expression to an ever-growing religious thought and experience. The teachings of the gospel cannot be stated in a way to make them final. They spring from a seed and are ever expressing themselves in new leaf, bud, blossom, and flower. Dr. Clark opens his *Outlines of Christian Theology* with this statement, "Theology is preceded by religion, as botany by the life of the plants. Religion is the reality of which theology is the study." Christ founded his church on the reality. In Dr. Robertson's church at Brighton there is a memorial window representing Christ among the doctors of the law; beneath it is a tablet bearing this significant inscription, "They were thinking about theology; he was thinking about God." The logic of history makes it self-evident that Christ's purpose for his church can never be realized through insistence on anything less important than that vital religion which remains fixed in the midst of a changing order.

Our little systems have their day:
 They have their day and cease to be:
 They are but broken lights of Thee,
 And Thou, O Lord, art more than they.

If the past attempts to unify Christendom sound loud warnings, they need not occasion despair or discouragement. "Not failure but low aim is crime." The New Testament church, which has already received the attention of this Congress, offers the only practical solution of this problem. It is evident that at the beginning the *ecclesia* was the simplest form of a religious democracy. Christ planted the mustard seed of the kingdom and left its growth to the centuries; he hid a kernel deep in the soil of human nature; then like the patient husbandman waited for

"first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." His supreme concern was not to organize a society, but to discover the human soul, and leave to it the creation of an institution through which it could find its highest expression. He would make high-souled men and send them forth to make a Church. As the Holy Spirit is sometimes used by the New Testament writers to designate the spirit of Christ continuing in the world, so the church is regarded as his visible body, the instrument through which the work of redemption is to be consummated. Paul has left a few classic passages in which this figure is employed. To think of dismembering that body and still having a church he looked upon as the height of absurdity. "Is Christ divided?" he asks of the contending Corinthians. Facing conditions which would shatter Protestantism into a thousand fragments he writes, "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord." The bond of union could not be a matter of temperament, for the church was composed of a heterogeneous company, representing all phases of tastes, talents, and beliefs. It could not be social, for beside the proud Pharisee stood the despised publican. It could not be doctrinal, for the age of creed making had not then begun. As President Faunce has aptly said, "The unity was that of one Lord, not yet psychologically analyzed, one faith not yet metaphysically formulated, one baptism not yet etymologically discussed." It was a common experience of redemption, and a mutual recognition of the lordship of Jesus which bound the church into a spiritual and visible whole. Paul dared to carry this broad principle to its logical and Christian conclusion. "Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth; for God hath received him. . . . Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received us to the glory of God." Dr. Sanday commenting on these passages reminds us that Paul here declares the high principle that all whom Christ has received should, without any distinction, be accepted into his church. Or to use Cyprian's noble phrase, "The church is the mother of all of whom God is the father." To break fellowship with one of Christ's most humble and immature disciples is to break fellowship with him. Thus

in the midst of a narrow and provincial age Paul lifted a standard toward which the Christian centuries have raised but lame hands.

Christ's prayer calls for a type of union which will make its imprint on the world. Not some form which will satisfy the church, but which will convince the world, a world devoid of spiritual discernment. Granting that the church is now one in spirit, it must not be a disembodied spirit if it would fulfil the Lord's command. "*As thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*" Here is a condition within the church which must be realized before she can proclaim her evangel with convincing power and authority. More convincing than philosophical speculations, than decrees of ecumenical councils, or the pious homilies of the mystics is a united body of believers of whom the world must say, "Behold how they love one another." Here is the one irresistible apologetic with which to face and convince a doubting world. The disciple who listened to this prayer with the clearest spiritual discernment never lost sight of its meaning. Jerome is responsible for the tradition that toward the end of John's life, when he was so weak that they carried him to the church to preach, he used often to say no more than this, "Little children, love one another." His friends were wearied of this and said, "Master, why dost thou always say this?" To which he replied, "It is the Lord's command, and if this alone is done, it is enough."

The prayer moves on to the second result which must follow the union of believers. "*I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me.*" The purpose expressed in vs. 21 was to convince the world that Christ was sent of God; now it is that the world may *know* that God not only sent Christ, but loves the world even as he loves Christ. The world must first be convinced and then evangelized. It is not surprising that the awakening interest in missions, the new evangelistic impulse, and the deepening interest in the question of union should appear together, for they are parts of the same spiritual quickening. Jesus makes the world's belief in his divine origin and mission, as well as its conception of divine love, depend on the previous existence of a church "made perfect in

one." Many have been the attempts in the past to evangelize the unchurched. The Franciscan monks drove their converts to the baptismal fonts at the point of the spear; the Reformers gave their message with a diversity which would tempt every form of taste and thought; the Puritans filled their rude meeting-houses by the help of the blue laws; while the church of today taxes her ingenuity to devise some new attraction with which to woo the world. Is it not time, high time, to give way to the Master's method—close ranks and win the kingdom?

This prayer raises so high the standard that from every side comes the cry, "It is too high; we cannot attain unto it." But happily Christ is not only the "truth and the light" but also the "way." He lifts the standard, prophesies the victory, and bestows the power. *"And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one, even as we are one."* The glory which Christ received from God when it is transmitted to the church will strike it into harmony. There are few words in the New Testament more common than glory, few more difficult of definition. Chrysostom interprets it in this passage as meaning the glory of the signs and of the doctrine and of the unity of spirit. Augustine makes it the glory of immortality which human nature was to receive in Christ. John Calvin defines it as the image of God, which, revealed through Christ, begets a new spiritual life in the hearts of believers. This last interpretation states the truth most clearly. To glorify means to interpret, to manifest, and make intelligible. Bosworth glorified Johnson by revealing the true character of his hero. Ruskin glorified the all-but-forgotten Turner by making intelligible the hidden genius of that great artist. Christ glorified God by making him manifest to the church; the church glorifies the Father and his only begotten Son by making them intelligible to the world. Professor Drummond puts it in a nutshell:

The word has many meanings; in ethics it can have but one. Glory is *character*, nothing less, and it can be nothing more. The earth is "full of the glory of the Lord" because it is full of his character. The "beauty of the Lord" is character. . . . "The Glory of the Only Begotten" is character, the character which is fulness of grace and

truth. . . . We all reflect as a mirror the character of Christ, are transformed into the same image from character to character.

The glory which is to unify the church is Christian character. When an intelligent, broad, and deeply spiritual type of character is evolved then church federation, co-operation, and organic union will follow as naturally as the meadow brook flows from the hillside spring. In the clear light of this great high-priestly prayer the path of present duty is made plain. The door has been opened and no man can shut it. The standard has been lifted and no power can lower it. The command has gone forth from lips divine and no church of the living God can disobey it.

During one of the fierce battles of the Civil War a young color-bearer ran before the advancing line and planted the colors on the ramparts. The colonel seeing his danger ordered him back to the line, but disregarding military discipline, he cried, "Bring the line up to the colors." Jesus Christ has planted the colors before the advancing line of the church militant; timid souls ask him to bring the colors back to the line; he orders the church up to the colors.

DR. WILLETT: The second paper, representing the Disciples, is by Rev. Vernon Stauffer, Angola, Ind.

REV. VERNON STAUFFER then read the following paper:

CHRIST'S PRAYER FOR UNITY

In the upper room in Jerusalem, just before the betrayal, a few hours only before the crucifixion, Jesus prayed. Every circumstance conspired to make the prayer express the full flood of his soul's deep yearnings. His "hour" had come. He had so nearly completed the work which his Father had given him to do that he conceived of it as already accomplished. He had glorified God on the earth. Another day would see the burden of responsibility for the world's redemption transferred from his heart to the hearts of his disciples. How would they bear it? To what end, at their hands, would come all his sacrificial planning and his holy hopes for humanity? Would his servants—his friends—prove true? Would they incarnate his spirit? Would they perpetuate his redemptive ministry and fill up that which was behind of his

afflictions, through the self-denying ministries of their own lives? Would disaster, in the shape of worldliness or discord, overtake his cause? Would the little leaven of sanctified human nature, which he was leaving in the world, be able, by the grace of the gospel, to leaven the whole lump of humanity and, in the end, gather up all things unto himself? Clearly, it was an hour for communion with God, an hour for prayer that these who were his own in the world, whom he had loved and whom he continued to love unto the end, might be equal to the responsibility, might be able to complete that which he had begun, and so bring his cause to universal beneficence and triumph. And as that prayer rises, as one has said, "like some celestial music, through all the interwoven notes of different fellowships, the fellowship of the Father with the Son, the fellowship of the Master with the disciples, the fellowship of the disciples with each other," we are permitted, shall I not say, to press farther back into the region of Christ's own soul than through any other words that ever fell from his lips.

The heart of the prayer is reached in his petition that his disciples who then were present with him and those, also, who should afterward believe upon him through their word might "be one." Not that his spirit does not truly unburden itself in the petitions that his Father should again invest him with the eternal glory of which he had emptied himself when he took the form of a servant, and that at last all who had been given to him might be with him to behold the glory to which his Father had appointed him; but, since his mission to the world was primarily and essentially redemptive, that which affected this, which would bring the world to faith in him as its Redeemer, must have been that which filled the most central deeps of his soul. To this end had he been born, and for this cause came he into the world, to bear witness unto the truth, and through this witnessing, in life as well as in death, to restore men to the fellowship of the sons of God. This was his central message and this his sustaining consolation when he passed to his cross, and humiliation and anguish girt him on every side. By the logic of his redemptive mission, therefore, as well as by the logic of all the occasions for solicitude which were gathered up into the yearnings of that holy hour,

this petition for unity constitutes the heart of the Savior's prayer.

1. In the interpretation of that petition we notice, first, its distinct humanistic interest and concern. He prayed that his disciples might be one—to what end? Because he would save his cause from the reproach of discord and unlovely strife? No, not primarily. For the sake of the exaltation of the church? Assuredly not that. Nay, he prayed that “they may all be one that the world may believe” (to quote his own words), “that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me.” Here, as always, his interest was not theological, it was not ecclesiastical, it was not even doctrinal (surely not in the narrow sense of that word), much less was it metaphysical; it was practical, philanthropic, evangelical, steeped in his master missionary passion. “For *their* sakes,” not for the sake of ritual or dogma or tradition, he consecrated himself. With him the needs, the rights, of manhood came first. Out of his boundless, inexhaustible love for men, his compassionate yearning for their redemption, he prays this prayer. The Christ who defined his life-mission in the simple words: “The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost;” who entered into the synagogue where a crowd of pious worshipers “were stupidly missing the whole secret of life and doing it in the name of religion,” and where, laying hold of a magnificent passage in their sacred literature, which to those dull worshipers had become a “dead letter,” but into which he breathed again the breath of a throbbing life, he affirmed as the proof of his sonship and his lordship: “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor: he hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.” The Christ who urged with almost impatient earnestness that even such hoary, venerated institutions as the Sabbath were made for man, and not, as the punctilious, passionless, Pharisaic spirit had it, that man was made for them; the same Christ who proclaimed that it was more profitable for a man that a great mill-stone should be hanged about his neck and that he should be sunk in the depths of the sea, rather than to cause one of the little ones that believe upon him to stumble,

he it was who prayed this prayer. Does it not seem as though there in the upper room, as he prayed to his Father, everything else in the world faded from his memory save the faces of men? What a holy, humane longing was his! Not that reproach would stain his fair cause if division and discord should come, but that men would die in unbelief and therefore lose the heritage which he purchased for them—that was the thing, one might almost venture to affirm, the *only* thing, that moved him fervently to ask God that his disciples might be one.

What, may I ask, in all these days wherein we are speaking so eloquently of the desirability of Christian union, do we know about this? And what, may I ask, dare we hope for in the way of healing the hurt of division, until we begin truly to share with Jesus Christ in his supreme longing and compassion for men? Is not this the missing note, the lost chord? Think of it! Even at this late day, when it might fairly be supposed that the Christian world had grown utterly sick of elaborating definitions, of analyzing theories, of resolving and settling opinions, one hears with dismay the vociferous protest, in certain quarters, that all this talk about Christian union only marks a decadence of religious conviction. "Is it a movement toward Christ, or away from Christ?" we are being asked. Men are saying (some men are saying; thank God, not many are saying it): "Is it a movement toward a more rigid adherence to the principles taught and the practices inculcated in the word of Christ; or is it toward a more tolerant spirit, toward the principles and the forms of the loosest among those who call themselves Christians?" The principles taught and the practices inculcated in the word of Christ! In Heaven's name, what were those principles and those practices? Was there anything deeper, anything more fundamental in his principles than this: "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me"? And is there anything clearer, anything more conspicuous about his personal practice than that he would not break a bruised reed, nor quench a smoking flax? Consider how he declared himself with reference to those Jewish rulers who cast out of the synagogue the man who had been healed of his blindness. In the interests of dogma, to preserve intact their traditional, conventional orthodoxy, without a qualm of con-

science, they cast him out. He might rot in body and be damned in spirit for aught they cared. "Must not the doctrine be preserved?" Yes, yes; but is the love of truth alone the touchstone of religion? Hear the stern, terrible, overwhelming words of the Master as he pronounces the condemnation of those false shepherds: "thieves," "robbers," "hirelings"! Was Phillips Brooks right when he said: "The love of truth *alone* is cruel"? Divorced from the humane spirit, what fanaticism has it not fostered, what schisms has it not produced, of what wanton disregard for the rights of manhood has it not been guilty? In the great Shanghai Conference, held in China in 1907, one of the speakers, Dr. Gibson, gave this apologue: "I went out in the mists of the early morning, and saw a tiger. When it came nearer I saw it was a man; and when it came close, I found it was *my brother!*" Oh, my brothers, what can we need more today to spur the lagging cause of Christian union, than to "put on, as God's elect, a heart of compassion"? The sense of kinship will come with the sense of a consuming, Christ-like service. A church succoring and defending the weak will come to unity a thousand-fold more quickly than a church defending the faith. The real problem is not a problem of method, of adjustments and readjustments; it is a problem of consecration, of sanctification. Here, as elsewhere, Christ is himself the way. To enter into his compassion, to have fellowship with him in his sufferings, to have written over the tablet of every Christian's heart his words: "For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth"—that would dissipate the obstacles which hinder the answer to the Savior's prayer, it would supply the momentum needed in our present snail-like motion toward the goal toward which we have set our faces, but not yet resolutely.

The testimony of the great modern mission fields confirms the statement. It is there, and not here in America where we hold polite conferences and make pretty speeches on Christian union, and sing with great gusto:

We are not divided,
All one body we—

but never seem really to get to anything more tangible than the

making of the speeches and the singing of the song. It is there, I say, and not here, that denominational Christianity is actually fading away; it is there in the Orient that there is being ushered in, with a rapidity that shames us, a new day wherein the instinct of solidarity, the sense of fraternity among all Christians is being felt irresistibly strong. That result represents an inevitable reaction. In the conscious presence of a debased, degraded, ruined humanity the church of the Orient is reincarnating the spirit of her Lord; she is sharing generously in his compassion, and therefore in the fellowship of ail who love the Lord. In the white flame of that intense missionary passion denominational differences and schismatic tendencies are being consumed. One in devotion, they become one in life. Is it not high time we were learning the lesson? Much as I rejoice in this occasion, highly honored as I feel to stand in this presence, I do not hesitate to say that the cause of Christian unity has far more to hope for from those influences and tendencies within the church which today are making so strongly for a passionate love for humanity and an agonizing ministry of intercession and service on behalf of its redemption, than in all the formal conferences which have been held, or which may be held, in the interests of a larger and a richer fellowship in Christ. It is the "man willing to die who becomes the master of the world." By the same token, it is the church which, in its yearning for unity, finds its inspiration, not in a concern to conserve its economic interests, nor in the lust for power, nor yet in the supreme desire to remove the scandal of division, but rather in the greatness and the insistency of its longing for the salvation of the world; it is such a church as this that comes to feel itself one with the Father and with the Savior and with all who love the Lord. Wherefore let our fervent prayer be:

Lord, make me one with Thine own faithful ones,
 Thy saints who love Thee and are loved by Thee,
 Till the day break and till the shadows flee.
 At one with them in alms and orisons;
 At one with him who toils and him who runs,
 And him who yearns for union yet to be;
 At one with all who throng the crystal sea,
 And wait the setting of our moons and suns.

2. We notice, secondly, the *nature of the unity for which Christ prayed*. Was it organic and vital; or was it a mere oneness of feeling and desire? Was it in the mind and heart of our Lord that it should manifest itself openly, legibly, objectively to the world? Before we venture to give our answer to the question, let us once more attempt to interpret the mind of the Master. These were his words: "Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe upon me through their word; that they all may be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me." And then, as though his mind could not free itself from the thought, so supremely significant it seemed to him, he continued: "That they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me." Mark well those phrases: "One as we are one;" "perfected into one;" "that the world may believe;" "that the world may know." Spiritual unity? Yes, assuredly: one in Christ and in God. Organic unity? Beyond all peradventure. The world is to come to its faith in the saviorhood and the lordship of Jesus through the clear and impressive witness it bears. Why try to separate the two, any more than to try to separate the letter and the spirit of the gospel? Is not the one the mold within which the other is contained? Did Paul have the mind of Christ, or spake he only as men speak, when he wrote his immortal analogy:

For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; it is not therefore not of the body. And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; it is not therefore not of the body. If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members each one of them in the body, even as it pleased Him. And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now they are many members, but one body. And the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee: or again

the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much rather, those members of the body which seem to be more feeble are necessary: and those parts of the body, which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more abundant honor; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness; whereas our comely parts have no need: but God tempered the body together, giving more abundant honor to that part which lacked; that there should be no schism in the body [mark the words!]; but that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffereth, all the members suffer with it; or one member is honored, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof.

The quotation is long, I grant you; but it is the pure word of the Lord, is it not? The body of a man, with all its various organs, performing each their various functions, yet tempered together into one body, wherein there is no schism, animated by one spirit, constituting through the one body and the one spirit—*one life*. How utterly foolish, alongside of that superb conception, sounds the statement of one of the most familiar of the modern ideals of Christian fellowship—a bundle of sticks tied together for the sake of mutual self-preservation, capable of being broken if the sticks are taken separately, but resisting every pressure if they are bound together. “A body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, . . . according to the working in due measure of each several part,” *versus* a bundle of sticks! To what base uses may not a divine ideal come! Would it seem amiss to quote here Bacon’s observation in the *Advancement of Learning*?

The interpretations of the Scriptures are of two sorts—methodical and solute, or at large. For this divine water . . . either is first forced up into a cistern, and from thence fetched and derived for use, or else it is drawn and received in buckets and vessels immediately where it springeth. The former part whereof it seems to be the more ready, yet in my judgment is more subject to corrupt.

Quaint metaphor that: “Forcing the divine water up into a cistern, and from thence fetching it and deriving it for use;” but wherein has it not been fully warranted with respect to the subject now under discussion? Up into the cistern of the denominational conception of Christianity have the divine waters of New

Testament Christianity been forced, and from the corrupted waters of that cistern we have been fetching and deriving the ideas which go to bolster up a conception of the church which represents the very antithesis of the ideal of the Scriptures: one body, one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all.

Yes, let us begin to say it with emphasis and without equivocation, no matter what rebukes it administers, no matter what traditions it overturns, no matter what shibboleths it repudiates, nor what creeds and party standards it flings into the dust: Jesus Christ meant a unity visible and invisible, vital and external, organic and spiritual, outward as well as inward. The world was to see it and to feel it and to be convinced by it. Because of it, where every other appeal failed, the unbelieving world was to respond to the challenge of Jesus: "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very work's sake." What else can his words mean: "That they may be perfected into one that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst Me"? All too long we have been making our apologies and drawing out our fine distinctions between "spiritual unity" and "structural unity;" between "an invisible oneness" and "an incidental non-conformity." The world mocks at the apologies, and confesses itself hopelessly muddled over the fine distinctions. With entire appropriateness did Dr. Goodchild represent that skeptical, scoffing world standing, listening to our vociferous affirmations that we are not divided, and answering with Emerson: "What you do speaks so loud that I cannot hear what you say?"

Are the words with which Principal Fairbairn closed his magnificent volume on *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology* too hard for us to hear?

It were to affirm no paradox, but rather a position capable of the clearest historical proof [said he], were we to maintain that the higher the theory of the church the meaner the conception of God, or that the growth of high church doctrine is always coincident with the decay of the highest theistic belief. For an absolute or infallible church means a limited God, a God whose working men condition, whose mercies they circumscribe, whose grace they regulate and distribute. Their limita-

tions are imposed on him; his attributes are not transmuted into their energies. They but repeat on a larger scale the sin of Israel—God belongs to their church rather than their church to God. . . . For the more worthily churches think of God, the more will they feel the fallibility of their popes and pastors; the more they are possessed with the faith of his sufficiency, the less will they build on the idea of their own; the more infinitely good and gracious he seems, the less will they be able to claim to be his sole and adequate representatives. The virtue of a church does not differ from the virtue of a man: all are but earthen vessels, even though they be vessels that bear the treasure of the Lord.

From this unworthy, ignoble love of church (I speak not of the body of the Lord) God grant we may be speedily delivered! To the passion of bringing a lost world to faith in Christ, God grant we may be as speedily and effectually committed!

3. Of the bearing of this divine prayer for unity upon the important and inviting theme of the authority of Christ, all this I pass over in silence, that I may come in the last few moments allotted to me to the plain and impressive implication of the passage with respect to the office of prayer in bringing about the consummation for which the Master himself prayed. We go back again to that sacred presence-chamber. The heart of the great Master is burdened for the welfare of his kingdom after he shall have passed into the heavens. As nothing else, he fears the danger of schism. Above everything else, he desires that his church may be preserved in perfect unity. And what does he do? Does he talk with his disciples about it, earnestly admonishing them, laying down for them a programme marking out for them a method? Nay, he meets the great subject with prayer! For him, our Lord and Master, this is the first thing, the most immediate duty, the most practical and effective method by which to attain to the desired result. He has given us an example. Oh, for the fulness of faith, the completeness of devotion, to apprehend its tremendous import! Shall we say it today:

Hushed be the noise and the strife of the schools,
 Volume and pamphlet, sermon and speech,
 The lips of the wise and the prattle of fools:
 Let the Son of man teach!

Who has the key of the future but He?
 Who can unravel the knots of the skein?
 We have groaned and have travailed and sought to be free:
 We have travailed in vain!
 Bewildered, dejected, and prone to despair,
 To Him, as at first, do we turn and beseech.
 Our ears are all open: "Give heed to our prayer!
 O Son of man, teach!"

Ah, he will give heed soon enough when we are ready for the lesson. And has not the time now fully come for us to turn to him and let him show us the way to do the thing which we desire but know how to bring to pass? Despite all the methods we have tried—fraternal conferences, campaigns of union evangelism, the federation of churches, the exchange of pulpits—none will deny that the movement toward unity still waits for the really powerful impulse that shall give it irresistible momentum and speedily carry it forward to a triumphant issue. In view of that which Jesus did in the upper room, it were well worth while for us to consider whether prayer, secret, individual, congregational, universal prayer, is not now the church's first great duty and resource. "In the last analysis the source of power of any spiritual movement is God, and the energies of God are released in answer to prayer." More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of. If the whole church, feeling at least in some small sense the necessity of unity as Christ felt it, should give itself to prayer, to prayer as a passion, as an entreaty, as the utter engulfment of the will in the great achievement, prayer that fulfils Coleridge's conception:

An affirmation and an act
 That bids eternal truth be fact!

who shall say what blessed results might not quickly follow? Where is the ministry of prayer on this behalf magnified as it ought to be? Where are the strong cryings and tears? Where are the ceaseless supplications and the blood-sweat intercessions? It is our shame that we are leaving to the last that which by divine precept and example ought to have come first. Brethren and fathers! The cause of Christian unity drags itself painfully

forward today because the church is not possessed by the spirit of prayer on behalf of the great end! In the last analysis, Christian unity will come, as every work of God comes, not by might, nor by power, but by the Spirit of the Lord. To have the mind of Christ is to make the solution of the problem immediately inevitable. Somehow, in some way, we must see to it that there is lifted upon the soul of every follower of Christ the vision of that scene in the upper room: the Master in the midst of his disciples, praying with impassioned yearning that all who believe in him may be one that the world may know that God sent him into the world and loves the world even as he is loved of God. Thrilled by that vision the church will enter upon a ministry of supplication and intercession because of which it shall see the travail of its soul, and be satisfied!

DR. WILLETT: The third of the three papers representing the Baptists will be read by Rev. Henry M. Sanders, of New York.

REV. HENRY M. SANDERS, D.D., presented the following paper:

CHRIST'S PRAYER FOR UNITY

The intercessory prayer of our Lord, recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John's Gospel, is, in some respects, the most precious utterance that ever fell from his lips. We have in it the words which Christ addressed to God in the critical hour of his life—words in which he uttered the deepest thought and feeling of his heart concentrated and clarified by the prospect of his approaching death. Even among the prayers of Christ this stands by itself as that in which he gathered up the retrospect of his past and surveyed the future of his kingdom; in which, as if already dying, he solemnly presented to the Father himself, his work and his people. Realizing the solemnity of the occasion, we may say with Melancthon, "There is no voice which has ever been heard, either in heaven or on earth, more exalted, more holy, more sublime, more fruitful than this prayer offered by the Son of God." It is toward the close of the prayer that he offers the petition for the unity of his disciples.

It is suggestive to find this thought of the unity of his people

almost the last that occupied the mind of the Master before his passion, as if it were the heaviest burden pressing on his heart. A kind of fear concerning the future of his disciples seems to have oppressed him. He knew he was leaving them under circumstances which might scatter them like sheep. He knew the twelve men so well in the varieties of their temperaments and the frailties of their natures. He had often found it necessary to rebuke and repress envyings and rivalries among them, and these might break out again. Peter, the impulsive and outspoken, James, the self-assertive, Thomas, the doubter, might soon come to misunderstand each other. Some trifling root of bitterness might easily spring up, causing difference and dissension. He knew their slowness of spiritual apprehension, their ignorance of the comprehensive character of the kingdom he came to establish; the temptation to pride and jealousy, the self-seeking which had been so manifest in them during his ministry, quarreling so often as to preference and precedence and chief seats.

Well may he have prayed for that sanctifying grace which would keep them in loving fellowship. And looking out on the world and the work he was intrusting to them, Jesus felt the importance of their unity. That alone would give power to their testimony concerning him. Out of the mouths of concerted witnesses would every word be established. A threefold cord is not easily broken. If his disciples but held together, testifying the same truths, maintaining a loving harmony of spirit, they would prove a persuasive power to the whole world of his divine claims and mission. And so he offers this prayer for their unity.

And what kind of unity is it that he seeks for his disciples? "That they may be one even as we are." Whatever the analogy means it refers evidently to an association that is very close and intimate. How far our Lord, when he spoke these words, had in mind the mysterious plurality, yet essential unity of the God-head, it is not easy to say. Certainly a number of independent beings can never be one in exactly the same sense that God is one. Yet something more seems to be implied than mere harmony of spirit and sentiment, something akin to organic unity, in which every part is quick with the same vital force. So he said a little while before, "I am the vine, ye are the branches." So Paul

said of himself, "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Whatever the relation between the Father and the Son consists in, it is manifest that the unity between them is inward, essential, vital, organic. They are one in feeling, counsel, action, name. The same acts are ascribed to both, the same purposes are formed by both. The same names are used of both. So in some manner, to some degree, at least, is it to be with those who believe on his name. In some way his life is blended with ours and fashions it to the same holy ends. This unity can only be expressed in terms of personality. This is the unity of which he speaks, for which he prays, an inner unity brought out of the mysterious communication of his life with ours, of his person with ours, by which they all inhere and cohere, as in the human body, which is used in Scripture to illustrate it, by bone and joint, sinew and ligament, building up the full stature of a man in Christ. "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit."

So Christian union has its originating impulse and continued inspiration in the Christian's union with God. It thus belongs to the deepest reality of the Christian life. Oneness with God and oneness with one another spring from the same source. Christian life is fellowship in its innermost meaning, fellowship with God and fellowship with man. The love which unites Christians with one another is the reality and result of the love which unites them to God. "And this commandment have we from him that he that loveth God, loveth his brother also." This fellowship of Christian hearts underlies and constitutes the visible church, which is primarily an assembly of Christians called out and met together to express and maintain and perfect the living communion of the soul with God and with one another. As such the church is manifold. There are various assemblies, many churches, according to the various localities in which they are gathered together. In the New Testament more frequent reference is made to these individual assemblies than to the general fellowship in which they are all participants. But we find in close connection references to the "church of God" and "churches of God" (1 Cor. 10:32; 11:16). Christ is the "head of the church" (Eph. 5:23); it is "the church of the Living God" (1 Tim. 3:15) and there are also "churches of Christ" (Rom. 16:16), and "churches of the

saints" (I Cor. 14:33). The unity and plurality are distinctly marked and neither was to the prejudice of the other.

The unity of the Spiritual Church now exists and has always existed. It underlies all differences. It constitutes the church invisible. That spiritual body of which Christ is the head, between whom there is community of thought, experience, purpose, movement—in a word, life. This body is independent of conditions of time and place and form. It has no outward organization. It has never been "constituted." Its condition of membership is not baptism but faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; its roster those whose names are written in the Lamb's Book of Life. Its sessions are not convened in any material structure but are held by those who sit in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus. Its baptism is not that of water but of the Holy Spirit; its communion not partaking of earthly bread and wine but feeding upon the Living Bread which came down from heaven. It has its polity, liturgy, discipline, but they are all spiritual. So you can take away creed, ceremony, muster-roll, building, polity, minister, all such, and you have taken away only what is formal, incidental, transient. The church of the Living God, which is the pillar and ground of truth, still survives in all the essentials of her divine nature. This is the church of the First Born, the corporation of regenerated spirits, the body of Christ—the Kingdom of God. This is the church invisible, indivisible, universal, immortal, ideal, indestructible, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail. This church is one, absolute and complete, and always has been and always will be.

Such being the unity of the spiritual church does it not follow that we ought forever to strive to realize this unity in outward fact, in the churches organized by men on earth? Ought not the church of man and the church of Christ, the church organized and the church organic, the church of manner and the church of matter, the church of form and the church of life to be coincident? As a thought craves a word by which to utter itself as a man's spirit demands a body in which to actualize itself, as the will hungers for an act in which to liberate itself, so this inner spiritual unity demands of necessity an actual embodiment, visible, concrete, organic.

And what do we really behold? The church of God divided, distorted, distracted, all mangled, torn, and broken. She is indeed the church militant, but it is largely internecine strife. Instead of working against the world-rulers of darkness and spiritual hosts of wickedness in high places, she wars against her own flesh and blood, making schism in her own body, tearing herself limb from limb. See her manifold and bitter divisions and subdivisions, sects and insects, for many of them are as pestiferous as they are small and insignificant; her clashing creeds, politics, and schools; all shrieking their various discordant shibboleths "I am of Paul;" "I am of Apollos;" "I am of Cephas;" "I am of Calvin;" "I am of Luther;" "I am of Wesley," thus proving by the apostle's rebuke and stigma their carnality and not their spirituality, their infantile weakness and not their manly strength, as they go on emphasizing divisions and glorying in them, and justifying them, insisting that they are all of the Lord whereas many of them are of the very devil. Can anyone in his senses believe that the present condition of Christendom is pleasing to Christ and in accordance with his mind and prayer? Who does not feel that our separations and sectarianism and alienations are most deplorable and disastrous? Who is not infinitely weary of the old acrimonious battles over jots and tittles, iotas and prepositions; tithing mint, anise, and cummin and forgetting the weightier matters of the law, to say nothing of the gospel? Who is not disgusted at the zeal to proselyte that is out of all proportion to the zeal to Christianize? Who that knows his New Testament does not see that heresy there (*aipeus*) does not mean aberration of opinion but the recklessness of faction and that therefore the worst of all heresies is the heresy of hatred, that *odium*, which to our eternal shame has acquired the distinctive title, "theologicum." And all the while that we are disputing and wrangling about the uncertain, and almost always about the infinitely unimportant, the enemy is at our gates. For,

A town at war
To manage private, and domestic quarrels,
'Tis monstrous!

Is it any wonder then, that Christians of every name are conceiving a fresh repugnance against our divided state and a great

disgust at our petty, parochial partisanship? that they are determined seriously and earnestly to examine anew the reasons which have been supposed to justify this religious anarchy, in order to bring about a more sensible ordering of our Christianity; and at whatever cost of sentiment, of self-importance, of vested interests, set themselves to the task of recovering the lost ideal and restoring that unity which the Master designed to be proof to the world of his divine character and mission?

If you want to know all that the church misses by her divisions, notice the blessings which Christ specifies in this prayer, as accompanying perfect unity. They are three: (1) "The glory which Thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one even as we are." The glory! What is that? It is the blessing that lies like the sunlight of a mighty consecration, hallowing, assuring, uplifting, inspiring; the supernal splendor which shines down when the heavens are clear; the calm delight in the consciousness that God is with us; the authentic sanction which accompanies the proclamation of the good news; the tokens of divine favor "as the smell of a field that the Lord had blessed;" high festival days of power and triumph. Doubt, fear, hesitation all gone! It is all so clear that God has uttered his voice, that he has brought forth judgment unto victory. That is the glory which would attend unity, and without which we plod wearily along, doing our work in a mechanical, listless way, laboring at a disadvantage, with powers checked, with no clarion peal to guide the moving host, no clear voice ringing out at critical moments, "This is the way, walk ye in it." We push on stumbling, startled, timid, unsteady, with no sure message, no explicit sanction, no good cheer, no outburst of song, no glad approval. Oh! do we not know it, alas! all too well in our churches today? Is that not just our condition—the timid faith that is not sure of its steps. The cheerless groping, the dull and blind plodding along? It is not that we have not much, but we have not the "glory," the power of the Holy Ghost, the abundant life, the full assurance, the joy of the Lord which is our strength, the glow and the gladness of service. Our work and our testimony have not the sure presence, the visible and authentic blessing which would come to a united Christendom.

(2) And another loss we are warned to expect is "perfection." "I in Thee and Thou in me that they may be made perfect in one." Complete unity of Christians would be a life of association, of mutual interchange of gifts, the compactness of the whole by that which every part supplieth making for the increase of the body into the building up itself in love." Each would be raised to full power by its combination with the rest. "That they without us should not be made perfect." In union there is perfection as well as strength. There would be an immense enrichment of the Christian life by the united church appropriating the best things that belonged to each contributing sect, as shown in all our hymn-books, where are Roman Catholic, Unitarian, Calvinistic, and Armenian hymns, which we all sing in sweet unconsciousness of their being anything but Christian. In our divided condition there is something one-sided, partial, meager, dwarfed, and dwindled about any one denomination. Each bears the mark of incompleteness. It may toil away but it brings forth no fruit unto perfection. Each lacks something which another can give. Each one possesses some characteristic which would add charm and efficiency to every other one. Alone, separated, segregated, however many and promising the signs of life, however much and vigorous the efforts made, yet all disappointing, missing fruition, falling short of completeness, the reason for which is found in this prayer, "that they may all be perfect in one."

(3) And we know well the third loss we must expect as long as Christians are divided as they are. It is given in the prayer, "that the world may know that thou hast sent me." Unity gauges the measure of our power to convert the world to Christ. If all Christians were gathered into an ordered combination of manifold gifts, if only they were welded into an organized host, cohesive, compact, and not a mere ragged mob, often a wild and quarrelsome mob, rushing along in rough disorder, Oh! what a power and persuasion would be ours, what conviction would we work, what might we would exert for the pulling down of strongholds! We are finding today, as never before, that the church has a work to do that demands that we stand together. You can't hit a target with a hand full of sawdust. A rock that needs fifty men to move it cannot be budged if only five men go at it at a time. When a

man wants to strike a blow that will be effective he concentrates his fingers into a good, hard fist. We have been fighting Satan now these many years with an open hand, with our denominational fingers all foolishly distended, and we have made comparatively little impression. What a waste of men and money spent on rearing and maintaining our denominational barriers, which are like fences in a crude stage of social evolution. They grow no crops. No wheat ripens on stone walls but only deadly nightshade and poisoned ivy. What labor they represent that might have gone into breadstuffs, to say nothing of the fact that they are not things of beauty but joylessnesses forever. Is it anything surprising that sensible men, seeing the folly, the waste, the uselessness of these barriers, are determined that as far and as fast as possible they shall be demolished that the fields may yield a wider and a whiter harvest? With a reunited church that competition of sects which, in our smaller communities, is often such a scandal, would cease; all missionary enterprises, especially in heathen lands, would receive a fresh impetus. In the presence of whole nations which are to be won to Christ, the divisions of Christendom are a disheartening spectacle and a disgrace. Our denominational differences seem very trivial, for instance, in India, where 200,000,000 people worship a cow! The consciousness of union would have a peculiarly enlarging and inspiring effect. A new thrill of life and joy, a new sense of power and hope would come to all. Unbelieving multitudes would feel it, the cavilings of critics would be silenced, the barriers of paganism be overthrown and the world lie conquered at the feet of Christ.

Thus, according to our Lord's prayer, the threefold loss which we experience while we are divided as we are, is the "glory," the "perfection" and the "victory." The inner unity will still exist, promise and presage of outward unity, which knits all believers into Christ and baptizes them into one Spirit, but it will be without marked signals of divine favor, without the crowning gifts, without complete conquest. The full sunlight will fall sparsely, the perfection come rarely, and the victories be few and partial, while the world—the solid, massive, wicked world, so fierce and so defiant, so stubborn and so unyielding—will remain unconverted to Christ.

It is not within the scope of my purpose to consider the practical steps by which reunion can be attained. If history and experience teach us anything it is that it cannot be brought about by coercion, by proselyting and persecution. The root of that theory lies in the claim to exclusive monopoly of spiritual authority vested in one particular form of ecclesiastical organization. The irreducible demand of such, however courteously expressed, must be the conditional surrender on the part of all the others. But this method has been discredited by experience, has met with dire and dismal failure. It has been abundantly tried, not for a few years but for successive generations. Europe was devastated by religious wars; multitudes perished on the scaffold, at the stake, in dungeons, under hideous torture, and as a result of all this vast accumulation of suffering, scandal, and crime, the grand object of uniting Christendom was not only not secured, but was made immensely more difficult. For one convert thus made, a hundred were alienated. That policy of coercion is futile. Nor can it be secured by absorption, by comprehension, the bringing of all denominations into any one of them. Overtures and attempts have been made in that direction, by some Christian bodies, reducing the terms of communion as low as possible, making the basis of fellowship as wide as was supposed consistent with their integrity. That proposal has been made by one of the smaller bodies but has been found to be practically fruitless. It is very much like asking all the people of the United States to become citizens of Rhode Island. The proposition to unite with any one denomination, even on the most favorable terms, can hardly be offered to churches, often more numerous, more widely dispersed, more powerful, and more efficient than the one making the invitation. That method is futile.

The only method that remains that is at all practicable at present, and one that is being applied with happy results in many directions, is that of federation—marriage and not mastication. It implies the provisional recognition of existing denominations or, at least, of so many of them as fulfil the conditions of federation. In pursuance of this policy, the churches belonging to one general family—most closely resembling one another in doctrine, polity, ordinances, will unite as rapidly as possible. Out of such

federation will come, slowly, perhaps, but surely, ultimate unity. This will follow the analogy of our civic growth, in which the nation grew out of the confederation of the colonies. That analogy might be crowded so as to walk on more than one leg, at least, out of the "all four." It is well known that at the close of our Revolutionary War, thirteen states, independent of each other, found themselves in a confederation which had the form of government but denied the power; that in those states commerce declined, friction and discontent ripened into open rebellion, and general confusion suggested general anarchy; that in this extremity, eleven of the thirteen states sent delegates to Philadelphia, who, after four months' deliberation put forth a Constitution which Mr. Gladstone pronounced "The most wonderful production ever struck off at a given time by the brain of man," under which the many were affiliated and the united people became prosperous and powerful. In this union of states each commonwealth is free to work out its own internal development. Massachusetts with her Puritan and Louisiana with her French ancestry do not interfere with each others' Sunday, marriage, temperance laws and the like, or forms of state, county, and town organization. The peculiar institutions of each are guaranteed by the authority of all. And yet we know how steadily and how surely this Union has grown into a compact, cohesive, organic nation.

So church unity does not necessarily involve uniformity. There may be the greatest variety and diversity within the limits of organic union, as witness the differences among brethren belonging to the same denomination. Liberty, large and generous, is consistent with ecclesiastical unity. The distinctions of "High," "Low," and "Broad" are found in each and all the denominations, Roman Catholic included. Men of the fundamental temperamental differences which appear in human nature have lived together in one church in the past and are living so today. No plan for Christian unity will gain acceptance or achieve success which contemplates the obliteration of all such differences. That eternal fact must be taken into account. God has made us different. We do not look alike and we do not think alike, and God never meant that we should. He never intended that the great orchestrated oratorio of religion should fall into one strain, the

various instruments playing one tone and the different voices joining in one monotonous note.

Perhaps we cannot hope to see the end of all our disunion for a long time to come. But all we have to do is to go on as we have been doing in recent years, and it will come about before we know it. For that matter, you can't stop it—you can't prevent that which God in his good and gracious providence is pushing on with powerful pressure. You might as well try to stop time elapsing by tying the pendulum or think to prevent sunrise by wringing the neck of the cock that announces it. But we can, in our day and generation, have a lot and part in this great matter. We can refuse any longer to encourage disunion, to justify it, to tolerate it. To all fostering party spirit, perpetuating partisan rancor we can cry out in the indignant protest of the apostle: "Has Christ been parceled into fragments?"

Oh, my brethren, do your best and utmost, I beseech you, in every possible way to break down the barriers between Christ's people. Let us never cease to be pained and penitent about this sin of separation. Let us face the facts, let us protest against them, let us repudiate them. They should not be, they need not be, they will not be. The church left the heart and hands of Christ one within and without, one in inward spirit, one in outward order, and we should never rest content until that condition is restored. To my mind ecclesiastical separation is schism and sin. The present condition of the churches of Christ is directly opposed to every purpose and principle made known to us in the New Testament. The church ought to be one externally. All who are in Christ should be ecclesiastically united. Every other arrangement is a rending of the body of Christ. Those who are one with him in spirit ought to be one with him and with one another in body. There can be nothing more sad and few things more hopeless than the excuses and extenuations which men give for the present disordered, unfriendly, even antagonistic condition of the church and seek to justify the unhappy and disastrous divisions, even going so far as to advocate the ridiculous idea that the cause of Christ is helped forward by the rivalries of numberless sects.

Oh, I pray you, set your face like a flint against all such

captious, specious arguments for a divided Christendom. "Speak, exhort, rebuke with all authority" those who still stand out against this clear and urgent duty of the Christian brotherhood. Be willing to make any concessions, yield any prejudice, defy any trivial tradition, ignore any incidental difference, if only we can hasten, even in the slightest degree, the time when all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth may be brought together and the whole church of God be one, as our Lord prayed it should be. "Prophesy, O son of man; say to the wind, Come from the four winds, O Breath, and breathe upon these slain that they may live," and there will yet be a shaking among the bones in the valley, be they never so dry and never so scattered, and the bones will come together, bone to his bone, and sinew and flesh and skin shall come upon them, and the church of God shall stand upon its feet, an exceeding great and victorious army.

CLOSING WORDS

DR. WILLETT: My brethren, we have come to the close of the third of three most notable days in the calendar of this church. I cannot but believe that these days have a place as an epoch-making event in the history of our common Christian faith. The men who have spoken upon this platform, both in the formal addresses and in the incidental conferences, have been men representative of widely different points of view and yet they have spoken with clearness, precision, Christian charity, and love upon these points.

We have had a very interesting programme and a most admirably balanced programme. We began with biblical instruction upon a great theme, the New Testament organization. We proceeded to the discussion of Christian theology at the very heart of the gospel. No theme is more impressive than that of the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have taken up questions of practical utility in the community. The question of the limits of free speech in a republic is a question of public interest; the question of therapeutics in the church is one of practical Christian service.

We have now come in the last evening's session and this afternoon session to perhaps the most notable theme, that which has

had its illustration in the very coming together of these three bodies of Christian people, and I cannot but believe that the church, visible and invisible, is watching and will watch the interests here generated with exceeding interest. I cannot but believe that those who love our Lord Jesus Christ and who are among the living exemplars of his will, will regard this as a most notable epoch in the life of the church. And can we doubt that those who have entered into life, those who have joined the choir invisible and are looking upon this transaction—can we doubt that they are deeply concerned with the issues of these days in the deepening of Christian love and the bearing forward of those interests which we have upon our hearts?

That we can come down from this elevation with a sense of fairness, with a sense of brotherhood; that we can make these moments of fraternity habitual in the days to come; that we can here organize some practical steps toward that Christian union of which we have been thinking and talking, should be certainly our desire and prayer.

The closing words of this Congress will be spoken by representatives of the three bodies of Christian people here assembled. The first of these, representative of the Free Baptist brotherhood, will be Rev. Benjamin Franklin (Free Baptist), of Minneapolis.

REV. BENJAMIN FRANKLIN: It gives me pleasure to take this platform to speak for myself and, if I may, for my brethren, first of all, in expressing my personal appreciation and the appreciation of the three kinds of Baptist men who have been here assembled in this Congress, our appreciation, I say, of the work which has been done by those men who have had to do with the shaping of this gathering. We certainly must feel, my brethren, that a great amount of hard work has been done in getting together such a congress as this.

I have been delightfully at home during the meetings of this session, for three reasons: First, as my friend Rice of Minneapolis tells me, because I bear a name which the Disciples swear by; secondly, because I was a pastor of a Free Baptist church, but now I am a pastor of a Free Baptist and a Baptist church. If I could not here be at home, I would like to know who can.

It was worth while calling this Congress if we listened to nothing more, I am sure, than the three speakers of this afternoon. I wish I could measure in the sight of heaven the good that has come into my own life by listening to a Baptist, a Disciple, and a Free Baptist, as they spoke on this prayer of our Lord. My brethren, such a congress as this is bound to bring us closer together. I shall go back to my city with a heart better prepared to sympathize with my people and better fitted, I am sure, for the position to which the Lord has called me.

Now, in this closing word I can do nothing better, I am positive, than to state briefly how it comes that I am pastor of a Free Baptist and a Baptist church—the First Free Baptist Church and the Central Baptist Church of Minneapolis. I state this briefly for this reason: it simply shows that when all selfishness is laid aside and we come together with a single purpose to do Christ's work, we forget our differences and come to love one another and work harmoniously. We have been beginning at the wrong end of the proposition.

Now, the sad news came to the Central Baptist Church at the last of August of this year that their pastor was deprived of his health and must needs go to the Coast. He had to move out just when they were depending upon him to continue his work after his vacation. The First Free Baptist Church of Minneapolis had arranged to discontinue services in its own building for the month of September in order that certain repairs might be made. These conditions obtained. A deacon of each of these churches met on the street and began to tell each other their experiences in church work. They spoke of the difficulties that they were facing. Then they said, "Isn't there some way whereby we can hold union service for September and relieve the difficulty of the First Free Baptist Church and of the Central Baptist Church?"

They called a meeting of the boards of deacons and of the boards of trustees and arranged to hold all of the services for September in the Central Baptist Church. The pastor of the First Free Baptist Church, because he was able to do so, that is physically able to do so, officiated.

As that month grew to a close, some of the men got together and said, "Hold on. This is too good a thing to give up: We

cannot afford to stop; we have enjoyed this. We ought to have some plan of continuance." They called another meeting of the board of deacons and board of trustees of both churches and arranged this plan which is now working and which is expected to work at least until May 1, 1909: The morning service and the mid-week service are held in the Central Baptist Church; the union young people's meeting—because they have united—and the Sunday evening service, in the First Free Baptist Church; the Bible schools, in their separate churches. That plan is working sweetly. We even split our choir right in two, and I will tell you, brethren, there is nothing that explains harmony after such action as that except the dominance of the spirit of God. We had to dispose of or dispense with our contralto and bass and organist in the First Free Baptist Church; and had to dispense with the soprano and the tenor in the Central Baptist Church, and mix the choir in order that we might have a union movement, and we did it. In harmony, too, and there is a sweet spirit going on.

Just this word: Why is it that we are thus working in harmony today? Because those people got together and worked together for one purpose. I tell you when in our Sunday evening services one Sunday evening there stood up seven persons to begin the Christian life, and deacons of the Central Regular Baptist Church and deacons of the First Free Baptist Church came forward to talk to those men and women as they were on their knees, about Jesus Christ, their Savior, the Central Baptist Church and the First Free Baptist Church were welded together in such a way as they could not have been by a thousand years of voting.

Now, that is what we need to do, to get acquainted with each other. I am delighted to have become acquainted with my brethren in the ministry and fellow Christians, and those noble men who have arranged this Congress on this occasion.

DR. WILLETT: The representative of the Disciples of Christ in the closing remarks is Dr. Garrison, of St. Louis, the editor of the *Christian Evangelist*.

DR. GARRISON:

Mr. President, and Brethren: I feel on an occasion like this

something of the sensation which I have felt on ascending some mount of vision and getting a far wide view of the landscape. I feel that this has been a mountain top to which we have come, and I am sure we have seen visions. Let me mention a few of the things which I think we have seen.

First of all, we have seen that there are others. As I have listened to these great and godly men from these other religious bodies, many of whom I have not met before, and thank God for such men, I have at the same time had a feeling of regret that I have been so long deprived of their acquaintance, of their friendship, and their fellowship in Christ Jesus. Why should it be so? They are my brethren. Why should we not know each other better?

That passage of Paul came to my mind when he was rebuking the church at Corinth for their division. Said he, "Why, all things are yours. Why do you say, I am of Cephus, and I of Apollos, and I am of Paul, taking the little section of truth that each one of these may present to me? Why, it is all yours. All things are yours." And all these brethren are mine. These great and good men that have spoken to you on this platform during this congress belong to me and they belong to you. Why should we impoverish ourselves by rearing division walls that shut out from each other the goodly life and influence and teaching of such men?

That is the accusation I have against our modern denominationalism. It rears up walls of division and impoverishes the various members of the church by depriving them of riches which belong to them in common. We have seen that on this mountain top, the practicability of men coming together with differing minds on many minor questions, yet with a common faith in Jesus Christ, and discussing their differences in a fraternal spirit. That is a great thing for us to see and to realize, that we can be brethren and differ; and it suggests to us, as has been stated so ably on this platform this afternoon, that it is not necessary to have uniformity of opinion nor of methods of work and of worship in order to be one. We may be one in our common faith, in our common Lord and in our common life, with variety of opinions and methods of work and of worship; and if unity

is ever to come, and I think it will come, it will be large enough to comprehend all this variety of opinion in teaching and in work. So I think we have seen that, come to see it, perhaps, with clearer vision during this meeting than ever before.

We feel, therefore, that we are members one of another, brothers all under a common Master. Not that we are going to be one some time, but that we are one now, united together.

But here is the problem: How can we better manifest that unity to the world? That is the practical problem really before us. Well, one of the ways is just what we are doing now in holding this union congress in which we come together and speak to each other on these great vital problems, and convince ourselves as well as others who shall read these proceedings that we after all are one in the essential and fundamental things of our Christian faith and life.

Another way we may manifest it is by interchange of pulpits. I do not think we are doing enough of that. We may increase that largely, I think, and thereby increase the spirit of unity and manifest to the world the unity which already exists. Somebody has been bold enough to suggest on this platform that we might even have an exchange of the editorial tripods; the editors might exchange their editorial chairs. However that might be, one thing I am sure is practicable, and that is that we editors will cease misrepresenting each other and be fair and Christian in our criticisms of each other.

I do not know how much responsibility rests upon religious journals for the perpetuation of our divisions, but I am afraid there is a great responsibility resting upon us in that respect; and I want to say right now, in all frankness, that if any of you discover in the paper that I publish, a misrepresentation of another religious body, Roman, Protestant, or Catholic, if you will notify me of that fact I promise you here and now to make the *amende honorable*. I want to be fair to my brethren and I believe that if we quit misrepresenting each other's opinions, which we often do by quoting some cranky and cantankerous editor and representing his as the view of the whole people; if we would quit doing that and be fair and just to each other, and quote only representative men and representative leaders we should do a great deal to

promote our greater unity, and to manifest that unity which now exists to the world.

My friends, I feel that in this closing hour we have come into the very Holy of Holies. When we come into that upper chamber and hear the Master's prayer—that we all may be one, that the world may be redeemed—we are on holy ground. It makes us feel, as I think we do not feel often enough and deep enough, how godly men we ought to be, how humble men we ought to be, how spirit-filled men we ought to be to complete this holy cause of union. We have not always gone about it in the right spirit. We have tried to argue each other into unity; we have tried to drag each other into unity by logic; we have tried to force a spirit of unity sometimes, but it is not going to come that way. It is going to come by the way of love; it is going to come by the way of kindness, and fairness and humility; it is going to come in the very spirit of the Master who on that last night before his betrayal prayed that they all might be one in him.

Have you ever noticed, my brethren, that Jesus prayed for the sanctification of his disciples before he prayed for their unity? Their sanctification by the truth; as he was sanctifying himself for their sins, he prayed that they might be sanctified by the truth. And do you know, I am coming to feel in these later years of my life, that we can do no better thing for the sake of unity, to promote unity, than to seek a deeper consecration by the truth to the Lord Jesus Christ, putting away our carnality, putting away our pride in denomination, our pride of intellect, and in the spirit of humility and utter devotion to the cause of Jesus Christ, get close to him, and share his life, become one with him. Then I believe it will be easy for us to be one with each other.

I believe that we are on the road to that sort of preparation for unity when we study the Master's prayer and seek to get closer to his loving heart. My brethren, the skies are full of the signs of promise. When I measure the sentiment that exists today in the church with what existed even within my memory, I am amazed at the progress that has been made.

Why, I think I can remember the time when if Dr. Sanders had stood on any platform in Christendom and made the magnificent speech which he made here this afternoon that he would

almost have been turned out of the church; at least he would have been pelted by the denominational press from one end of this country to another. When the Sage of Bethany back yonder early in the century lifted up the banner of reform and said, "Divisions are sinful and God's people must get together," was he not scoffed at and abused, and was not the scheme of Christian union denounced as Utopian, if not even wicked? "For our denominationalism," said they, "is the normal state of the church, and God so ordained it." That was the view less than one hundred years ago. And I believe the time is coming, if not here now, when that great and good man who has been so much abused and misunderstood, whatever may have been his mistakes or excesses in other regards, will be honored throughout the Christian world for his bold advocacy of Christian union and his denunciation of the sin of schism in the body of Christ and his plea for a permanent and a lasting unity of the church on the basis of simple New Testament Christianity.

Now, here are some of the signs that I see written upon our moral heaven: Here is our great Christian Endeavor movement; here is our great union Sunday-school movement; here is a congress like this, a union congress which would not have been possible a few years ago; here is that great meeting yonder in New York City three years ago and another one to meet in a few weeks in Philadelphia, when Protestant Christianity in this country meet together through their representatives to ask the question, "How may this prayer of our Divine Lord be answered most speedily?" Oh, that is a sign of the times, my friends, at which my heart rejoices, when God's people can thus come together and sit at the feet of the Master and ask how his own prayer may be most speedily fulfilled that the world may be converted.

What is the meaning, my brethren, of this coming together, of these erstwhile scattered forces of the church there joining hands and hearts together in closer union? What is its meaning? I remember, in the army, when the scattered portions of the army were being brought together and massed at some point, even the common soldiers caught its significance and they said to each other, "Boys, there is going to be a great battle." Does not this

massing of our Christian powers under the leading of the spirit of Jesus Christ mean that our great captain is going to call for a forward march? He is massing his followers together for a great forward march on the ranks of heathenism and our own abominations for the purpose of subduing the whole world to the beneficent reign of himself under the divine Father. That, I believe, brethren, is the deepest meaning of this union movement. It is the conquest of this world in our Lord and Master.

DR. WILLETT: As representing the Baptists I have pleasure in calling upon Dr. W. C. Bitting, of St. Louis.

DR. BITTING: The Congress is making heavy draughts upon St. Louis in the closing hour, the preceding speaker being also a citizen of that great city.

In the vibrations of our lives there sometimes come nodes at regular intervals. I am experiencing one such this afternoon. A few years ago, in the great city of New York, in the interest of a great benevolent enterprise, there spoke upon the same platform representatives of the Methodist, the Dutch Reformed church, the Congregational, the Presbyterian, and the Episcopal churches. The speaker was the last in the long list. As nearly always happens upon such occasions, the last speaker suffered because of the undue prolixity of those who had gone before—I have no reference to this afternoon (laughter). He was tempted to say as Pat did, when told that he was in danger if he traveled on the last car of the train, "Why don't they leave off the last car?" (Laughter). I had the privilege, however, of saying at that time that after listening to those representatives of the different churches, "I felt like a Metho-Formed-Presby-Gational-Bapto-Palian." I then had the pleasure of sitting down.

I think it would be impossible to leave this place without having obliterated the sense of denominationalism. In the years gone by, our Congress was called by a very distinguished Baptist minister, "a herd of untamed mustangs prancing in an unfenced pasture." How long it took the originator of that very picturesque expression to elaborate all the features contained therein, we do not stop to say. But the Baptist Congress has always said, "We propose to prance." Alluding to some words of the last

speaker I may say that Dr. Sanders has run this identical risk of being turned out of churches by saying frequently for many years what he said this afternoon. Had he not been the chairman of the Baptist Congress Executive Committee perhaps he might have suffered. The Executive Committee has always been predisposed against fence building. It has always said that we must erect partitions which are to inclose mere closets in which men tuck away, to be guarded most jealously, conceptions of the Christian church, like neatly tied bundles, well knotted and sealed.

We have stood for the idea that Christian life and truth are not gems but germs. We are not running safe-deposit vaults, and are not attired in the livery of some ecclesiastical corporation, standing outside iron bars to hold fast to things that were delivered to us. We are busy growing plants in our own walls, and have come here from many places to show what kind of flowers we have been growing. We have simply gathered the bouquet made of blooms that God himself has grown.

Now, we are feeling this afternoon the valuable effects of the Congress. For, he that turneth an editor from the error of his ways shall save a denominational journal and shall hide a multitude of denominational sins. There is no man, however, in the United States who less needed conversion than the editor who has just spoken to us.

In 1890, in New Haven, this Congress discussed this very matter of Christian union from the point of view of the Anglican quadrilateral. The citizens of the United States refused to become citizens of Rhode Island at that time. It has been a continual desire of the members of the General Committee and of the Executive Committee of the Baptist Congress that we should show that, while the tones of our voices were not alike, there might be uttered the same great truth. That while the great theme was the same, there would inevitably be many variations of it.

Not many years ago I heard two groups of college boys of different fraternities singing their rival fraternity songs—we all know what that means. When finally tired and weary with that, one of the groups started up "Home, Sweet Home" and the other joined in "Sullivan's Lullaby," in the same key, and they sang

along in perfect harmony. I feel sometimes, when we shout our peculiar fraternity songs, that we are trying to rival others, and to outdo ourselves in vociferation of loyalty. But, if we can only get this note, that the only real home for any Christian man is in the heart of God, and that one is a rover if he is outside of the great and infinite love of the Father, who belongs to others as well as himself, we shall be united.

We peek over one another's fences and then see what wealth of manhood God has in other places than in our own denomination. Now, this is just where we are feeling today something of the power of our Congress.

I wish that our intelligent secretary might write an article for the papers in which he would show by study of the topics discussed by the Baptist Congress how many of these discussions have been but the preludes to advances by the Baptist denomination. I think he would have the grand finale of such a paper best illustrated by the discussions of this meeting of the Congress.

SECRETARY GESSLER: That would make a pretty good-sized book.

DR. BITTING: Well, you need not take in all the history. But now that we have gone outside, what are we going to do? The editor of one of our newspapers said to me, "The Congress had a good function when it started in the Baptist denomination." I can myself remember twenty-four years of it. The time was when a man who began to think in the terms of today found it difficult to get a hearing. The Congress was organized to give him an opportunity to say his say. We did not want anything on the safety valve. We wanted a place where what was inside of a man's soul could be talked about. Today the difficulty is to get the man who holds to the reactionary and extremely conservative side of questions to come to the Congress and utter himself. That is the reason we have fallen into disfavor in some quarters.

Now, is this mission in our own denomination to be given up? In some parts of the country some Baptists yet need the Congress. Perhaps some Disciples need it also. If all the Disciples and Baptists and Free Baptists were like those who have spoken upon

this platform, there never would have been any division between us. It is the other fellow who is not here who needs this Congress. We must take it to him, or get him to come to it. If we can get the full ministry of this Congress it will abundantly justify us in enlarging its scope, so that we can take in these other denominations.

And so we come to the close of this most delightful session, feeling that we are not here to be a mere congress of immersionists. We are not yet ready to take in Mormons. If all that these immersionist bodies, here represented, stand for is holding fast to a symbolic piece of religious ritualism, we are in the poorest business that ever occupied an aggregation of serious men. Now, the problem to be met before the extinction of the Baptist Congress, before the amalgamation of the Congress of Disciples with that of the Baptists, and the admission of Free Baptists, is, How can we deliver ourselves from that characterization as a congress of immersionists? Have we really gotten together? I know some Baptists, who, if you ask them why they are Baptists, drown in the Baptistry while telling you. This is the new problem that faces us. But God has given us grace to come to this hour, to meet the problems of our past, and to face the problems of our future.

Inter-denominationally we have here stood before problems of truth and of ecclesiasticism. Here is a great mountain. On the east the clouds have come out of the sea. They have condensed against the cold air of its summit. The floods have run down the slope toward the Orient and have corrugated it with ravines from top to base. On the north it is precipice, rock, lichen, stalactite and stalagmite of ice, deciduous trees. On the west is virgin forest from top to bottom, majestic, great, gloomy, inviting. On the south it is lawn and flowers and vines and sunshine. Four men stand around that mountain's base, at each of the cardinal points of the compass, and debate about it. They write books, they divide mankind into schools of thought, every man claiming that his view is the only true view of that mountain. At last it occurs to these men, that, as has been so magnificently suggested here in the second paper this afternoon, "We must climb; we must climb." As they work their way toward the top,

each hears a rustling in the bushes and becomes conscious that somebody else is engaged in the same task. When they come out upon the level spot at the top of the mountain, they look into one another's faces and laugh as they think, What fools we were at the bottom. Then they clasp their hands, bow their heads, and repeat together, "Our Father, who art in heaven! It is the same mountain."

DR. WILLETT: There is a single word of announcement to be made in connection with the answer which has been made to the overture of the Baptist Congress to the Disciples on the first afternoon of our session. Dr. Gates will make that announcement.

PROFESSOR ERRETT GATES: At the mixed gathering of all of us, the Free Baptists, Baptists, and Disciples, held the first afternoon of this Congress, the following resolutions were introduced by Dr. Lawson, I take it on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Baptist Congress, as well as on behalf of himself and his Baptist brethren:

Resolved, that we most heartily approve the election of our Disciples and Free Baptists ministers to membership in the Executive Committee which has already resulted in the enlargement of our programme for this Congress;

Resolved, that in order to unite the Disciples Congress with our own we request their Executive Committee, in conference with our own Executive Committee, to take immediate steps to perfect such a union.

These resolutions were unanimously approved at a joint meeting of Baptists and Disciples held at the close of one of the sessions of this Congress.

Since that time a meeting of the Disciples present at this Congress was held to consider and formulate a reply to the overture from our Baptist brethren and the result of this meeting was the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved: 1. That we express our deep appreciation of the large fraternity and Christian courtesy of the executive committee of the Baptist Congress in opening the programme of their Congress to the Disciples of Christ and receiving them to equal participation in its sessions.

2. That we recognize a joint Congress as a most necessary and im-

portant step and a providential agency in the promotion of closer relations between Baptists and Disciples.

3. That we express to the Executive Committee our hearty acceptances of their invitation and our readiness to join, in the permanent organization of a joint Congress on the basis of a representation and responsibility to be agreed upon by a joint committee of the two bodies.

4. That we request the Executive Committee of the Disciples' Congress to appoint a committee of three to act in conjunction with a similar committee of the Baptist Congress, to formulate the plan of a joint Congress which shall be laid before the Disciples' Congress for final action.

Since the adoption of the above, the following committee has been appointed by the Executive Committee of the Disciples Congress: Rev. I. J. Spencer, Lexington, Ky., chairman; Rev. A. B. Philputt, Indianapolis, Ind.; Rev. Errett Gates, Chicago, Ill.

This committee now awaits the appointment of a similar committee to act in conjunction with it on the part of the Baptist Congress.

DR. WILLETT: The final word of the Congress will be spoken by its president, Doctor Jackson.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I must thank the Congress for coming again to Chicago. I thank you on behalf of the pastors of this city, the churches, and the community. As often as you come, you always do us good and this meeting has been the best of all. The coming together of these three bodies has been a new inspiration to us. How full this gathering has been of good things; full of fellowship, of inspiration and of wisdom. Some one asked a friend how it was that there was so much wisdom at Harvard. The friend said, "That is easy enough to explain. Each freshman that comes brings with him a little wisdom and the seniors do not take anything away." Now, I think you can afford to take some of this wisdom, some of this inspiration away with you. This great Congress is rich enough and full enough and wise enough to impart some of its goodness and wisdom and inspiration to all of us. Let us take it to our homes and to our churches.

One other word: I want to say as far as Chicago is con-

cerned that this union is pretty well consummated. The Baptists and Free Baptists are already united. When a Free Baptist comes to Chicago, he always comes into our churches. Here is one standing opposite me now who is just coming into my church, a good loyal Free Baptist. When we and the Disciples come together we have the same blessed bond of fellowship. I think there is less difference between the Baptists and the Disciples of Chicago than between the Baptists of this region and of some other parts of this country.

You know what Bishop Fallows said to us about sanctification. I think the way for us to do is to become sanctified in spots. We must come together in spots. We must come together here and there as we can, in love, in fellowship, and without force. In that way without knowing it we will finally become a single denomination. That is our hope and our prayer. Let us go back to our churches and to our homes and once more offer the prayer of our Lord, that all of his children may be one.

Let us now close by singing Hymn No 724, the second and fourth stanzas.

(The Congress joined in song.)

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The closing prayer will be offered by Doctor J. M. Philputt.

REV. J. M. PHILPUTT invoked the Divine blessing as follows :

CLOSING PRAYER

Our Heavenly Father, in this closing hour we thank thee with united hearts for all that this Congress has meant to us. For the inspiration of its great messages; for the sweetness of its blessed fellowship; for the strength that has come from the widening of our acquaintanceship, and from the touching of one spirit upon another. We bless thee especially for the Holy of Holies of this afternoon when we have been caught up with a great vision, and we pray thee that this great vision may abide with us; that it may be a kind of star by which we shall steer our future course and shall ever be to us a source of inspiration and comfort.

And now as we go down from this mount of privilege, as we face the mighty tasks that await us in the valley, we pray for divine equipment, for divine guidance. We thank thee for the word of our Christ, "Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world." Make us

more conscious of his presence; more sensible of his power, and may the Holy Spirit guide us into all truth.

We thank thee for the blessed fellowship of this Congress and we pray that that which has here been begun may become permanent in the history of the church, and that this may be but the beginning of a great movement for the union of God's people.

And now do thou cement our hearts in Christian love. Help us to speak the truth, but ever to speak it in the spirit of love, and may the burning spirit of our Lord's prayer abide in all our hearts and be ever our inspiration and help.

And now, may the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, our Father, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, abide with us ever more. *Amen.*

And the Congress stood adjourned.

MEETINGS OF THE BAPTIST CONGRESS

DATE	PLACE	PRESIDENT
1882.....	Brooklyn	George Dana Boardman, D.D.
1883.....	Boston	Alvah Hovey, D.D.
1884.....	Philadelphia	Henry G. Weston, D.D.
1885.....	New York	Thomas Armitage, D.D.
1886.....	Baltimore	William E. Hatcher, D.D.
1887.....	Indianapolis	Hon. William S. Holman, Jr.
1888.....	Richmond	Hon. J. L. M. Curry, LL.D.
1889.....	Toronto	Hon. David Mills, M.P.
1890.....	New Haven	Hon. Francis Wayland, LL.D.
1892.....	Philadelphia	Colonel Charles H. Banes.
1893.....	Augusta	Governor William J. Northen.
1894.....	Detroit	President A. G. Slocum, LL.D.
1895.....	Providence	President E. B. Andrews, LL.D.
1896.....	Nashville	President J. T. Henderson, A.M.
1897.....	Chicago	Adin A. Kendrick, D.D.
1898.....	Buffalo	Mr. H. P. Emerson
1899.....	Pittsburg	D. B. Purinton, LL.D.
1900.....	Richmond	A. P. Montague, LL.D.
1901.....	New York	Professor A. S. Bickmore, Ph.D.
1902.....	Boston	President D. W. Abercrombie, LL.D.
1903.....	Philadelphia	Russell H. Conwell, D.D., LL.D.
1904.....	Louisville	Jos. Benson Marvin, M.D., LL.D.
1905.....	Cincinnati	Gershom M. Peters, A.M.
1906.....	St. Louis	R. H. Jesse, LL.D.
1907.....	Baltimore	Mr. Eugene Levering
1908.....	Chicago	John L. Jackson, D.D.

NOTE.—The Fall session of 1891 was transferred to the Spring of 1892. This left the year 1891 without any report.

Proceedings for Sale

No proceedings were issued in the years 1882 and 1901. A full set should therefore contain 24 numbers. No full sets are for sale. All numbers prior to 1902 are out of print and rare. The following partial sets are offered for sale at the prices indicated:—

Partial Sets

One set complete, except years 1883–1885, and 1898. 20 Numbers. Price, \$20.00.

One set containing years, 1890, 1895–1897, 1899–1908. 14 Numbers. Price, \$11.00.

Two sets containing 1899, 1901–1908. 9 Numbers. Price, \$6.00.

Four sets containing years 1899, 1902–1908. 8 Numbers. Price, \$5.00.

Single Numbers

Years prior to 1902 sold only in sets, except a few of the year 1899.

Years 1899, 1901, 1903, 1904, and 1905—75 cents each.

Years 1906, 1907, and 1908—50 cents each.

ORDER OF

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

OR OF

William B. Matteson, Treasurer, Red Bank, N. J.

The Treasurer would be glad to receive from members any old copies of Proceedings they can spare.

OUR LATE PUBLICATIONS

Our New Testament

How Did We Get It?
Prof. Henry C. Vedder.
16mo. Price, \$1.00
net, postpaid

The Outlines of Systematic Theology

Augustus H. Strong,
D.D. 8vo. Price,
\$2.50 net, postpaid.
Uniform in binding with
the author's "Systematic
Theology."

How to Grow in the Christian Life; or, Wells by the Way

W. Wistar Hamilton.
Vest-pocket edition.
Price, leather, 25 cents
net, postpaid; paper,
10 cents net, postpaid.

Sermons That Won the Masses

Madison C. Peters,
D.D. 16mo. Price,
50 cents net; postage
8 cents.

Fresh Water From Old Wells

Robert G. Seymour,
D.D. 12mo. Price,
80 cents net, postpaid.

Forward Movement Textbooks

For Foreign Mission Study Classes

The Why and How of Foreign Missions

Arthur Judson Brown. Illustrated.
Price, cloth, 50 cents net; paper, 35
cents net; postage, 8 cents extra.

The Moslem World

Samuel M. Zwemer, F. R. G. S.
Illustrated. Price, cloth, 50 cents
net; postage, 8 cents extra.

For Home Mission Study Classes

The Frontier

Dr. Ward Platt. Price, cloth, 50
cents net; paper, 35 cents net;
postage, 8 cents extra.

For Stewardship Classes

Stewardship and Missions

Rev. C. A. Cook, D.D. Price,
cloth, 50 cents net; paper, 35 cents
net; paper, 35 cents net; postage, 8
cents extra.

*A Song Book for Missionary Classes
Generally*

The Forward Movement Hymnal

Price, 15 cents net per copy; post-
age, 4 cents extra; \$15.00 per hun-
dred. Express extra.

My Pets

Marshall Saunders.
Illustrated in black and
white, and colors, by
Charles Copeland.
12mo. Price, \$1.25.

Five Months on a Derelict

Prof. Edwin J. Hous-
ton. Vol. I in "The
Pacific Series." Illus-
trated. Price, \$1.25.

Wrecked on a Coral Island

Prof. Edwin J. Hous-
ton, Ph.D. Illustrated.
Vol. II of "The Pacific
Series" Price, \$1.25.

The Christmas Book

Jane A. Stewart. Il-
lustrated. 12mo. Price,
75 cents net, postpaid.

The Sifting of Phillip

Everett T. Tomlinson,
Ph.D. Illustrated.
12mo. Price, \$1.25.

The Pastor's Diary

Vest-pocket edition.
Price, flexible leather,
35 cents; the same,
indexed, 50 cents
postpaid.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY

1701-1703 Chestnut Street

:: :: ::

PHILADELPHIA

AMERICAN BAPTIST
HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Ms. 9.1.1.1
JUL 21 1926
Carter

Proceedings of the Baptist Congress

at New York City, 1909

Topics

- I. Can Pragmatism Furnish a Philosophical Basis for Theology?
- II. Is the Present Tendency toward a Co-operative Social Order Desirable?
- III. How Is Salvation Mediated to Us through Christ?
- IV. Recent Tendencies to Change Denominational Practice. Are They Desirable?
- V. How Can Ethics Be Taught in the Public Schools?
- VI. Realizing the Presence of God.

Baptist Congress

Treasurer's Report, October 1, 1908, to September
30, 1909

Receipts

Balance	\$ 54.40
General Committee.....	670.10
Annual Members.....	335.00
	<hr/>
	1,005.10
Sales of Proceedings	156.14
Donations.....	185.00
Grand Rapids Church.....	10.00
Red Bank Church	10.00
Advertising	15.00
Collections.....	49.89
	<hr/>
	\$1,485.53

Expenditures

Traveling Account	\$740.10
Proceedings.....	500.75
Stationery and Printing.....	75.95
Postage and Express	64.03
Clerical Help	56.00
Incidentals	12.75
	<hr/>
	\$1,449.58
Balance	\$35.95

Twenty-Seventh Annual Session

OF THE

Baptist Congress

HELD IN

The Madison Avenue Baptist Church
New York City

November 9, 10, and 11, 1909

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO AND NEW YORK

Published December 1909

**Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ADDRESS OF WELCOME	I
REV. CHARLES A. EATON, D.D.	
THE PRESIDENT'S RESPONSE	2
I. CAN PRAGMATISM FURNISH A PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS FOR THEOLOGY? 4	
PROFESSOR MELBOURNE S. READ, PH.D.	
PROFESSOR DOUGLAS C. MACINTOSH, PH.D.	
PROFESSOR GEORGE B. FOSTER, D.D.	
REV. CLIFTON D. GRAY, PH.D.	
REV. RUFUS P. JOHNSTON, D.D.	
II. IS THE PRESENT TENDENCY TOWARD A CO-OPERATIVE SOCIAL ORDER DESIRABLE? 41	
REV. HARRIE R. CHAMBERLIN	
DEAN J. W. A. STEWART, D.D.	
MR. GEORGE W. COLEMAN	
REV. HERBERT S. JOHNSON, D.D.	
REV. LEMUEL C. BARNES, D.D.	
PROFESSOR GEORGE B. FOSTER, D.D.	
III. HOW IS SALVATION MEDIATED TO US THROUGH CHRIST? . . . 73	
PROFESSOR JOHN B. ANDERSON, B.D.	
PROFESSOR CORNELIUS WOELFKIN, D.D.	
PROFESSOR DELAVAN B. REED, D.D.	
REV. W. G. FENNELL, D.D.	
PROFESSOR GEORGE B. FOSTER, D.D.	
REV. LEIGHTON WILLIAMS, D.D.	
IV. RECENT TENDENCIES TO CHANGE DENOMINATIONAL PRACTICE— ARE THEY DESIRABLE? 112	
T. O. CONANT, LL.D.	
REV. E. A. HANLEY, D.D. (letter)	
PRESIDENT W. H. P. FAUNCE, D.D.	
REV. GWILYM O. GRIFFITH	
REV. H. W. BARNES	
REV. CHARLES R. McNALLY	
REV. ROBERT G. BOVILLE	
REV WILLIAM H. BAWDEN	
REV. ALFRED H. C. MORSE	

V. HOW CAN ETHICS BE TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?	144
PRESIDENT JOHN H. HARRIS, LL.D.	
MR. CLARENCE E. MELENEY	
PRESIDENT JOHN L. ALGER	
REV. R. G. BOVILLE	
REV. E. F. MERRIAM, D.D.	
REV. GEORGE U. WENNER, D.D.	
REV. ALBERT G. LAWSON, D.D.	
REV. H. W. BARNES, D.D.	
VI. REALIZING THE PRESENCE OF GOD	176
REV. G. G. JOHNSON, D.D.	
REV. JOHN F. ELDER, D.D.	
VII. CLOSING WORDS	193
THE PRESIDENT, REV. LEIGHTON WILLIAMS, D.D.	
REV. CHARLES A. EATON, D.D.	
REV. ADDISON MOORE	
REV. RUFUS P. JOHNSTON, D.D.	

BAPTIST CONGRESS

PLAN OF ORGANIZATION

1. *The object* of the Congress is to promote a healthful sentiment among Baptists through free and courteous discussion of current questions by suitable persons.

2. *The work* of the Congress shall be subject to the control of a General Committee of one hundred members or more. The Committee shall be composed of persons who have consented to contribute five dollars or more annually toward the expenses of the Congress.

3. *The General Committee* shall elect a permanent Executive Committee of fifteen persons residing in or near the City of New York, at the meetings of which Executive Committee any member of the General Committee may be present and vote; and to this Executive Committee shall be entrusted, except as may have been already provided for by the General Committee, entire control over the public meetings—e. g., determination of the time and place, the number of days and sessions each day, selection of the presiding officer, the topics, the appointed writers and speakers, the provision for volunteer speakers, and rules of discussion. The Executive Committee shall also secure a full stenographic report of the proceedings, and funds to meet any other necessary expense.

4. *A Secretary* shall be elected, who shall also be Secretary of the Executive Committee, and of the public meetings, the expenses of whose correspondence, etc., shall be met by a tax levied by the Executive Committee upon the General Committee.

5. *The General Committee* shall meet in connection with the public meetings, and where called together by the Executive Committee.

6. *The Executive Committee* shall secure the appointment of a local committee in the city or town where a public meeting is to be held, which shall provide a suitable place for the Congress, and entertainment for the officers and appointees of the Congress.

7. *Any member* of a Baptist Congregation may become an Annual Member of this Congress, and thus be entitled to all its privileges, and to a copy of the published proceedings, by the payment of the sum of two dollars.

RULES OF DISCUSSION

1. *The Chairman* of the Congress shall be appointed by the Executive Committee, and on all points of order his decision shall be final.

2. *Any member* of a Baptist Congregation who, by sending his card to the Secretary, shall signify his willingness to speak on the topic under discussion, may be called upon by the Chairman.

3. *All writers* and speakers shall take the platform, address only the Chair, and confine themselves to the subject assigned for the occasion.

4. *No person* shall speak twice on the same subject.

5. *Readers of papers* shall be allowed twenty-five minutes, appointed speakers¹ twenty minutes, and volunteer speakers ten minutes. The Secretary shall notify all participants by stroke of the bell three minutes before, and also at the expiration of their time, beyond which no one shall be allowed to proceed.

6. *No paper* shall be read in the absence of its writer, nor shall any paper be printed in the proceedings except it has been read at the meeting.

7. *No resolution* or motion shall be entertained at the public conferences.

¹ Appointed speakers must not use MS, the object of their appointment being to encourage the volunteer discussion which follows their addresses.

OFFICERS OF THE NEW YORK MEETING

President

REV. LEIGHTON WILLIAMS, D.D.
New York

Secretary

REV. THEO. A. K. GESSLER, D.D.
Landing, N. J.

Treasurer

REV. W. B. MATTESON, D.D.
Red Bank, N. J.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CONGRESS

REV. HENRY M. SANDERS, D.D., *Chairman*
No. 9 E. 39th Street, New York

REV. JAS. M. BRUCE	REV. WILLIAM M. LAWRENCE, D.D.
REV. CHAS. A. EATON, D.D.	REV. ALBERT G. LAWSON, D.D.
REV. HARRY E. FOSDICK	REV. ROBT. MACDONALD, D.D.
REV. FRANK M. GOODCHILD, D.D.	REV. I. HERMAN RANDALL, D.D.
REV. W. A. GRANGER, D.D.	REV. E. T. TOMLINSON, PH.D.
REV. RUFUS P. JOHNSTON, D.D.	REV. RIVINGTON D. LORD, D.D.
REV. W. B. MATTESON, D.D., <i>Treasurer</i> , Red Bank, N. J.	
REV. THEO. A. K. GESSLER, D.D., <i>Secretary</i> , Landing, N. J.	

THE GENERAL COMMITTEE

Aked, Charles F., D.D.....	New York City
Alger, President J. L.....	Providence, R. I.
Anderson, Professor John B.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Anderson, T. D., D.D.....	Albany, N. Y.
Andrews, President E. Benjamin, LL.D.....	Lincoln, Neb.
Anthony, Professor A. W., D.D.....	Lewiston, Me.
Applegate, Hon. J. S., LL.D.....	Red Bank, N. J.
Armstrong, Hon. E. A.....	Camden, N. J.
Baldwin, Mr. Jesse A.....	Chicago, Ill.
Barbour, C. A., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Barbour, T. S., D.D.....	Wollaston, Mass.
Barnes, H. W., D.D.....	Binghamton, N. Y.

Barnes, L. C., D.D.....	New York City
Barney, Mr. E. J.....	Dayton, Ohio
Batten, S. Z., D.D.....	Lincoln, Neb.
Beaver, Mr. F. P.....	Dayton, Ohio
Berry, Professor George R., D.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Bigelow, Mrs. L. H.....	New York City
Bitting, W. C., D.D.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Boville, R. G., D.D.....	New York City
Boyd, Mr. S. G.....	Covington, Ky.
Braislin, Edward, D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Brooks, Rev. Arthur C.....	New York City
Brown, Rev. A. Watson.....	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Brown, Mr. Samuel N.....	Boston, Mass.
Brownell, Rev. Clark T.....	Newark, N. J.
Bruce, Rev. James M.....	New York City
Bryan, President E. B., Ph.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Burdette, Robert J., D.D.....	Los Angeles, Cal.
Burggraf, Mr. G. A.....	New York City
Burnham, Professor S., D.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Burton, Professor Ernest D., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Burton, N. S., D.D.....	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Butler, Mrs. Maria E.....	New York City
Calley, Walter, D.D.....	Jamaica Plains, Mass.
Case, Rev. C. D., Ph.D.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
Cate, Carter E., D.D.....	Providence, R. I.
Chamberlin, Mr. Willard D.....	Dayton, Ohio
Cheney, Rev. J. L., Ph.D.....	Wheaton, Ill.
Clarke, Mr. E. J.....	Baltimore, Md.
Clarke, Professor W. N., D.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Clinch, Hon. Edward S.....	New York City
Colby, Hon. Everett.....	Newark, N. J.
Colby, H. F., D.D.....	Dayton, Ohio
Colgate, Mr. James C.....	New York City
Colgate, Mr. Richard M.....	West Orange, N. J.
Colgate, Mr. Sidney M.....	New York City
Colwell, H. S., D.D.....	Granville, Ohio
Conwell, Russell H., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Cook, R. B., D.D.....	Wilmington, Del.
Craig, W. B., D.D.....	Denver, Colo.
Crandall, L. A., D.D.....	Minneapolis, Minn.

Davis, Mr. F. H.....	Elizabeth, N. J.
de Blois, A.K., Ph.D., LL.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Dickerson, Mr. Frank.....	New York City
Dimock, Mr. G. E.....	Elizabeth, N. J.
Dodd, Charles H., D.D.....	Baltimore, Md.
Eaches, O. P., D.D.....	Hightstown, N. J.
Evans, Professor M. G., D.D.....	Chester, Pa.
Farnham, E. P., D.D.....	Richmond Hill, N. Y.
Faunce, President W. H. P., D.D., LL.D.....	Providence, R. I.
Ferris, George H., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Fosdick, Rev. H. E.....	Montclair, N. J.
Foster, Professor George B., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Garabrant, Mr. D. G.....	Bloomfield, N. J.
Gates, Professor Errett, Ph.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Gates, Mr. I. E.....	New York City
Gessler, T. A. K., D.D.....	Landing, N. J.
Gifford, O. P., D.D.....	Brookline, Mass.
Goodchild, F. M., D.D.....	New York City
Goodchild, Mrs. F. M.....	New York City
Granger, W. A., D.D.....	Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
Gray, Rev. Clifton D., Ph.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Grenell, Z., D.D.....	Detroit, Mich.
Grippin, Mr. William A.....	Bridgeport, Conn.
Gurley, Mr. W. F.....	Troy, N. Y.
Hagerman, Mr. Joseph G.....	Red Bank, N. J.
Harris, President J. H., LL.D.....	Lewisburg, Pa.
Haywood, Oscar, D.D.....	New York City
Hegeman, Mr. John R.....	New York City
Hillman, Mr. Wm.....	Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
Hills, Mr. William.....	New York City
Hobart, Professor A. S., D.D.....	Upland, Pa.
Holton, H. D., M.D.....	Brattleboro, Vt.
Horr, President George E., D.D.....	Newton Centre, Mass.
Hubbard, Mr. Harry.....	New York City
Hughes, Governor Charles E., LL.D.....	Albany, N. Y.
Hunt, President Emory W., LL.D.....	Granville, Ohio
Hyde, Rev. J. Chester.....	Cleveland, Ohio

Jackson, J. L., D.D.....	Sharon, Pa.
Jefferson, Albert W., D.D.....	Portland, Me.
Johnson, Rev. Herbert S.....	Boston, Mass.
Johnston, R. P., D.D.....	New York City
Jones, Carter Helm, D.D.....	Oklahoma City, Okla.
Jones, Howard L., D.D.....	Charleston, S. C.
Jones, M. Ashby, D.D.....	Columbus, Ga.
Judd, Mr. Orrin R.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Judson, President H. P., LL.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Keen, Professor W. W., M.D., LL.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Kenyon, Hon. James S.....	Providence, R. I.
Lawrence, William M., D.D.....	East Orange, N. J.
Lawson, Albert G., D.D.....	Waterbury, Conn.
Lent, Rev. Frederick, Ph.D.....	New Haven, Conn.
Levering, Mr. Eugene.....	Baltimore, Md.
Lincoln, Mr. William E.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Logan, Professor John H.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Lord, Rivington D., D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Loux, Rev. Edward.....	New York City
MacDonald, Robert, D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
MacDonald, Mrs. Robert.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
McDonald, Mr. William.....	Albany, N. Y.
McKibben, Rev. W. K.....	Seattle, Wash.
McLeish, Mr. Andrew.....	Chicago, Ill.
McNally, Rev. C. R.....	New London, Conn.
Marston, Mr. Edgar L.....	New York City
Mathews, Professor E. B.....	Baltimore, Md.
Matteson, W. B., D.D.....	Red Bank, N. J.
Mauck, President Jos. W., LL.D.....	Hillsdale, Mich.
Meeser, Professor S. B., D.D.....	Upland, Pa.
Metcalf, Mr. Edward P.....	Providence, R. I.
Milbank, Mr. Joseph.....	New York City
Moore, Addison, D.D.....	New York City
Mott, Mrs. E. E.....	New York City
Mullins, President E. Y., D.D., LL.D.....	Louisville, Ky.
Murray, Mr. George Wellwood.....	Montclair, N. J.
Nuveen, Mr. John.....	Chicago, Ill.

Parker, A. K., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Parmly, Mr. Randolph, A.M.....	New York City
Parsons, Major Charles B.....	Red Bank, N. J.
Parsons, Mr. Charles W.....	New York City
Pierce, Robert F. Y., D.D.....	New York City
Porter, Hon. H. K.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Randall, J. H., D.D.....	New York City
Rauschenbusch, Professor Walter, D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Rhees, President Rush, D.D., LL.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Rosselle, Rev. W. Quay, Ph.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Rowland, A. J., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Rullman, Mr. Henry D.....	Baltimore, Md.
Sampey, Professor John R., D.D.....	Louisville, Ky.
Samson, Thomas S., D.D.....	Germantown, Pa.
Sanders, Henry M., D.D.....	New York City
Schulte, Mr. Theo. E.....	New York City
Scott, Rev. Walter.....	North Cambridge, Mass.
Shalenberger, Hon. William S.....	Rochester, Pa.
Shaud, Mr. Miles M.....	Washington, D. C.
Slocum, President A. G., LL.D.....	Kalamazoo, Mich.
Snape, Rev. John.....	Utica, N. Y.
Spalding, C. H., D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Stevenson, Mr. George K.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Stickney, Hon. W. W.....	Ludlow, Vt.
Stilwell, H. F., D.D.....	Cleveland, Ohio
Stoddard, Ira J., D.D.....	Germantown, Pa.
Stott, W. T., D.D.....	Kingstown, Md.
Strong, President A. H., D.D., LL.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Strong, Professor J. H.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Sutphen, Mr. C. Edgar.....	Newark, N. J.
Thresher, Mr. E. M.....	Dayton, Ohio
Thresher, Mr. J. B.....	Dayton, Ohio
Tomlinson, Rev. E. T., Ph.D.....	Elizabeth, N. J.
Torrence, Hon. Francis J.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Tustin, Hon. Ernest L.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Waldbach, Rev. William F.....	Chicago, Ill.
Welch, Mr. Pierce N.....	New Haven, Conn.
Wells, Mr. F. A.....	Chicago, Ill.

White, Mr. Edward D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
White, Mr. Josiah J.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Williams, Leighton, D.D.....	New York City
Wishart, Rev. A. W., Ph.D.....	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Woods, E. A., D.D.....	San Francisco, Cal.
Woodward, Mr. S. W.....	Washington, D. C.

ANNUAL MEMBERS

Abbott, Mr. Augustus L.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Adams, George D., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Anderson, Professor F. L., D.D.....	Newton Centre, Mass.
Arthur, Rev. F. P.....	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Ashworth, Rev. Robert A.....	Meriden, Conn.
Barry, Mr. Charles C.....	Melrose, Mass.
Bates, President Miner Lee.....	Hiram, Ohio
Bawden, Rev. William H.....	Perth Amboy, N. J.
Betteridge, Professor W. R., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Bickmore, Professor A. S., LL.D.....	New York City
Blair, Rev. V. W.....	North Tonawanda, N. Y.
Bonsall, Rev. A. J., Litt.D.....	Allegheny, Pa.
Bosworth, Rev. R. B.....	New York City
Bovenizer, Mr. George W.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Bowman, Mr. E. M.....	Chicago, Ill.
Bradbury, Rev. Woodman.....	Cambridge, Mass.
Brockett, Hon. E. J.....	East Orange, N. J.
Bronk, Rev. Mitchell, Ph.D.....	Bayonne, N. J.
Brown, Professor Charles Rufus, D.D.....	Newton Centre, Mass.
Brown, Rev. John R.....	Providence, R. I.
Brown, T. Edwin, D.D.....	New Britain, Conn.
Bullen, George, D.D.....	Needham, Mass.
Burnham, Rev. F. W.....	Springfield, Ill.
Bustard, Rev. W. W.....	Cleveland, Ohio
Butler, Professor Nathaniel, D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Cant, Mr. Andrew.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
Carman, Rev. A. S.....	Granville, Ohio
Carpenter, Mr. I. W.....	Omaha, Neb.
Carroll, Professor Mitchell.....	Washington, D. C.
Carver, Professor W. O.....	Louisville, Ky.
Chamberlain, Rev. Harrie R.....	Newton, Mass.
Chard, Mr. James F.....	Buffalo, N. Y.

Clare, Rev. Daniel H.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Clyde, Rev. J. A.....	Yonkers, N. Y.
Colby, Mr. Gardner.....	New York City
Cole, Rev. Arthur S.....	Manasquan, N. J.
Coleman, Mr. George W.....	Boston, Mass.
Coler, Professor S. P.....	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Conant, Thos. O., LL.D.....	New York City
Conklin, Rev. J. C.....	Trenton, N. J.
Crossley, Mr. J. H.....	Bridgeport, Conn.
Davis, Mr. E. G.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Dayton, Mr. A. A.....	Albany, N. Y.
DeWolf, Rev. D.....	Newark, N. J.
Dickerson, Mr. J. S.....	Chicago, Ill.
Dickinson, J. T., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Donovan, Professor W. N.....	Newton Centre, Mass.
Dunning, Mr. Amos W.....	Haverhill, Mass.
Dussman, Rev. John.....	Gurzalla, India
Elliott, Mr. A. J.....	Peoria, Ill.
Elmer, Rev. F. D.....	Winsted, Conn.
Evans, Rev. P. S.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Fennell, W. G., D.D.....	Hartford, Conn.
Fortune, Rev. A. W.....	Cincinnati, Ohio
Foster, Rev. Allyn K.....	Worcester, Mass.
Fowler, Mr. B. F.....	Haddonfield, N. J.
Francis, J. A., D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Franklin, Rev. J. H.....	Colorado Springs, Colo.
Garrison, J. H., LL.D.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Garton, Rev. J. V.....	West Somerville, Mass.
Glover, Mrs. H. R.....	Cambridge, Mass.
Greene, B. A., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Greene, President J. P., D.D.....	Liberty, Mo.
Greene, S. H., D.D., LL.D.....	Washington, D. C.
Greul, Frederick B., D.D.....	Haverhill, Mass.
Grout, Mr. T. J.....	New York City
Haggard, F. P., D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Hare, Rev. J. Madison.....	Jersey City, N. J.
Hartwell, Mr. F. W.....	Providence, R. I.
Haskell, Mr. Edward H.....	Boston, Mass.

Hayden, Rev. W. L.....	Indianapolis, Ind.
Henderson, Professor C. R., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Henson, L. L., D.D.....	Providence, R. I.
Hoben, Professor Allan, Ph.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Holmes, Rev. H. C.....	Lawrenceville, Ill.
Holyoke, Edw. M., D.D.....	Providence, R. I.
Howe, Rev., T. C.....	Indianapolis, Ind.
Hudson, Rev. Birney S.....	Atlantic City, N. J.
Huhns, Rev. F.....	Houston Heights, Tex.
Hull, Rev. R. C.....	Summit, N. J.
Jennings, Mr. A. E.....	Detroit, Mich.
Jones, Mr. L. B.....	Wilmington, Del.
Jones, Rev. O. E.....	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Jones, Philip L., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Kelly, Claude, D.D.....	Bellevue, Pa.
Knapp, Rev. A. E.....	Amsterdam, N. Y.
Knox, Superintendent George Platt.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Laws, Curtis Lee, D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Lawson, Principal George B.....	Saxton River, Vt.
L'Hommedieu, Rev. J. B.....	Greenwich, N. Y.
Leshner, Mr. A. L.....	New York City
Lewis, F. G., Ph.D.....	Upland, Pa.
Lindsley, Mr. Irenaeus H.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Loxley, Mr. B. Ogden.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Lyell, John W., D.D.....	Camden, N. J.
Macintosh, Professor Douglas C.....	New Haven, Conn.
MacMurray, Rev. D. A.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
McGarvey, Rev. J. F.....	Detroit, Mich.
McGlothlin, Professor A. J.....	Louisville, Ky.
McLean, Rev. A.....	Cincinnati, Ohio
Magill, Rev. David T.....	Chicago, Ill.
Marble, Rev. F. E., Ph.D.....	Cambridge, Mass.
Mathews, Professor Shailer, D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Maxson, Rev. C. H.....	Marquette, Mich.
Merriam, E. F., D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Moody, Rev. Thomas.....	New York City
Moore, Mr. Paul.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Mosely, Mr. John.....	Needham, Mass.

Moss, Rev. C. H.....	Malden, Mass.
Nash, Rev. C. E.....	New York City
Needham, President C. W.....	Washington, D. C.
Neubauer, Rev. Eugene.....	Goshen, Ind.
Norton, Rev. F. W.....	Hiram, Ohio
Oeschger, Rev. Wm.....	Vincennes, Ind.
Osborne, Mr. Thomas D.....	Louisville, Ky.
Owen, Rev. William Russell.....	Baltimore, Md.
Parker, Rev. F. C. W.....	Portland, Ore.
Partridge, Warren G., D.D.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Pattison, Mr. F. W.....	East Boston, Mass.
Pattison, Harold, D.D.....	St. Paul, Minn.
Peaver, Mr. Frank W.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Penny, Rev. F. D.....	Burlington, Vt.
Phillips, J. W., Ph.D., D.D.....	Binghamton, N. Y.
Philputt, Rev. Allan B.....	Indianapolis, Ind.
Philputt, Rev. James M., D.D.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Pinkham, Rev. Henry W.....	Denver, Colo.
Pollard, Professor E. B., Ph.D., D.D.....	Chester, Pa.
Powers, Frederick D., D.D.....	Washington, D. C.
Quay, George M., M.D.....	East Cleveland, Ohio
Reed, Rev. Delavan B.....	Hillsdale, Mich.
Rhoades, W. C. P., D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Richardson, Rev. W. S.....	New York City
Rowland, Mr. Ed. A.....	Rome, N. Y.
Rowlison, Rev. C. C.....	Iowa City, Iowa
Ryrie, Mr. James.....	Toronto, Canada
Sage, Mr. John D.....	Cincinnati, Ohio
Sears, Rev. Charles H.....	New York City
Schwartz, Rev. Albert.....	Clinton, Ill.
Skevington, Rev. Samuel J.....	Newark, N. J.
Slater, Professor John R.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Sloper, Mr. A. J.....	New Britain, Conn.
Smith, Professor Gerald B.....	Chicago, Ill.
Smith, Professor J. M. P.....	Chicago, Ill.
Stevens, Professor W. A., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.

Stewart, Dean J. W. A., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Sweet, Rev. F. W.....	Adrian, Mich.
Taylor, President J. M., LL.D.....	Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Thomson, Hon. D. E., K.C.....	Toronto, Canada
Thresher, Mr. Albert.....	Dayton, Ohio
Tomes, Rev. O. E.....	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Van Arsdale, Rev. G. B.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Vander Roest, Mr. William.....	Pelham, N. Y.
Van Kirk, Rev. J. M.....	Kinross, Iowa
Vosburgh, G. B., D.D.....	Denver, Colo.
Vose, Rev. Riley A.....	Owego, N. Y.
Walker, Rev. Louis A.....	Demarest, N. J.
Wallace, Mr. H. S.....	New York City
Wallace, W. B., D.D.....	Cleveland, Ohio
Waterman, Professor L.....	Hillsdale, Mich.
Watson, Charles H., D.D.....	Arlington, Mass.
Whidden, Howard P., D.D.....	Dayton, Ohio
White, C. L., D.D.....	New York City
Whitman, B. L., D.D.....	Seattle, Wash.
Whitney, Mr. Geo. C.....	Worcester, Mass.
Willett, Herbert L., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Williams, Professor C. L.....	Granville, Ohio
Williams, Mr. Mornay.....	New York City
Woods, Rev. F. C.....	Baltimore, Md.
Woods, Rev. J. R.....	Mason City, Neb.
Wright, Mr. W. J.....	Cincinnati, Ohio

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BAPTIST CONGRESS, 1909

FIRST DAY

Afternoon Session

MADISON AVENUE BAPTIST CHURCH, NEW YORK CITY

Tuesday, November 9, 1909

3 o'clock P. M.

REV. THEO. A. K. GESSLER, D.D.: In the absence of Dr. Sanders who is the Chairman of the Executive Committee, it is my duty to inform you that the Executive Committee has requested Rev. Leighton Williams, D.D., of this city to act as President of these sessions of the Congress.

REV. LEIGHTON WILLIAMS, D.D.: The Congress will come to order and be led in prayer by Rev. J. Hervey Appleton, of the Episcopal church of this city.

REV. J. H. APPLETON: O Thou who art the truth, in whom is all purity and all grace, may thy spirit abide upon us and upon these our brethren all, in the deliberations of this Congress. For thy glory are they met and to thee above all human reasons or predilection we would look that thy grace may lead us into all truth. Move upon our hearts; give us the surrendering of even our choicest thought to the power of thy blessed truth. So may the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ his Son enter every heart, move every speech, and bring all into that blessed unity which shall correspond to the unity of thy church triumphant to which we are looking forward and for which we are seeking and laboring here on earth. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Savior. *Amen.*

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Eaton, the pastor of the church, will give the address of welcome.

DR. EATON: *Mr. President, members of the Congress, visiting friends:* I have been asked by Dr. Sanders to extend to you a welcome. He mitigated your sentence, however, by assuring me that I must not consume more than two minutes. I therefore extend to you on behalf of the Madison Avenue Baptist Church a most cordial welcome to our home.

Back of these walls (*indicating*) is a very beautiful building which we place at your disposal. In addition to this we hope that you will enjoy being here and will make use of our building as seemeth unto you good. You are welcome to this church; you are welcome to the city, and to everything else that you and I can think of without mentioning.

And now in closing permit me to say that we are all expecting from this Congress a spiritual and intellectual uplift. We expect to see unfolded before us a clearer vista of those divine truths to which we have surrendered our lives; and perhaps in the light of the discussions which are to come we shall get a clearer vision of Him for whom and by whom and unto whom are all things and in whom all things hold together.

We are glad you are here, and we hope and pray that this Congress will meet the highest expectations of us all.

THE PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Congress it becomes my pleasant duty to reply to these words of courteous welcome.

It has been said that the Baptist Congress often is received with suspicion and it departs in high favor and approval. That seems to be its history in the past, more, perhaps, than in these more recent years, and the reason for it is not far to seek. For we Baptist people, while we do believe in liberty of conscience and in liberty of prophesying, have found as a matter of experience that this liberty tends rather to union than to disunion; and we have therefore come to feel a very high sense of the importance of views that seem to us correct views and that are views generally held and received by our people. But the Baptist Congress has always maintained that liberty of conscience meant primarily in practice liberty to differ. Liberty to agree is a very unnecessary privilege, if it be a privilege at all; it becomes a real privilege when we are allowed to differ and yet hold full rights in the fellowship. And yet the Baptist Congress, while it believes thus in the widest expression of diversity of views, is not in any way careless of the conception of orthodoxy, for orthodoxy is a matter of immense importance. It certainly must be as important if not more important in religion, as in science, but the Baptist Congress has always stood for that scientific idea of the method of attaining orthodoxy and maintaining orthodoxy,

namely, the continual reverent study of the facts and a willingness always to learn. The Baptist Congress in that attitude has gone forward through its twenty-eight years of history, and I think has now clearly fixed itself in the affections of our people.

I remember years ago when I was invited to become its secretary that I consulted a very well-known leader among our people in this city and he said to me, "Don't accept it." He said, "It is a dying body; it is not likely to last long." It has lasted a good many years since then—more than I like personally to recall very often, and it has now proved its right and duty.

After all, my friends, such a book as that which has had a good deal of prominence this last year or so, Edmund Gosse's book, *Father and Son*, has shown us that the older method of seeking and maintaining an orthodox opinion sometimes becomes a very sad and bitter failure, as it did between that noble father and his son—both admirable men. We have, I say, not lost our conception of the value of orthodoxy; we have simply studied other methods of maintaining it.

I would like also to remind the brethren present that the Baptist Congress, while not in name founded for the purpose, has had a very considerable influence in extending the unity of our Baptist people. We, I think, were among the very first to become in any sense international. We crossed the border into Canada and held one of our sessions—now many years since—in Toronto: one of the very best of them. And in our recent session at Chicago the Free Baptists and the Disciples of Christ were accorded an equal place with our own denomination on the platform. We believe in full freedom of discussion; we have, however, very strict rules. I think it will be my duty, in a moment, to call upon the secretary to read these rules and to remind the audience that while no action is taken in a Baptist Congress, no votes are allowed, we do preserve very strict rules of order. While we allow full freedom of opinion, we allow only the recognized and restricted expression of it within the limits and according to the rules prevailing in all deliberative bodies.

I hope that the meeting may keep up to the high rank of those that have preceded it. Permit me to say how deeply I

feel the pleasure and honor of presiding over this gathering to which you have elected me.

I will call upon our secretary to read the rules here.

The Secretary then read the Rules of Discussion.

THE PRESIDENT: Our first topic this afternoon on this rich programme is "Can Pragmatism Furnish a Philosophical Basis for Theology?" I call first on the writers, and the first of these is Professor Melbourne S. Read, Ph.D., of Colgate University. (*Applause.*)

PROFESSOR MELBOURNE S. READ, PH.D., of Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., then read the following paper:

DOES PRAGMATISM FURNISH A PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS FOR THEOLOGY?

The great claim and merit of pragmatism lie in its appeal to the realities of experience. These are its realities, and philosophy becomes for it the setting-forth of the general conditions under which these realities present themselves. On what experience frankly shows does this philosophy rest its case. In this it is not altogether unique, for there have been and are other empiricisms; but the appeal to experience, one's whole experience, and nothing but experience, is here especially insistent and full of meaning. Religious experience takes its place along with other phases of experience, none the better and none the worse for being religious. And if theology be the result of reflection upon this religious experience, we naturally have the expectant inquiry which appears as the topic which this paper is to introduce.

Without attempting an exposition of pragmatist doctrine, it is desirable to call to mind some of its main characteristics and contentions.

The springs of the movement are many. First in importance, in my judgment, is the view of the human consciousness in terms of biological evolution. All preserved variations have a genuine utility in the development of the world's processes. The function of knowledge, and of consciousness in general, becomes the illumination of the pathway of the organism and its guidance along the way. The development of mental processes is justified

and secured by the unique and invaluable services they render. When once consciousness is looked upon in this way as a product and helper in the struggle, like unto the eye, or the vertebral column, it becomes difficult to distract one's attention from this its primary significance. Knowledge, feeling, and determination here find their origin and their obvious task and opportunity. Forms of perception and categories of the understanding lose their lordly position of static, immovable domination, and acquire a history and a new significance. They become fluid characteristics of the knowledge gropings of the race, postulates, hypotheses, to persist or disappear as their efficiency in interpretation and guidance seems to warrant.

Another spring of the movement has been the method of the sciences and the practical application of scientific knowledge to human needs. For the scientist a theory is true if it works. By the tested theory the scientist can control the further development of experience. The applicability of this theory in experimentation, and in devising new methods of satisfying human needs, shows, or makes, its truth. For the scientist then knowledge is decidedly instrumental in character.

A third spring of the movement, and somewhat justifying its rather peculiar name, goes back farther in the history of thought. A world whose essence consisted in merely being known, or a world standing apart in solid isolation from the inner life of man, however satisfactory to the idealist or the realist, has ever failed to be taken with deepest seriousness by some pragmatic souls. To illustrate the point, I need mention in modern philosophy only two names, Kant, who urged for the primacy of the practical reason, and Schopenhauer, who held that the world is fundamentally will rather than idea. The realities of the world of feeling, faith, and determination have been also set forth in literature and believed in by humanity as being of unquestionable right as worthy as those of reflective thought.

The pragmatic method is that of empirical trial carried out consistently in interpreting the realities of experience. Thoughts, ideas, judgments, become working hypotheses, instruments by which one attempts to control the flow of events. If the tool will

not work, does not lead one anywhere, or in any satisfactory way control life's fluid course, it is discarded, no matter what ancient trademark the tool may be imprinted with. If the idea fails in this practical test an honest soul following the pragmatic method will have none of it. If this idea cannot show what it is good for, how it differs from some other idea in the practical issues of life, it can hardly be taken seriously. Furthermore the idea is essentially just what it can show itself to be in the way of *making* a difference. If it *makes* no difference, then it is just indifferent, trifling, of no account. The proper mission of the idea, or judgment, as used in pragmatic method, is shown by the function of consciousness biologically considered, by the scientist in his quiet quests, and by every son of man who tries to be really at home in *this* world.

This method of course suggests the pragmatist meaning of truth—not truth in the abstract, but truths about the world of real experience. Ideas, judgments are true when they fulfil their proper function, when they become means for ordering well the refractory elements of a flowing and overflowing world. That hypothesis which enables man to master nature is the true one. That conception which enables one satisfactorily to handle, change, and direct the fluid experience, is the true one. And not only is its truth thus tested by its satisfactory workability, but this constitutes the truth of the conception or really makes it true. The agreement of truths with reality is not that of mere mirroring, but means genuine hearty co-operation in the thick of the battle. Judgments *become* true just in so far as they actually do their work satisfactorily in the particular exigencies of understanding the world and controlling life's experience.

Experiences are genuine revelations of reality for the pragmatist. We find in pragmatism no contrast between reality and experience, as Kant and the agnostics would hold, nor indeed between an absolute experience and human experiences, of which the idealists make so much. Experience is rich in the variety of its manifestations but these are all self-characterizations of reality. The soul or the knowing process should not be looked at as something apart from the real world, but as just as real as the world of matter. They are all a part and parcel of the same

world, as the evolutionist has shown; and when we make distinctions we make them in reality itself, one aspect of experience being set over against another aspect for certain life purposes. Indeed these distinctions and the many limitations and conditions of the varied experiences are themselves just the forms under which reality exists, while experience itself is fully able to take account of these various aspects. Against the old distinction between the phenomenal and the real, pragmatism protests, regarding these as but useful distinctions within experience, expressing fundamentally for the will and the affections its better and worse phases.

Experiences, we are warned, must not be identified with the objective, the material, that of which the physical sciences treat, or that which is *experienced*. A philosophy of reality must not be merely a philosophy developed from these physical sciences. Nor again should experience be identified with the subjective, the conscious as personal, the *experimenting* aspect. Philosophy cannot be merely a following-out of psychology. Experience is richer than either of these distinctions for they both come out of it when reflection becomes necessary. Philosophy must take account of all the riches of experience as represented by the mental and social sciences as well as the physical. The pragmatist insists on keeping his ear to the ground in order that all the varied rumblings and whisperings may be heard.

The world as a world of knowledge, as a world of action for this purpose or that, as a world of feeling and of values—for the pragmatist philosophy must be true to all these as features of a world really active, changing, developing, through and through.

Reality reveals itself or experience functions in several ways. We may speak of the way of knowledge, or the scientific way. Then there is the economic, utilitarian, or technical. Related to this is the world of art, the aesthetic-artistic phase of reality. Then we have the moral or ethical, and finally the religious aspect of reality, or experience as religion. From the pragmatist point of view these are all to be considered as valid, each for its purpose. As to the purpose and purport of the religious aspect of reality some further inquiry must be made.

I am not aware that we have from the official pragmatists any

thoroughgoing statement of the nature, validity, and function of religion in the world. Nor is there anything like an attempt explicitly to answer the question which is the subject of this paper. It is rather from the scattered material available, and still more from what seems the drift and meaning of the doctrine, that these questions may be definitely considered.

Certainly it is held, as we have already said, that religious experience must be considered as much a part of real immediate experience as any other phase or aspect of it. The world is not merely a world known through the medium of scientific knowledge, it is just as really a world aesthetic and artistic, a world of moral values and endeavors, a world of economic stress, and finally just as really a world of the kind which religious experience reveals or makes. In the present as in the past there is the great fact of experience experienced religiously. There is a candor in pragmatic doctrine at this point which should not be overlooked. In its insistence on the realities and values of experienced religion it is not surpassed by the religious devotee. Whether pragmatism affords a basis for theology or not, there is no doubt as to its serious manner in regarding religion.

For the pragmatist religion has the same claim as have science, art, and industry, in that it is on the whole useful and satisfying. It really belongs of right in this world because it works. Knowledge in all its forms, truths—these are justified by, and really consist in, instrumental value in achieving, as we have seen. The development of the fine arts evolving the ideal products which are our delight, moral and social struggle and reform, industrial wonder-working with its still more wonderful promise—all these for the pragmatist are but experience or reality constantly modifying itself into more useful and satisfying forms. Religion, too, in its progress from primitive crudity through many devious ways to its present high vantage ground, is the inevitable expression of the human spirit ever making its career in experience more satisfying and ever becoming more capable in determining the realities of the present and future. It is a necessity in the struggle for life, in the interpretation of the world, and in the spirit's part creation of its further world adventures. The pragmatic philosophy is thus in line with what seems to be the main

trend of religious study in our day, the investigation of actual religious experiences giving us our psychologies of religion with the inevitable philosophizing thereon.

Dewey has called religion essentially a sense of ratio between what is under our control and what is not. James makes it consist of those "feelings and experiences of individual men in their solitude so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider the divine."

These religious emotions and beliefs have in all the ages been potent factors in molding future experience. If we acted by sight alone and not also by faith there would hardly be room for religion. The further reaches of possible experience, those which we cannot with exactness define and control, but which we must in a way reckon with, these mysterious phases of reality which we experience personally in the way of non-cognitive processes, faith, awe, communion, these are in their nature essentially religious. These experiences are real, they are and have ever been of the greatest service in the evolution of man and society. Their very persistence under many forms indicates their vitality and the fact that they are products and partners of the actual world in its development. They are facts of individual life, are native to the human spirit and cannot be let go, they have been tested and believed in so far as experience reaches. That which is regarded as objective in this experience has been, in its unsophisticated state of the tension of sentiment, vague and ill-defined but most deeply believed in, while reflection on what these non-controlled factors may be has produced all the theologies and all the dogmas of religion, which have seemed solutions to the elated but sorely perplexed spirit of man.

This religious experience is very fluid, adapts itself marvelously to the exigencies of events, has satisfactions unique and unspeakably valuable, pieces out the unsatisfactoriness of the other phases of reality, has high heaven for its witness and its helper, believes in the dark, is satisfied with scant measure, and in its triumph over the ills of life issues a challenge to all other forms of experience, that it possesses the secret of the world and is that which is most satisfactory, works best, is truest. Its values

are the supreme values and all else seems something tributary or something to be overcome.

But according to pragmatism there is a deeper meaning in the claim of the reality of religious experience. It has not only proved a useful expedient in man's journey through the world, not only a refuge and a sustaining comfort when other values are blotted out, nor yet merely a spur to high endeavor. It is nothing less than a call to remake or help remake the world. Experience is as really fluid as it seems and the issues no one can safely prophesy more than in small part. Reality is made day by day, and moment by moment, as experience modifies itself according to the various situations and crises which arise within it. The field is free. The results of the races are not outlined beforehand on the paper of agreement. The game is not meaningless. What the religious consciousness needs and calls for, that it really has the opportunity to bring to pass. If the world is as yet a place of ill repute and shifting satisfactions, it may be made by strong endeavor a place where the ideals of the religious consciousness shall become a genuine part and parcel of the world. The economic stress calls for many inventions for a certain control of experience. These really come and the world of economic experience is different from what it was, different really, and not merely on its surface. It is a genuine remolding of elements. It is none other with the world of real experience from the artistic or from the ethical point of view. The whole process of organic evolution tells the same story of need of re-adjustment of control of new beings in a new world. For the ideals of religion there is the same opportunity and clear call to go up and possess the land. According to the pragmatic conception of religion it is a real enterprise which is on foot, a real battle which is being or may be fought, and the issue, what of that? It is what it is made to be. There is a real chance for defeat or for victory. As in the sphere of organic evolution, in the realm of scientific research, in that of economic prosperity vs. adversity, reality is constantly reasserting the elements called the better, and ignoring or destroying the elements called the worse; and as this is all a metaphysically real world-struggle, so like unto these others is the religious experience with its own

peculiar better and worse, its own real struggle to achieve the one and conquer the other. Reality is thus to its very core involved in the religious life, its very quality is in the issue, its fortunes thus dependent. The contests are real contests; and the ideals of a religious faith valiantly striven for may transform the very depths of being. Pragmatism thus lays the deepest stress in action upon those very events and deeds which the religious spirit of our day is making so prominent, and regarding as all-important.

When one reflects on the possible consequences of these pragmatic views for theological thought, one may at least conclude that the world really lends itself to the realization through human endeavor of the ideals set up by the religious consciousness of man. Whether or not reality actively co-operates in this holy enterprise pragmatism does not assert. But it is possible that the pragmatic method may indirectly yield something of a satisfactory answer.

And for this we must return to some pragmatic ways of regarding the structure and function of knowledge. The forms of perception and the categories of the understanding, to use Kantian terms, and the so-called laws of thought, are not fixed and unalterable, static molds, as it were, of experience. They have had a long evolution, and have developed from timid, tentative, as yet ill-formed methods of mastering or controlling the flux of events, to the clear, decisive, practically necessary methods of determination of the pure reason of man. They are not the rationalistic axioms they were once supposed to be, but mere postulates after all, racial hypotheses which have been perfected and tested by experience, and have proved and constituted their validity in that they have worked. It has proved satisfactory to interpret reality in these ways. These ways of judging are useful instruments, only relatively fixed, fundamentally adjustable. They are the ways by which the spirit of man has been able to interpret and control his world. They are the active productions of the spirit, justified in experience in so far as that experience is regarded as object of knowledge. So with all empirically inferred scientific hypotheses. These too are trials of the mind to be proved or disproved in the issue.

But the spirit of man has never been willing to stop here. In Kantian terms the practical reason has always asserted its claims. Life is more than knowing. Experience is affectional, appreciative, and active, as well as cognitive. Pragmatism is the champion of these aspects of reality. And if indeed the scientific interpretation of reality is at bottom itself practical, if it proceeds by hypotheses set up in faith to be proved or disproved by the issue honestly lived, if truth is fundamentally satisfactory, it is not surprising that the spirit of man should have its ambition fired to further exploits of interpretation. The faiths of the spirit of a moral and religious sort have the same claim to be tried as have those of purely scientific intent. They may not have as manifold and sharply defined a concrete perceived material to work upon, the actively imaginative nature of the spirit may be more decidedly manifest, the relative proportions between fact and postulated belief may be changed, but after all, the exploits of the so-called practical reason or spirit of valued faiths in men are not decidedly unlike those of the purely cognitive sort, there being a difference in degree rather than in kind. But what faiths and what beliefs are we entitled to hold as valid, on this general certificate of worth? Here pragmatism warns us that we must not be too hasty. It does not give, Professor Dewey has said, "an uncontrolled field for some special beliefs to run riot in. . . . Any one of our beliefs is subject to criticism, revision, and even ultimate elimination." That this does happen to beliefs in the wear and tear of experience no one can doubt. The pragmatist is entitled on his philosophy to those beliefs, projections of the affections and the will, which in any way tend to make more satisfactory the actual exigencies of experience. Beliefs in the moral order of the world over and above specific human endeavor, beliefs in a personal God, the friend and helper of men in their struggles, such beliefs it would seem are in accord with pragmatic doctrine, just in so far as they make actual concrete experiences of life more full of abiding satisfaction, not of the order of the fool's paradise, but the kind resulting from a better grip of life's realities, making them more amenable to ideals. In other words, beliefs that actually work. But the tests must be real, and this is not an easy matter for an honest man,

not content with empty words with a high sound, and a sickly sentimentality.

If these beliefs, subjected to a fair trial and genuine criticism, actually work satisfactorily in any real sense, they become in just such measure true. They are true in the sense that they are really justified in understanding our total experience, hypotheses which work in the sense that they really do straighten out life's crooked ways. There is much of faith and comparatively little definite proof in them when compared with strict scientific research; but, if we have interpreted the pragmatic method correctly, the difference is one of degree, for all search for truths is of one kind, the attempting to find out what will work satisfactorily in interpreting and controlling the flux of events.

A recent critic of pragmatism has maintained that according to pragmatic doctrine one is deprived of the right to talk about God and belief in him because he is not included within our experience, while all truth and meaning according to the pragmatist must be confined to matters within human experience. But if pragmatism is right in extending the term experience beyond that of sense-perception, and if such a hypothesis as that of a God of some character should enable one to understand that experience better, be more at home with it and better satisfied in relation to it, then the gulf between the empirical and the so-called transcendent would be in a manner bridged. A God that could not be in this manner explanatory of experience, that would make no practical difference in experience, such a God would, as the critic implies, have no place in the pragmatic philosophy. Beliefs that transcend life's varied experience in the sense of making no actual and advantageous differences in it, the pragmatist must forego. It is friendly to such beliefs as will submit to the test of being really worth something in actual experiences. In its scheme of reality and in its epistemology it seeks to give them a place and a valid claim.

There are some doctrines and beliefs, however, which pragmatism is not friendly to. The pragmatists one and all repudiate the God or Absolute of the monistic idealists. Their reasons for this rejection are fundamental, and have been vigorously set forth in the controversial literature on the subject. The Absolute is

generally held to be a mere abstraction and essentially helpless to perform its august tasks. It cannot get into the world of reality, and can really make no difference in men's actual experience. With this rejection one loses the basis of that theology which has been so dominant in somewhat recent times and of which I suppose the late Principal Caird was the chief exponent.

Pragmatism would fail to recognize as valid the traditional intellectualistic proofs of the existence of God. It would be as stern a critic of these as Kant himself. And so with the proofs of the doctrine of immortality and many a theological dogma. Theologies constructed upon such an intellectualistic basis would find pragmatism very destructive. Beliefs must be tested in the fiery furnace of practical endeavor, and their effective and satisfactory usefulness clearly shown. We are called upon to accept those beliefs or faith hypotheses which stand this test.

The theology of pragmatism will not consist of speculative reasonings of traditional metaphysics, any more than of the piecing-together of supposedly authoritative dogmas. In keeping with its method, its conception of truth, and its view of reality, it will be essentially an inductive study of concrete religious experience and a testing of faith constructions by the facts of developing experience, a very decided testing of faith by works. It will seek to ascertain common factors in religious experiences, and working faiths, to establish those hypotheses which seem to be implied in these actual experienced realities, and to bring them into harmony with those other phases of reality which are within the realm of science, morals, art, and industry.

The theoretic basis afforded to religion and theology by pragmatism is thus akin to that afforded to the subject-matter and method of science. It limits theology's range, questions some of its fundamental tenets, makes light of many of its metaphysical dogmas and intellectualistic methods, and for this will in turn be cavalierly dismissed by many. On the other hand, the new reading of reality giving religious experience a fundamental significance, the conception of truth and the place of faith coupled with test, in science as in religious belief, the patient inductive method insisting on finding all values in actual concrete experiences of actual human beings, these and other features of prag-

matism will commend it to many who take most seriously the stress and struggle of the world, who look on religion as an active participant in the great world drama, and who believe that theology most valuable which keeps in closest touch with human need and human hope.

THE PRESIDENT: I will call next on Professor Douglas C. Macintosh of the Yale Divinity School, New Haven.

PROFESSOR DOUGLAS C. MACINTOSH, PH.D., then read as follows:

CAN PRAGMATISM FURNISH A PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS FOR THEOLOGY?

In order to establish a negative answer to this question one would simply have to show either that pragmatism itself is not tenable, or else that it can afford theology no adequate support. To establish the affirmative, however, it would be necessary to show in the first place that pragmatism is in itself tenable, and in the second place that it is compatible with and gives some real support to theology. But for the would-be theological pragmatist himself neither of these positions can be readily accepted as established without the other. On the one hand he cannot say that pragmatism supports theology unless it is itself tenable, for if untenable, so far from being the philosophical basis of theology, it cannot be a real basis for anything. On the other hand, the person who finds religion essential cannot, on pragmatic principles, accept pragmatism, if it is not at least compatible with the fundamentals of religion and theology—unless, indeed, he needs pragmatism more than he needs religion. While beginning, then, by inquiring whether pragmatism is tenable or not, it must be recognized that a final affirmative answer cannot be given until we have considered the question of the bearing of pragmatism upon the essential affirmations of religious faith.

The investigation of the question, Is pragmatism tenable? involves, of course, the preliminary inquiry, What is pragmatism? To answer this question fairly is no small task in itself.

A common attitude toward the whole pragmatist movement is expressed in the criticism, "If it is new, it is nonsense; if it is

old, it is obvious."¹ When it is affirmed that true judgments must be ultimately satisfactory, and that none but true judgments can be really satisfactory as working principles in the service of legitimate human interests; that indeed all true judgments about reality are actually or potentially useful, so that the experienced usefulness of a belief indicates with more or less probability its truth, most thinkers agree that this is obviously true. There is an intimate relation between the truth and the practical utility of judgments, but the truth, they say, is something to be established independently of the usefulness; we test the truth first and find it useful afterward. Such a position may be called *semi-pragmatism*, but it is not pragmatism proper.

Many of those who criticize pragmatism seem to regard it as the doctrine that all satisfactory judgments are true, simply by virtue of their giving satisfaction to some particular desire; that all judgments found useful in the realization of purposes are, to the extent of their usefulness, true. Now it is undoubtedly true that much of the popular so-called pragmatism is of this sort. And Professor James himself often uses such unguarded expressions that he has to complain, in spite of his popular style, that he is very generally misunderstood as teaching some such doctrine. For example, in his book entitled *Pragmatism* he says, "Truth is only the expedient in the way of our thinking,"² and again, "On pragmatic principles we cannot reject any hypothesis if consequences useful to life flow from it."³ And yet in his latest work, *The Meaning of Truth*, he characterizes as "silly" and "an obvious absurdity" the view attributed to him "that anyone who believes a proposition to be true must first have made out clearly that its consequences *are* good, and that his belief must primarily be in that fact,"⁴ or "that whatever proves subjectively expedient in the way of our thinking is 'true' in the absolute and unrestricted sense of the word."⁵ Now this doctrine which Professor James seems at times to teach, but which he strenuously repudiates, is very evidently, as it has been characterized, nonsense. It is what the newspaper wit had in mind when

¹ E. E. Slosson, in *The Independent*, February 21, 1907.

² P. 222.

⁴ Pp. 272 f.

³ P. 273.

⁵ P. 231.

he wrote, "The Eskimos would seem to have a strong natural leaning toward pragmatism." But this is better called *pseudo-pragmatism*, for it would be a very superficial judgment which would identify the essence of the whole pragmatic movement with this absurd doctrine.

But if the essential nature of pragmatism consists neither in the doctrine that all true judgments are useful, nor in the doctrine that all useful judgments are true; if it must be differentiated from semi-pragmatism, which is obvious, and from pseudo-pragmatism, which is nonsense, just what then is it? What escape is there from the horns of this dilemma? Now it is the fault of the typical absolutist critic of pragmatism that he has a passion for expressing every movement and tendency in the form of a universal principle, and it is his mistake to suppose that when he has refuted the principle he has virtually annihilated the movement. And it may very well be that the proper pragmatist easily avoids both horns of the intellectualist's dilemma.

The fairest way to answer the question, What is pragmatism? is to settle it pragmatically. In pragmatism, then, what is the practical attitude? What does it really propose to do? To this the answer is that it proposes, in any crisis in which a judgment is demanded, to take the most promising suggestion as a working hypothesis and test its truth by the way it *works*. If the hypothesis has been thoroughly tested and has worked satisfactorily, it is properly called not only useful but true. Thus usefulness is taken as a mark of truth, although it is not claimed universally, that all judgments that are subjectively useful or temporarily satisfactory are objectively true. But further, pragmatism takes as its working hypothesis that every test there is for truth can be stated as a test of working, and that the results of speculation are problematic until verified in the experiences of life.

It will be seen then that pragmatism proper does not make for a greater laxity of thought, but rather for a more rigorous and extensive application of the principles of scientific method. Now in all scientific judgment the predicate is regarded as a mere *trial-predicate* and the judgment is made purely hypothetically at first, in order that by acting as if it were true it may be shown by the manner of its working whether the best hypothesis was used, that

is, whether the best trial-predicate was employed. And pragmatism, as we have intimated, does not propose to find a substitute for science in the study of nature or history, nor to change scientific procedure, nor to discredit in any way the results of scientific investigation. On the contrary it takes scientific procedure as its model, and undertakes to make philosophy, with which it is chiefly concerned, more scientific. If there is to be thinking about any reality beyond the reach of the phenomenal sciences, that thinking must imitate those sciences as far as possible; it must refer to experience wherever possible and find truth only through some kind of verification of working hypotheses. This surely is a tenable position.

But pragmatism is young and vigorous, and it has exhibited a good many overgrowths and excrescences that will doubtless be pruned away in time. To some extent this is already taking place. Early pragmatism tended to discredit system, consistency, and the so-called theoretical interest. Schiller of Oxford was especially pronounced in this respect. But now it is more usual to find the practical set forth, not as opposed altogether to the theoretical, but as including it as a special type of the practical. Science was described by Professor Dewey six years ago as "just the forging and arranging of instrumentalities for dealing with individual cases of experience."⁶ But what shall we say about the pursuit of science as something interesting apart from its further application; what about the interest in truth for its own sake? This is now interpreted as an instance of the shift of interest whereby the process of securing means to possible practical ends becomes interesting and an end in itself, the original practical purpose being lost sight of, and this new purpose being now itself an active principle, organizing other activities into its service as means.

It is to be expected also that pragmatists will give up the somewhat dogmatic assertion that any particular truth has only temporary value. There is a manifest contradiction, as has been repeatedly pointed out, in stating universally that there is no universal truth, assuming that it will be permanently satisfactory to hold that no truth will permanently satisfy, that all things else

⁶ *The Logical Conditions of Scientific Treatment of Morality*, p. 8.

are in a flux but only pragmatism has come to stay. To guard his position the pragmatist must say that it is simply his working hypothesis that all truths will prove ephemeral; but as a matter of fact he tacitly assumes that some truth at least will be permanently valid, and he might more consistently adopt as his working hypothesis that some human judgments will be abidingly true.

Again, there is a decided tendency among pragmatists to go beyond the hypothesis that the only way to test truth is by an experience of its working, and to assert that truth is a species of utility. Of course this does not necessarily involve the crass utilitarianism that has been charged against pragmatism, but which really belongs to what we have styled pseudo-pragmatism. And yet it is questionable whether pragmatists may not prematurely identify their position with this doctrine, for the following reasons. In the first place the doctrine that truth can be defined accurately and adequately in terms of utility can be established, if at all, only after a thorough analysis of the psychology of meaning and of the judging process, and after an adequate examination of the representational theory of truth. Again, the statement lends itself very readily to misinterpretation on the part of critics, thus hindering the acceptance of what truth there is in pragmatism. In addition to this, when taken as a principle, it tends to lead one into making statements which come dangerously near to pseudo-pragmatism. And, lastly, since one can set forth, as above, the essence of pragmatism without making use of this disputed principle, on the pragmatic ground that no difference should be recognized unless it *makes* a difference, the pragmatist should perhaps content himself with the irreducible minimum definition of pragmatism as the hypothesis that there is no test of truth which is not essentially a test of usefulness in some concrete situation. The *necessary*, that is, what man really *needs* to believe in order to live as he ought, is true. And this fundamental hypothesis of pragmatism is still a working one; it has not been shown to be scientifically untenable.

But even if one should accept the essential postulate of pragmatism, it does not follow that he must accept all that can truly call itself pragmatism. For even in essential pragmatism wide

is the gate and broad is the way that leads to theological destruction, and many are they that enter in thereby.

At the very gateway of pragmatism there is an obvious downward path whose finger-post points in the direction of animalism. It is undoubtedly true that originally consciousness and in man the judging process were valuable chiefly as means of better adjusting the animal organism to its environment, so that the physical life might be preserved and propagated. In that primitive situation the biological function of judgments, that is, the way in which they functioned in the service of the physical life of the individual and of the race, was, roughly speaking, an index to their truth. But when it is assumed that not only then but now and always the only test of truth is its function in man's struggle for physical existence, we have an animalistic pragmatism which cannot be adequate to the demands of man unless he is satisfied to live simply as an animal. In criticism of this type of pragmatism attention may be called to the notorious fact that in conscious life new interests are constantly developing, many of which are not centered in the fate of the physical organism at all. Moreover, these new interests peculiar to man as a spiritual personality may lead to a transvaluation of all former values, so that instead of life being interpreted in its lowest terms, as the physical existence of the individual and of the race, it is interpreted in its highest terms as the spiritual development and efficiency of the individual and society. Then instead of consciousness and judgments being regarded as mere means for the promotion of the physical life, the physical life is regarded as simply or chiefly instrumental in the promotion of the conscious life in its spiritual aspects. The ideal interests no longer exist for the sake of the physical, but the physical life for the sake of the ideal. Or, as Professor Montague puts it, "Man began to think in order that he might eat; he has evolved to the point where he eats in order that he may think."⁷ Instead of the animalistic type, then, we are led to a *humanistic pragmatism*, in which the truth of judgments is tested by their utility in the service of that life of the individual and of society in which all the peculiarly and legitimately human interests are recognized as

⁷ *Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. VI, p. 489.

being of primary importance. Once the ends in view are thoroughly accredited it may be assumed that those judgments that are ultimately necessary for the achievement of these ends are valid. Thus, in the sense of what is humanly necessary, necessity remains the test of the truth of judgments.

But sometimes humanistic pragmatism presents itself in an extremely *individualistic* form. That Dr. Schiller does not entirely escape this is shown by his assertion that two men "with different fortunes, histories, and temperaments *ought not* to arrive at the same metaphysic, nor can they do so honestly."⁸ But over against individualistic pragmatism which would make usefulness or necessity for the individual the sole criterion of truth, pragmatism is coming to state more clearly that it is the function of ideas in the *social* situation that is the test of their truth. For example, Professor A. W. Moore says, "When the pragmatist talks of attention and thought as arising at the point of a need for readjustment, this need must not be taken to mean the need of some one lone, marooned organism or mind *only*. The readjustment is always in and of a 'social situation.'"⁹ The humanistic pragmatism then, to be defensible, must be of the social rather than of the individualistic type. It is not in merely individual but in social utility and necessity that truth is assuredly to be found.

But once more, even this type of humanistic pragmatism may vary according to the interests which are recognized as genuinely and legitimately human. For example, there may develop on the one hand a *positivistic pragmatism*, in which the distinctly religious interest is repudiated, and on the other hand a *religious pragmatism* in which, along with the social, scientific, aesthetic, and moral interests, the distinctly religious interest is recognized as essentially human and valid, so that judgments which are really indispensable to the promotion of the highest type of religious life are regarded as validly claiming our acceptance as true.

Just here is the crux of the question as to the relation of pragmatism to theology. There are some with whom pragmatism is a methodological principle for accrediting the postulates of

⁸ *Studies in Humanism*, p. 18.

⁹ *Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. VI, pp. 382, 383.

religious faith with regard to realities that transcend phenomenal experience. There are others who employ their pragmatism to discredit speculation and assertions about transcendent reality generally; they do not recognize as legitimate and significant for philosophy the religious interest which requires to express itself theologically. But theistic religion must accept, and, I take it, is ready to accept the challenge of pragmatism. Any pragmatic philosophy which is to satisfy the whole man at his highest and best, and the race at its highest and best cannot afford to ignore a religion which meets fundamental spiritual need with abiding satisfaction, and which necessarily expresses itself in a theology for which it just as necessarily claims objective validity.

Now pragmatism in alliance with religion is not a new thing under the sun. Exactly that which gave to the Ritschlian theology its vitality and appeal was its religious pragmatism. But the Ritschlian pragmatism was partial; it was applied to religious judgments only, leaving scientific and philosophical judgments apparently on an entirely different footing. In keeping with this absolute distinction between theoretical and value-judgments, it refused to mediate philosophically between its dogmatics on the one hand and the sciences and philosophy of nature on the other. Its pragmatism was thus dualistic in its tendency. It encouraged the impression that certain judgments were valuable and valid in theology, but not in philosophy. The outcome in many cases was that instead of being a thoroughgoing religious pragmatism to the exclusion of positivism, Ritschlianism became a partial and *dualistic pragmatism*, religious in theology and positivistic in philosophy. This ignoring of the logical principle of contradiction is a characteristic of pseudo-pragmatism. Ritschlianism began well in its pragmatic doctrine of religious value-judgments; it should have gone farther and recognized the pragmatic character of all real live judgments as opposed to fossilized propositions, and then, instead of keeping the religious value-judgments in unhealthy solitary confinement, it should have brought them out into the philosophical arena to try conclusions with other judgments about reality. In other words, Ritschlianism made its chief mistake in not seeking to mediate between the scientific

and religious views of the world, taking the essential ideas of religion as working hypotheses in philosophy.

But it is not to philosophy alone, but to life generally, that we must look for the solution of our ultimate problems. The lack of finality in speculation is due to the limitations of philosophy when abstracted from life. With regard to the most fundamental convictions, what is lacking in philosophical demonstration is to be made up by the demonstration of life. Reflection can never furnish a philosophy of reality which can afford to dispense with its bearing upon the moral well-being of society as a test. And indeed, a philosophy that settled all problems apart from life would be no servant of life, but a substitute therefor, such as mediaeval scholasticism often tended to be.

Still it must be equally emphasized that it is not to life without systematic reflection, such as philosophy is, that we must look. That would not be fulness of life that ruled out philosophy. Life is to be guided by reflectively developed hypotheses which subsequent life experience either confirms or rejects. Or, to state it differently, the verification of consistency is to be regarded as an essential part of the verification of life, for, after all, the interest in consistency or rationality is the interest in harmonizing the various practical interests recognized as valid.¹⁰

Thus it will be seen that the kind of use one makes of pragmatism in philosophy depends upon the kind of interests and purposes one has, and so, ultimately, upon the kind of man one is. He who uses pragmatism—or pseudo-pragmatism, to speak accurately—in order to justify the rejection of scientifically obtained results in any department of human investigation, is dishonest at heart. And on the other hand, as Dr. Schiller significantly says, "A perfect and complete metaphysics is an ideal defined only by approximation, and attainable only by the perfecting of life. For it would be the theory of such a perfect life."¹¹ And, we may add, philosophy must make room for a saving gospel for the individual and society, if it is to be pragmatically verified.

So much then may be expected to result from pragmatism in

¹⁰ Cf. Professor A. K. Rogers, *The Religious Conception of the World*, p. 71—a suggestive book in connection with our present topic.

¹¹ *Studies in Humanism*, p. 21.

epistemology: religious knowledge must be integrated with other knowledge in the final philosophy. If we turn now to a very brief consideration of the bearing of pragmatism upon ontology, we find that the standing of ontology is in dispute among pragmatists; there are some who profess to dispense with it altogether as either unimportant or impossible or fictitious. Nevertheless it must be evident that wherever there is room for epistemology there is room for ontology; if there is knowledge there must be reality known.

Professor Dewey has indicated what he conceives to be the pragmatist theory of reality in two articles entitled respectively, "The Postulates of Immediate Empiricism,"¹² and "Does Reality Possess Practical Character?"¹³ In the former he says that if we want to know what anything is we must go to immediate experience and ask what the thing in question is experienced as. In the latter essay he says that pragmatism means the doctrine that reality possesses practical character; that knowing reality changes it; that, in fact, knowledge is reality changing itself in a definite way. Now it would be very easy to interpret this in terms of a solipsistic pragmatism, according to which reality would be just what the individual takes it to be, and individual psychology would be the only possible ontology.

But the charge of solipsism pragmatists meet with a vigorous disclaimer,¹⁴ and we are given to understand that it is to social psychology that we are to make our ultimate appeal in order to know what reality is. The ideas we use are social products; the realities we recognize are social achievements, and they are what they are to the social consciousness.

But are we to understand then that this exhausts their whole reality? What about realities which we know to exist, but of which humanity has never had immediate experience? What about the center of the earth, the other side of the moon, and the south pole, for instance? It is evident that the postulate of

¹² *Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. II, No. 19.

¹³ *Essays Philosophical and Psychological in Honor of William James*, pp. 53-80.

¹⁴ See, e. g., article by A. W. Moore in *Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. VI, No. 14.

immediate empiricism, while valuable as far as it goes, is not a sufficient criterion for the definition of reality so long as it does not recognize an experience which transcends not only the individual man but all humanity. Common-sense and pragmatism are both right in affirming that we know reality, and that we know it as it is, in immediate experience. But it is equally compatible with common-sense and pragmatism to say that we do not and cannot know reality completely, because we do not experience it fully. But we have to think about this reality which transcends immediate human experience and as a matter of fact we do think of it and have to think of it as it would be to someone to whose experience it was immediately present. Why not assume, then, according to pragmatic principles that this necessary way of thinking it indicates the true way, and that in reality, although not present to immediate human experience, it is immediately present to some experiencing subject?

To sum up then: We have criticized pragmatism as it is and attempted to depict it as it might be and ought to be. Our main results are two. Pragmatic epistemology, to be consistent, must make room in its philosophy for the essential postulates of the religious consciousness. Pragmatic ontology, with its postulate of immediate empiricism, to be consistent, must make room for a philosophy of reality transcending all human experience. These are two points. Taking the shortest distance between these two points we get a straight line indicating that pragmatism *can* furnish a philosophical basis for theology.

THE PRESIDENT: We have heard from Professor Read a very lucid presentation of the ground offered by pragmatism for theology, and the very searching analysis by Professor Macintosh. The subject is so clearly before you that I hope the secretary will have a snowstorm of cards from those who would like to take part in the discussion. While you are preparing those cards, those already invited to open that discussion will be called on, and I will remind them that their time will be five minutes less than that given to the readers of the papers. I will call first on Professor George B. Foster, of the University of Chicago.

PROFESSOR GEORGE B. FOSTER, PH.D.: *Mr. President: Inas-*

much as the authors of these able and instructive papers have elected to begin with the conception of pragmatism, and pass to its bearing upon theology, I think I shall vary the programme by beginning with the conception of theology, and inquire whether pragmatism can render any contribution to theology.

It was remarked by the author of the first paper that no definite literature exhibiting the position of pragmatism, or its attitude toward theology was in evidence. That is quite true, but the reason is significant. Theology being reflection—possibly, I should say, speculation—has been historically most alien to pragmatic interests. The pragmatic interest has been in religion rather than in theology. In so far as pragmatism has concerned itself with theology at all, it has been quite skeptical as to the possibility, certainly the justification, of theology.

Only recently Professor Dewey in a brilliant article in the *Hibbert Journal*, entitled "Is Nature Good?" closed by warning the pragmatists that if they took a certain tack, pragmatism would go the way of theology, he said, meaning by that, that long journey into the bourne whence no traveler returns.

As a matter of fact, thinkers have never been in agreement as to whether there can properly be theology at all or not, and very much of the reflection of theologians has had to do with the justification of the right of theology to be, with somewhat ambiguous success so far. If psychology and history of religions observe, describe, and explain the personal and historical religious experience; and if—a little in advance of these—the science of religion presents, shall I say, the morphology, and physiology of religion, its structure and its function; and if, in addition to this, the philosophy of religion ascertains the validity of the religious idea, and the value of the religious motive, what else is there left for theology to do? Is there any other religious subject-matter than this? Is there any other method of which theology has some sort of esoteric control? Is there a regenerate logic and epistemology different from the unregenerate? It would seem not, and on account of these things one may conclude that there is no subject-matter and no method of which theology has peculiar and exclusive use.

The right of our theology to be, therefore, is not the right

of so-called pure science, but of so-called applied science; and theology must come under the same head with medicine and law and pedagogy. Its justification must be found in its practical ecclesiastical end, rather than in the independence of its subject-matter, or of its method. But it has then the same right to be that medicine and law and pedagogy have so long as we have churches dependent upon pastors, on the supposition that the reality and end with which it has to do are certainly of equal importance with that with which these sciences have to do.

Now, from such a point of view, in its threefold capacity as apologetics, dogmatics, ethics, apologetics is concerned with the certainty or validity of our religious ideas, and dogmatics with the content of our religious faith, looked at from a strictly religious point of view, while Christian ethics treats of the same content viewed from a practical point of view. It will appear therefore that if pragmatism shall have any abiding concern with theology, it must be more fully with apologetic theology, than with either the dogmatic or ethical theology; for pragmatism is a theory of truth, primarily, better, perhaps, it is a search for a new criterion of truth; and searching for a new criterion of truth, it at the same time, simply as implicated with this search, pensions many concepts of reality which have ceased to be true according to the pragmatic test of truth. Now, a possible effect of pragmatism upon theology so understood, since its effect is yet to be seen in the modern world, may perhaps be set forth by reference to pragmatism as it cropped up in a religious way in an era of the ancient Orient more than 2,500 years ago—not quite 2,500 years ago. Gautama Buddha was a pragmatist, and I should like to indicate to you the situation and outcome of the movement then. Preceding him was the period of speculative Brahmanism which arrived at a fixed static absolute, at the All-One engulfing all existence in the way of the famous story of the lion's den in which all tracks entered, but none returned. Gautama Buddha considered his mission as a protest against that absolutism and that idealism. Hence he said that it was not his mission at all to furnish philosophical metaphysical information concerning the last essence of being, or concerning the origin of the world, or concerning the origin of good and evil, inasmuch as these specu-

lative questions did not in any way vitally bear upon the great concern of life as he counted life, namely, release from the pain of existence. And so his was a reform, which, like all reforms, made progress, not by an addition, but by a subtraction, limiting reflection solely to that which had value for experience and eliminating all those concepts, however venerable and sacred, which interfered with, or did not serve, the progress of vital experience as he counted vital. When he was asked certain questions about Nirvana even, he said that it did not make any difference which way the question was answered, inasmuch as the question was not fruitful, either in producing or controlling valuable experience in the world. Such is an illustration from Gautama's pragmatism. It was a reduction of the conceptional burden of life in the interests of practical experiences of redemption and consummation of life as he counted redemption and consummation. It has also an adjustment to the skepticism that had grown up in his day.

Now, the outcome of his movement was significant. This exclusively practical life on the part of Gautama Buddha ended, and I think logically ended, in a system of rules legalistically controlling experience, ended in ascetism and monasticism, ended in the mechanizing and in the ecclesiasticizing of life; ended in casuistry and a system of external control, and it is simply a question now whether exclusive emphasis upon practice, upon work, will not terminate in our case in casuistry, asceticism, and ecclesiastical control, rather than in precisely just that which we have most of all in mind, namely, that we may have life and have it more abundantly. I do not say that it will be so. I say it is something to think about that we may keep our practicisism from making life juiceless and joyless.

Now, our modern pragmatism variously called by radical empiricism, instrumentalism, and humanism is, as a matter of fact, neo-positivism; our modern pragmatism is an extension of the Darwinian theory of the struggle for existence, and of natural selection, to the realm of the spirit. It is biology applied to ideals, standards, and judgments. Whereas once there was a mechanical explanation of the teleology of organisms, there is now teleological explanation of the mechanism of organisms, and that is the

fundamental thing in the whole movement. In psychology pragmatism is voluntarism; in epistemology, it is nominalism; in metaphysics, it is agnosticism; in natural philosophy, it is what Oswald would call energetics; in ethics, it is meliorism, utilitarianism; and in every respect it is anthropomorphizing of existence. And the only question is, since we cannot escape the anthropomorphizing of existence at all—we are built that way—the only question is whether we are going to humanize existence intellectually and have rationalism, or sentimentally and have romanticism, or voluntarily and have pragmatism. Voluntaristic humanization of existence is making our word-view pragmatic.

Now, how does all this square with scientific psychology? According to scientific psychology, there is a moment of intellect, of emotion, and of volition in every pulse of human consciousness. You cannot alienate either of these moments. And their mutual relations are invariable and fixed, except that at one time any one of them may be more vividly in evidence than the others. But while this is true, it is also the verdict of scientific psychology—the great contribution of modern times to the study of man—that primacy belongs to the willing moment of human nature. Therefore in humanizing reality voluntaristically, we do the best that we can do, we make the deepest in us the measure of all things. But inasmuch as we are also intellect and feeling, beginning at that central point of will, pragmatism must improve upon itself—indeed, it has already done so—by intellectualizing and emotionalizing reality. That is, then, interpreting existence in terms of ourselves, we must personize existence. But here possibilities burden, perhaps frighten us. Personalities such as ours are an outcome of the cosmic process. But may they not be transitory by-products? May not the end of the human race be—not a temple of the universe—but a museum visited curiously, perhaps pathetically, by other bearers of cosmic progress, as we now visit the museums of the sub-human and pre-human bearers of life? Or may we think of the universe as structurally and functionally such that it must ever create and conserve the human? Shall we affirm that the essence of the world is a personality-producing essence? Or shall we be able to go what is perhaps a step farther and contend that personality

is not simply the outcome of the cosmic process, not simply a temporary phase of the cosmic process, explicable in terms of the evolutionary hypothesis, but also *Principle* of that process? It is the modern attitude to this great question which has brought on the crisis of all crises in religion. What shall the answer be? The human seems to be but a line in the great cosmic poem or drama or tragedy—however you wish to think of this everlasting mysterious becoming. What right have we to judge the whole scheme and process of things, the whole poem or play—some would say farce, some vaudeville, but some grand opera, indeed—in terms of the line which we are, and on which account alone we know? Some hopeful answer to this question is required if there is to be a theology at all, such as our churches can live upon and work with.

Now, it is here that pragmatism may come in. Not, however, with the assurance which burned in the heart of the faith of the fathers and made them a living fire. Pragmatism, this definitive formation of specifically English philosophy, courageously draws the relativistic consequences of the evolutionary hypothesis and system. Pragmatism is the doctrine of the evolution of the a priori basis of all knowledge and all evaluation. Pragmatism holds that these supreme theoretical and practical principles are nothing but results of the adaptation of the human spirit to the life-conditions of the individual and of the race. Therefore the sense and worth of these principles do not consist in their being truth that is objectively determined. They are at all, and as they are, because they have proven to be effective instruments as man has sought to orient and satisfy and fulfil himself in his situation. Thus the old theoretical concept of truth is gone—seriously gone. No longer the naïve task of bringing ideas into harmony with reality! The essence of truth is not in that. No longer the agreement of ideas among themselves. That is not the basic criterion of truth. But according to the pragmatic hypothesis only those ideas are true which empirically evince themselves to be usable and effective means in the life of conduct.

Now, applying this pragmatic test to the ideas—those three possibilities of interpreting and explaining the world which I was

stating a moment ago, which one of those possibilities is most serviceable? If, accordingly, the basis of the universe is personal, of course we can then have a theology founded upon pragmatism. Even if the universe was not personal in this sense, but personality-producing, we could still have a pragmatic theology. This is about my own position at present.

But, in the vast future transformations and adaptations of human nature, will such theistic or approximately theistic hypothesis—I say hypothesis, for pragmatism knows no “eternal truth”—be a needful function of human life? Pragmatism, being relativism, is agnostic at this point. It is just there that I would leave the matter. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Foster's quotation from Dr. Dewey suggested a half-humorous reflection: To what other bourne would you have theology go than to that from which no traveler returns, namely, heaven. (*Laughter.*) The second appointed speaker is Rev. Clifton D. Gray, Ph.D., pastor of the Stoughton Street Baptist Church, Boston. (*Applause.*)

REV. CLIFTON D. GRAY, PH.D:

CAN PRAGMATISM FURNISH A PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS FOR THEOLOGY?

I have never realized until the present moment how a solitary layman feels who takes part in a discussion where all the other speakers are ministers. I am a layman in philosophy, and make but little, if any, pretension to technical knowledge in this department. You have been listening to those who are qualified to speak as experts. Whatever value there may be in what I have to say will be due, not to any contribution of my own, but to the fact that my point of view is that of any serious-minded person, interested in theology in particular, in so far as it bears directly upon personal religion, and in the movements of philosophy in general, in so far as they affect the ethical and social temper of the present age. This is, I confess at the outset, a very pragmatic attitude toward these sciences, and in this respect no doubt we are all pragmatists. Whether we are in some other senses remains to be seen.

Professor James has defined metaphysics in a well-known phrase as "an unusually obstinate attempt to think clearly and consistently." One cannot read long in the history of philosophy without now and then having the suspicion that it is an unusually obstinate attempt to think with neither clearness nor consistency. Rightly or wrongly, we somehow feel that Browning's line,

Oh, men spin clouds of fuzz where matters end,

is not altogether unjust to the situation. George Eliot has put it even more precisely:

Small words held mighty meanings: Matter, Force,
Self, Not-self, Being, Seeming, Space, and Time—
Plebeian toilers on the dusty road
Of daily traffic, turned to Genii
And cloudy giants darkening sun and moon.

In the light of this, it may seem to some a rather useless task—this attempt to bring philosophy down from the stars to the city streets. That it is a difficult one cannot be denied, but it ought not to be more difficult for the average man to get into touch with the "world" of philosophy than it has been for philosophers to get into touch with the "world" of the average man. One of the greatest needs of philosophy today is its popularization, the careful translation of its technical concepts into the language of those of ordinary education. For science this is already being accomplished; for philosophy it has hardly been begun. This reason alone would justify the present discussion, and all the more because of the claim of pragmatism to be a popular philosophy. But there is a still more cogent reason, which I can best give you in the classic words of Francis Bacon: "Howsoever these things are in men's depraved judgments and affections, yet truth, which only doth judge itself, teacheth that the inquiry of truth, which is the lovemaking or wooing of it, the knowledge of truth, which is the presence of it, and the belief of truth, which is the enjoying of it, is the sovereign good of human nature." You see, therefore, that it is no idle problem that confronts us.

The best approach to the discussion of the question at issue is a brief survey of the significant events of the world of thought in the last half of the nineteenth century. To some of these

reference has already been made, but for the sake of clearness I ask you to look at two important considerations.

1. The first is the growth of the biological sciences, the starting-point of which, as you know, was the publication just fifty years ago of Darwin's famous book and which has since affected every department of human thought. In two rather important particulars it has changed greatly our conceptions. (a) That old friend of ours, the human mind, with its ancient endowment of abstract faculties, has been relegated to the Museum of Philosophical Antiquities, and we now study in lieu thereof the phenomena of consciousness from the biological point of view. Thus it has come about that functional psychology has raised the black flag against metaphysics, and has claimed not a little of the territory formerly under the latter's suzerainty. Logic, aesthetics, and ethics, from this point of view, have become simply elaborated forms of the psychology of judgment, feeling, and volition, respectively. Even metaphysics has been called upon to abdicate and become nothing more than the psychology of cognition. In other words, under the influence of the biological sciences the attempt is being made to subsume all reality under terms of experience. (b) No less radical a change has been brought about by the same process in the field of history. All human customs, social, ethical, religious, are subjected to the keenest of analysis, and the genetic method is the method of the hour. The result of this has been to discredit absolutism in philosophy on the one hand and dogmatism in theology on the other. Systematic theology has given place to what the Germans call *religionsgeschichtliche Methode*. Truth is no longer conceived of as static, but dynamic. The so-called laws of science are seen to be nothing more than convenient, shorthand symbols for summing up and unifying experience.

2. While this revolution has been going on in the realm of thought, human society has been passing through an equally remarkable series of changes. Politically it has been the day of democracy, ever growing in strength and becoming more and more impatient of authority. It has also been the day of marvelous achievement in the physical sciences, when men as never before have controlled and utilized the forces of nature for their

own ends. In consequence of this there has arisen an exalted belief in human power, which refuses to recognize any non-human limitations. This in its turn has reacted upon our reflective thinking, with the result that we are inclined, as Schopenhauer did, to subordinate the intelligence to the will and to set great store by the prevailing voluntaristic psychology. The philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche is thoroughly characteristic of an age when men believe they have become super-men, and no God is worshiped but Success, whose followers are not the weak, but the strong.

This is the *milieu* in which current theology finds herself. All the old props are slipping away. Like a New Bedford whaler, tied up to the wharf for the last quarter of a century, and unexpectedly put into commission for a new voyage, theology has exchanged the quiet harbor of her institutions and axioms for a sea full of unknown perils, and is in constant danger of being run down by strange craft. It is not that the ship is without a rudder, but that theology has not yet gotten her bearings. She is still making a circle in the fog. She hears certain sounds, but cannot tell exactly whence they come. It is not strange, therefore, that some on board the ship have turned to pragmatism in the hope that it may set her once more upon her proper course. What is the justification of their hope?

Pragmatism has many aspects. Giovanni Papini says that it cannot be defined, but follows this statement immediately with a very full description of its attitude toward almost everything under the sun. Perhaps he fairly represents the vigorous Italian variety of this popular philosophy. Of two things at least we may be certain. Those who have studied pragmatism on the outside have very diverse opinions as to its tendencies. This diversity of judgment is due in no small measure to the fact that it has not been thoroughly worked out. Its supporters have been obliged to give so much time to controversial aspects of the subject that they have not been able as yet either to clarify their own ideas on many vital matters or to present a thoroughly consistent theory. We are, therefore, evidently dealing with what is by no means a well-defined and certain tendency of modern philosophy. The baby is yet too young to know what sort of a boy

it will turn out to be. The answer to our question depends entirely upon what we mean by pragmatism.

Of pragmatism as a method in philosophy many favorable things can be said. Men's ways of thinking are like clothes. The latest style is but an ancient one come again into fashion. Long ago Plato gave utterance to a famous dictum which has since become the watchword of the new movement: *πάντων χρημάτων μέτρον ἄνθρωπον εἶναι* ("man is the measure of all things"). That which commends it most is its emphasis upon the practical character of our knowledge, a matter which philosophers have rarely denied, but have frequently forgotten. We cannot too quickly banish the abstract from our thinking. Furthermore, pragmatism has rendered a most valuable service to philosophy by its insistence upon the concrete, psychological nature of our human truths. That old Platonic world of innate ideas seems as strange to us today as one of Cimabue's alter-pieces. Thus a way has been opened for a process of discrimination between matters of opinion which are genuinely vital and matters which are of a trivial nature, or, to use a technical phrase, pragmatism is a method which determines the relative importance of propositions.

From this standpoint, pragmatism cannot fail to have anything but a wholesome effect upon theology, who, like her sister science, metaphysics, has often wandered in the arid alkali of speculation. It is good that both return to the places where men dwell. But it may fairly be asked whether this is due to something which is peculiar to pragmatism itself, or rather to something quite outside this particular movement in philosophy and at whose breast other lusty infants beside pragmatism are receiving nourishment. Perhaps we shall find that functional psychology is the nurse of pragmatism as well as of current theology.

The heart of pragmatism is its theory of the nature of truth. That is true, it says, which can be defined in terms of experience. This statement in itself is innocent enough, but when it is explained serious difficulties present themselves. Starting with the practical or instrumental origin of truth, as disclosed by a teleological psychology, pragmatism makes a thoroughgoing application of this to a theory of knowledge. "If truth originates as

a means for the control of experience as an instrument to guide to useful action, then the obvious test of truth will be its success in the accomplishment of its practical purpose." In other words, truth is that which will "work," that which is in the long run useful, not to the individual alone but to society at large—*Was fruchtbar ist, das allein ist wahr*. The only way, therefore, to conceive of truth is to think of the practical consequences which follow from possessing true ideas.

This is the citadel around which the warfare has waged most hotly, and not without considerable success on the part of the besieging army. From the point of view of abstract logic, the keenest attack is a paper by Mr. G. E. Moore recently read before the Aristotelian Society of London. We may not enter into the pros and cons of this discussion except to remark that the defenders of pragmatism as a logical theory fail apparently to distinguish between the real nature of truth and the test of its validity, and that they seem to identify the process of proving an idea true with the process of making it true.

Pragmatism has not offered us as yet a theory of knowledge that is not open to serious objection, but even if it should ultimately do so, I have grave doubts whether it will ever furnish a philosophical basis for theology. The very form of the question under discussion is highly inconsistent and at variance with the fundamental principle which underlies both pragmatism and functional psychology. The word "basis" is not to be found in the pragmatists' vocabulary, at least in its usual sense. We mean by the word "basis" something fixed, permanent, that upon which a structure may be raised, and in the present connection a foundation upon which to build our reasoned-out thoughts about God, duty, and immortality. But pragmatism tells us that we do not live in a static world, that truth is not fixed, but fluid, that reality itself is something that grows. It is like the rip off No Man's Land where the tide ebbs and flows twice in twenty-four hours. The subject-matter of theology itself is carried along with the current. It is literally *current*, flowing theology, here today, yonder tomorrow. The only basis that pragmatism can offer to theology is that there is no basis.

We must doubtless become reconciled to this aspect of reality.

We have long recognized the gradual and continuous unfolding of Christian doctrine, but not for a moment have we imagined that this was a modification in reality itself, but was rather a change in our own conceptions of truth. But pragmatism tells us that truth itself grows, and that we have something to do with its growth.

No one can deny that the study of theology from the functional point of view has given to faith a philosophic standing which it has never before possessed. The postulates of religion are seen to rest upon an equally valid basis with those of science, all of them being essentially matters of faith and awaiting verification at the bar of experience. The emotional and volitional interests, long held in bondage to the tyranny of abstract reasoning, have at last come to their own. The impulses of religion seem thus to have been a constituent and even necessary part in that slow and never-ending process of development of which the human mind is the highest product. Put to the test of serviceability, the place of religion holds its own with science, contributing also its share to the successful achievements effectuated by the ideals of the human race. These are great gains. But is this the end of the story?

The gist of this point of view which I have just outlined can best be put in a quotation from a recent book, with the main conclusion of which I am totally at variance, for the author of which, however, I hold the warmest admiration because of his fearless and unsparing honesty in laying bare some of the deepest problems confronting our theology. "If religion stands the test by which you try every other human creation—namely, the test of contributing to the rich and full development of the ideal interest of humanity—if, in a word, religion stands the test of workability and of service equally with other subjective creations like art and language and morality, what more have we a right to demand?"

This question which Professor Foster asks lays open the marrow of the problem at present under discussion. What does religion become under the implication of this statement? The answer is plain. Such a point of view puts religion into the same category with aseptic surgery, symphony concerts, express

steamers to Europe, and a thousand other equally valuable products of human need. What more have we a right to demand? It is true that men have made gods just as they have made signposts. Both have been useful adjuncts to the development of the human race, in spite of the fact that neither gods nor signposts have always told the truth. The fact that a signpost says the distance is one mile when it is really two is not specially important. If you keep on, you will get there anyway. The deeply significant thing about a signpost is the direction of the finger. It points to something *beyond*. The deeply significant thing about the gods which men have made is that they, like signposts, point to something *beyond*.

This is precisely what functional psychology denies. Pragmatism has a strong aversion for *metaphysics*. It points to nothing *beyond*. While it indignantly repudiates solipsism, it denies the existence of any truth that is trans-experimental. It would hardly be fair to say that it is a twentieth-century revival of what Carlyle called "pig-philosophy," but it does shut up humanity in a huge prison with no windows open to the greater world beyond. The prisoners may dream of the green fields of Eden, and functional psychology says that the dreams are just as valid as, nay, *are* reality itself.

Before closing, I wish to turn aside to make the briefest reference to what is, in my mind, the most important aspect of the entire subject, but which is only indirectly connected with the particular question at issue. I mean the ethical problem. This is the point at which pragmatism as a philosophy comes immediately into touch with human life. From the point of view of pragmatism absolute truth is a fiction of the mind. The values of an action determine its truth, not vice versa. Life consists in results—by these it is to be judged. Right and wrong do not belong to the vocabulary of pragmatism. I am indebted to a friend for suggesting a very interesting analogy between the ethical aspects of pragmatist philosophy and the Jesuit theory of probabilism, both of which are based upon the assumption that exact knowledge is impossible. Philosophy makes queer bedfellows. Ignatius Loyola and William James are as far apart as black from white, but when the latter says that the true is the

expedient in our way of thinking, he is making a statement capable of ethical implications not dissimilar to those regulative principles which commended themselves to the founder of the Society of Jesus. Of all the strange things that have sprung out of this wooden horse, the strangest of all is the casuistic ethics of the sixteenth-century doctors of the church.

To sum up the entire matter in a word: Pragmatism cannot furnish a philosophical basis for theology without being fundamentally, not only from the logical but from the metaphysical point of view, inconsistent with itself. No matter how exalted or transcendently holy are the gods it offers us, they are still made, not as of old by human hands, but by human minds. Pragmatism apparently hesitates to make that leap from the self to the not-self, which we all sooner or later must make to avoid the insanity of solipsism. On the other hand and over against this point of view, the inalienable moment of the deepest religious conviction is the belief in the existence of an eternal reality, upon whom we may depend, to whom we may go, and of whom theology may predicate at least some things of certitude. Our highest thoughts about God are more than the palace of music reared by Abt Vogler, never to be again! Seated with him at the organ, after the last echoes have died away, our souls shall sing with his:

Therefore to whom turn I but to thee, the ineffable Name?

Builder and maker, thou, of houses not made with hands!

All we have willed or hoped or dreamed of good shall exist:

Not its semblance, but itself; no beauty, nor good, nor power

Whose voice has gone forth, but each survives for the melodist

When eternity affirms the conception of an hour.

The high that proved too high, the heroic for earth too hard,

The passion that left the ground to lose itself in the sky,

Are music sent up to God by the lover and the bard;

Enough that he heard it once: we shall hear it by and by.

THE PRESIDENT: Drs. Johnston and Lawson have been soliciting cards indicating the willingness of those present to participate in the discussion, but up to this moment none has reached the chairman.

DR. RUFUS P. JOHNSTON: I cannot get any cards, so I will hand you my own.

I am not so sure that pragmatism will furnish a basis for theology, but I am sure that it furnishes a solvent for a good deal of it, a dissolver for a great deal of it, and I am very much interested in the question as to whether pragmatism will furnish, not a basis for theology, but a guide, and an assistant in practical application of teachings and of doctrines to the life we are trying to live. I think that our Savior was a pragmatist when he said, "By their fruits ye shall know them," and if we should apply that test to a vast deal of our dogmatics and of our creeds and of our teachings, I wonder how much of them we would have to throw overboard in our own denomination. Not trenching on the subject that will come, possibly tomorrow evening, how much would we have to throw over if we put it to the test of the superiority of the fruit it produces in the actual practical life of the man and woman who make the profession? Whether pragmatism will furnish a basis for theology, or not, I do not know, because I am neither a philosopher nor a theologian, but I am quite sure that if a doctrine which we continue to preach and which we hold as divine, and specific in our denomination, does not result in a higher type of Christianity than is to be found in other denominations, we may take it as pretty sure that the doctrine does not meet the highest test of truth. And so it seems to me that apart from the philosophical and theological side of this question, there is a very practical side of it which we could discuss, and which we could put into practice with a great deal of benefit to our denomination, as well as in our own individual lives. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: The evening session will take place at eight o'clock in this audience room. The topic, one that we may expect to attract a large audience, is, "Is the Present Tendency Toward a Co-operative Social Order Desirable?" I presume that under that long title "Co-operative Social Order," something like socialism is hinted at. The audience will be adjourned after the benediction by Dr. McArthur.

REV. DR. R. S. MACARTHUR then pronounced the benediction. An adjournment was here taken until eight o'clock P. M.

FIRST DAY
Evening Session
November 9, 1909
8 o'clock P. M.

THE PRESIDENT: We will be led in prayer by Rev. Dr. T. Edwin Brown, of Philadelphia.

DR. T. EDWIN BROWN then offered prayer.

THE PRESIDENT: We will proceed at once with the topic of the session: "Is the Present Tendency Toward a Co-operative Social Order Desirable?" The first reader is Rev. Harrie R. Chamberlin, of Morgantown, West Virginia.

REV. HARRIE R. CHAMBERLIN read the following paper:

IS THE PRESENT TENDENCY TOWARD A
CO-OPERATIVE SOCIAL ORDER DESIRABLE?

Our theme tonight is not the *fact* of the drift in modern society toward socialism. We assume at the outset, what all thoughtful men must perceive, the presence through all our civilization of a strong impulse toward a co-operative social order flooding in like a rising tide. As Dr. Washington Gladden said recently, "All the signs indicate that modern society is being forced by the disastrous failure of the methods of strife to entertain the possibility of co-operation as the fundamental social law."

After we accept that fact I must admit that it may seem to some absurd and futile to ask whether that fact is to our liking. If we argue that the socialistic tendency is undesirable we may find ourselves in the difficult position of Mrs. Partington by the seashore facing a similar "tendency." After all our protests there is sure to be some troublesome socialist in the audience to rise with the disconcerting question, "But what are you going to do about it?" And, on the other hand, if we approve the tendency we only lay ourselves open to that dry and biting comment of Thomas Carlyle, when someone told him that Margaret Fuller had said, "I accept the universe." Carlyle's brief response was, "Gad, she'd better."

There is, however, one other attitude—not acquiescence, but

enthusiastic faith in socialism as expressing a large part of our hope for the future of the world. I do not approve of everything that claims the name of socialism. A Christian ought to understand above all others that the ideas and ideals of a great movement have a right to broad and adequate interpretation. Neither Christianity nor socialism ought to be judged by the assertions and arguments of narrow-minded and intolerant advocates, however earnestly such men may claim to be the only orthodox, the true defenders of the faith. Socialism as much as Christianity has suffered from the hard dogmatism of some of its exponents. Socialism also has harbored prosaic souls who have tried to reduce its noble vision of the "Comrade Kingdom" to the description of certain stiff and mechanical arrangements for the Socialist State—arrangements that would make it as a place of residence rather less desirable than the heaven of certain Christian writers. But socialism broadly and worthily interpreted is more than a new system of economics, or a new conception of history, or an opportunist political programme with a definite aim, or a specific ideal for the future organization of industrial society. Like our Christian faith socialism surpasses the eloquence of its most brilliant advocates and the insight of its wisest teachers.

I am prepared to state frankly, therefore, at the outset, that I believe the tendency toward a broadly defined socialism is desirable. And I will try to defend my faith by presenting three definite contributions that the socialist philosophy has made to my Christian interpretation of the social order. Socialism gives a clear diagnosis of the inherent wrong of our present economic order. In its immediate aims and methods socialism expresses the best idealism of our time, and, finally, socialism shows the essential part that Christianity must take in the coming stage of social evolution, and thereby reveals the next great enterprise of the Christian church.

I. Socialism gives a clear diagnosis of the inherent wrong of our present economic order. Not that this evil is the only one in our modern world. Christian teachers maintain with truth that there are inherent evils in the hearts of individuals which no ideal social arrangements will eradicate. But the socialist replies that there is also a fundamental wrong in our present economic

system which casts a blight over the lives of all men, good and bad, rich and poor alike, and which might be remedied.

Let me try to show in a paragraph the socialist's view of our modern world.

Whenever a society reaches the stage of a commercial civilization, and above all in our own age of machinery, the distribution of the products of labor becomes highly complex. Capital, the necessary social tool of production, becomes concentrated in relatively few hands. Presently the return paid to capital from being the reward of abstinence and industry becomes increasingly the reward of foresight and greed and even of chance. Only by eternal vigilance can society prevent its public resources, which are potential capital, from being appropriated by individuals and used for private benefit. From the unearned increment of land and public franchises, capital now grows of itself with increasing rapidity. And presently its greatest aggregations, becoming larger year by year from sheer momentum, come to be inherited in fortunate families precisely as was despotic power in a former age. And capital then becomes no longer money, but a new kind of power, the right of a private individual to tax up to the limit of revolt the masses of the people.

We may not stop to think of the evils that flow indirectly from such a capitalistic régime. The appetite for profits grows by what it feeds upon. And every movement for social betterment finds the interests of capital as such arrayed squarely against it. But to speak of the direct social result of capitalism. It is more and more completely a denial of that equality of opportunity which is democracy. When some men come to citizenship equipped with all that wealth can give, and when other men are handicapped at the start because they have not had the chance to get an adequate education or the opportunity to choose a congenial occupation, when they are hampered by meager wages and the constant fear which the possibility of loss of work imposes, when the thought of the coming of old age brings only anxiety and dread, there can be no equality.

Then going deeper to that human relation in which a man ought to face his fellows as a brother upon equal terms, capitalism prevents real brotherhood. In the words of Professor Rauschen-

busch, it is "a prime divisive force in actual life. It wedges society apart in horizontal strata between which real fellow-feeling is paralyzed." In the simple life of a small community this may not be felt so keenly. But in the life of a great modern city the barriers are hard as steel.

Now Christianity has always had a blind perception of something wrong in the relations of rich and poor. In the times of her clearest insight she has repeatedly developed a spirit of distrust and antagonism toward wealth. All of the monastic orders, founded by earnest Christian men who were seeking in evil times to realize in small societies withdrawn from the world the spirit of Jesus, made the vow of poverty a prime essential. There could be no rich and poor in a truly Christian brotherhood. In that morning glow of love and faith in which the Christian church in Jerusalem was born, for those who believed, to be "together" and to have "all things common" seemed the inevitable expression of their new Christian spirit. The fact that as their numbers grew the Christian brotherhood could not maintain a family relation so naively simple detracts no whit from the ideal beauty of the picture.

And then there is the teaching of Christ himself. It is time we were done trying to reconcile the selfishness of individualism with the spirit of Jesus. It may be true that the "needle's eye" means only a comparatively small gate through which a humble-minded camel might readily pass. Those most caustic words of Jesus about the rich that Luke records may perhaps be whittled down a good deal by skilful exegesis, or even laid gracefully aside by vague references to Ebionitic sources. But the most ingenious commentator cannot entirely eliminate a spirit which pervades the whole gospel story. What is the obvious reason why Jesus would not allow the rich young man to become a disciple bringing his wealth with him? The man was worthy and sincere. Is not Professor Rauschenbusch's explanation the most natural, when he maintains it was because Jesus knew that one rich man would destroy the simple fellowship of their little company? In a phrase, for one man to be rich and his neighbor to be poor is unbrotherly. And Christianity is the very spirit of brotherliness. That all men are brothers is Jesus' first deduction

from his great teaching that God is the Father of all men. But a rich man and a poor man, the rich man living partly on the labor of the poor man, cannot be brothers.

Now socialism points out clearly this inherent contradiction between our present economic order and a truly Christian society. It has no quarrel with the rich man as an individual. He is often a man of great ability, perhaps as an organizer and administrator most useful to society. His opportunities of travel and of wide acquaintance usually make him personally agreeable and often a man of genuine culture. He may even feel the anomaly of his position as a rich man and a Christian and endeavor to make to society the only reparation in his power by using his wealth wisely and for the good of all. But he is none the less the product of a system that is evil because it is based upon essential injustice.

And this economic system, urges socialism, because it is unjust injures all that it touches. It harms the rich man by putting in his hand an unrestrained and lawless power. It narrows and debases the life of the poor man whom it daily robs. As the wise man said of old and as Dr. Devine has lately verified, "the destruction of the poor" is not their laziness or their intemperance, but "their poverty." And because it is the enthronement of a wrong it corrupts the whole community. As Mr. Gifford Pinchot said the other day in New Orleans, "The present economic order, with its face turned away from equality of opportunity, involves a bitter moral wrong, which must be corrected for moral reasons and along moral lines."

II. Second, in its immediate aims and methods socialism expresses the best idealism of our time. We need not dwell now on the ultimate aims of socialism. To criticize the Utopian dreams of individual socialists is quite beside the point. It is enough to say that socialism aims at equality of opportunity through eliminating the unequal handicap of private capital, and seeks to make possible among all men real brotherhood, through making labor a direct service to society instead of a competitive struggle for personal advantage. Socialist writers are becoming more and more modest in their forecasts of the distant future.

Interest is now centered on the next steps and the means by which these may be realized.

This, to be sure, marks a striking change in the attitude of socialism. It began with the expectation of an almost immediate revolution. Mr. John Spargo has described how vivid was this hope at the first.

I remember [he says] that when I joined the Socialist movement, many years ago, the Revolution was a very real event, inevitable and nigh at hand, to most of us. The more enthusiastic of us dreamed of it; we sang songs in the spirit of the *Chansons Revolutionnaires*, one of which, as I recall, told plainly enough what we would do "when the Revolution comes." Some comrades actually wanted to have military drill at our business meetings, merely that we might be ready for the Revolution, which might occur any Monday morning or Friday afternoon.¹

It is not for us Christians to doubt either the sincerity or the high idealism of all this. Our Christian faith began with a very similar eschatology. Mindful of our own past we can afford to have sympathy for those who, feeling keenly the evil of this present age, looked for the bloodiest of revolutions to overturn it all in a moment and usher in the better day. Even now there crops out occasionally among sincere and tender-hearted Christians the expectation and hope for a millennium soon to be ushered in by a series of world-catastrophes beside which the dreams of the socialist revolution fade into insignificance.

But just as we Christians have become more modest in our knowledge of God's plans for the future, so the socialist programme is becoming in the minds of its wisest teachers less comprehensive and omniscient. And the socialist, in common with all thoughtful men, now trusts in the universal methods of evolution. Mr. Spargo, whose earlier expectation I have just quoted, writes thus of his present hope:

What we must bear in mind is that the social fabric of tomorrow, like that of yesterday, whose ruins we contemplate today, will not spring up complete, in response to our will, but will grow out of social experience and needs.²

¹ John Spargo, *Socialism*, p. 324.

² *Ibid.*, p. 280.

So also writes that brilliant English socialist, Mr. H. G. Wells:

Socialism is no garment made and finished that we can reasonably ask the world to wear forthwith. It is not that its essentials remain in doubt, it is not that it does not stand for things supremely true, but that its proper method and its proper expedients have still to be established. . . . The battle for socialism is to be fought not simply at the polls and in the market-place, but at the writing-desk and in the study. To many questions the attitude of socialism today is one of confessed imperfection.⁸

A like change must be noted in the modern socialist's analysis of the factors of social evolution. The first presentation of the materialist conception of history was rightly criticized for ignoring the factor of human will and effort. But to call even Marx's faith in evolution fatalism does his thought injustice. We might equally well call the Book of Revelation fatalism. Marx firmly believed that the ideal social order would surely come, regardless of human help or opposition, and expressed that faith in what we call the inadequate terms of science. The author of the Apocalypse had the same sort of hope, and expressed it in the personal language of religion.

But socialism rapidly learned the same lesson that Christianity learned before it. Evolution does go forward. God's purpose in the world is fulfilled. But men are the means. We Christians believe in the certain coming of God's kingdom among men. And yet we daily pray, "Thy kingdom come." And century after century brave-hearted men and women have in every land laid down their lives in the great world-enterprise of bringing that hope to realization. We have learned that faith and works go together. Sometimes we can bend all our energies to the task of pressing forward toward the high ideal. And sometimes we confront the dark waters of an open lead, and can only wait until it closes again and the road is clear to the pole of our endeavor. Socialism now accepts this paradox which all Christians understand. And it too makes the sure expectation of the final triumph of the cause the motive to inspire the enthusiastic loyalty and devotion of its followers.

⁸ H. G. Wells, *New Worlds for Old*, p. 222.

It is because of this larger interpretation of its own philosophy that socialism as a movement is coming now into close touch with all the ideal movements of our own time, and its spirit is being diffused among all earnest men. Whatever may have been true of its early aims as a class movement, it ought now to be recognized as wholly a democratic movement. Much objection to it has arisen from a false conception that socialism was to be imposed upon an unwilling society. It must at last be imposed, I fear, upon a few; just as the present law of the land concerning burglary has to be imposed today upon a few unusually energetic individualists. But socialism must be self-imposed upon the great majority of men before it can succeed. And its spirit of devotion to the good of all alike, kindling men's hearts to loyalty and willing service, must permeate the socialist state. Marx himself recognized in part this need, and said to his followers that it would take fifty years, "not only to change existing conditions but to change yourselves, and make yourselves worthy of political power."⁴ "A compulsory religion," someone has said, "is the same as no religion at all." In the same sense a compulsory socialism is no socialism at all.

And from the recognition of this truth modern socialism is also increasingly opportunist and Fabian. It does not propose to wait until all have come up to the socialist ideals of brotherhood and mutual service before incorporating the spirit of brotherhood into the social order. But each step in the long process is made possible by the hearty approval and support of the majority of men toward the steps already taken. And the successful working of each application of socialism will prepare the way for further advance.

Like feudalism in the different countries of Europe, socialism will probably come in different ways and take on different forms. Perhaps only very slowly will these be amalgamated into one. It may be that the socialist parties in the various countries will have small share in its actual adoption. In England the Liberal party is now doing most to further the socialist programme. In Germany the Emperor, in his effort to weaken the socialist forces, is himself carrying into effect their measures. In the United

⁴ Quoted in Spargo, *op. cit.*, p. 327.

States socialism as a political force is still very weak. But it may well be that not only the remarkable growth of our great trusts, but even such anti-socialist plans as that of the United States Steel Corporation in selling stock under favorable conditions to their employees may actually prove to be long steps toward socialism. When the control of capital and the ownership of capital become widely separated socialism is almost here. But whether friend or foe be the agency at work, the socialist is content if he can only see the cause go forward. The ultimate goal may be more distant than we thought at first; it may be that we cannot see into the future as far or as clearly as we once believed; but we are on the road.

III. Last, socialism shows the essential part that Christianity must take in the coming stage of social evolution, and thereby reveals the next great enterprise of the Christian church. The finding of a place for religion among the factors of social progress has been a curious story. The first evolutionists were not inclined to give it any place at all. Then came a strange doctrine perhaps best developed in Benjamin Kidd's *Social Evolution*. Civilization, he taught, proceeds in common with all living forms according to the law of the survival of the fittest. But as society becomes self-conscious in its members the less fit individuals become restive at a régime which so completely ignores their personal aspirations. The survival of the fittest is a beneficial and beautiful law—except to the unfit. But among such unfortunates Christianity, with its promise of another and happier world beyond for the meek and lowly ones of earth, becomes a soothing medicine to quiet their restlessness. To use the figure of another, it makes the less perfect roses more contented to be prematurely plucked for the sake of producing thereby one full-blown American beauty. So Christianity is useful to evolution in that it persuades its adherents patiently to submit to the ruthless sacrifices the stern law of progress demands.

In comparison with this the ordinary individualist philosophy is far more worthy of respect. Here the work given to religion is at least honest and humane. Instead of duping its adherents to their own destruction religion leads them to strive to mitigate as much as possible the stern stress of competition. Like the

rule-makers for football, religion tries to get laws adopted which will make the game of life somewhat less brutal. It provides for certain institutions like Sunday, which from the industrial viewpoint is a sort of intermission for rest between the halves. Like the football referee, religion tries to penalize certain overt acts in the competitive strife as unfair among gentlemen—if they are seen. Like the crowded bleachers religion applauds courage and endurance, sometimes the pluck of the defeated, almost always the success of those who win. And like the physician in attendance by prearrangement, religion hurries first upon the field to assuage, if may be, the sufferings of those thrown down and trampled in the strife. And how many there are beaten down in the terrible struggle—the sick and the injured, the ill-trained and the inefficient, women and children and old men who can work no longer, all sorts of failures and broken men left behind upon the field as our reckless, heartless civilization sweeps forward on its triumphant way! To do all this is indeed a noble task for religion, and so long as injustice and misery endure Christianity must stand ever ready to protect the weak and to raise up the fallen.

But for us Christians who have caught something of Jesus' enthusiasm for the kingdom of God it seems impossible that there is no place for us upon the fighting line. For an energy so strong and vital as Christianity there must be some essential place among the forces that make for social progress. The socialist philosophy finds for religion just such a place and makes our Christian motive necessary to its success. We have come now, says socialism, to a stage of evolution where other factors enter besides the stern law of competition. A new self-respect in the individual, the struggle for the life of others side by side with the old struggle for personal advantage—these now have their place in the law of progress. And the only motive able to make these forces effective is religion.

There is the restraining influence of the new self-respect and personal aspiration that religion gives. Malthus a hundred years ago showed truly that population will increase to the limit of the possibility of human existence. The first inference from this was that false one that to help the poor was therefore of no

avail. They will only increase in numbers till they are as badly off as they were at first. A later and truer observation was that the level of what is regarded as a "bare existence" is gradually rising. In Malthus' day it was vastly higher than in the times of our first savage ancestors. Since his day it has risen higher still, and it is yet rising. Whenever a minimum wage is established in an industry it recognizes and legalizes the fact that a decent living on a less income than that minimum is not possible. And the motive power behind this constant rise of the minimum that makes life worth while is a moral and religious one. We see it strikingly illustrated in the rapid rise of the standards of living in every heathen community where Christianity is established. One may note it among the genuine converts in every mission church in our cities. Shortly after a man in the slums becomes a Christian he is almost sure to move away to a better neighborhood. Now socialism requires an almost universal demand for this higher standard of living. Unless it can supply this insistent ambition to all, social progress must drop back to dependence on the iron law of struggle. And to provide this aspiration religious faith has so far proved to be the only adequate and constant motive.

Finally, in socialism is the first practical recognition of altruism as a necessary factor in social progress. Since Henry Drummond developed the doctrine that as civilization advances the struggle for the life of others plays an ever-increasing part, this factor of social evolution has in theory been accepted. But only socialism has taken it seriously, has shown faith in it as a present force among men, and has prophesied the coming of a time when even in the economic field it should become the dominant force.

Socialism has recalled the large part that altruism has already played in history. It has told how even primitive man labored and sacrificed first for his family, and by successive steps for his tribe, for his nation, for his fellow-men. And on the belief that this motive among men is always growing stronger—the love of the mother for the child, the care of the father for his home, the loyalty of the tribesman to his clan, the devotion of the patriot to his nation, all these coming into largest expression in the allegiance of the citizen to the socialist state—upon this faith

the hope of socialism is based. And these are every one moral motives, fostered above all by our Christian faith, and finding in the thought of the Fatherhood of God and the consequent brotherhood of man their perfect justification. Socialism and Christianity are thus found to be complementary. Socialism has given to a Christianity that too long cherished only an other-worldly hope, a new vision of what it will mean when God's will is done on earth. And Christianity alone can give to socialism the motives adequate to its realization.

I have tried to show that socialism gives in clear economic terms a genuinely Christian view of our present social order, and that it also greatly enriches our Christian thought of that ideal society which is to come. Let me briefly summarize my argument. Socialism presents a clear diagnosis of the moral wrong in our economic system of which Christian consciousness is already vaguely aware. Socialism, because it combines radical aims with methods which are evolutionary, democratic, and opportunist, is in accord with the only way of social progress. And socialism gives to Christianity, as the individualist philosophy does not, a significant place among the positive and essential forces that are to bring in the new order.

It has become a commonplace for Christian teachers to assert that while socialism would be ideal, yet it will not work without the Christian motive. As a socialist I admit that this is true. But as a Christian I add that if socialism does express the Christian ideal then we ought to begin to supply that motive. Instead of treating socialism as only a beautiful dream of the far-distant future the Christian ought to be working for its coming. Already we delayed too long. Would that we might learn the spirit of the young Russian about whom Miss Jane Addams told in her *Newer Ideals of Peace*. He belonged to that strange sect called Doukhobors, who believe in non-resistance. On his refusal to enter the army he was brought for trial before a judge who reasoned with him about the folly of his course, and in return received from the young man a homily on the teachings of Jesus. "Quite right you are," said the judge, "from the point of abstract virtue, but the time has not yet come for us to practice the literal sayings of Christ." "The time may not have come

for you, your Honor," was the answer, "but the time has come for us."

For all of us who believe that in the strife and the injustice and the widespread suffering of our present social order God's will is not being done, but that it ought to be done and in large measure can be done, for us the time has come to enter on that noblest enterprise. The old order is already dying of its own brutality and human cost. The new order is waiting to be born. If we Christians really hold in our hands, as we profess to do, the leaven that some day will transform society, we ought to thrust it deep into the life of our industrial and social order now. If the power of a new life for our old world has indeed been entrusted to us, then for the love of God and for the love of our fellow-men let us begin to use it.

THE PRESIDENT: The second writer on the theme is the highly honored and beloved dean of the Rochester Theological Seminary, Mr. J. W. A. Stewart. (*Applause.*)

DEAN J. W. A. STEWART, D.D., Rochester Theological Seminary, then presented the following paper:

IS THE PRESENT TENDENCY TOWARD A CO-OPERATIVE SOCIAL ORDER DESIRABLE?

I would suggest that there is an ambiguity in the question. A *tendency* may be desirable, and yet the specific goal to which it tends may not be desirable. Many an enterprise in history, many a movement in society has never reached the definite result that was aimed at and yet has resulted in untold good, a far greater good than the one consciously sought. A tendency in society may be desirable because it indicates an awakened conscience, a revolt against and a departure from conditions which are evil and oppressive; it is a sign that a better day is coming. And the tendency itself may have in it large elements of good. The spirit it expresses, the comprehensive, general conception for which it exists may be vital to human welfare. And yet the specific end at which it aims, the specific way by which it would have the good accomplished, may be undesirable, may indeed be something which would be a serious evil. There may be a wrong way of trying

to get at a good thing. To illustrate, the general result, the emancipation of women, the throwing-open to her of privilege and opportunity is greatly to be desired; but it is by no means so clear that the specific end known as "political equality," the giving of the franchise to women is desirable. So here, the present tendency toward a co-operative social order may be desirable because it represents a struggle toward a better day for the toiling millions, and yet the specific thing, "a co-operative social order," the thing known as "socialism" may not be desirable. One may rejoice in the great social movement of our time, may see in it the foregleams of a more righteous social order than the world has ever known, and yet one may not be a socialist.

But I understand the question to mean not simply, is the tendency desirable? but is the goal itself, a co-operative social order, desirable? Should we pray and talk and work for this specific end?

What then is meant by a co-operative social order? I understand by it the economic and industrial order known as socialism. And by socialism I do not understand only an increase of a fraternal spirit among men, or an extension of municipal or government ownership of public utilities, or an increase of what is known as paternalism in government. This mild diluted kind of socialism is not the kind which on the one hand inspires the earnest socialist propaganda of our time, or which, on the other hand, excites the fears and the deadly opposition of conservative minds. By socialism I understand something definite, thorough-going, a genuine reconstruction on a new foundation, along new lines, of the industrial and economic order. Socialism means three things: (1) the replacing of private capital by collective capital, the collective instead of private ownership of all the instruments of production, land, factories, machinery, tools, means of transportation, warehouses, *et cetera*; (2) corporate organization and management of the process of production, in the place of private business; "public organization of the labor of all on the basis of collective ownership of all the working materials of social labor;" (3) distribution of the collective output of all kinds of manufacture in proportion to the value and amount of work done by each worker.

Of these three the first and second are the essential factors of socialism: as to the third, the basis of distribution of the products of labor, socialists are not agreed. But they are agreed as to the collective ownership of the instruments of production, and the corporate organization and management of the process of production.

Suppose just now, in order to a clear understanding, that we are not socialists, how much can we concede to the socialist's position?

1. For one thing we gladly acknowledge the genuine Christian spirit of many socialists. Socialists today are far from being all alike. There are still plenty of them who strike at true marriage and the Christian home, who seem to be enemies of everything sacred, whose spirit is very bad. On the other hand, in the ranks of socialists Christ has now some of his sincerest followers, the purity of whose motives, their magnanimity, their devotion command our reverent regard.

2. For another thing, we can only be in deepest, sincerest sympathy with the aim to advance the common man, to raise the level of life for the toiling millions. To quote Professor Ely, "The labor movement in its broadest terms is the effort of men to live the lives of men. It is a systematic organized struggle of the masses to obtain *primarily* more leisure and larger economic resources. But that is not by any means all, because the end and purpose of all is a richer existence for the toilers and that with respect to mind, soul, and body." It is at root a struggle for the development of manhood, the realization of the possibilities of life according to the manifest purpose of the Creator. Why should the few have more privileges than they can possibly use and the many be cramped and narrowed and find it impossible to live lives worthy of men? The progress of mankind thus far has meant the gradual emancipation of the toiler. This process of emancipation is far from being complete, why should it come to a standstill? The Bible idea is that privilege is given to one that he may pass it on to the many. How any man can call himself a servant of God and a disciple of Jesus and not be in sympathy with the great struggle of the millions to rise to truer, richer life I do not know.

3. For a third thing conditions will and must change. The status of the toiler is not going to remain what it is, the relations of capital and labor are not going to continue as they are. Has not even Mr. Carnegie tried to tell us "How Labor Will Absorb Capital"? It is not merely that this is a world of change, but it is also and especially that we are seeing more and more the advance of democracy—democracy, not the rule of one, or of the few, but the rule of the people. We already have the political enfranchisement of the common man. We are all working for the education, the enlightenment of the common man. We have political equality of men; we are striving for something more like intellectual equality; think you that we can have these things and not have something more like economic equality? Mr. Carnegie has written on "Triumphant Democracy;" do you suppose that there are not other triumphs for democracy yet to win? John Stuart Mill pointed out that once the few had the wealth and the political power; that now the few still have the wealth but the many have the political power; and he added that inevitably that power will be so used that in the end the many will have the wealth as well as the power. This does not forecast spoliation of the possessors, or violent revolution, or communism of property; it just means that the evolution of civilized society is going on and that some day it will be something better than the world has yet known. Moreover not only does the common man now possess the franchise, but in addition there is a great and increasing awakening of public conscience; in a large and growing number that conscience is getting very sensitive, it is causing a good deal of unrest, it is inciting to discussion, investigation, agitation, effort, and that awakened conscience will not let things remain as they are. What is really at the root of all this is the principle of spiritual equality of all men, enunciated by Jesus Christ. That principle of spiritual equality contains exhaustless meaning for the life of mankind here and now.

4. For a fourth thing we concede that the indictment against things as they are has sufficient foundation. There is neither time nor is there need in this presence for me to cite any of the facts which sustain this indictment. We may grant that in the last few decades there have been some marked improvements in the

condition of the toilers, and that there are movements on foot now which will result in further improvement. But granting this, the injustice, the inhumanity, the misery which still remain are often appalling. Most of you will recall that chapter in Brooks's *The Social Unrest* entitled "The Inevitableness of the Social Question," in which the author gives quotation after quotation from a number of the ablest economists, thinkers, and writers of Great Britain, the Continent, and the United States, all of them in withering condemnation of the present order. And you all recall that chapter in Professor Rauschenbusch's book, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, entitled "The Present Crisis." That chapter is the most effective indictment against things as they are that I have ever seen, and the substantial truth of it can hardly be called in question.

5. Further still, we concede that natural resources belong primarily not to individuals or corporations, but to the people as a whole. Governments have made tremendous mistakes in allowing great natural resources to become the property of private owners without sufficiently safeguarding the conditions of that ownership in the interests of the people at large. I do not say that there should not be private ownership of great natural resources such as mines and forests, but I do say that the only principle which can justify a government in permitting such ownership is that that is the most practicable way by which to develop these resources and to place them at the service of the people. And in permitting this private ownership and development the government should see well to it that the private owner is faithful to his trust, and that the people are not exploited and robbed by him, but are efficiently and economically served. Mr. Rockefeller accepts this same principle when he says in *The World's Work*, "It is the duty of men of means to maintain the title to their property and to administer their funds until some man, or body of men shall rise up capable of administering for the general good the capital of the country better than they can." Efficient administration for the general good is according to this the one and only sufficient guarantee of the title to private capital and the right of its control. Where that guarantee is not forthcoming the title to a great natural resource should revert to the

state, and no longer should the government hand out titles to such resources in the reckless way it has done in the past and so assist in exploiting and impoverishing the people.

6. We concede also that there may be and we believe that there will be, a considerable extension of governmental and municipal control of public utilities. The banks will not always be able to prevent a system of national postal savings, nor the express companies a parcels-post system, nor the telegraph companies a telegraph post. Some day the government will be less dominated by great money-making interests and will approach nearer the ideal of "government of the people, by the people, for the people," and then it will be found that there are several utilities upon which all the people depend, the control of which the government may very well assume.

7. Lastly, in this list of concessions we are agreed that the end before us in this great social movement is justice, and not charity. It is certain that for a long time to come there will be plenty of room in society for the exercise of charity, for deeds of philanthropy. Indeed the need for this may never cease in man's life on this earth. Further still, I would not for one moment discount the value of those great gifts to educational and philanthropic objects with which we Americans are familiar. And yet it is as clear as day that no number or size of such gifts can solve the industrial and economic problem which confronts us. And this for the simple reason that charity can never be the foundation of a rightly ordered and peaceful society. Only one thing can be that foundation—justice. As long as it is believed that the prevailing system results in injustice, that there are large sections of society which do not receive their equitable share of economic good, that the labor of the wage-earner is exploited in the interest of the profits of capital, so long will there be unrest and conflict and bitterness. Some way must be found to prevent the piling-up of vast fortunes for which no proportionate service is rendered, some way must be found to bring about an equitable distribution of the whole product of the industrial and commercial process or there will never be such a thing as "peace on earth."

These seven points seem perfectly clear: that the spirit of many socialists is eminently Christian; that we ought earnestly

to seek the advance of the common man ; that conditions will and must change ; that the indictment against things as they are is well founded ; that natural resources belong primarily to the people ; that there may be a considerable extension of government ownership and control of public utilities ; and that nothing but justice, equity, can solve the problem of society. Still other things might be conceded. But to concede things like these is not to adopt socialism as the remedy and the goal. That there will be a great deal more of co-operation, that large numbers of individuals and of companies, that many capitalists and laborers will come together on a co-operative basis, that, as Mr. Carnegie prophesies, labor will to a considerable extent absorb capital, this I believe. More and more labor will have a voice in the management and control of industry. But all this does not mean that a co-operative commonwealth is desirable, that co-operation is to be established by law. It is one thing for individuals in the exercise of their individual liberty, in the control of their own capital and labor, to come together in co-operative relations ; it would be quite another thing to have the capital and enterprise of the country taken over by the government and co-operation practically enforced upon nearly all.

As I view it a co-operative commonwealth, the scheme known as socialism, is not desirable, and my business now is to tell why I hold this view. The question assigned for this paper does not require that I propose a solution of the social problem, and there is time only to suggest a part of the argument against socialism.

Let us look first at the question of distribution. How, under socialism, shall distribution be made? To each according to his need, say some. This would destroy the co-ordination of work and reward, and would make charity rather than justice the basis of government, would modify we know not how much that great stimulus to work which our economic needs supply, and would rob multitudes of whatever independence of spirit they still possess. Human nature being what it is this method is impossible. Shall it then be an equal distribution for all kinds of work? This would be unjust, for one kind of work is worth more than another, and one worker earns more than another. So far as the economic question is concerned this also would do away

with equitable reward, and would so far destroy the motive to superior work. And how under this method would the disagreeable work be done? Shall distribution be made according to the amount and value of each one's work. This will have to be if justice is to rule, if there is to be any co-ordination of work and reward. But how all the decisions are to be made as to the relative values of all the different kinds of work, and how it is to be secured that all the people will peacefully accept these decisions are questions which are beyond me. From the point of view of distribution socialism seems to me either an impossibility or an insufferable tyranny.

Another serious and indeed fatal objection to socialism is found when we consider its bearing upon individuality. One of the supreme services which Jesus rendered was the emphasis he laid upon the worth of the individual man. One of the greatest achievements of history is that, in a measure, we have come to Jesus' point of view in this regard and we recognize the immeasurable worth of the individual. In this latter time the individual has at last come to his own, and this fact has been the motive power of reformation in religion and of the rise and progress of democracy. In ancient times the individual existed for the sake of the state; now the state exists for the sake of the individual. Society is not an end and the individual just a means. The individual is the end; the individual personality is the thing of intrinsic and supreme worth. True, the individual can only come to self-realization in relation to society. The mission of the state is to aid the person, to give him room and opportunity. Certainly in the past century there has been an excessive individualism and it has wrought untold harm. It is the business of government to restrain the excesses of individualism and to secure for every man a fair field. Individual enterprise has achieved the enormous economic development of the modern world. Upon individual initiative and enterprise no check must be put excepting only those which justice enjoins. Honestly to determine what justice requires and to enforce that is the first business of true government.

Individuality, self-realization requires that a man be at liberty to choose his work. If the state assumes the right to dictate to

me what my work shall be I am no longer a free man, and the state has exactly reversed its function which should be to safeguard my liberty. Can socialism provide for freedom in the choice of work? Having chosen his work, individuality requires that a man be allowed to pursue it in his own way, to bring to bear upon it his own intelligence, his own capacity, his own devotion. If I am restrained from using my intellectual powers and my full capacity for work, if individual initiative and enterprise are denied me, if I am only a cog in the enormous wheel known as the State, I am not free. Having chosen his work and having done it according to his capacity, individuality and justice require that a man shall receive his due reward. For the state to enforce it that he shall not receive his due reward, but that a part of what he has earned shall go to others who have not earned it is wrong. In the exercise of his powers and the use he makes of the rewards of his labor the man has his probation and is accountable to God. Of course this man exists in relation to society and the state must stand for equal liberty to all. It may be said that the liberty I advocate is possessed by only a fraction of our citizenship. What then? Shall we take it away from this fraction and reduce all to bondage? Or shall we struggle on toward the emancipation of all? In other words shall the goal toward which we strive be a lessening of individual responsibility, a curtailing of individual initiative, a great process of leveling down, or, shall it be a process of leveling up, a holding fast by the great principles of individuality and liberty which in their present imperfect application have been won at such cost, a relentless struggle until these principles are made the conscious possession of every man? I know that solidarity is as true a principle as individuality, that brotherhood is as precious as personal liberty. But brotherhood cannot be forced; for beings constituted as we are brotherhood can only be built upon the free exercise of individual liberty and personal character. There is no short cut to the kingdom of God by which the long and tedious process of the making of personal character can be evaded. Long before that general sense of brotherhood predominates which socialism must presuppose if it is not to be the biggest tyranny the world has yet seen—long

before that the evils of individualism will be so far overcome that socialism will not be needed as a corrective of them.

THE PRESIDENT: I will now call for the first of the appointed speakers who are to take up the discussion for this evening. I am very glad to welcome as the first of them Mr. George W. Coleman, whose work at Ford Hall along similar lines to our Congress, and among other movements that a great many of us are deeply interested in is well known. Brother George W. Coleman, of Tremont Temple, Boston. (*Applause.*)

MR. GEORGE W. COLEMAN, of Boston, Mass., said:

IS THE PRESENT TENDENCY TOWARD A CO-OPERATIVE SOCIAL ORDER DESIRABLE?

Understanding "a co-operative social order" to mean a democracy in material things, I believe most profoundly that the present tendency in that direction is highly desirable. And these are my reasons for that belief.

1. The tendency in the direction of a co-operative social order, which this discussion takes for granted, is one that is natural, logical, and reasonable. It does not aim to destroy our civilization, which has cost so much; it aims to fulfil it. It does not do violence to our best instincts; it seeks to develop them. It does not look for a better day to come by magic; it expects that day will come by gradual processes through much toil and trouble.

The co-operative social order tallies precisely with our fundamental and almost universal religious beliefs wherein we profess to love our neighbors as ourselves and to do unto others as we would that they should do unto us. The new order waits only on an intelligent and sincere application of these elements of faith to the world of material things.

The co-operative social order accords with our democratic ideals which acknowledge every man's inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We have but to safeguard these rights of the citizen in the realms of industry, commerce, and finance to secure him their substance as well as their shadow; for, to be politically free and industrially, commercially, or financially enslaved, is to take the shadow for the substance.

The co-operative social order is but the necessary outcome of our history. Civilization has been working toward this end from the beginning. De Tocqueville, years ago in this country, foresaw the necessity for it if he did not define its method. It will come just as surely as the flower and fruit follow the bud.

The co-operative social order provides naturally and reasonably for the satisfaction of that universal unrest of the common people so clearly manifest wherever they have any power of expression. Just as political democracy was the only thing that would satisfy the unrest of the people in the eighteenth century, so now nothing less than democracy in material things will satisfy the unrest of today.

And, furthermore the present tendency toward a co-operative social order is desirable because all current-day signs tell us that the time is already fast ripening for its coming, if indeed the day is not already at hand. Surely the quickening can already be felt. Very likely we are right now in the midst of it.

2. The tendency toward a co-operative social order is desirable not only because it is natural and reasonable, but also because it is necessary. Without it there would be hopelessness, sullenness, or reckless indifference, whereas now there is the liveliest faith, the utmost expectation, and a tremendous activity. It is necessary that the people should see a way out of their sorrows and distresses even though it may not be the best way. Even mistaken zeal is better than stagnation.

This tendency toward a co-operative social order is necessary in order to save an anti-social order from destroying itself. Under the present order of things a system that was perhaps good enough in its day has, through the exhaustion of free land, the development of manufactures, the growth of great cities, the increase of inventions, and the spread of popular education, become so overgrown as to be not only incompetent, but grotesque and destined to fall of its own weight. Just as the Roman Empire contained within itself the seeds of its own destruction, so has the Empire of Business gone to such extremes that it cannot much longer be maintained on its present basis.

The co-operative social order is necessary in order to save society from the enormous wastes of life and capital which the

present system entails. The nation is already alarmed over the frightful waste of our national resources due to unrestricted competition and we sacrifice tens of thousands of lives every year through preventable industrial accidents and preventable diseases, all for the lack of a co-operative social order.

It is necessary that the co-operative social order should follow political democracy just as democracy, autocracy, serfdom, and slavery in turn followed each other. A nation cannot survive as half-slave and half-free—democratic in politics and autocratic in business. It must be one principle or the other throughout.

3. And, lastly, the co-operative social order is desirable because it is inevitable. It is a wise man, and fundamentally a religious man, who tries to find out in which direction the laws of the universe are moving in order that he may keep step with them. That is like thinking God's thoughts after him.

The present order in the world of material things, which is based on the principle of every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost, is out of harmony both with the world of science and the world of religion and, looking at it through the telescope of the ages, it is not too much to say that it is on its last legs.

The extremes of wealth and poverty between citizens of the same municipality, where a few men have their millions and a million men have nothing, is fast becoming "impossible," however fine the casuistry may be that supports it. The natural outcome of the present order is fast showing itself to be a logical absurdity, entirely apart from the right or wrong of it. Such absurd extremes cannot continue in the face of popular education.

It is the demands of our economic life that incite nations to war. And here again, the cost of war and preparation for war have gone to such lengths as to have become already impossible and absurd. While war has grown too expensive to indulge in, the expense of preparation for war has become well-nigh insupportable in Europe at least. It is inevitable that some relief must be found from this vortex of indebtedness into which an unrestricted competitive order is hurrying the nations.

Then again, on the positive side, a co-operative social order is made inevitable through the breaking-down of barriers by

means of universal communication and education. Mutual acquaintance and knowledge is a forerunner of co-operation.

And finally the co-operative order becomes inevitable because of the very lessons in co-operation which the present order of things is teaching us. Commerce and industry have shown us very clearly and emphatically that the most widely divergent peoples can be united in co-operation for a given end when the motive is strong enough. And, what is more, the world of business all unconsciously and unwittingly is developing to a very high degree the methods that will be necessary in a co-operative society and is also training men to handle vast co-operative enterprises.

If men are now co-operating on a vast scale to perfect production, transportation, and distribution of material things, it is only one step farther to co-operate in a distribution of the fruits of that co-operative labor—wealth and power.

I am, therefore, emphatically of the opinion that the present tendency toward a co-operative social order is desirable, because I believe that tendency is natural, logical, reasonable, necessary, and inevitable.

THE PRESIDENT: The second of the appointed speakers is Dr. Herbert S. Johnson, Pastor of the Warren Avenue Baptist Church, Boston. (*Applause.*)

DR. JOHNSON: *Mr. President and Gentlemen:* Let me say to you that I will ask the privilege of defining the question which is before us, as the other speakers have done; the line of the argument of each one is dependent, of course, on the definition of the question. I wish to say that I will speak on it from a slightly different point of view than has been presented, namely, from the point of view of the masses of the people of the United States. I shall not discuss the socialism introduced here tonight by the first speaker of the evening, a socialism held by a comparatively small number of all the people, and not by the masses; they know nothing of it whatsoever; but I shall speak to you about the socialism with which I myself come continually in contact as pastor of a church in a great metropolitan center of the

United States, and that is the socialism of the masses of the laboring people of this country.

One of the old socialists of the world said not long ago that we must rid ourselves of the very first idea of religion before the great economical problems of the world could be solved, and that idea is this—"In the beginning, God." Another of the great socialist leaders of the country has also said that the doctrines of modern Christianity are probably as distasteful to the real socialist of today as were the heathen rites in the temples of the Greeks and the Romans to the ancient Christians.

As I read the literature of socialism of today, and as I come into contact with laboring men, I have come to the opinion that the tendency of modern socialism is away from God, and that it sets up socialism itself, the organization, or the brotherhood of man, in the place of God as the object of worship. Now against this type of socialism I wish to say I have the greatest antipathy, and that for two reasons. It throws away the two profoundest motives that are known to man to induce his greatest activity, his productivity, and the development of his individual character. This socialism of the masses of the laboring people of today is founded upon a sociological falsehood, namely, that a man in the co-operative régime when wages have become practically equal, under spur of what you might call patriotism, or because of the spirit of brotherhood, however that is to come about, will be just as energetic in the activity of production as he would be under the motive of self-interest. I should hate to have the sun and the stars torn out of the sky, and the fields robbed of their corn, and the roses robbed of their perfume, and the whole world reduced to the bare monotony of the drab desert; so I fight against socialism, because I should hate to see the greater evil of its bare monotony resulting from destroyed individuality, and men changed by the thousand into parasites and sluggards to be carried along by society as long as society would bear it—which would be a precious short time in my opinion.

If I have learned anything since I left the Theological Seminary as a result of my contact with men, it is that one of the greatest motives known to man to make him active is self-interest. I say this of Christian men as well as of non-Christian men.

I know a gentleman recognized today as one of the financial powers in the United States. Twelve years ago he was a mere butterfly of society interested in the breeding of dogs and horses, and in the dancing of his beautiful wife. Suddenly he lost his fortune. For twelve years this failure, this financial parasite who inherited his wealth from his father, has climbed up until he is vice-president of one of the greatest railroad systems of the United States. And what may I ascribe as the spur that induced him to show what was in him? It was the compulsion of self-interest, and everything that socialism, as I see it, is trying to throw out of society.

Then the second great motive that this socialism of which I speak disregards, is the motive, or the series of motives, that inhere in the Christian system, in the doctrines of Jesus Christ.

It is a well-known fact in the history of the world that men in their productivity have followed their ideas, or as we ministers say, their ideals. If we look into the history of Jacob, a mere materialist before he found his God, we will find that while he accomplished much in a material way through self-interest, nevertheless his life was very much like the bare desert about him. But that when Jacob found his God he began to build his altars. And so has it ever been in the history of the world. Men whose minds have been set upon material things, upon cobble-stones, or the petty profits of the barnyard, have been builders of chicken coops, not builders of cathedrals and palaces. The great architects, the great artists, the great moral and philanthropic leaders of the world, in almost every case have been men and women who have had the clearest and profoundest vision of God. I charge against the socialism of today, that is, the practical everyday socialism of the laboring man, that it leaves out the profoundest, sweetest, finest, and most beautiful of all motives that exist, that which we see in the face of Jesus.

Now I am not bringing anything new to you, but I would like to remind you that when you take away religion, even though you achieve the ideal material order of a Godless socialism, you have left only a miserable husk.

The last thing I did before coming here tonight, and in leaving my home, was to leave a dying woman who loves life; and the

first thing that I do when I return to my own parish, and to my own city, is to see that woman if she still be alive; and she will ask me to pray; and what shall I say if there be no God? Suppose that you pave your streets of your city with cobble-stones of marble or of gold; suppose that the corn grows twice as high, and the sky were twice as blue, and the sun were twice as bright; without God the world in which we live would be simply a splendid tomb.

I urge you ministers of the gospel, in every way to combat the present socialism that really exists in American life, in order to save the world of the modern practical socialist from being a husk, from being a tomb.

Now, having said this much, let me close by saying that I am thoroughly in sympathy with the modern tendencies toward co-operation in so far as they mean simply the correction of the terrible abuses that exist under the modern order of competition. I do not deny them. I meet them every day. I see them in the lives of the men, and especially the women, with whom I have to daily meet. Oh, the awful contrasts in modern society! Here is a great man in the city of New York who for a single set of Charles Dickens pays easily the sum of \$155,000. There is that woman in Lenox, in the Berkshire Hills, a relative of friends of mine, who, after a life of selfishness and luxury, dies and leaves behind \$12,000,000, and not one cent for sweet charity out of all those millions. On the other hand, the average working-woman in the city of Boston, in the day of prosperity, lives on the line of starvation. There are adult women in the city of Boston, whose entire working wage is \$6.00 a week, \$5.00 a week, \$4.00 a week, \$3.00 a week, and I know of one case of an adult woman, a young girl twenty-one years of age, whose entire working wage for six days was \$2.50, and out of that she spent 60c for carfare, which left for her room, her clothing, her food, her all, \$1.90 a week. The difference between life and death, between misery or wretchedness and happiness, between the wife and the mistress, between heaven and hell, is the difference between \$6.00 a week and \$3.00. I say to you, Christian ministers, until the church of Jesus Christ comes to the correction of these abuses, until we assist in removing these abuses, your evangelistic services are

only practically a farce. Why pray? Why urge young women to give themselves to Jesus and be good, when you pay them \$4.00 a week, \$3.00 a week, and \$2.50 a week?

Brethren, I do not believe in socialism, but I do believe there is work to do. The income tax, the graduated inheritance tax, these are some expedients. We need to change the system. How? Through socialism? No. But we will find a way, and the way at last will be that One who said, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: As I listened to my friend, Dr. Johnson, I asked myself whether that young girl lost her right hand on the Congo. The last address I heard from Dr. Johnson was one in which he depicted the cruelty of King Leopold and his officers cutting off the right hands of the people on the Congo. It seems that something of that kind is done in our country. My second reflection was that Dr. Johnson objects to socialism, but a rose by any other name will smell as sweet.

I have not received many cards but I am glad to say that I have received two which bear names of men whom the audience will have great pleasure in listening to. They are Professor George B. Foster, and Dr. Lemuel Paul Barnes. I will call first on Dr. Barnes.

DR. LEMUEL C. BARNES, D.D., of New York City: I do not rise to discuss this question. Perhaps in common with some others here I have been thoroughly convinced by the arguments that have been presented to us on both sides—convinced that this vastly complicated question requires of us much honest, earnest study and discussion more than it requires dogmatism. I rise not to add anything on either side, but to state a simple fact.

A few years ago I ran across a statement by a distinguished Bostonian to the effect that a large part of the real property of that city was already owned co-operatively, in a socialistic way, if you prefer that term. It was a mere sentence, no facts were given.

Living in Pittsburg, Pa., a somewhat significant city, I thought it might be worth while to find out the exact facts in that respect in our city. So the first "survey" of Pittsburg—concerning that one item—was made. Going to the official sources, in order to

find out how much of the realty was owned socially in the name of the municipality, the county, the state, and the nation, and putting all these items together, after many careful computations with the best expert advice of accountants and keen business men, the conclusion reached was that 26½ per cent. of the real estate in that city was then owned socially. I had had many fears about this sort of thing. How perilous it must be to civilization to have common ownership of land and other real property! But, in view of the enormous estate already owned, managed, and enjoyed collectively it occurred to me that since it was safe to live in a city with 26½ per cent. owned socially, it might not be ruinous if, say, 27 per cent. were to be owned that way.

THE PRESIDENT: Professor George B. Foster, of the University of Chicago.

PROFESSOR GEORGE B. FOSTER, Chicago, Ill.: *Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen:* It is not simply that it is on my conscience to earn my salt while I am here that I venture to speak for a moment or two again, although I look upon that as a very serious duty, doubtless more serious than you do from the way in which I am undertaking to earn the said salt, but that, to speak personally, my interest is increasingly turning to the problem which has received such earnest and thoughtful discussion from our brethren as one of the spiritual issues both in the world of thought and in the world of practice of our country. Philosophically, of course, it is a piece of the great problem of the one and many, or of the realities and the rights respectively of society and the individual. But into that philosophical problem which I do not believe can be speculatively but only practically solved, it is not my purpose to enter. I am concerned with the subject from a little different point of view.

Society is not an organization. It is an organism. An organization is arbitrary. An organism is natural. An organization is a product of choice and deliberation; society is as deep as the constitution of human nature and the order of the world itself. Now, society is not a figure of speech; it is a fact.

What is an organism? In an organism, and so in a social organism, no individual is mere means, but all are at the same

time ends, and the goal of humanity is an organism—shall I say—a kingdom of moral love in which no individual means but all in every respect are ends as well. That is the goal, in other words, and I understand this to be the essence of the teaching of Jesus. In other words there is the identity of all human interests in social organism. In my physical organism, if my little finger even be sick, the organism of which that finger is a part cannot be well, and so in this social organism, in the long run, and in the main, I cannot be up if my brother is down. I cannot be well if my brother is sick. I cannot be good if my brother is bad. I cannot be innocent if my brother is guilty.

Now, the first thing of importance that follows from that is the arousing of a social conviction that the individual who does the economical wrong, is not exclusively responsible for that wrong; that the social whole of which he is a part is jointly responsible, for it is the social whole that creates the ideals and circumstances which have led the man in his love of gain to be cruel to his brother.

The first duty of the hour then is not simply that the church should denounce these wrongdoers and should ask them to repent; the first duty of the hour is, so to speak, collective repentance of our sins as a whole in this matter, for we have all done the wrong deed.

There are some words that I thoroughly dislike: “merchant prince;” “railroad magnate;” “oil king;” “coal baron—by Divine right,” if you please. (*Laughter.*) What are we doing with princes and magnates and kings and barons in our democratic America? (*Applause.*) But the responsibility does not lie primarily at their door, but at the door of our social life, and there must be a social correction of the matter.

Now, having said that, I should like to point out the matter that gives me pause in the socialistic programme. The constant insistence is upon collective ownership of economic goods; but it seems to me that the crux of the matter is not there; by a sort of violence, perhaps, that end could be consummated. The crux of the matter is not in the collective *ownership* of the economic goods, but in the collective *production* of those goods. What is the socialistic motive that will incite men to that work which

will produce the goods that are now produced under the present motives? That is the real issue. Now, what are the motives that obtain today? The love of gain; the need of bread; the social standing and preferment; interest and business success. These, and such as these of the individualistic character are mainly, as a matter of fact, the motives which incite to the production of economic goods.

Now, if socialism provides for collective ownership, how can it provide for the collective production of these goods? Suppose tomorrow morning this city takes a socialistic régime; there is ownership in idea. By what arrangement will men be kept to their tasks which will produce goods? The milkman, will he be around at four o'clock in the morning? The street sweeper and all the rest of them with their common ownership, will they do the common work? What is the motive? One of two things: There must be an outer compulsion of force, which will keep them to their work of production, which logically would land in an absolute militarism of labor in this country, and in other countries, or there must be an inner compulsion of freedom that will keep them at this work. But do you think what kind of character that means? Do you think what it means to get this work done on the basis of collective ownership on the one hand, and on the basis of simple fidelity to vocation on the other? I mean to indicate that the kind of men that we need for the socialistic régime is not in sight yet. What an ideal for life that is: simple fidelity to vocation as the incentive that shall keep me at my work; positions and possessions assured to me! What does it mean in order that there may be socialism? We must put it briefly; we must be in possession of an inner world of truth and beauty and holiness and fidelity; but as soon as we are in possession of that world we will care comparatively little about the external ownerships of life. After all, as soon as we come to possess the character which is necessary that socialism shall be a success, we will be comparatively indifferent to the goods that socialism offers us. What we need most of all, therefore, is not money, but the moral ability to be poor. (*Applause.*)

The benediction was pronounced and the Congress adjourned.

SECOND DAY

Afternoon Session

Wednesday, November 10, 1909

3 o'clock P. M.

THE PRESIDENT: Brethren, may I invite you to come to order for the afternoon session of the Congress. The Congress desires to maintain its reputation for punctuality.

We will be led in prayer by Dr. Curtis Lee Laws, of Brooklyn.

DR. LAWS offered prayer.

THE PRESIDENT: The topic for the afternoon is one of very present as well as perennial interest: "How Is Salvation Mediated to Us through Christ?"

The first of the writers is Professor John B. Anderson, of Colgate University. (*Applause.*)

PROFESSOR ANDERSON then read as follows:

HOW IS SALVATION MEDIATED TO US THROUGH CHRIST?

This paper will not attempt to describe, much less discuss, all the ways in which Christ is the medium of our salvation, as, for example, the transforming effect of his present personal influence as he lives in personal contact with us. We shall instead fix our reverent gaze upon only one peak of the vast mountain-range of truth we are to contemplate and to some extent to explore this afternoon, its most sublime and glorious peak indeed, the Mount Holy Cross, whose foundation is in the deep immutable nature of God and whose summit pierces the blue far above the reach of human vision. Let us seek, then, to answer the question, How is salvation mediated to us through the sufferings and death of Christ? **And it should be kept clearly in mind that the brevity of the paper permits only a very incomplete discussion even of this more specialized topic.**

In this paper salvation will mean the deliverance by God of sinful men from sin and from certain of its consequences, namely,

evil character, lack of perfect happiness, and the estranged relation, though not unloving disposition, of God to the sinner. Salvation consists of a threefold blessing divinely bestowed: forgiveness, moral perfection together with the serviceableness to God and men necessarily bound up with it, and supreme felicity.

Let us first inquire how moral perfection and supreme felicity are mediated to us through the sufferings of Christ? The fundamental fact is that God cannot transform miserable sinners into blissful saints except by a process that includes pain for himself. This divine suffering is threefold. In the first place, all the distress and trouble that come to men in connection with their own reformation and moral progress and that are involved also in their self-sacrifice for the deliverance of other men from evil constitute a part of the consciousness of God in whom we live and move and have our being. When men suffer for righteousness' sake he suffers in them what they suffer. The torture and death of the martyrs is also the experience of the God who is closer to them than their breathing, nearer than hands and feet, the very life of their life. In all our affliction in saving others and ourselves he is afflicted. Immanence in humanity spells sorrow for Deity. In the second place, God suffers the pain arising from his perfect moral sensitiveness to human sin. The shock to a pure woman suddenly brought into close and painful contact with foul obscenity affords to our morally obtuse natures an all too inadequate suggestion of the sensitiveness and even anguish of God's holy personality living close up against the badness and the wrong of human sin. In the third place, God suffers the sorrow of ineffable love, the agony of a breaking heart as he bends in compassionate yearning over his sinning and suffering human children. He weeps over the world as Jesus over Jerusalem, and his "Spirit makes intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered." The earthly suffering of Christ is a part of this wider suffering of God for human betterment and blessing; and it is God's experience, not in this case because God is immanent in men and therefore in Christ, but because Christ is God, thoroughly God and thoroughly man—sublime paradox, inscrutable and glorious mystery!

If, however, we would even attempt to understand the pro-

foundest significance of the cross of Christ, our thought must pass beyond the world of merely local and temporal events and endeavor to range over the illimitable vastness of the eternity in which the omniscient, prescient God lives his life of perfect knowledge and foreknowledge. God looks over his universe and there spread out beneath his all-comprehending gaze is the complete and circumstantial panorama of its entire history. And, still more stupendous and amazing, not only the history of the universe in minutest detail, but even the infinite content of the consciousness of God, is at every moment known unto him with absolute completeness. His infinitely complex life is a unit and his consciousness is always a complete experience all at once and all together of everything that from eternity belongs to the life of God. Therefore the varied sorrows of God felt in the process of delivering men from moral evil are endured not temporarily but from that beginning which never began. And the crucifixion and death of Christ which we look back to as occupying a few terrible hours in a distant, bygone time has been for God a perpetual crucifixion. There is deep and fearful significance in the declaration that Christ is "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." From all eternity God has been lifted up upon the cross of Calvary.

It is, then, only by suffering, and by suffering whose extent and intensity is utterly unimaginable by man, that God can ransom sinful men from their slavery to evil habit and character, and from present incompleteness of joy, and from the misery to which sin unchecked is sure to lead at last. God must make us good and happy through his own suffering or else leave us to sink in sin and be whelmed in woe. Unless he pays the colossal price of a self-sacrifice that has no parallel, we are irretrievably lost to goodness and fail of our proper and high destiny.

As has already been stated, the sufferings of Christ are a part of the sufferings of God involved in the process of winning men out of evil and misery into goodness and joy. This winning power of his cross finds its classical expression in the prediction of Jesus, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself." But while the suffering of Christ is a part of the suffering of God for men, yet it is in a unique way the medium

of our deliverance from moral evil because it is visible to us. It visualizes on the stage of human life the eternal tragedy of Deity suffering for humanity. The visible cross has a tremendous moral influence all its own. It is one thing for God to suffer invisibly in the secret of his divine being or even to tell us of the anguish of his spirit through a Hosea or Jeremiah, or through anyone else; it is an altogether different thing in its moral influence over men for God himself personally to come forth out of his invisible heaven into this world of sin and sorrow and in a human life suffer excruciating agony for the sake of men and for the sake of men who despised and crucified him. It would seem as if in this way alone God's suffering for men and for righteousness could adequately come home to the human conscience and make a sufficiently pathetic and powerful appeal to the human heart. Our moral renewal and our entrance into fulness of joy is mediated to us, therefore, not only through the other suffering of God for us, but in an especial and indispensable way through the earthly sufferings of Christ.

Having now gained some glimpse as to how our moral perfection and supreme felicity are mediated to us through the sufferings of Christ, let us next inquire how forgiveness is mediated to us through his sufferings. All are ready not merely to admit but to affirm with solemn gratitude that the sorrowing Christ is a medium of our moral renovation and perfecting, but many demur at once at the idea that God's forgiveness requires any mediation or can possibly have any. Forgiveness, we are told, is as free as the air or as the sunshine. Yet, after all, these brethren do not really believe that forgiveness is thus free, but on the contrary proclaim to sinning men that the divine forgiveness is conditioned and rigidly conditioned. For they teach that God forgives men only upon the ethical condition of repentance. In other words, although God is a Being of infinite love, he is estranged from his impenitent child. Perhaps "estranged" is not the best word (the Bible says "wrath" and "indignation"), but whatever term may be preferable, the plain fact is that God does not forgive certain persons. This means, of course, that he is against them, not indeed opposed to their true welfare, but against them nevertheless, against them relative to their present

character, conduct, and attitude toward the moral order and highest interests of humanity. And this view that God does not forgive certain persons is quite correct. For while God is glad to change from opposition to harmony, while he is eager to forgive, yet he will not do so lightly and still less unscrupulously, but only when there exists a solid ethical foundation for forgiveness, a foundation as deep as the moral nature of God.

And there is a still larger sense in which it is true that forgiveness must rest upon an ethical foundation deep as the moral nature of God. Men, as we have seen, must meet an ethical condition of forgiveness; but it is equally true that God has ethical conditions of forgiveness which he on his side must meet.

What are these ethical conditions which God must meet in order to forgive the sinner? We remark, in the first place, that God would not be morally justified in forgiving sinful men except in connection with the most effective possible process of making them good. It is a fundamental principle that forgiveness or pardon should not be bestowed upon wrongdoers, whether children, acquaintances, or criminals, with no regard to the eradication of evil propensities and habits and to the formation of right habits and good character. Such forgiveness or pardon not only does not comport with a worthy self-respect on the part of a good father, teacher, acquaintance, or government but it is also harmful to the offender and hurtful to the family, school, social order, or state, as the case may be. Likewise God ought to maintain his self-respect. He must honor his own perfection. He must vindicate the moral law. He is morally bound to safeguard the universal social system and promote the best interests of the human race. Forgiveness is no flippant, careless, jaunty act of him who is at once responsible for the care of the moral universe and is lovingly considerate of the well-being of the individual soul. Therefore it would be unjustifiable in God to forgive the sinner except in connection with a process which is God's best endeavor for the moral transformation of humanity.

We remark, in the second place, that if God were unwilling to make the illimitable and awful sacrifice of himself which is involved in the process of making men good and happy, he would be incapacitated for forgiving the sinner, because, in that case,

as will be shown later, he would himself be imperfect. Now the point here is: Only a perfect being can in the very nature of things confer a perfect forgiveness. For indifference to moral evil disqualifies a person for the experience of forgiving in any worthy sense or measure. A coarse, lewd nature, incapable of indignation at that which is vile, cannot have a satisfactory experience of forgiving indecency. A heartless man is disqualified for the experience of forgiving cruelty. A man with but a slight sense of honor can only superficially forgive an offense against the finest honorable feelings. In all such and similar cases the man cannot properly forgive because he is not sufficiently sensitive to the evil in the case. His own experience of forgiving cannot possibly transcend his perception and feeling of the wrong. The forgiver's experience of forgiving is determined by his insight into the real character of the wrong committed and to his feeling and reaction against it. Now, perfect insight, feeling, and reaction in respect to moral evil are possibly only to a perfect being. Therefore a perfect and adequate experience of forgiving is possible only to an absolutely perfect God; and since God would be imperfect if he were unwilling for any self-sacrifice for sinners, his moral perfection as an ethical condition of forgiving practically means that his suffering for men is an ethical condition of his forgiving them.

We remark, in the third place, that it is in accordance with the eternal fitness of things that if God were a sinner he would not have the authority to forgive sin. It is true that though we men are morally blameworthy we have under certain conditions the right, duty, and privilege to forgive those who trespass against us. But our forgiveness of them is not the forgiveness of the wrong as sin, as an offense against the moral order. It would be altogether unfitting and presumptuous for us to profess to forgive a neighbor if we were viewing his action as directed against the moral order. To take an extreme illustration, imagine the devil, if one were to wrong him, assuming to pardon the action against the eternal law of righteousness. While such pardon is the prerogative of God alone, yet it would not be fitting for him to exercise that prerogative if he were himself morally defective or blameworthy. And since he would be blameworthy

if unwilling for the extreme of necessary sacrifice for the purpose of making men good, it would not be fitting that he should forgive men unless he suffered for them.

It has been assumed above that God would not be perfect if he held back from any sacrifice, even though terrible beyond all human conception, that may be necessary for the moral transformation of men, and that therefore such necessary suffering on his part is a practical ethical condition he must meet or else forfeit both his capacity and his right to forgive men. It is desirable at this point to examine more closely into the relation of God's self-sacrifice for men and his moral perfection. This examination will show more clearly that God's forgiveness of sinners depends upon his practical conformity to certain requirements of his nature. The requirements to be mentioned are not mutually exclusive, but the discussion of their mutual relations is forbidden by the brevity of this paper.

First, God is love. Uttermost self-giving is essential to the divine perfection. Moral perfection is not static; it is ever in the making. God is ever entering into the kingdom of his own perfection by continuous self-giving and self-sacrifice. And since perfection is prerequisite to the capacity and authority to forgive the sinner and since self-sacrificial love is an essential element in perfection, God in order to forgive men must undergo all the tribulation that accompanies his most effective endeavor to make men good. But the glorious truth is that God does sacrifice himself on the altar of man's need. If the making men good and happy requires God to gather into his bosom all the heart-aches, all the sorrows, all the anguish ever felt by any and every man and endure this inconceivable woe from all eternity; if it means incalculable pain to a nature infinitely sensitive to evil; if it means the agony of God's perfect sympathy with his beloved offspring going to hideous moral ruin; if it means the inexpressible yearning of a heart overflowing with tenderness and longing—whatever suffering may be involved in God's living with and in men to make them good and happy—a mother is not readier for work and weariness and pain in the endeavor to save her child from death than is God to endure with superhuman patience the measureless woe of a universe. Ah! this is love indeed. When

we remember those hours of agony on Golgotha, our hearts are filled with a tender and abounding love for him who was nailed for our advantage to the bitter cross. And our hearts burn within us as we sing:

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.

Forbid it, Lord! that I should boast,
 Save in the death of Christ, my God;
 All the vain things that charm me most
 I sacrifice them to his blood.

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.

But if that was love, if we see there the divine compassion, what compassion and what love must it be that leads God to suffer Calvary in all its depth of anguish and woe, not only then and there, but through eternal ages, and thus to endure not only Calvary but also all other of his limitless sorrow? In this light the sacrifice of the divine love for sinful men is seen to be so terrific as to appear almost impossible even for an infinite God. It is an illimitable ocean of love rolling onward out of the dimness of a past eternity toward the eternity that is to be.

What a vindication of the moral law, the law of love, is this! How God honors love by perfect loving! Surely if anything can make it safe to forgive selfishness, it is the love that suffers infinite pain in order to win the sinner out of selfishness. For of all God's ways of purifying men's hearts and thereby making it safe to forgive, the way of self-sacrificial love is the most potent.

Secondly, God is righteous and thoroughly righteous. The river of a renewed moral life for men is the outflow of the divine righteousness as well as of the divine love. For a righteous God cannot be content to leave men in their unrighteousness without an effort to save them. God's holiness demands the holiest possible universe, and demands not simply

that men shall become holy but that God himself shall do all he can to win them to holiness. A good God must and will seek to make men good. Indeed, he loves righteousness so much that in order to bring men out of evil into goodness, he suffers Calvary and all the rest of his fathomless woe unceasingly throughout the ages. What a love of righteousness is this! And what a vindication of violated law, a sublime and unrivaled tribute to the worth and honor and rightful supremacy of the eternal law of righteousness! But anything less than even infinite suffering, if necessary for righteousness' sake, would be a moral defect in God. If he put forth the slightest volition not to endure such suffering, ICHABOD in black letters of doom would have to be inscribed on the great white throne, for God's glory would have departed. Lacking that glory because refusing suffering for righteousness' sake, God would have neither the power to feel nor the right to confer a perfect forgiveness upon his repentant children.

Thirdly, God would not have this power or this authority to forgive if he did not act always with perfect justice in his relation to men and their salvation. By justice is meant what is commonly meant by it, namely, the observance of rights, while injustice is the violation of rights. Either word may mean also the quality of the act or the quality of the man who performs the act. Perfect justice is the complete observance of all the rights of everyone concerned in any given case.

Now, a just character is essential to moral perfection. If God were not wholly and invariably just, just to himself and just to everyone else, he would not be perfect. He must observe all genuine rights. Real rights never clash. Sometimes they seem to do so, just as sometimes duties seem to conflict, but a wider, more comprehensive view of the situation shows that the kingdom of duties cannot be divided against itself and neither can the kingdom of rights. This vast and profound theme of the justice of God and its relation to human salvation can only be barely touched upon here as a sea-bird touches the great ocean for a moment only to fly again the next instant over the deep. Only one phase of the subject will engage our attention and, indeed, only one aspect of this one phase. What is not said is needed to supplement and balance what is said. Let me, then, suggest for

your consideration the great truth that in his relation to our salvation God must be just to himself, and that, if he were to fail of utmost necessary self-sacrifice to make men good, he would not be just to himself and therefore, being in that case morally imperfect, he would not be qualified to forgive men.

God has the right to live his constitutional life and to act out what he is. He has therefore the right to love and to promote in men the life of love, and he has no right not to love and not to promote in men the life of love. Further, he has the right to be righteous and to promote righteousness in men and he has no right not to be righteous and not to promote righteousness in men. Furthermore, he has the right to suffer all sorrow necessary in the out-reaching of his love and righteousness to increase love and righteousness in a sinful world, and he has no right to hold back from any such necessary suffering. In undergoing therefore his unimaginable travail for the new birth of humanity, God is respecting his own rights; he is being just to himself at the cost of infinite pain. And if God did not suffer all that his love for men and his responsibility for promoting righteousness demands of him, he would be trespassing upon his own inalienable rights and would be violating the divine justice. But the glorious fact is that God is just to himself although at a price that is appalling to the human imagination, and absolutely fulfils this ethical condition of his power and authority to forgive sin.

Thus the forgiveness of the sinner is conditioned upon God's fulfilment of the demands upon him of his perfect love, perfect righteousness, and perfect justice. God's love, righteousness, and justice require him to seek to make bad men good though the endeavor costs him infinite suffering. It is at least partly because God fully satisfies this demand which with uncompromising self-consistency he makes upon himself that he has the capacity and the right to confer an absolutely complete forgiveness of sin.

The love, righteousness, and justice of God, however, do not call upon him to pass through any unnecessary suffering in connection with making men good. In fact, they forbid it. For unnecessary suffering is unmitigated evil and therefore immoral. And if we hold that the suffering of Christ is a medium of God's forgiveness, we must regard his suffering as necessary. But why

was the cross necessary? It is plain that in the process of bringing men out of evil into goodness God suffers inevitably and terribly. But why was this particular experience of the cross necessary? Let us not delude ourselves with the idea that the death of Christ was a martyr's death unavoidable under the historical conditions of his career. All reformers do not die a violent death. Tyndale did, but Wyclif did not. Huss did, but Luther did not. Jeremiah may possibly have come to a violent end, but at any rate he was an outspoken, uncompromising reformer in Jerusalem itself for about forty years. And in this connection remember the career of the apostle Paul! We simply do not know what was from this standpoint inevitable in the case of Jesus. Certainly there was no physical necessity for his going to Jerusalem when he did or for his not evading arrest. It was against his principles to run recklessly into danger. "When they persecute you in one city, flee ye to another" was his own counsel to his disciples. He himself several times withdrew from the presence of menacing hostility. And we have reason to suppose that such a sagacious person could have evaded and outwitted his enemies for many years. And we might add, How could anyone without his consent kill a person who had the unique power to reanimate and raise his own dead body?

There being no physical necessity for Christ's violent death at the time and place of its occurrence or indeed at all, there must have been a moral necessity for it. And this is precisely the view that the entire New Testament presents to us. Jesus is represented as going up to that particular Passover on purpose to die. According to the Fourth Gospel he said, "I lay down my life for the sheep. . . . No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." The New Testament references to the death of Christ as a sacrifice and as in some sense a vicarious substitution imply the view that his death uniquely met some divine necessity. That it did meet such a necessity we have seen. For if God in Christ had traveled the way of the cross, he would have omitted that which has been his most effective means of transforming mankind. History proves, and our own hearts tell us, that without the cross God would not have done and suffered

his utmost for a sinful world. Because the cross possesses an unrivaled and indispensable influence over the consciences, affections, and lives of men, it is an essential part of God's self-sacrifice for sinners. Therefore if God held back from Calvary, he would be lacking in love, in righteousness, and in justice. Without the cross, then, he would have neither the capacity nor the right to forgive sin. The cross being thus essential to God's greatest moral influence upon men and therefore to his forgiveness of them, the incarnation is necessary and Christ, the God-man, is a necessary medium of all the elements of our salvation, not only of our moral perfection and supreme felicity, but of our forgiveness as well. The proposition, that is, God's satisfaction of his own ethical demands upon himself, must be made. The ransom must be forthcoming. Without the shedding of the blood which is even now being offered up in the heavenly sanctuary there can be no remission of sin.

And Isaac spake unto Abraham his father, and said, My father: and he said, Here am I, my son. And he said, Behold, the fire and the wood: but where is the lamb for a burnt-offering? And Abraham said, God will provide himself the lamb for a burnt-offering, my son.

And they sing a new song, saying, Worthy art thou . . . for thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation.

And every created thing which is in the heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth and on the sea, and all things that are in them, heard I saying, Unto him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb, be the blessing, and the honor, and the glory, and the dominion, unto the ages of the ages.

THE PRESIDENT: We will now listen to a paper on the same topic by Dr. Cornelius Woelfkin, of Rochester Theological Seminary.

PROFESSOR CORNELIUS WOELFKIN, D.D., Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y., then read the following paper:

HOW IS SALVATION MEDIATED TO US THROUGH CHRIST?

Words are the symbols of ideas. What is the idea behind this word, salvation? What content do we express by this term, and

how is Christ related to that process? These questions define the limits of our theme. As I understand the word, salvation means the recovery of life from the tyranny and disintegrating power of sin, and restoring it with power to achieve the ideal of its creation. Salvation is the antithesis of destruction. Destruction implies that we are morally and spiritually insolvent. We are in danger and threatened with disaster, unless some reacting power intervenes, to save us from our present condition and tendency.

Beginning with man as we find him, we discover a confused composite. Human life has multigenerous possibilities hidden within it. Its potentialities may unfold in virtues or vices. Its diverse qualities set a double stream of tendencies in motion. One disposition moves upward toward righteousness, and follows some noble, mysterious idealism. The other bias is downward, a kind of moral undertow, drifting toward perdition. Both tendencies are very real in experience. The upward tendency finds its emphasis in our noblest moods and loftiest inspirations. The downward tendency meets its sharp accent in self-centered ambitions and self-seeking activities. The lower gravitation seems politic. It promises to conserve self-interest, while it actually undermines our best potencies. The higher idealism seems extravagant in its waste of vantage, but it really gains the life eternal.

These contrary dispositions create antagonism. The animal instincts would strangle the spiritual aspirations, while the religious impulses would conquer the sensuous indulgences. There is a civil strife in the soul. Naturally these tendencies cannot remain in perfect balance. One or the other will determine the current of life. In most men the downward tide has gained the dominant force, and in all men there are times when the activities of life drift on this current. When the balance is disturbed, the winning force gains strength with cumulative power, like the force of gravitation upon a falling body.

In this condition, life is betrayed into manifold tyrannies. Yielding to the baser tempers and appetites, they begin to assert the authority of habit over us. The protest of the oversoul becomes weaker and intermittent. The higher ideal may still be formally approved, but it is dislocated from life's activities, and

its intrusion is resented as an impertinence. In retirement, the sensitiveness of the soul begins to wane. The eye of conscience becomes astigmatic; the faith faculty falls dormant; and the will is made to grind in the interests of the flesh. This surrender to, or compromise with, the lower instincts of our being, is sin. And sin includes everything, from an insincere trifling with our highest ideals, to those gross forms of indulgence, wherein men, through hardness and lust, fall below the level of the brute beast.

This retrogression is far from the noble purpose of man's creation. It vetoes the prophecy which inheres in our better self. The long reaches of biological development, ever driving upward, have endowed human life with mysterious potentialities. Man retains many links of union with the organic forms of life in the lower stages of creation. But the latencies of mind and soul which differentiate him from the animal world about him are more emphatic. However we may interpret the Genesis account of the beginnings, still "God created man in his own image." That is the continuous preface of every human life. God has planted a divinity in all men, wherefore all souls are his. But this divinity is only a virtual capacity. It must subdue the nether instincts, and bring them into subservience. When this divine capacity is denied and resisted, life is on the retreat. The spiritual capacity atrophies. The divine image, instead of transfiguring the personality, becomes eclipsed, distorted, destroyed.

Sin is the failure to realize the divine ideal. Sin is not primarily the transgression of a statute. Statutory law is an invention, a mirror revealing conditions, not creating them. To exalt the statute to a royal place, and make sin an offense against the majesty of law, will tend to subject us to mechanical systems of salvation. Sin is a violation of the constitutional law of our own highest being. We were made for partnership with God, and endowed with capacity to know him. We were fashioned with a view to understand his truth, discover his purpose, co-operate with him in service, and ultimately to share his glory. When this birthright is bartered, we sin against him and wrong our own souls.

Sin is a miscarriage of the divine purpose. Failing to adjust life to the law of progression, it falls a prey to deterioration.

With the true center gone, life becomes eccentric. The circles of thought, ambition, and activity, contract and become concentric in self. Faculties of mind and functions of body may still find exercise in art and invention, but the horizon is gone. Life is swung out of the current, and becomes an eddy on the side.

In the sinful condition, man develops morbid ideas concerning God. If the inherent retribution of sin is not too poignant and immediate, he treats God as a negligible, and laughs off responsibility in a shallow agnosticism. But when the punishment is sharp and proximate, he conceives God as his enemy. If God knows, he does not care: or if he cares, he abandons him to sorrow and pain. He is ready to curse God and die. He is afflicted with a theological insanity. As a demented man imagines his best friend a foe, mistakes love for hatred, and misconstrues a benevolent motive for a deadly purpose, so the sinful soul entertains a caricature of God in his mind, and in resentment renounces him. Sin then is an abnormality. It is a disease productive of morbid and pathological conditions. Unless it is arrested, neutralized, and counteracted, it must inevitably make for destruction.

Salvation implies that some power can intervene, and turn life from the forces of decay, and invest it with energy to achieve the lost ideal. Is this possible? Can the soul overcome the force of sin's downward momentum? Can anything break between an act and its issues, or must a cause inevitably work out its ultimate effect? These are pertinent questions. In this day when scientific inquiry seems to reveal the absolute sovereignty of law, "the problem for reason is not the punishment of sin, but its forgiveness." Yet nature is not so arbitrary as to exclude reversals within its domain. There is a system of compromises and compensations, that interlace within the natural order. The same nature which may suffer disease is stored with recuperating agencies. Stimuli and sedatives abound, and by them physical conditions and tendencies are changed and reversed. These compensations in the material realm are prophecies of analogous moral forces, which may act in the interests of salvation from sin.

We must remember that salvation has primarily to do with internal conditions, because it saves from sin which is internal.

Salvation is not immediately effected by any system of external propitiations. The very conception of having to placate God, appease his wrath, and buy his favor is fatal to the genius of salvation. The first essential in salvation is the conviction that God is love. The sacrificial systems are based upon the idea that, if God is love, his love is not free to act. It is limited by some more regal attribute in the deity. The offense against his majesty must be conciliated before his real nature can come into exercise. The sacrificial systems so constantly tend to misunderstanding and abuse, that Jesus and the prophets removed the emphasis from them altogether. One might offer a sacrifice and experience no change in his moral experience or his idea of God. That were only a temporary truce between antagonists, not a reconciliation between the Heavenly Father and his child. I would be far from saying that a true penitent does not experience the grace of salvation while offering a sacrifice. But then, salvation is effected through his penitence. On the other hand, a sacrifice may degenerate into a bribe, and a man's idea and feeling toward God and his own sinful heart be the worse for his act. It all depends upon the motive in the heart, and if the heart is right in the sight of God, saving grace is operative apart from the sacrifice. The principle and issue is no different, though that sacrifice be the cross, if the idea of the mind and the attitude of the heart be the same. If the punishment of sin were an arbitrary infliction from without, then some external mediation might be employed to ward it off. But since the punishment is inherent in the transgressor, an external propitiation will effect a moral recovery as much as a bank deposit will cure scarlet fever. When physical diseases were attributed to the affliction of evil spirits from without, incantations, rites, and noises were employed to drive the demons off. But the patient never recovered as the immediate issue of such exercises. The therapeutic value of the ceremonies lay in their suggestiveness and these were as liable to be fatal as curative. Recovery is due to some internal potency being awakened and stimulated to overcome disease. In the case of sin, which is the moral disease of the soul, the principle is the same.

How is Jesus Christ related to our salvation from sin? Dis-

tracted o'er his wife's wild raving through remorse for sin,
Macbeth appealed to his doctor asking—

Canst thou not minister to a mind diseas'd,
Pluck from the memory a rooted trouble,
Raze out the written troubles of the brain
And with some sweet oblivious antidote
Cleanse the stuff'd bosom of that perilous stuff
Which weighs upon the heart,
.
And purge it to a sound and pristine health?

The doctor answered—

She is troubled with thick-coming fancies,
That keep her from her rest.
Therein must the patient minister to himself.
.
What a sigh is there! The heart is sorely charged.
This disease is beyond my practice.
More needs she the divine than the physician,
God, God forgive us all.

The patient minister to himself! As well expect a man to stay his fall in mid-air. Sin has no power of self-recovery. If God should fail us, we are hopelessly undone. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, . . . and sent not the Son into the world to judge the world: but that the world should be saved through him." When Jesus entered upon this mission he said, "I am come to call sinners to repentance. . . . He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment but hath passed out of death into life." Repentance and faith, these are his specifics. Through them he will effect forgiveness and impart his own spiritual life to men. The processes of salvation are extremely subtle and beyond our powers of complete analysis. Several elements, however, stand out with clearness.

1. Christ restores the mind with the true idea, that "God is love." Nothing is accomplished toward moral recovery until man thoroughly understands this. Despite his sin, God's interest, love, and purpose toward the man are unchanged and unbroken. The

sinner must be persuaded that God has not abandoned him. The heavenly Father has not forsaken the sinner in the pique of disappointment, nor does he abide afar off nursing an indignation against his erring, sinsick, demented children. He is ever near, yearning and grieving over them, longing for their return and restoration. This attitude of love and desire to save, Jesus reveals in his own attitude toward sinners. His consideration for those who had made shipwreck of life was an outrageous scandal to the Pharisees. They separated themselves from people caught in the sensuous vices, and were hard and overbearing toward them. Their hauteur grew out of a false notion of God. They thought of him as a colossal Pharisee, a sacred, unsympathetic separatist. Hardened in their vain hypocrisies, they deserted the needy and drove them into despair. Jesus humbled himself to give them assurance of his sympathy and love. He never raised the question of sin upon a sinner. Compassion, mercy, forgiveness, and hope were the magnets that drew sinners unto him. and when they gathered about him and felt the power of his grace and truth, they learned and knew that "God is love."

2. The love of God begets repentance. Disappointment, disgrace, suffering, and the sequences of sin may bite with remorse. But repentance can be realized only in the atmosphere of love. There and there only, is sin discovered to be a tragedy against the Father-heart of God. And yet his love survives the pain and grief, and rushes forth to cleanse the sinner of his guilt. Then godly sorrow fills the soul and makes him turn in shame and horror from his sin, and stretch forth hands toward God for help. There can be no forgiveness without repentance. That were a psychological impossibility. How can a man be loosed from that which he persistently holds fast? Repentance is the divine love and truth working in the soul, loosing it from sin.

* 3. The same love of God creates anew a saving faith within the soul. Jesus had faith in the power and purpose of God to redeem man. This faith in God had its corollary in faith in man. Beneath the catastrophies of sin, there is still the image of God immured within the soul. The godlike potency is smothered and dying, but it is waiting the redeeming touch of the Savior. With the love of God burning in his soul, Jesus believed that he could

touch these hidden dormant qualities into life and action. And he believed that men would respond to his saving touch. Zaccheus seemed nothing but a hopeless, grafting tax-assessor, but Jesus saw in him a lost son of Abraham. "A bruised reed will he not break." He will make him a pillar in the temple of his God. The Samaritan woman by the well seems a crass abandoned degenerate, but he saw a "pearl of great price." "A smoking flax he will not quench." He will fan it into an altar fire, burning with devotion and holy service toward God. He ever greets the penitent soul with cheering words, "Go sin no more." It is the inspiring preface of a new beginning. It is the newest edition of, "Let us make man in our own image." This greeting of grace kindles a new faith in the sinner. The past need not be a millstone about the neck. The present need not be an irresistible tyranny in life. "He holds it truth with him who sings, that we may rise on our dead selves, to higher and to nobler things." With faith in God, and a new faith in himself through God, the enfranchised sinner takes up the broken threads of life, and moves upward toward the divine ideal. God-likeness and God-fellowship shall yet be achieved. Faith is the energy of the entire self reaching out to respond to the energy of redeeming love.

4. The love of God in Christ is the power of God unto salvation. Throughout the earthly life of Jesus this love steadily shone forth. Its brightest glory however is seen against the background of the cross. The cross is a central thing in the economy of redemption, because there the divine love finds its supreme emphasis. It is necessary to evaluate the cross correctly if the love there displayed is to find its highest efficacy. If the cross is regarded as an expedient to be thrust between a sinner and an indignant judge, it will neutralize, not to say defeat, itself. It becomes a refuge and a hiding-place. But if the death of Jesus is seen to be the issue of divine love, and not the ground of it, then do we with confidence and joy meet the Heavenly Father in reconciliation. In the death of Jesus, two flood-tides met. History and experience have furnished many startling violences of sin. But instinctively we feel that the crucifixion was the highwater mark of sin. There sin became exceeding sinful. But where sin abounded, love and grace superabounded.

Where sin does its worst there love finds its brightest transfiguration. Whenever we wish to know the depth and height, the length and breadth of the divine love, we instinctively bow in the shadow of the cross. There "God commendeth his love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." The uplifted Savior draws us to himself, and as we realize that "He loved us and gave himself for us," the deepest darkest deadliest sins loose themselves from us, and penitent souls stand reconciled to God through the death of his Son.

5. "If we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more being reconciled shall we be saved by his life." Here is the undiscovered remainder of salvation. The forgiveness of sin is the initial step in salvation. After that, the soul must work out its own salvation with fear and trembling. Here is where the life needs to be recapitalized, that it may work out its high calling. In some unexplainable way the Christ who redeems us from sin, also makes us partakers of his divine nature. "He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit" with him. We live; yet not we alone, Christ liveth in us. We abide in him and he abides in us. There is a sweet confusion in which the divine and human interpenetrate one another, and the life and service of each becomes merged in the other. The redeemed life is an organism in which Christ lives and works the will of God. Yielding ourselves to his sovereignty, we overcome sin, and daily experience a transfiguration, in which the image of God is realized in us. This process goes on in proportion as we lay hold of that for which Christ Jesus laid hold on us.

6. There is one further thought which I would suggest. Salvation is also mediated through the disciples of Christ, who are one with him in faith, and love. The gospel is not confined to the written Scriptures. It comes through the children of God, who accept the stewardship of the manifold grace of God. Wherever men have faith to penetrate the tragedies of sin, and search for the hidden image of God; wherever they with loving ministries try to touch that dormant quality into life; wherever they through self-sacrificing service win men to faith and love in God, they too became saviors. They learn to know the meaning of that scripture, "Whosoever sins ye forgive they are forgiven unto

them." This is a ministry that needs a new emphasis in our day. And if Christ dwell in us richly through faith, we too may have his spirit upon us, "to preach good tidings to the poor . . . to proclaim release to captives, recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."

THE PRESIDENT: The Secretary has an announcement to make.

THE SECRETARY: I desire to call your attention to the fact that the General Committee of the Congress will hold its annual session after the adjournment, and request all members of that committee to retire immediately as soon as this meeting is adjourned, to the Parish house in order that there may be no waste of time waiting for absentees.

THE PRESIDENT: The first of the appointed speakers is Professor Delavan B. Reed, of Hillsdale College, Michigan. (*Applause.*) The Secretary calls our attention to the fact that our brother represents the Free Baptists among us. We very gladly welcome him. (*Applause.*)

PROFESSOR DELAVAN B. REED, Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Michigan, then said:

Mr. President: In case we allow our minds to revert to the history of dogma and the teaching of the apostolic church, we are impressed with the fact that the question before us is one that has received no little attention, from the days of Paul even unto the present.

Such being the case, it seems as though this question ought to have been definitely settled long ago.

Two reasons, however, may be urged, either of which would be a sufficient justification for the introduction of this question to the representatives of the Baptist brotherhood here assembled. First, in case the reasons for our faith in this or that particular dogma have begun to fade and grow dim in our mind, or in the mind of the Church, this in itself would constitute a sufficient justification for the reconsideration of the question. Second, in case the question before us has never been satisfactorily settled,

this fact alone must in time necessitate a reconsideration and possibly a restatement. I believe that the history of dogma will verify the assertion that no dogmatic statement with respect to the mediatorial work of Christ has ever fully satisfied the mind of either the church universal or of any ecclesiastical organization within the church universal.

The prevailing soteriological view from the days of Irenaeus to the days of Anselm, has been relegated to the museum of antiquated dogmas.

Furthermore Anselm's justly celebrated answer to the question before us, together with the modifications of Grotius and Duns Scotus, have not been found sufficient to settle once and for all the question, "How is salvation mediated to us through Christ?"

In the discussion of all great questions there is a principle which consciously or otherwise determines more or less our thought. We come to the consideration of all great questions with certain presuppositions, and these presuppositions must inevitably affect our conclusions.

This principle is in my judgment universal in its application. In the subject before us, salvation is the first word which commands our attention. It is not within the scope and aim of the present discussion to trace the word salvation with its various meanings throughout biblical literature.

Now, what do you mean by salvation—what do I—when we approach that man in the shop or in the home and endeavor to persuade him to seek salvation through Jesus Christ our Lord? Personally I expect to be saved through the mediation of Christ, from sin, both the love of it, and as far as possible from the consequences of it. All this I expect to receive through the mediation of Christ. How is this mediation effected? How are you to find out? How am I? Where shall I go, and to whom shall I appeal for an answer to this question? The apostle Paul is the first writer who ever attempted to articulate the cross in a theological system.

At the time of our Savior's advent the Jewish people held crass and materialistic views of the Messiah and his kingdom. Paul was a Jew, and it would have been difficult for him entirely to disentangle himself from the faith of his fathers.

The time, however, came when in the providence of God, Paul became fully convinced that Jesus was indeed the Christ, the long-expected Messiah.

In the city of Damascus, Paul began his notable career as a preacher, and we are not left in doubt in regard to the principal proposition which he endeavored to defend, since we read in the book of Acts, "But Paul increased the more in strength and confounded the Jews which dwelt in Damascus, proving that this is very Christ."

The Jewish people had looked for a conquering Messiah. Jesus died upon the cross, and the cross, we are told, was a stumbling-block for the Jews. Our sources do not inform us with respect to the objections urged by the Jewish opponents to the reception of Jesus as the Messiah. I do not, however, think that we shall go far astray when we assert that one of the principal objections must have been the cross.

May not that cross have been something of a mystery to Paul himself in the beginning of his work as a preacher of Christ? May not that cross have forced him into self-imposed retirement into the desert of Arabia? Would not Paul's entire training in the school of Gamaliel have necessitated that he hold fast to his faith in the conquering Messiah, notwithstanding the fact of the cross? Must not a man with the splendid dialectical powers of Paul come to an agreement with himself with respect to that cross? Must he not have so articulated the cross in a theological system that the cross itself became at last to him one of the principal evidences of the all-conquering power of the Christ?

To the solution of this problem the apostle Paul bent all the energies of his splendid intellect. To Paul as well as to all others the principle already stated is applicable. He as well as others must come to his task with certain presuppositions, by means of which his thought is determined, and his system articulated to the thought of his day and age.

What were some of the presuppositions which Paul made use of in the solution of his problem? First, there was his positive conviction of God's absolute holiness and justice. Second, law being an expression of the will of that holy and just God must by virtue of this fact be holy and the commandment holy and just

and good. Third, all penalties affixed for the transgression of this holy and just law must be paid, lest God himself be found unjust by virtue of his neglect to inflict these holy and just penalties. Fourth, the law of God had been transgressed both by Adam and all of his descendants. Fifth, the penalty affixed for the transgression of God's law upon the part of our representative, Adam, was death, both spiritual and physical; indeed, this penalty in its physical aspect extended to the entire created universe. "For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God, for the creation itself was made subject to vanity, not willingly but by reason of Him who subjected the same in hope, because the creation itself shall also be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God." Sixth, there was the Christ, absolutely sinless, bleeding, dying upon the cross. Seventh, there was the sacrificial system of the Old Testament writings. How could a just God permit the sinless Christ to bear the penalty of sin? Not on account of his individual transgressions, since he had never committed any transgressions. Not on account of inherited corruption, since Paul's system logically presupposes that corruption had not been transmitted to the Christ.

Paul finds the solution in the idea of substitution, and the tragic death of Christ upon the cross becomes the payment of penalty, by means of which the justice of God is safeguarded when he pardons sin, and the whole creation is freed from the bondage of inherited corruption. Most assuredly the Christian world will never cease to be thankful that God in his providence raised up the apostle Paul to interpret the cross to his generation and age.

Furthermore, in the Pauline system the cross becomes the symbol of the conquering Messiah, such as Judaism had never conceived. What answer, however, has the church to give to that increasing number of men and women who can no longer accept all of the presuppositions which Paul made use of in the solution of the problem of the cross? Must they be left in permanent intellectual confusion with respect to a doctrine which we all regard as the heart of the gospel? Has the life and teaching of Christ no light to throw upon the question before us? When we

turn to Jesus Christ for an answer to our question, there are certain facts to be noted. First, the Christian world is united in affirming the supremacy of Jesus. There is probably not a man on the floor of this Congress, who would dissent from these words of Principal Fairbairn. Jesus Christ is in his own order, namely, the order of the founders of religion, the transcendent person of history, and to be transcendent, he is to be transcendent everywhere, for religion is the supreme factor in the organizing and the regulating of our personal and collective life. Second, we must not forget that Christ never makes use of forensic analogies with respect to the results of his death. Third, we are all practically agreed with respect to the basis of Christ's supremacy. In Christ we find the sinless and impenitent one. In Him we have a life of consciously realized ideals, and the absolute unity of his moral self-consciousness.

In him we feel that we have revealed the heart of our heavenly Father, and the life which he lived speaks to all with authority, and validates his lordship over the children of men. Fourth, in case we throw out our thought over the reported utterances of our Lord, we shall find that the dominant note which runs throughout the teaching of Christ in relation to salvation is that salvation is mediated to us through him by means of a personal relation to himself. "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." "I am the way, the truth, and the life." "All things are delivered unto me of my Father, and no man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him." "I am the vine, ye are the branches, and my Father is the husbandman." "Ye will not come unto me that ye may have life." "Then said they unto him, what shall we do that we may work works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, this is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom he hath sent." "All that the Father giveth to me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out."

Were we to ask who is this Christ, we shall find no better answer than that which the New Testament gives, "Christ is the Son of God, the express image of His glory, He is God manifest

in the flesh," and what is this but to say that Christ is the manifestation of God's eternal attitude toward a sinful world?

Instead of making too much of the cross, we have made too little of it. We have made it the symbol of a single event in the life of Christ, whereas, it should be made the symbol of his entire life of self-sacrificing service for the sake of suffering, sorrowing, and sinful humanity.

Furthermore, if Christ was indeed God manifest in the flesh, then the cross must become the symbol of God's eternal self-sacrificing love in behalf of his erring children. In case all this be true, we may say in the words of another,

The barrier to be removed in order to forgiveness, is on man's side, not on God's. It consists not in God's unwillingness, but in man's unreadiness; not in God's offended justice, but in man's incorrigibility. God's love impels him to forgive. He is rich in mercy and ready to forgive. Why is forgiveness ever withheld? Solely because man is not prepared to receive it. The love that gives, and the love that forgives is the same; but it is governed by different conditions. The love that gives is love unrestricted. The love that forgives often finds an obstacle in man.

How is this obstacle upon the part of man removed through the mediation of Christ? First, the self-sacrificing life and death of Christ become to us one of the strongest motives to repentance. When we behold in Jesus Christ the manifestation of God's self-sacrificing love, we begin to realize not only what sin costs us, but at the same time what it costs our heavenly Father. This revelation of what sin costs God becomes to us the clearest revelation possible of the heinousness of sin. Knowing what sin costs, and its heinousness, becomes the strongest possible motive to repentance. Indeed, these words of Sabatier with respect to this matter are none too strong, "Thus it is that the passion and death of Christ act upon the heart of sinners." His was the most powerful appeal to repentance humanity ever heard, and also the most operative and fruitful in marvelous results. We now have all that is necessary for the forgiveness of sin. The self-sacrificing love of Christ, the manifestation of the eternal self-sacrificing love of God leads to contrition, so deep and sincere that we are now ready, yea intensely desire, to co-operate with God in his

loving purpose with respect to us. In biblical literature this thought is no more clearly and powerfully set forth than in the parable of the Prodigal Son. Here we have a picture of the father whose love never abates or grows cold—a suffering father, a vicariously suffering father. His suffering is necessitated by virtue of his love. Here we have the son who voluntarily rejects his father's love, and the blessings of his father's home. Here we have at last the deeply penitent son who is now ready to make his father's will the law and end of his being. Surely this would seem to be an all-sufficient reason for the forgiveness of sin, since humanly speaking such penitence upon the part of the sinner is the strongest possible guarantee that the sinner will cease from his sin, and lovingly co-operate with God in the accomplishment of his Father's holy will with respect to him. Second, salvation is mediated to us through Christ, by means of the impartation of his own spirit whereby we are progressively freed from the love of sin. We are now dealing with a fact which is evidenced by the writings of the New Testament—observation and experience. Paul in his epistle to the Corinthians writes as follows: "But we all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the spirit; but the word of the cross is to them that are perishing foolishness, but unto us who are being saved it is the power of God." Paul evidently regarded the members of the church at Corinth not only as men who had been saved, but as men who were being saved. They were men whose sins had been forgiven on account of their repentance and faith. They were also men who had been reconciled unto God, and consequently were giving unto God an opportunity to work out his holy will in them.

Observation is in perfect accord with these scriptural statements. The lives of the Christian men and women with whom we associate bear witness to the fact that they are being gradually freed from the love of sin by means of the spirit of Christ. The state of spiritual supremacy which characterized the life of John G. Paton at the close of his splendid career is not the state of spiritual supremacy which characterizes the babe in Christ Jesus.

Furthermore, these scriptural statements find their confirma-

tion in our own Christian experience. That was a great day when we stood before God, through the mediation of Christ, pardoned and reconciled. It was a day of rejoicing, but at the same time it was the beginning of a struggle for spiritual supremacy, which for some of us has not yet ended. We are not, however, discouraged, since by the impartation of the spirit of our Lord we are made conscious of our progressive liberation from the love of sin.

THE PRESIDENT: We regret that the bell should have brought to such sudden conclusion so admirable an address.

The second and last of the main speakers on the programme is our friend, Dr. W. G. Fennell, formerly of Newark, now of Hartford, who returns to give this address.

DR. W. G. FENNEL: *Mr. Chairman, Men and Brethren:* We sincerely sympathized with our brother, Mr. Coleman, last evening, when he spoke of the difficulty of discussing papers we have never seen, in an address already prepared before we came. I suppose we are expected to imagine what the brethren before us will say.

Perhaps we are in somewhat the same position as Goldstein, when he had already punished little Ikey. Ikey sat there sullen, bruised in spirit, and the father holding the rod over him said, "Ikey, what you dinks? you don't answer; I know what you dinks, you dinks a very bad swear word, and I whips you for that." (*Laughter.*)

I suppose we are to imagine that the brethren who go before us express some great heresy which we are to answer; but I am sure we haven't had very much of the radical here today, and so each man must go his own way.

It has come to be an almost trite expression of fact in the life of Kant, that after he had gone through all his speculative reasoning, and could not find the essentials of religious life, his own soul called for them so deeply that he returned and went over the path again, and wrote his practical reason. What was true of that great thinker in his great speculations is largely true of all of us with our smaller minds in the practical relations of life. I can never forget the experience of my seminary days when I had

studied the theories of atonement, until in sheer reaction I went back to agnosticism with no theory, and was confronted by a laboring man of intelligence, a man with a great burdened heart for his own sin. He asked me the direct question, "What shall I do to be saved?" I had to answer him. I was "up against it," as we say: I had to give him the direct word: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." The fact persists that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation. It is true that we have gone beyond some of the old views, those of the Middle Ages, those of Anselm, those of Grotius; we wonder now how such views could have been held. There are views of substitution in terms of law-court and market that now seem revolting to us, and limited atonement has become archaic. We are feeling that the emphasis of human tragedy has been carried too far, and we find our good Dr. Mabie differentiating between the tragedy and the offering through the Eternal Spirit.

But now there is the danger that we go to the other extreme; there is the danger of teaching a forgiveness that is little more than weak indulgence, and we are realizing that there are great objections to this. There is the possibility of human pride which seeks to find some justification for its own wrong attitude toward God. We know that a weak view of sin means also a weak view of goodness; there is a good that becomes the enemy of the best, and especially of blessedness. We know, too, that a weak view of atonement is ineffective, both in the way of ethics and in awakening to service. We know again, that it tends to make the human the measure of the divine; as one of the reformers of the old time said, "Your views of God are entirely too human." We think of forgiveness in terms of human thought; our forgiveness of a personal injury may have no other relation; but the forgiveness of a personal injury that involves a wrong to a whole community will involve a second element, and it is that second element which appears with God's forgiveness.

Then, again, we call our views modern, and think that they prevail today. Nearly all of us love the modern views; I love them myself, and yet sometimes I ask myself how general is this view which we call modern. When we look at the great mass of the people—the great Roman communion still deep in orthodoxy,

the communion of the Greek church, and the majority of the people in our Protestant churches, our modern view is rather the view of a comparative few. And are we sure that it is always an advanced view? When Paul preached at Athens or at Corinth, he met a people who believed they had modern views, but now we know that their views belonged to a day of intellectual senility. Let us be careful lest our advanced views go so far as to be judged a decline of truth in the years to come.

Between the views that are past and gone, and the views that tend to leniency, let us try and ask what did Jesus actually do?

Let us assume consciousness in all hearts of an unreconciled relation; everybody feels there is a great gulf between us and God; even the most modern cults have the same experience; in other words they believe there is a difference; some may call it an "error"; but there is an aspiration in our hearts to bridge the gulf that exists between us and God. We want to ask a question today, without much theory: "What has Christ actually done for us?"

First, he has revealed to us two great facts essential to reconciliation. We believe there is no change necessary in God; never has a change been necessary; his attitude toward us has always been that of eternal love; but we need to have a change with reference to two facts in our own consciousness: We need to change our conception of God's attitude toward us, and we need to change in our attitude toward God. Those two must meet. They must be brought together, and the first great fact of the mediation of Jesus Christ is to show us God's great willingness, and to make us feel the need of coming to him. On one side he has revealed God to us as Love, not vindictive, not to be placated. Text after text in the New Testament shows "the great love wherewith he loved us." And too, he has revealed to us the holiness of God, a holiness just as genuine, just as true as the Old Testament, but with a difference. When I stood by Lake Lucerne in Switzerland, on the right hand was Mount Pilatus, grand, sublime, majestic, but dark and threatening; on the other hand was Mount Rigi, probably of the same rock, with height, grandeur, and sublimity, but it was clothed with verdure and touched with sunlight. God's holiness is righteousness aglow with love. Christ has shown us

also that God has taken the initiative in man's redemption—the exact reversal of the world's thought which has ever been trying to propitiate him, trying to bring him into sympathy with us. We remember that in every reconciliation in this world, the one who is wronged must take the initiative, and must dictate the terms. Jesus revealed God as a God of love, of righteousness aglow with love, as taking the initiative, as possessing what Ritschl calls "the will of love," what Fairbairn calls "the transitive element in the immanent being of God."

On the other side is the healthful sense of guilt. Guilt is a universal fact, no matter what men may call it. They may try to soften its terms, but we find it everywhere. The great necessity is to have a healthful view of guilt. There is a guilt that leads to suicide or to wreck and ruin and wasted life. There is guilt that leads to temporary sorrow. There is a guilt that leads to selfish reaction. What we need is a sense of guilt that is deep; that is conscious of its wrong toward God; a sense of guilt that has its roots interlaced with the whole human race. The scholar counts that man his best friend who awakens him out of his lethargy and makes him hunger for scholarship. The physician is doing the best service who awakens the appetite. Jesus Christ has done the first work of mediation in showing God's willingness to come to us and in creating in us a healthful longing for God.

In the second place, Christ has objectified the Father's love and holiness, interpreting them in terms of human comprehension. We must ever keep before us the eternal purpose of God's love as primary. Fairbairn has said that Christ is but "the externalization of the eternal heart of God," and in Hebrews we read that the offering was made "through the Eternal Spirit." We believe this is the thought of the Bible. Jesus is forever trying to manifest the Father. We emphasize the Son to the neglect of the Father just when the Son is trying to lead us to the Father. He is "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Paul is forever emphasizing the historical fact of the crucifixion; yet in his last days in writing to the Colossians, he goes back to the cosmic Christ, leading us to the very heart of God. And Paul says again that when at last all things are made subject to the Father, even Christ shall become "subject unto him, that God

may be all in all;" in other words, Jesus is God's heart thrown into relief that we may understand him, feel him, and know him. There are several facts, some of them modern, the synthesis of which leads us to feel the necessity of the manifestation of God in Christ. One is, we cannot live in the abstract; we must have the concrete. Note the instance of Dr. Mabie's long experience, which has been the experience of many of us, that subjectivity in religion leads to doubt and inactivity; it is the objective truth that calls forth the best that is in us. Then all religion seeks historic bases; wherever they have it not, they will find it; where they are more subjective, they will either decline, or you will find them gathering around places, individuals, or events. All the world seeks a religious deliverer; if it has them not, it has developed them—something objective by which they may come into relation with God. For the highest reaches of the soul we need an interpreter. This is true in art. You cannot learn art without a brush and a teacher; you cannot find the highest harmonies in music without a musician and an instrument of music.

Then we believe it is true that the world still thinks in terms sacrificial. When you find millions, from the age of Christ until now, carrying their sacrifices for propitiation, can you answer them better than by giving the answer in sacrificial terms? Are there not many who still think in forensic terms? If we have passed beyond that, is there not with all of us a rugged morality that must be recognized in the order of the universe? There is also a powerful appeal in the objective lesson. It is not a stage-play for effect. It is not merely emotional appeal; it is leverage we seek. In aiding the foreigner, we speak to him in his own tongue. Jesus came to us and spoke to us in a tongue that we can understand, and extended to us the very human hand of God. All this becomes a ground of assurance and a basis of faith. All this is like the geometrical figure that leads to the ideal behind it, until we say, "Yes, now I see." Christ takes our hand, places it in the Father's hand, and then we feel like singing from the depths of the heart—

Plenteous grace with Thee is found,
Grace to cover all my sin.

Once more it is through the personality, the teaching and service of Jesus that our salvation is carried on to its completeness. "Gazing upon him as in a mirror, we are changed into the same image." Here are the larger reaches of salvation beyond the mere fact of forgiveness. "Not of works, lest any man should boast," where we have the relation of salvation to the refinement and the beauty and the humility of Christian character. "He died for us that they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves," where salvation means cutting the fetters that bind us in our selfishness. "The world is crucified under me, and I unto the world," where we find mastery and achievement over all material conditions. Then again we are "purified from dead works, to serve the living God," where salvation means taking us out into the broad freedom of God's great creation, and making us live in the true orbit of our being. I believe salvation means calling men from a state like that of a wandering comet in the heavens, to find a true orbit around the very central sun, God himself.

Whenever we become disturbed with all the theories of the atonement, we may fortify ourselves with four facts. Let us give them in words of others. Denney says that "the love which can literally go out of itself and make the burden of others its own is the radical principle of all genuine and victorious morality." Simpson says: "To understand fully the atonement is to understand three things and their ultimate relation to each other: The greatest thing in God is love; the greatest thing in the universe is his law, and the darkest thing in man is sin." Then take the words of Lecky: "Three years of Jesus have done more to regenerate and soften humanity than all the disquisitions of moralists and philosophers." Last of all, I like this from the sermon of Rev. R. J. Campbell of London, eleven years ago. He said that he was called to the bedside of a woman, one who had been brought up in the refinement of life, but had given herself chiefly to the oriental cults. On her death-bed her conscience was ill at ease, and this was her plea: "Oh, that some great, strong friend would take my conscience as if it were his own, that I might find a little peace." When I realize these great facts in the practical experience of life, I feel, for one, like going on and preaching

“Christ crucified,” realizing that he is actually the power of God and the wisdom of God. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: Our friend Dr. Lawson has been unable to secure cards from the friends in his pilgrimage, and Dr. Foster has gallantly consented to fill the breach and says, if we desire, he will again speak to us.

DR. GEORGE B. FOSTER: At the outset I am not quite conscious that Dr. Lawson accurately represented my attitude. I am most reluctant to speak; first, because I have had some share, however indifferent, in every session of this Congress, so far; and if my saying so did not seem to refute it, I would really urge that after all I am a modest man.

But for another reason, I am frank to say to you that the subject under consideration itself is one that gives me pause, and I am not clear in my mind either as to whether you would like to hear what I have to say about it.

A VOICE: That is what we want.

DR. FOSTER: Or whether what I think about it is a firm enough conclusion, and mature enough conviction in my own mind to warrant an expression before so representative a body as the Baptist Congress.

Instead of my speaking upon the subject, what would give me the greatest satisfaction would be to know what you thoughtful brethren are thinking about; what is the content of your consciousness now? I am wondering whether these able addresses seem to set forth that which is actual and dynamically real and useful in your own experiences today. I am also wondering whether these excellent addresses are not the expression of a waning rather than a rising conviction among us. Is it the dying wave, or is it the rising tide? Is the vitality, is the nourishment of life, actually exhibited to us in this discussion of the subject?

Now, if I could raise such a question as that without seeming in any indirect way, even, to be offering criticism upon these addresses I would be very glad. I speak out of a different experience, and if I may be permitted to say so, as a man who has suffered as keen spiritual anguish for twenty-five years as one

could well suffer, and maintain his sanity and his health, in brooding and living through these great problems, and I am wondering whether or not a great change is not coming to us. But now for the main point.

For one thing, historical and philosophical criticism now look upon the church's doctrine of the present work of Christ as an unhistorical construction and that person and doctrine have suffered disintegration and retirement by this criticism on the part of those who have engaged in it. Consequently, what was left after that was the Messiah of the Scriptures. You have there a majestic drama of a pre-existent Heavenly Being, not God—not quite God—certainly not at first—who came from heaven. Now, all this was not a figure of speech but a fact—he came to earth, entered the body of a woman, was born, lived awhile, and talked; was put to death; went down into the grave; came back again; returned to heaven; will come back from heaven again to earth and judge the world; then after the judgment and the dual issue of the judgment, will return to heaven again—or possibly stay here upon earth. That, I choose to designate now as the messianic drama. Are you sure that there is actually and distinctly such a being as the Messiah? Philosophical and historical criticism doubt that. Besides, the presupposition of science is unbroken continuity from aboriginal cosmic stuff to the perfect saint, consequently no messianic irruption into the order of the world can be allowed, from such a point of view. Then there is left for us the Jesus of history, but owing to the heterogeneity of his life and situation with our modern life and situation to the scantiness of our information concerning him, to our ignorance of his own conviction as to his death, to the vitality of the sacrificial idea being incident to blood-covered altars which are alien to our experience—owing to all these things it seems as if the time had come when we force ourselves to retain these ideas in our consciousness, rather than that they were vital sources and fountains of strength to our experiences today. We forcibly keep the ideas rather than that they keep us!

Finally, the possible advantage which I see to be gained from this mediation of Jesus—to use this phrase—the possible advantage, and it is my own position, is to see in it a supreme ex-

pression of a certain universal law, so that the value of Jesus is not in anything that is aloof and apart from humanity, but in his organic identification with us, and in our belief that he has done something which is not different from what we do, and something which is a constitutional necessity in the life of every man and of all society; that is to say, we must subsume Jesus under the head of the universal law of solidarity, and interpret him from that point of view, and also under that other universal law of dying to live. But inasmuch as these are immanent and constant processes in the life of nature and the life of man, redemptive in our experiences, we can understand what he did, what he supremely did. But that what he did is to be put in the place of our doing, is something which it would seem that our experience cannot bear out. It is rather illustrative and incentive to us that we ourselves in our place, and in our way, shall be as redemptive in our disposition and activity as he was in his degree, in his place and his way. In other words, instead of the isolation and aloofness of Jesus as the valuable point about it all, it is rather the membership of Jesus with the rest of us; it is rather that he shared experiences which is intelligible to all of us, and which is indispensable in the redemptive process of life—it is this that is the stirring thing. In case that this is true, then our modern thought of God and our modern thought of man will allow this position harmoniously to be integrated in our general view of the world and of life. But the very words that are used seem to picture an individual God here, and a man here, and some third party coming in between them. I ask you to recall how manifold and complex this ecclesiastical mediation between God and man once was, how progressive reduction has gone on for centuries, and how the immanence of God now supersedes the necessity for such kind of mediation at all.

Now, our doctrine of the immanence of God, spirit of our spirit, and processes of our processes, and suffering in our suffering, so that the Cross is the constant fact in life—our thought of that is a much more wholesome and dynamic thought than the Israelite and ancient historical fact detached and disparate from the rest of life to which we once looked back as the source of our

strength. Thus God and Christ and cross and redemption are before us as well as behind us. (*Applause.*)

REV. ALBERT G. LAWSON: I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, as the reason given me why three different brethren did not send cards readily—one of the interests of our Congress, one of the interests most vital to us, is an out-and-out and frank and true volunteer discussion of all papers here presented—one of our rules is that the appointed speaker shall not use manuscript, and three men have declined to send cards, or to speak, because we have permitted the overruling of our rule. And they have said that it was unfair to give a man an opportunity to present practically a manuscript prepared beforehand when it was understood that they were appointed speakers, and then ask for men from the floor to volunteer, to think on their feet, and to discuss questions so important as these.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, for use in our future meetings, that we take a little more pains in a rightful regard for our own rules, and just legislation in regard to that feature on our programme, and I think we shall have a more lively, and more fairly distributed, and more worthwhile discussion of the various questions presented to us.

THE PRESIDENT: Will you take the chair for a moment?

(*Dr. Lawson took the chair.*)

DR. LEIGHTON WILLIAMS: If you will allow the chairman to become a speaker for a moment, I would like to remind you of the difficulty of the situation, and then to say a word on this important matter before us. It is exceedingly difficult for those who have been asked to prepare addresses, so called, to come here with their thoughts fixed in certain channels, and then re-adjust those thoughts to a situation that is necessarily different from that which they have imagined it to be. I think, therefore, that we must allow some discretion, especially on philosophical or theological topics; we must allow some infringement of the rule, but I do heartily agree with Dr. Lawson, that as far as it is possible, we ought to abide by the rules which we have adopted; I trust you will excuse the chair for offering these reasons why I have allowed it at all.

Now, to come to the discussion of the afternoon, I would suggest that the reason why we put one of our cherished views, the view of the atonement, up for first discussion, is this fact, that in view of the current tone of men of the day, and the influences of that, we must again consider the question whether our statement of our belief needs in any way to be modified. I would not say with Dr. Foster personally, that it seems to me that it is not historical or literary criticism that forces this so much as the inductive method of reasoning, the scientific atmosphere in which we all live, because I venture to suggest to you in the words that I used a few moments since, the question has forced itself again and again on many minds how in the orderly world, where the sequence of cause and effect is everywhere recognized, can you say that a fact that happened 1,900 years ago is one that is directly interjecting itself, so to speak, between the individual souls today and the Eternal One. Now, we may just as well meet that question, and if we do not feel that it is fully and satisfactorily met by anything that has been said, at any rate we welcome the effort to say something. That is the way I look at it. I would not feel that I had been able to feel entirely satisfied with statements that have been recently made on that, and therefore I would not feel at once that I can be in entire agreement with Dr. Foster, but I do cherish a sort of love for a man who is willing to do what seems to me a courageous thing, and what I believe to be a very necessary thing for someone to do. I believe it is exceedingly necessary that we should address ourselves to the religious and ethical consciences of the men of our time, and these men are affected very largely by these drifts of opinion about us.

Now, in all theological readjustments there must be a period of uncertainty, and it is a time of uncertainty with many minds, I myself look upon it far more hopefully than many do, and if I may venture now to give my own view, it will be something along this line, that a cataclysm has happened in this chain of cause and effect, and after this event which we call cataclysm, we find the whole chain again has started afresh, but in a somewhat altered way—it is a break, as it were, as we call it in geology. We do find again that the eternal order of things is some way or other manifesting itself continually in the temporal, and that it

manifests itself more or less in certain times, and in certain crises, and in certain persons, and beyond it is the eternal, and that therefore endures.

We do say that in the historical processes concrete stages continue for long periods, and then suddenly an individual interposes, and the individual becomes the leader of a new crisis or stage, and lastly, we do see that in personal experience of divine communion we ourselves enter into experience of divine communion in some way or other through the mediation of a symbol, and that the symbol is that which induces relation by suggesting in us the absolute, and we only get the suggestion of the absolute when we contemplate the symbol, and of all the symbols, the Christ is the one in whom we see the absolute and the divine. I know that those who cannot sympathize as I do with mysticism do not look with favor along all these lines, perhaps, but with me the great hope of the truth is summed up in the two words, "Mysticism" and "Socialism." (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: If you gentlemen have nothing to offer in the way of discussion on this subject, I will call for the benediction to be pronounced by Dr. Haywood.

The closing prayer was offered by Dr. Haywood, after which an adjournment was taken to 8 o'clock P. M.

SECOND DAY

Evening Session

November 10, 1909

8 o'clock P. M.

THE PRESIDENT: *Brethren and Sisters*, the hour has arrived for the session of the evening. Let us join in the 1056th hymn.

(The hymn was then sung.)

THE PRESIDENT: We will be led in prayer by Rev. Dr. Merriam, the editor of *The Watchman*.

DR. MERRIAM offered prayer.

THE PRESIDENT: The topic is, "Recent Tendencies to Change Denominational Practice: Are They Desirable?" And the first

of the readers is our honored brother, the editor of *The Examiner*, Dr. Conant. (*Applause.*)

T. O. CONANT, LL.D.: If you think you are going to get anything but straight old-fashioned orthodoxy from my paper to-night, you will be disappointed.

RECENT TENDENCIES TO CHANGE DENOMINATIONAL PRACTICE

Mr. Chairman: The first step away from the simplicity of the gospel order was taken when, very early in the history of the church, the ecclesiastical leaders, arrogating to themselves powers which did not belong to them, began to substitute their own fanciful interpretations for the plain precepts of Christ and the apostolic writers. The assumption that they were at liberty to do this lay at the bottom of all those terrible perversions of the principles of the gospel which transformed the simple brotherhood established by our Lord into a vast spiritual despotism, pretending to wield supernatural powers and to control the keys into the Kingdom of Heaven. And the most far-reaching and mischievous of these perversions was the substitution of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration for that of the baptism of believers. From that malignant root sprang the mighty Upas tree of error which still flourishes in the Greek and Roman schisms, and too largely pervades even some of the Protestant communions. The Reformation of the sixteenth century, whose spirit had already been for two hundred years in the air, was a long step backward toward the New Testament ideal; but alas! it proved a case of arrested development. For various reasons, which cannot now be specified, infant baptism was retained in the Reformed State churches, and, more than anything else, became a bar to their complete emancipation from some of the most pernicious errors of Rome. Some of these churches, and offshoots from them, still linger in the twilight of ecclesiastical reform, unable to free themselves wholly from the traditions of men; and that others have approached nearer to the New Testament standard is mainly due to the fact that, in the midst of that deplorable arrest of progress, men of courage and clear vision arose who discerned and embraced the truth, and at the cost of ostracism, imprisonment,

torture, and death, bore their testimony to the spiritual nature of Christ's church and the peril of departure from the New Testament ideal. But for their fidelity and zeal in the face of persecution, and the vital seed they planted and fertilized with their heart's blood, there might have been no truly evangelical churches in the world today. Now, the vital principle on which they stood may be summarized in the following propositions, which I present as the basis of my argument today :

I. There is but one safe guide for Christ's disciples in the organization of a Christian church—the New Testament.

II. The New Testament, by command, precept, and example, plainly indicates what a Christian church should be.

III. Any departure, for any reason, from the fundamental principles of this New Testament pattern is perilous to the spirituality of the church, and a hindrance to the spread of Christ's evangel in the world.

This is the essential spirit, if not the precise words, of our Baptist fathers' message to the men of their time—a message vital still, and worthy of earnest heed.

I. It is not many years since it would have been superfluous to argue for the truth of my first proposition in a Baptist assembly. Every Baptist held it as a sacred and irrefragable article of faith. "The New Testament our only rule of faith and practice," has been our battle-cry for generations. But we have fallen upon other and, as some profess to think, more enlightened days. There are among us those who hold the authority of the New Testament in somewhat light esteem. Oh, yes! 'tis a good book—one of the best, perhaps the best, that we have. It contains much to which we ought to give heed. But wisdom did not die with the writers of it. New truth is breaking, not only out of it, as honest John Robinson meant, but out of the air, so to speak. "They didn't know everythin' down in Judee," you know. And so they feel at liberty, like the ancient fathers, to depart from the pattern given, and follow the devices and desires of their own presumptuous hearts.

But this, I contend, is precisely what we have no right to do. Why? Because, if you please, God has been good enough to reveal a plan for church organization, we are not free to reject

or modify it to suit our own ideas. Do you say that this is begging the question? How do you know that this plan is God-given? I reply that we know it, as our fathers knew it, because it is contained in a book which bears the hall-mark of divine inspiration. I know that that is a venturesome assertion in this age of interrogation points, but I believe the facts justify the statement. The question is too large to argue here. I can only say, briefly, that he who doubts the inspiration of the New Testament is self-condemned, confessing his lack of the spiritual discernment necessary to an appreciation of the truth. To such a one it cannot be made plain. How can you describe to a blind man the beauty of the lily or the splendor of the stars? Inspiration is not clear, and cannot be made clear, to an unilluminated mind. It is a spiritual truth, spiritually discerned. Our fathers learned what it means by faith; and so must we. And looking into the Book with spirit-illuminated eyes, they received and humbly followed its teachings, and were guided to the rediscovery of truths long latent concerning Christ's church—truths that were hidden from the wise and discerning of their day—and in the light thus given were able to lay foundations which have endured the test of time and trial, and have profoundly influenced the thought and action of the entire Christian world. We shall be wise if we follow in their steps.

II. Since organization is essential to successful work, it ought not to surprise us that God should reveal the kind of organization he desired his church to have. And we find it in the New Testament. It is very simple: A company of believers in Jesus Christ, immersed in his name on confession of their faith, bound together for worship and service by their common love for him and for each other. That is all—divinely simple! But it is enough—for *it works*. It seems loose as a rope of sand; but the bond is strong as steel. Age after age it has forged ahead, a mighty and a united host. Against calumny, against persecution, against contempt, against misrepresentation, against failure to measure up to its own ideals, this loose organization has won great victories, enlarged its borders, and so wrought upon even its enemies and detractors as largely to shape their ideal to its own God-given pattern. Now you may search the New Testament from A to

Izzard and you shall find no hint or suggestion of any organization more complex than that which I have described, or than is embodied, in its essential features, in every Baptist church on the globe today. Not that the pattern extends to unessential details. As to these the New Testament is not explicit. The essentials being conformed to, there is wide liberty in details. Our social customs differ, in many ways, from those of the early disciples. The beauty of the New Testament norm is that it fits into every social order in every age—not the least proof of its divine origin. Forms of worship, modes of administration, methods of work, anything that is not in conflict with the fundamental principles of the spiritual brotherhood, may be freely adopted, if thereby the Kingdom of Christ may be advanced.

III. Since, then, the model is God-given, it is evident that any departure from its essential elements is inadmissible. We readily admit that the substitution of the idolatry of the mass for the simple meal of the Lord's Supper is unimaginable for us. Why should it be thought that a radical change in the terms of admission to the church—a change that involves a complete perversion as to the subjects and the mode of baptism—is less objectionable? Ingenious attempts have been made, of late, to show that baptism is no longer obligatory—if, in fact, it ever was—and therefore that subject and mode are of no particular consequence. But there is no foundation for such a plea. There can be no manner of doubt that every convert in the early days was required to be "buried with Christ in baptism" in token of his entrance upon the new life in Christ. It was an obligation from which none was exempt. As to its present obligation, it is incumbent upon those who deny it to show when and by whom it was abrogated. To whom has Christ made it known that his disciples need no longer be baptized? Those who presume to set aside his law are bound to give conclusive reason for their presumption. But they have no reason. The commandment stands, unrepealed, unamended.

Today we are confronted with a proposition to exempt certain disciples from compliance with this universal obligation. It is significant, however, that no argument is advanced in favor of this proposal which would not really be equally valid for exempting all believers from baptism. Possibly that is the ultimate pur-

pose. But the contention is inadmissible—unless on the ground that it is admissible to make the Word of God of no effect. For Jesus commanded it. In the same breath with which he commissioned his disciples to go into all the world and preach the gospel, he commanded them to baptize those whom they discipled. If the one is not binding, then is not the other—and away goes your commission for evangelizing the world! But we may venture to suppose that the apostles and their immediate converts knew the mind of their risen Lord; and they went right on making disciples and immersing them precisely as he had enjoined. What they did there is no possible excuse for our not doing. It is a plea without basis in sense or reason that asks us to subordinate our hallowed principles, drawn from the New Testament, to the mistaught consciences of some who wish to join with us, not from principle, but for sentimental reasons. If anyone wishes to join a Baptist church, let him conform to the usage of the church, not look to the church to conform its usage, received from the Lord, to his personal preference.

And so, I contend, the new proposition—new at least to this country—to receive to our membership those who have not been scripturally baptized, who have only been subjected—who have not even subjected themselves—to a rite that has not the remotest resemblance to New Testament baptism, is not unwise only, but involves positive disobedience to the law and will of Christ. This objection is fundamental, and should be controlling. But there are practical consequences which would follow its adoption which deserve mention here.

a) It would introduce an element of cleavage into our churches. There would be two classes of members, the baptized and the unbaptized. We boast of our democratic equality; but here would be a favored class, brought into the church without submitting to an ordinance required of others. Can we afford to introduce an element so likely to produce discord and division?

b) It would tend, as it has done in England, to confuse the minds of the people, especially our young people—as to the relative importance of the two forms and subjects of the ordinance; and in time the less convenient and agreeable form would be sure to be crowded into the background.

c) It would cause division in the denomination. American Baptists as a whole will never, in my judgment, tolerate a practice so subversive of their fundamental principles as the reception to membership of unbaptized persons; and the individual church that does adopt it is doing so at the risk of making trouble for itself and for its sister churches, and, so far as it can, paving the way for a split just at the time when we are trying to foster union with brethren from whom we have long been separated. We have at this very time, an illustration of what will happen in the case of a church not far from Boston.

d) It would tend to weaken the conception of our people as to the real meaning and importance of believers' baptism. I am not at all disposed to exalt a mere form. If the form were all, I should say, Let it go! But in this case the form is not all—the form is essential to the truth expressed by it. It proclaims the Lord's burial and resurrection, and the believer's burial and resurrection with him—the symbol of a fundamental and glorious fact. Surely our Lord knew when he instituted it whether or not it was needful. Are we wiser than he?

e) Finally, the history of the church from the beginning has demonstrated the peril of changing an ordinance of Christ into a rite teaching a doctrine different from that which he intended it to teach. He left but two—both relating to the solemn facts of his death and resurrection. We as Baptists profess to desire above all things to conform to the will of Christ. We base our right to be upon such conformity. Shall we now belie our profession in order to minister to a sickly sentimentalism which aims to make easy the path of disobedience in others? By such a course we may gain a few members, but we shall forfeit the respect of the world, which has hitherto accorded us—in these late years at least—praise for our consistency in adhering to principle at the sacrifice of much that is agreeable and, from a worldly point of view, desirable. But more than that, and chiefly, we should reject this new proposal because it would dishonor our divine Lord in the house of his friends. We could not do this thing without proclaiming to the world by that act that we no longer regard the command of Christ in the matter

of baptism as binding upon us. God forbid that we should ever be guilty of such folly!

But if we should be thus guilty, what then would become of our age-long protest against the error of infant baptism? This ancient rite is not simply a pretty service of dedication; it is the supplanting of a vital ordinance of Christ by a fundamental and pernicious perversion of that sacred ordinance. If now we accept it as valid baptism—as we shall do if we accept for membership those who have been thus “baptized”—we fling our protest to the winds, and no longer have any reason for being. We have committed denominational “hari-kari.”

Just a word, in conclusion, as to other matters named in the programme.

1. With regard to “open communion,” so called, allow me to say that Baptists ought never to have allowed themselves to be side-tracked from the main issue, which was, and is, believers’ baptism, to defend a matter of comparatively small *practical* moment. Our opponents were wiser in their generation than we. They attacked us at a point where divisions—mainly sentimental, but none the less powerful for that—were sure to arise in our own ranks; for us it was a tactical blunder to permit such a diversion. There our defenses were weak; on the question of baptism we were impregnable. I have long believed that we should refuse to accept the pedobaptist lead, and return to our main contention—believers’ immersion the sole New Testament baptism.

2. With regard to “private baptism” it can only be said that, inasmuch as the New Testament is silent on that point, no hard and fast rule can be laid down. The number of witnesses is immaterial, and the course to be pursued should be determined by circumstances.

3. Any member of a Baptist church in good standing, desiring to withdraw from its fellowship, is entitled by Christian courtesy to receive a certificate of Christian character, addressed to any person or body he may desire. I can see no impropriety in granting such a certificate. And it seems to me equally plain that a letter from any evangelical body should be received as evidence of Christian character and fitness for reception to membership,

after compliance with the law of Christ regarding baptism. No right-thinking person would wish to join a Baptist church on any other terms.

4. "Associated membership," like the old New England "half-way covenant," is an absurdity. What does it mean? What would it amount to? Every chance attendant at a Baptist church today is accorded nearly every privilege belonging to a member: what more is wanted? Baptism and the right to vote at church meetings alone remain, and these can be obtained by a simple compliance with the command of Christ. Must we abrogate that law to suit the taste of these fastidious "dry Baptists"?

Mr. Chairman, I stand simply for the maintenance of the faith once for all delivered to the saints. The New Testament, plainly interpreted, is our sufficient rule of faith and practice. Let us accept its guidance, loyally follow it, and we shall not go astray.

THE PRESIDENT: I am sorry that a disappointment is in store for the Congress, in that the next speaker is detained, and has sent a letter in place of his paper, which letter the Secretary will now read to us.

THE SECRETARY: Before leaving home I received a letter which I hold in my hand from Dr. Hanley, dated November 5, in which he states he expects to be with us beginning with Tuesday, and to stay throughout the Congress. I have another letter which I will read *verbatim et literatim* in accordance with the request contained in it.

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH

ELIJAH A. HANLEY, PASTOR
PROVIDENCE, R. I.

November 9, 1909

To the Baptist Congress, Rev. Theodore A. K. Gessler, D.D., Secretary:

Dear Brethren: At the request of your committee, I have carefully prepared a paper on the subject assigned me, setting forth a serious situation before Baptist churches today and pointing out that change in policy which I believe to be required by fidelity to the truth and spirit of Jesus Christ and also by consistency with historic principles enunciated by our fathers.

While I firmly believe that the paper contains a vital message, I have

come to feel, on further consideration, that the time has not yet arrived when I can fully declare my views on this subject without bringing grief to many and without arousing controversy which by its emphasis on secondary things would misrepresent my real attitude and would greatly embarrass my present work.

Without the least compromise as to convictions of the truth and ideals for the Baptist church, but with recognition of the law of growth in spiritual progress, I beg to send earnest regrets, after having done my utmost to fulfil all obligations in this matter.

For the sake therefore of service in my own field, more important I believe for the progress of the denomination than anything I could now say at the Baptist Congress, and with the unwavering confidence that a larger policy in our Baptist churches must surely come, I cheerfully forego the privilege of attempting to forecast what course American Baptists must take for the future, if they are to fulfil their mission in the work of establishing the Kingdom of God.

This communication may be read or printed, provided it be used entire.

Very sincerely,

E. A. HANLEY

THE PRESIDENT: We regret the absence of Dr. Hanley, and still more the reason that he alleges for its necessity. Every man is a judge of his own position and his own acts. It is not for us to judge, but I hope and believe that any man in our denomination could fully and freely express his opinion, provided he did it in a courteous and Christian way.

The appointed speakers of the evening are now to address us. I hope that gentlemen who desire to take part in the discussion will be preparing themselves to follow immediately, and without pause, at the close of these two addresses.

The first of these speakers is our honored brother, so long pastor of the Fifth Avenue Church in this city, where he and the editor dwelt together in loving unity, and who is now the honored president of Brown University, Dr. Faunce. (*Applause.*)

W. H. P. FAUNCE, LL.D.: *Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen:* I am certainly in a difficult position. I cannot discuss Dr. Hanley's paper, because it is not here. I cannot very well discuss the paper of my warm personal friend, Dr. Conant—to be candid—I am so much on the other side.

I appreciate afresh the genial, unfailing courtesy and patience with which he listened to my preaching in those years—it now seems so long ago—when he must have hoped, Sunday after Sunday, that I would present something along the lines of his thought tonight.

Dr. Hanley's letter affords us food for thought, even if there should be no discussion whatever. It is not the paper of a coward, of a man who skilfully retreats. On the contrary, it expresses definitely and clearly his view, and any man who wants to know that view in detail can talk with him. I urged him to come here. I saw no reason why he should not come here, why any Baptist should not speak his mind at this Congress. But others urged him very strongly not to come, and as he is doing just now a magnificent spiritual work, he refuses to enter into any propaganda, or become entangled in any controversy on a subject which after all is on the circumference of Christian faith.

The Baptist denomination is today experiencing two great movements: One a movement for organic unity in work; the other a movement for greater freedom from ceremonial restriction. The movement for organic unity has amazed us by its rapidity, its determination, its imperativeness, its success. All the venerable arguments from popular exegesis, just as strong today as ever, all the precepts of our fathers and the experience of two or three hundred years have been swept away in the imperious demand for real and visible unity in advancing the Kingdom of God. The other movement is working as yet under the surface, but working steadily, and in due time will also sweep away all the arguments against it, from whatever source they may be drawn, and will achieve in some way a larger freedom, a genuine exaltation of the spirit above the letter.

I know at least a dozen Baptist ministers in churches as prominent as that of Dr. Hanley's who share his convictions and ought to be heard here tonight. They will be heard in the next ten years, either in the churches that they now serve, or in other churches that will be glad to listen.

Our Baptist churches have drifted into a position at variance with the teachings of our Baptist fathers, at variance with our fundamental principle, and which is causing today great searching

of hearts. What is that fundamental principle? It seems a work of supererogation to state it. For the sake of the contrast, however, we may attempt a statement. Our fundamental principle is the assertion of the human soul, the belief that every soul has immediate access to God, and in his presence can stand erect and fearless before all human authority. The primary Baptist position is the vindication of the individual, not only his right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, but to formulate his own faith, and to interpret Scripture and history for himself. It is to affirm what Celsus denied, when he said: "The root of Christianity is an excessive valuation of the human soul, and the absurd idea that God takes interest in man." The eternal value of the soul, the interest of God in man, and the immediate access of every man to God we steadily affirm. We hold that the Christian religion is a spiritual experience and possession; not a code of laws to be obeyed, not a set of external requirements to which we must adhere, not a series of propositions to which we must give intellectual assent, not a set of ceremonies which must be performed, but an experience "hid with Christ in God." Such expressions are almost too sacred to be used in debate; they go too deep; they touch the very roots of our being. These great affirmations and insights have generated the enthusiasm which has carried our churches into every continent and the islands of the sea. "Baptist history has been a bush aflame with the presence of God."

Now there are two corollaries from this position, both very obvious. One is that religion must be free from state control. Surely we need say nothing about that tonight. The other is that believers are free from sacramentalism of every kind. Sacramentalism means either belief in the magical efficacy of certain sacred objects, or a literal bondage to certain clauses in formulas, incantations, or documents. When sacramentalism deals with crucifixes and holy water and swinging censers it attributes magical efficacy to the material objects. When sacramentalism deals with ancient formulas or phrases in liturgy or sacred documents and declares that the essence of religious life is literal adherence and conformity to these formulas or phrases, it is

literalism. This sacramentalism is materialism on the one hand, or literalism on the other.

For instance, as we all know, the sacramentalist says: "'Baptism doth now save us;' is it not so written in the Scripture? How then dare you call baptism a mere symbolic act? Has not the very Word of God proclaimed that baptism is a saving rite?"

Again the sacramentalist quotes: "This is my body." We all remember how Luther brought down his fist upon the table in his argument with Zwingli again and again, and said, "Here is the Scripture: 'this is my body.'" When Zwingli, forerunner of the Baptists, affirmed that the bread simply represented the Lord, Luther repelled the idea as dishonoring to Scripture. Again he quoted: "This is my blood," and to him anyone who affirmed it to be simply a symbol, a mere help to the spiritual memory of our Lord, was taking the heart out of this most sacred ceremony of the Christian faith.

The sacramentalist quotes again: "Through the laying-on of hands the Holy Ghost was given." "That," he says, "is the very word of God. Beware how you make it of none effect by your tradition. It means that without the laying-on of hands there is no such thing as apostolic succession or apostolic success. This is the divinely prescribed form for the conveyance of the Spirit." And that again is literalism.

But are we ourselves wholly free from this literalism? Our fathers fought for their freedom from formulas and ritual. Are we still fighting for it? Today in the opinion of the whole Christian world, outside the Baptist church, by a most unhappy misunderstanding, we are understood to lay our chief emphasis on the ritualistic element in religion. This perpetual misunderstanding is, in the phrase of Dr. John Clifford, "one of the most ghastly ironies of history."

Go out into the street here tonight and take any ten men passing this church, men of intelligence and men of Christian training, and say to those men: "What do the people inside that church tonight mainly stand for?" And out of ten men, intelligent and Christian, nine will answer: "Those people stand for a tremendous emphasis on the ceremonial element in Christianity." You say that is a sad misconception, and so it is. But it is miscon-

struction not only by the rank and file, but by the most intelligent men in the Christian world. I have a sentence burning in my memory tonight from the last book of George A. Gordon, *Religion and Miracle*. Dr. Gordon is one of the most sincere and intelligent and truly prophetic preachers in America today. In that latest book he says in a sentence which many of us will resent: "The Baptist cannot surrender a mere form, even for the sake of the Eternal Spirit." Do you say that is false witness? It is the judgment of one of the keenest minds and best informed men in the modern world. The triumphs we have gained in missions are too often overlooked today. What we have done in magnificent service for the separation of church and state is in the background today. The emphasis is not where our fathers put it. They fought for freedom and for liberty and for spiritual religion. Our emphasis against our will seems somehow to rest chiefly on the ritualistic element in religion.

Who then is responsible for this? Largely the popular defenders and exponents of our Baptist tradition. For when we come to these exponents and read the little tracts that they hand around in the interest of propaganda, this is what we hear them say: "Is not the fundamental virtue of the Christian life obedience? But obedience specifically requires a definite ritual. Therefore, no man is a true Christian in the fullest and deepest sense of the word until he has been through this particular phase of obedience." Obedience thus is singled out as the primal quality of the Christian life. But what do they mean by obedience? If by obedience they mean absorbing and assimilating the life of Christ, if they mean sharing his attitude toward God and toward man, if they mean absolute surrender of spirit for the great ends for which he lived, then obedience is indeed the primal virtue of the Christian life. But if they mean conformity of ritual to a few clauses in certain ancient and disputed texts, then I deny that in any genuine sense ceremonial obedience is the primary virtue of the Christian life.

Are not some of our friends familiar with modern textual criticism? Surely they are. Does biblical scholarship leave us any passage which makes it indubitably certain that Christ regarded his religion as bound up forevermore through all the

millenniums with a particular ritual? I will not answer that question. Each man must answer it for himself. Some men will doubtless always regard ceremonial obedience as the great test of discipleship, while others will make moral likeness to our Lord and possession of his spirit the final and sufficient criterion.

If I wanted to make the Baptist position—and I am a Baptist from the soles of my feet to the crown of my head—if I wanted to make the Baptist position, for which our fathers lived and died, absolutely clear to the Christian world, I would ask a hundred Baptist ministers to preach next Sunday morning from the text, "Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples." And when they had done that I would ask them to preach on the following Sunday morning from the text: "I thank God I baptized none of you." In all seriousness I say it, if a hundred Baptist ministers were to preach from these two texts on successive Sundays the original Baptist position, which made personal faith the essential for admission to a regenerate church, would become obviously plain to the whole Christian world. Such preaching would not involve the surrender of any principle or any symbol, but simply put the symbol in its original and proper place. Of course, *βαπτίζειν* means precisely what we have always said it means. The battle of exegesis has been fought and won. But after all, what would our Lord think of the mountainous erudition piled on the study of that one word? Would he count it vastly more important than the discussion on the length of the fringe of the Jewish garments? The battle of exegesis has been won; but the battle for spirituality remains yet to be fought and won; the battle for a life that shall place the supreme emphasis on a man's Christ-likeness, and on his faith in God the Father and his only Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Theoretically we profess to exalt the spirit above the letter; but is that the practical result?

Today the churches all around this one, in whose sanctuary we meet, are receiving Christians of every kind, if they truly believe in Jesus Christ. This church is receiving one species of Christian only, that which fully acknowledges that without the ritualistic element there is no full obedience. Yet no ritualistic requirement can ever rank with spiritual demands. Though it were blazoned on the sky, though it were spoken out of the clouds,

no ritualistic requirement can ever take rank with the command to love one's God and love his neighbor as himself. These are the supreme things in religion, and somehow we must make them seem so.

Now, as regards the details on this printed programme, I do not feel much anxiety about them. I am not here to lay out any programme or make any recommendation. I am merely diagnosing a condition. We must not shut our eyes to changes that have already occurred. "Open communion" I see on the programme as an appointed subject for discussion. But we already have that in nearly all the most influential churches of the North. In some we have more than that. I wonder what Dr. Edward Bright, the "grand old man" of thirty years ago, would say, if he knew of the present attitude of the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church of which he was a member? Would he rise from his rest and dis-fellowship the church, and dis-fellowship any of us who condone the attitude of the church? Yet with that attitude the last three pastors of the church are in cordial sympathy.

Brethren, we should be standing in another and larger way for just what those stalwart men and women stood for in the last generation—obedience to Christ. Only let our obedience be of the spirit before the letter, and make it clear that our main doctrine is not a dispute regarding the meaning of a word, but a demand for faith in the living God. The great contention of our Baptist fathers was not regarding the mode of baptism, but the subject of baptism, i. e., not regarding the outer, but the inner requirement. While the world stands the original form of baptism will doubtless endure. It is pictorial, and in it the great apostle to the gentiles saw symbols of cardinal Christian facts. It is an exact imitation of our Lord's act, as other forms are not. Through it millions have entered into the joy of absolute surrender. But we cannot conceal from ourselves that many among us are refusing longer to punish by exclusion from the Lord's table their fellow-Christians who think the outer ritual unessential to spiritual discipleship.

So today there is a great movement among our people toward a depression of insistence on ritual, and a reaffirmation of the supremacy of the spiritual. Just how this supremacy is to be

made manifest we cannot say. The little devices mentioned on our printed programme—"Associate Membership," etc.—may be wise or unwise. We cannot compel our churches to any rigid order. But we can all unitedly determine to set ourselves right before God and man by making likeness to Christ the supreme thing in the Christian life. Thus shall our churches be truly representative, not of a school of exegesis, but of the entire Kingdom of God.

But someone may say, Where then does the function of our denomination come in? What is left as our "distinctive tenet"? Just what was left to our fathers—evangelism, Christian education, the exaltation of the spirit of Christ above the letter of any law. This last week a New York clergyman in one of our sister churches—for every Christian church is a sister church—publicly said: "We believe in the salvation of souls through the sacramental system. . . . With (many) Protestants salvation is obtained through faith and conversion. Our prayer-book teaches us that we must come to God through baptism, confirmation, and holy eucharist." As long as sincere Christian men believe that, our Baptist churches will have a function divinely given, and will continue to affirm that, useful, beautiful, historical as ritual may be, men are not driven to come to the Father through eucharist or confirmation or baptism, but they come in spirit and truth.

Spirit with Spirit can meet,
Closer is he than breathing,
Nearer than hands and feet.

(*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: We gladly welcome to this platform Rev. Gwilym O. Griffith, of Brooklyn, who is the second appointed speaker on this topic.

REV. GWILYM O. GRIFFITH: *Mr. Chairman and Dear Friends:* I find myself in somewhat of the attitude equal to that which Dr. Faunce complained of, for those things that I came here prepared to affirm were in part so much better affirmed by Dr. Conant than I could possibly state them, and those things in which I came prepared to disagree with Dr. Conant (for I was not surprised or disappointed by his paper) I found answered so unanswerably by the last speaker that I am very much inclined to wish myself in

the place of Dr. Hanley, and to have written a paper and stayed away. (*Laughter.*)

However, it is impossible, of course, in a discussion such as this to treat exhaustively upon any other of the subjects we have before us within a speech limited to twenty minutes. I shall say in regard to the general theme of the possibility of contemplated change in denominational practice, that the subject is an open one, and we have not reached the point of finality. We cannot affirm that we have so perfectly wrought out our ecclesiastical or denominational systems according to the pattern shown us on the Mount, that to suggest any alteration or change would be sacrilegious. We stand as Baptists for certain principles that abide against all changes of men or methods, all mutation and fluctuation of the passing ages. These are fundamental principles of evangelical faith and practice. But how impossible it would be for us to affirm that the deductions and constructions woven around these fundamental principles are absolutely final! These things are subject to the law of change and alteration and progress that governs all things that are the emanation of the human mind (and our denominational system is the product of fallible minds). It is very easy to state, as we heard stated in the paper which was read, that there are certain fundamental facts in the Bible regarding church constitutions which are perfectly plain and which God has been good enough to make known to us, and that this settles the question once for all regarding the practices of the Baptist church. The fact is that when we pass from these fundamental facts to their interpretation, we find ourselves at once in the realm of diversity, variety, and contrariety. In these things we must absolutely repudiate any suggestion of finality. I am aware that this is perfectly platitudinous, but the pity is that we have to reiterate these platitudes, because there is in our churches an attitude, not perhaps a representative attitude, but one that is sufficiently garrulous and which would claim for these denominational practices an absolute finality that does not belong to them. Its representatives are too ready to raise the cry of sacrilege against those who advocate denominational reform, as if those who suggested the change were putting forth their hand, as the Chairman said, to steady the Ark, when all they may be

doing is putting forth their hand to overthrow the pedestal of Dagon.

Now, there is another word on this subject: We must consider all the subjects of this evening's discussion on their own merits. They must have separate discussion. I mention this because it is too glibly assumed, that in regard to those who entertain a view favoring some reform respecting one of these matters that concern our Baptist faith and order—it is too glibly assumed, I say, that they must necessarily be on the side of reform and drastic revolution regarding all these other matters that may be brought into question. For instance, if a man suggest reform in the matter of open communion (and I do not think that this matter of open communion is altogether the dead issue that has been suggested tonight; if some of my friends had been through a Baptist council here in the East that it was my pleasure, or pain, rather, to submit to a few months ago, perhaps they would temper their opinion); if a man, I say, suggest reform in this matter of communion, he is very likely to be charged forthwith with being in favor of associated membership and all the other terrible heresies which have been listed on the programme tonight.

Well, now, for my own part I am not in favor of associated membership, and I repudiate the idea that to stand for any one of these reforms means to be heretical on all the other charges. It does seem that there are some good friends who hold their opinions, their Baptist convictions, as so many pegs in a bundle of kindling wood; if one peg is knocked out, the whole bundle falls through, and these friends cannot conceive it possible for anyone to maintain a radical attitude regarding one of these subjects, without his being altogether out of sympathy with the so-called conservative view in regard to the others.

Now, our position is not of that sort. We do not hold our convictions as so much dead wood to be bound up in an orthodox knot, and useful occasionally for throwing at the head of a heretical intruder, or to throw into a heretic's bonfire. We hold our convictions rather as branches united to a living vine, and when one of these branches is dead we cast it away, but the vine of our Baptist convictions is not the loser thereby. It grows and flourishes all the more for its riddance of so much dead wood. And

then in this matter (if I may refer very briefly now in the time that is allotted me)—in this matter of open communion, I would suggest that it cannot be argued on the basis of expediency. I do deplore very deeply that argument that is reiterated so constantly in our papers and in our councils, that really it would not *pay* for us as Baptist churches to entertain this suggested reform, because (to take one instance, the case of the English churches) it has been shown so often that the English churches have lost in membership because of this change. Now, I will not controvert that statement. I believe it to be absolutely false, absolutely mistaken. But I do protest against the argument itself, as though any such argument should deter us for one instant from taking our stand for the principle of open communion, if we believe it is *right*. It is not for us to be totting up figures and asking, "Will it pay? Will it pay?" The question is not to be settled that way. The question is not, Will it mean a shrinkage in membership, or will it mean an augmentation of membership? The question is, Is it right? If it is right, then let us announce it; let us not maintain an ambiguous reticence; let us announce it. The question must be forced to this issue; all these questions that have come up before us must be brought to this issue: Are they right in principle? Are they scriptural? Are they in conformity with the Catholic spirit, with the apostolic spirit, with the Christian spirit, or are they not? That is the issue.

To refer again to the question of open communion, the question is, Is it scriptural, or is close communion merely an outworn expediency (that has served its time and served its ends, and served them well) but an outworn expediency like the brazen serpent in the wilderness that did good service in its day, amidst the fiery serpents, but which in the day when it became an idealistic conventionality was a hindrance to the spiritual progress of the people, and had to be hammered to fragments?

Here is the question, then: Is it scriptural? Is it one of those eternal fundamental principles of our evangelical faith? Or is it a changing expedient? We are quite prepared to take that stand and have it discussed on that basis.

And then all these questions must be regarded in their correlations. It is impossible to regard any of these denomina-

tional questions merely in their denominational relations. We must have a wider horizon. An artificial horizon may be of great value to an Arctic explorer, but there is a kind of artificial horizon which is sometimes the implement of the denominationalist, and which is of very doubtful value. I mean the artificial horizon which confines his vision within denominational limits so that he becomes unable to view things in their proper proportion and perspective.

No man has a right to be in denominational affairs like a cow in a clover patch, believing that the end of all things is the other side of his own denominational fence. He must take a broader outlook, and view these questions in relation to a larger perspective.

Now, it is impossible for us to escape the fact that we are now in the throes of a great movement that is making for unity and solidarity. We are certainly in the presence of arrayed and marshaled forces of evil which maintain a sinister and menacing solidarity. We ourselves as a Christian church in this world have found ourselves disorganized, badly disciplined, and cursed by ecclesiastical feudalism. And now we find ourselves, as never before, in the midst of a movement that is making for the gradual unification of the Christian forces. We have come to see that this growing solidarity, cannot be expressed in terms of intellectual uniformity; we will not perpetuate the mistake of Romanism, the terrific blunder of Romanism. We are coming to understand that when we read of our "coming into the unity of the faith and knowledge of the Son of God" we are, I say, coming to understand by that unity, a spiritual unity; by that faith, not faith as an articulated confession, not faith as a theological creed, but a repose of the heart, a personal confidence and personal trust in a personal Christ; and by that knowledge we do not mean the accumulation of any intellectual perceptions but a personal intimacy with Christ, a heart-knowledge of him. And we are looking about for the expression and the formation of that deeper unity which we believe is to come to the church of God, if the church of God is to be saved from disaster and catastrophe in our age. And I say we find that the consciousness of this unity deepens more and more as we look toward the Cross, and as we associate the idea

of the Cross in the mind of Christ and our own experiences with the sacrament, the simple ordinance, which he himself has ordained, we find this to be the great rendezvous, the great rallying-point where the hosts of God forget their ecclesiastical feuds and feudalisms, and meet and mingle and merge in Christian fellowship. There, at any rate—as we foregather in obedience to the command of Christ to all loyal and obedient-hearted disciples—as we foregather around the table of the Lord, our divisions, our controversies, our animosities must cease for that one brief hour at least where we unite not to discuss, not to dispute, and not to debate, but to worship and adore. And I say, Sir (if you will allow me this closing moment of my address), those of us who stand for close communion have a grave and awful responsibility, as we pile up our barricades around the Lord's table and draw the cords of our denominationalism around it, and stand before these vast approaching hosts and say, "Hands off! Break away! Be off! This is the Lord's table, and we Baptists are the sole custodians of it! None but Baptists need apply here!" I say that if we can stand in that position we must be able to give a reason, an overwhelming reason, to our sister denominations who inquire into the justification of such an attitude, before we can save ourselves as Baptists from the deserved censure and displeasure of the church of Christ. And when we come to inquire into that reason, what do we find but this, that it is the old played-out, exploded shibboleth of intellectual conformity that has been raised again? For why will not my close-communion brother allow his non-Baptist brother to approach the Lord's table? Why is he suspicious of him and why is he jealous of him? Why is he uneasy when he approaches? Why? Simply because on this one point of church ritual he himself is unable to conform intellectually with the Baptist brethren. Now, we would not for a moment suggest that our non-Baptist brethren are deliberately disobedient in their attitude toward the command of Christ—I know there are individual cases, I understand that—but you and I would not for a moment assert that the great non-Baptist denominations of Protestantism have been founded on a basis of antagonism to this command of Christ, and have been from the first inspired with the spirit of mutiny and disobedience. To say

that would be preposterous. What is the position? Simply that on this one point of ritual they are unable to interpret that command of the Lord and that ordinance of the Christian church in a way that conforms with the interpretation of the Baptist church. It is a matter of intellectual nonconformity only. When my close-Baptist brother sees his Arminian friend approaching the table, he does not say, "I object; I myself am a Calvinist, and you are not; you will not conform intellectually with me in this matter and I object to your communing." Nor would my close-Baptist brother, finding a man sitting next to him in a Baptist church who differs from him in regard to the inspiration of Scripture, object to pass the elements to him. Oh, no; but when he finds a man that differs from him in his interpretation of the Scriptures, not in the matter affecting the fundamental principles of our evangelical faith, but on the matter of Christian ritual, then he puts up the bar and says, "Hands off, clear away, none but Baptists need apply." I say that is deplorable; that is impossible; that is an impossible state of things. I say impossible because I don't think that such a state of things really exists, except in theory today, at least here in the East. At least you will find very few Baptist churches in the East here that are living up to their close-communication principles. But assuredly, my dear friends, the time has come for us to break the ambiguous reticence that has so long prevailed and to come out clearly and boldly in these matters and state what we believe to be true in the broadest tolerance, in the spirit of the Christ, in the spirit of the courage of the Christ.

I am sorry if I have spoken perhaps too controversially. I scarcely have touched on other matters that are of as much or more importance.

I thank you for the patience you have accorded me in listening to these words, and I would simply desire to affirm once more at the close what the speaker who preceded me affirmed, that after all the fundamentals of our Baptist position and faith are not those of ritual, but those that lie deep in the spiritualities of the Christian religion. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: Ladies and gentlemen, I am very glad to say that we have a very prompt and interesting response to the

invitation to talk. I have been handed six cards of those who are willing to talk to us. I will first call upon our honored brother, Mr. Barnes, for many years the secretary of our state convention.

MR. H. W. BARNES: *Mr. Moderator, and Brethren of the Congress:* I shall certainly be obliged to differ very positively from some of the utterances which have been heard here this evening. I am glad, however, to believe that down deeper than appearances, which sometimes do not mean just what is in the hearts and minds, I am in very much closer agreement with them than my words, compared to theirs, would seem to indicate. In the first place I believe that there is a very positive and decided reason in Christ's purposes and in Christianity's representation of the initiatory ordinance of baptism, as positively representing and picturing the great realities or the very fundamentals of Christianity as a system, and the great realities of the experiences of Christianity; both of them are set forth in the simple act of immersion implying also resurrection. So far as I can judge, I say that there is not another possible act, within the scope of man's imagination, that can do that. Immersion represents the death and burial of Christ, and the resurrection of Christ, and these two are the fundamental doctrines in Christianity. Repentance through sin, death unto it, new life unto God by regeneration, are the fundamental facts of Christian experience, and both the fundamental doctrines and the fundamental facts are presented pictorially in baptism. The Trinity bore witness in the baptism of Jesus, by its presence, and voice, to the significance of that service of immersion. So much on the question of baptism.

A person deaf and dumb can act out in that ordinance his faith in Christ as crucified and raised again for him, and his personal experience as dying unto sin and living again unto God. And if there was no other reason for maintaining it, this is a sufficient reason for maintaining baptism unto the end of time.

Now as to another matter, it is assumed all the way through here, at least in the attitude of certain brethren, that the Lord's Supper is a communion of people with each other. I do not read my Bible that way. The very meaning of communion is an actual giving and receiving, and the Scripture declaration is that the bread that we break is the communion of the body of Christ, and

the cup which we drink is the communion of the blood of Christ. He gives and we receive. The Lord's Supper is not a communion of people with each other, but of individual members with Jesus Christ. What have I to do then with the question of another's coming or not coming? I have only to do with it by my teaching what the will of the Lord is. I am not a sheriff to arrest a person who is violating the law of Christ here or elsewhere. If I teach that the ordinances are not individually complete, but are complementary, I cannot say that our baptism is completed without the Lord's Supper to follow it, and the significance of the one runs into the other. If, therefore, baptism be the initial profession of the faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and personal piety, the profession of personal piety, is the condition of rightly partaking of the Lord's Supper, then a person does not come in that manner to the Lord's Supper if he has neglected to be baptized. This is the position which I have held and grown into in fifty-six years in the ministry, and a pretty careful study of the Scriptures and of Christian matters. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: I still have six cards and less than thirty minutes. Can the brethren be trusted to limit themselves to half time? I will first call on Brother Charles R. McNally, now of New London, whom we are very glad to have with us again.

REV. CHARLES R. McNALLY: I heard of a couple who were married and entered into an agreement that all of the girls that appeared in the family were to be named by the wife, and all of the boys were to be named by the husband. The husband was a traveling man, and he was away from home when the first arrival came. The message came that there was not one, but two, and that they were both girls. He hurried home, and with some amusement put it up to his wife that she was to name the new arrivals. She was truly troubled for a little while, but finally decided that she would name one Kate and the other Duplicate. (*Laughter.*) It happened that there was to be another arrival in that home, and at that time they were again twins, and they were boys. The wife looked to the husband to name the boys. It was his turn to be puzzled, but he finally got back at her and said,

"All right, I have the names. I will name one Pete and the other Repeat."

Now, the thing happened still a third time, and they were boys, and he was truly puzzled this time, but after pondering awhile he decided to name one Max and the other Climax, and said that would end it.

Now, what we have been saying here tonight seems to be a case of duplicate and repeat, but we have not yet got to the desired climax by any means. There seems to be a pretty general feeling that a kindly spirit in interpretation does largest justice to the spirit of the Master. The first principle of the Christ life is the manifestation of the Christ spirit. This must show itself in all our fellowship, not only with Christians of our own body, but with all Christians who are such in the evidences of their life. It is to be feared that some of us have been so over-zealous in our love of the form that we have violated this fundamental requirement, namely, the manifestation of the spirit of Christ in a kindly and generous fellowship.

It seems to me that there is possibly an aspect of the truth concerning these ordinances which has not been recognized and emphasized as I believe it ought to be. We have had insufficient emphasis placed upon the real spiritual contents of the ordinances themselves. I believe the ordinance of baptism and the ordinance of the Lord's Supper to have been distinctly appointed by Jesus Christ for definite spiritual ends. No man can see the ordinance of baptism as we perform it in our Baptist churches, and ask the question, "What are they doing?" without having Jesus Christ in his sinless beauty, him crucified, buried, and raised again, preached to him. I had a beautiful illustration of that a while ago up in New London. A young man came to me and wanted to have the service of baptism explained to him and we sat down together. He had a Bible with him, with marked passages, and as I turned to the various passages relating to baptism I found that he had them all marked, and knew of them and had studied them. I said, "You don't seem to need much instruction from me." He said, "I should like to follow the Lord in baptism. I was converted three years ago, but have never had this thing presented to me before. Ever since I saw the service of baptism

about two weeks ago in your church here, I have desired to be baptized." Now, my point is that I believe there is a spiritual content in baptism which if we emphasized more as a positive teaching, aside from all spirit of controversy, would cause the ordinance to do its own work. If we have less controversy about these questions, we can trust the spirit of the Lord to bless them to the spiritual upbuilding of those who will receive the true teaching. The same thing is true also of the Lord's Supper. I can remember one instance in connection with my ministry in Brooklyn, when one of the good deacons there looked me in the eye with rather protruding eyeballs, and told me with the utmost alarm that if I remained pastor of that church it would not remain a Baptist church. Now, as an illustration that the churches do progress in liberality in these matters, observe that my good brother Griffith whom I have never had the pleasure of meeting or seeing until tonight, has come in to carry on that work to give instruction in the matter of open-minded interpretation with even more vigor than I. It was a case surely of Max and Climax. Perhaps this is indicative of the future attitude of our churches. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: Brethren, some will certainly be left out unless you limit yourselves. I next will call on Rev. Robert George Boville:

DR. BOVILLE: We enjoy tonight the unusual pleasure of criticizing ourselves, and I believe that the insertion of this discussion in the topic of the programme should be looked upon as proof that the Baptist Congress regards the Baptist church as of some value—as of so much value to America that they think its form ought to be discussed and its doctrines ought to be canvassed. I for one am heartily of those who revere the fathers, the fathers that have carried the burden and heat of the day; that have held by the old standards; that have held by the old faith, and that have battled for the kingdom of God in the midst of great adversity and when the church was in the minority. I revere them for those great services that they have done, and while I may not view matters quite as they do, I want to say as my first word that the men that founded the Baptist Missionary

Society, and the men who cut the original tracks through the hard fastnesses of this country for Baptist success are men that must always be spoken of with great reverence and regard. If the discussion of the new departures that are spoken of here tonight means that we are to have a church of anaemic quality, means that we are to have hardly enough of belief to make it worth our while to exist, I for one don't care to belong to a church of that kind. I want to belong to a church that believes enough to make it feel it is necessary, and a church that believes enough in the great fundamental truths of religion to furnish members who will contribute to home missions in a state like this one and one-quarter millions, and five millions to foreign missions in the great work of spreading the kingdom of God. And if any change of doctrine were to deter any man from writing a huge check for the progress of the kingdom of God, I for one would be against anything of this kind.

Christian men among us divide themselves into two classes which might be roughly called organization men and organic men; organization men who look at the church largely from the standpoint of simple organization, and who believe that the form of the organization is essential to its continuance, and who, because of the instinct of preservation, which is deeply founded in the human heart, originally were moved to add as a safeguard to our church, the practice of close communion.

Someone asked me recently if I believed in the closed shop of the workman. I said: "No, I do not believe in the closed shop, nor do I believe that it will survive, but it is the workman's rough bludgeon with which he is fighting the close corporation of capital, and until he fights that battle I cannot condemn him if he carries on the practice of the closed shop." And so to me close communion was nothing but the necessary result of the limitation of the denominations in their early contest, and the brethren who regard it as a matter of importance in the denomination, must admit that the time has come when the closed shop can practically be done away with. Organization men insist on regularity; to them regularity is a supreme matter; they look at the question of regularity so closely that if you don't vote the regular ticket you become disqualified and are practically thrown

out of the party; with them regularity is a man's adhesion to the details of his denomination, so that they often place more emphasis on that than on his moral character, on his moral stamina, on his moral truthfulness, and sometimes even on his moral honesty. Regularity makes them forget sometimes that the highest form of loyalty to a man's denomination is like the highest form of loyalty to a man's country, that is, to differ from it on great and important questions, and to stand for that higher loyalty, which means direct loyalty to the Head of the church.

On the other hand there are the organic men to whom the church is an organism with a divine life and definite character, but an organism which began as a germ—as the Christian germ—and because it began as the Christian germ it was bound in the growth of time to develop itself along various lines. To me it is unthinkable that there is but one church polity laid down in the New Testament, just as unthinkable as that God has ordained just one form of political government for the great varieties of the human race. This germ that God has created has grown into manifold forms, and the natural sequence is that we have today on the face of the earth great varieties of organizations who would not be satisfied by one particular form. I believe that if you run through the New Testament carefully you will find in it germs of Congregationalism, and germs of Presbyterianism, and semi-Episcopacy.

The Christian germ began with the power of adaptation and of meeting new conditions as they arise from time to time. It is like a boy who grows, and as he grows he changes his garment from the garments of a boy to the toga of a young man and the matured life. So the church has the power to change its form: not its inherent character, but its dress and its polity. Its practice is in fact but the dress which the church wears. If this be true, the quest for heresy today should be a heresy defined as a failure to carry out the purpose of God—heresy, a refusal to think squarely and honestly; heresy, a failure to practice intellectual straightforwardness; heresy, anaemic blood and unwillingness to go forward in answer to the call of the great Master himself to win the world for Christ by the teaching of the great vital doctrines of religion. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: I have five cards, brethren, and but fifteen minutes; can you limit your remarks to three minutes apiece? I will now call on Rev. William Henry Bawden.

DR. BAWDEN: Mr. President, there is just one thing that brings me to my feet tonight—the phrase, “The faith once for all delivered unto the saints.” Some time ago I attempted to prepare a sermon from that text, but could not because I found the word “faith” did not mean what I thought it meant. I found it to mean a definite deposit of doctrine. But when I turned to look for that deposit of doctrine I could not find it. Without going outside our own denomination, right in this congregation tonight, are there any two people who will agree in putting down on a piece of paper what they believe to be that deposit of faith? And when we turn to the New Testament can we find it there? Peter is set over against Paul, both of them over against John, and all of them over against Christ. Instead of a deposit of doctrine may be found a spirit. The same night in which Jesus was betrayed he took bread and gave thanks. That same night in which he was betrayed he also said to his disciples: “I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now; but when the Spirit of truth is come he will lead you into all the truth.” Why cling to the former, and not insist upon the latter?

Brethren, it seems to me that in relation to these questions our position as Baptists ought to be, not that of the ear to the ground, to catch the echo of what our fathers may have said, although we may reverence them highly, but rather that of the ear open toward heaven, to hear what the Spirit of God may whisper to us now, in this year of Christ, 1909. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: I will now call upon Rev. Alfred H. C. Morse, of Strong Place.

REV. A. H. C. MORSE: I am sorry now that I sent my card to the desk for two reasons. One is, because no man can say what he ought to say in three minutes and there are others whose cards ought to be called for instead of mine. And a second reason for which I regret having sent my card is this; that I have always had the reputation of being progressive; but when I stand beside

some of the brethren here tonight, I find I am a long way behind them. Yet I believe we have this evening listened to a representative discussion in a Baptist Congress.

I remember when, ten or twelve years ago, I first made my acquaintance with a Baptist Congress, they were discussing another question which was kindred to this: "Is baptism essential to church membership?" and I remember the furor created in Buffalo after this discussion that came up. This reminds me of a story that is told of the time when the railroad was put over the western plains. I think of that frequently when the Baptist Congress assembles. A man on the western plains had never seen a train and knew nothing about the great swing of the train, but he saw the construction, and rails being laid, and one day he was given to understand that the train would go through; and, in common with all his town, he came to see it sweep through—this great and wonderful train. In the afternoon, when the train had gone, he was seen leaving town, and his friends said to him, "Now, Uncle Si, where are you going?" He said "I am going to leave the country, the trains are ruining it." "Oh," they said, "that was all right; didn't you see the train go through this morning?" "Yes," he said, "that was all right, but suppose she had gone through sidewise, how then?" (*Laughter.*) That is the way we feel with a Baptist Conference. When it is past we heave a sigh of relief and we say we hope she will go through endwise next time. So with this discussion.

Now, I believe, my brethren, there has been dust thrown in the air this night regarding this subject, which is by no means a dead subject; it is sufficiently alive to alarm people in certain quarters of our quiet and well-behaved country. For instance, we have had it insinuated here this evening that some of the things that we set value upon are like the fringe upon the garments of the high-priests, or the number of steps which a man may take, for instance, on the sabbath day. Now, I submit that those were not things which were given in the old Mosaic regulations. I submit that I cannot find them in the Old Testament, but they grew up with something entirely outside of religion that was given to those ancient people. They were matters of tradition. I speak of that one thing, not because I set value by the fringe on the garment

or the color of the goat's hair, or anything of that kind, but simply to say that the reference is scarcely fair. Then, to state two or three texts and say it would be a good thing if next Sunday some of our pastors could preach on this text, for instance, and then next Sunday on another text—it reminds me that I could propose texts that would stump the very best of them to be consistent. I can cut a text in two in the middle, or I can take it according to its definition. Take this text next Sunday, and preach upon it and be true—"Let him that stole steal." That also is in the Bible.

Again I am reminded, apropos of these texts, of the very good counsel that was given us at one time by one of the great leaders of our denomination in this great state. He was teaching us the great things of biblical theology, and of course he was embarrassed sometimes by the questions that awkward young men would ask, because they did not seem to fit together very well with certain of our favored passages, and he said, "Young men, I would like you to remember regarding texts of Scripture, that they are like those coupon tickets that are used upon the railroad trains for long trips: they are not good if detached." (*Applause.*) An intimation has been given to us here this evening that we are to devote ourselves to the culture of character and the sweet influences of fellowship with sister denominations. That is all very well, but I submit to you that our fathers who went before us, and who were willing to walk through the river, had characters just as quickly and rigidly developed as those congregations you and I preach to Sunday after Sunday, and their characters were not changed by the persecution to which they were subjected.

This afternoon I rode twenty miles to conduct a funeral in the town of Flushing, and there I thought of the struggles of one of our fathers, who fled from the first colony and settled in the town of Flushing, and was persecuted and driven out, not because he was a bad man, and not because he was a close communionist, and not because he simply believed in the liberty of soul by which he had access to God, but because he insisted on dipping the people. I believe that was a good thing, and I believe that Long Island today would be richer and more fruitful if there were on those desert plains of the island some more people of that same kind. (*Applause.*)

Let me state this to conclude: In the borough of Brooklyn we have been having some excitement about the signing of the contract for the new subway. We have had a subway, and our people have become accustomed to the up-and-downstairs of the subway just now, but when the subway first came to Brooklyn, in one of the longest of the flights of steps, a mere man was passing down there and before him was a woman. Unfortunately, he slipped, and as he slipped he happened to strike her, and they went down the toboggan together. When they reached the bottom, he tapped her upon the shoulder and said, "Madam, will you please take the next train, this is as far as I go." (*Laughter.*)

THE PRESIDENT: And this will be about as far as we can all go tonight, as we have arrived at the hour of ten o'clock. It seems impossible for eight brethren, each accustomed to occupy more than half an hour, to put into five minutes' time that one-half hour address, and it can't be done unless they move sidewise.

Let us close the discussion with the hymn, No. 459—two verses, if you please. I regret very much that I have three excellent names that I would like to have called on before our adjournment, but it is impossible.

After singing I will call on Dr. Gray to dismiss us with the benediction.

(*Singing.*)

The benediction was pronounced by Rev. Dr. C. D. Gray.

THIRD DAY

Morning Session

November 11, 1909

10 o'clock A. M.

THE PRESIDENT: Brethren, the hour has arrived for the morning session, and the Congress desires to preserve its record for promptness. Will you come to order? We have with us this morning Dr. George U. Wenner, who is the proposer of the plan with regard to religious instruction, and whose presence here at this session is especially fitting. Therefore, Dr. Wenner, of the Lutheran Church, will now lead us in prayer.

Prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. George U. Wenner.

THE PRESIDENT: I would now like to say, Brethren, that popular attention is in inverse ratio to the importance of the questions discussed in the Congress. Certainly the topic of the morning is one of the most important, and one of the most pressing now before the religious world: "How Can Ethics Be Taught in the Public Schools?"

I regret at once to announce a disappointment. Dr. Bryan, President of Colgate University, whose presence here we are looking forward to with especial interest, and who has but recently been installed in his high position, is unable to be present, and the Executive Committee has therefore very wisely asked President Harris to occupy his place as a reader instead of the speaker of the morning.

I have pleasure in introducing Dr. Harris, of Bucknell University. (*Applause.*)

PRESIDENT JOHN H. HARRIS, LL.D., of Bucknell University, then read the following paper:

HOW CAN ETHICS BE TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

It affords me pleasure to meet again with the Baptist Congress. I am glad also to find presiding over it the son of a man to whom

we all owe much, a man concerning whom Dr. McClintock, of the Methodist Episcopal church, once said, "There is William R. Williams preaching to the little church in Amity Street sermons which a conclave of archangels might listen to with rapture."

We can deduce, or at any rate define, the work of the state in teaching ethical truth in the public schools by the concept of the state itself. The object of all social institutions is the development of manhood. The fundamental social institution in our country is the family. The family is the great moral educator. Most men and women are what they are, because of the homes in which they were reared. We practice the lessons learned at our mother's knee, rather than those learned in school or church. Society in performing its function differentiates into the state and the church. Without such differentiation there can be no freedom and no progress. Spiritually considered, the state is society energizing in the sphere of justice; the state is organized justice. All those moral duties, therefore, which come under the concept of justice can and should be taught by the state. The purpose of the state is to develop the just man, and therefore all duties and obligations arising out of man's social relations to his fellow-man will furnish the subject-matter of ethical teaching by the state.

The purpose of the state is not only the development of the good man, but also the good citizen. The virtue of the good man and that of the good citizen are not identical. The voter has duties which the non-voter does not have. The duties of the office-holder are other than the duties of the private citizen. A chief function therefore of the public school is the development of enlightened patriotism. Sentimental patriotism is the constant refuge of the political scoundrel. The remedy, however, is not to replace it with a watery cosmopolitanism, like that of the man who loved all countries, even his own. He can love the whole world the best who loves his own land the best, who loves his own state and city the best, who loves his own home the best. True cosmopolitanism must begin with the home, but it must not end there. The remedy is an enlightened and rightly directed patriotism. I am persuaded that the most effective way of instructing youth in patriotic duty is by concrete example, that is,

by the reading of biography and history. Nor do I agree with some of my friends who would cut out of our histories all accounts of wars. If a war is merely a collision of blind forces, then the study of it would have morally only a negative value; but when an army as an embodied moral idea, whether of national union, or of freedom, civil or religious, meets and crushes embodied error, not without blood, then we have as sublime a moral spectacle as this world affords. Our children must not be deprived of the uplifting and enlarging power furnished by the majestic struggles of nations for truth and right. However, neither we nor our children are likely to be called on to "venture life and love and youth, for the great prize of death in battle." We are called, and our children ought to be instructed in their duty, to vote on election days, to attend and take an active part in suggestion conferences, in party caucuses and primaries. They should be taught also that it is no discredit to seek for office in order to serve the state. There are some offices of great importance but which confer no distinction and which it is therefore the special duty of educated men to covet. Such are the position of school director, road master, election judges. Horatio Seymour, governor of New York, said that there was only one office he coveted, that of road master, an office he held and the duties of which he was conscientiously discharging at the time of his death. Especially should the pupils of the public schools be taught to contribute each his part to that intangible but resistless thing, public opinion.

We do not sufficiently appreciate, our children are not taught to appreciate, our debt to society, our obligation to the past. No man can earn one-tenth of 1 per cent. of what he receives. If anyone thinks that statement too strong let him consider how long it would take him to make a common steel pen. Not if he had the genius of Edison and lived to be as old as Methuselah would he be able to do it. How many mathematicians, from before Euclid and after, toiled in obscurity and were forgotten, how many Galileos went to prison, how many Brunos to the stake, before Newton could solve the problem of the heavens and link his name forever with the stars? How many Marathons were fought out, how many Nasebys, how many Yorktowns, before

the Constitution of the United States could be ordained? That document might well be written in blood, for every syllable of it cost the lives of a thousand men, men of whom the world was not worthy. And yet there are thousands of citizens who year by year sell their birthright for a drink of whiskey; or, more culpable still, good moral men, but poor citizens, neglect to exercise their blood-bought privilege. Surely here is a field for ethical education in the schools of the state.

Now the state may educate in morals indirectly or directly. Indirectly the state may educate by furnishing a wholesome environment for the schools. When, as in one case, the state licenses nineteen saloons and permits eleven houses of ill fame on the streets facing one schoolhouse, the state can scarcely be said to fulfil its duty. So the conditions upon the school grounds and within the schoolhouses are such as to breed moral disease more deadly than the "Vampire of the South." We bear grateful testimony to the great improvement in this respect in recent years. The state educates directly by the teachers it places in the school as its agents. It is said to be the whole aim of the British constitution to get twelve honest men into the jury-box. The whole aim of our state educational system should be to get men and women of ability and character into the schoolroom. All the rest will follow. In some places there is systematic effort to have the Bible read in the schools. If the teacher believes in the Book and loves it, I should rejoice exceedingly to have it read to my children. In that way they now read it with their mother. Their mother believes in the Book and lives it. But if, as in one instance, the teacher, after reading a selection because required so to do, remarks with a sneer, "Perhaps there are people who believe that stuff," the effect will be disastrous. It will be scarcely less so if the sneer is only in the heart. It cannot be highly helpful if done in a perfunctory way. Instead then of trying to force the New Testament into the schools, I think Christians should request that it should not be used as a textbook in the secular schools but that it should be reserved as the sole and incomparable textbook of the church, where it will be lovingly studied and reverently read. That would not exclude the New Testament or the Christ of the New Testament from the public

schools. Ethical religion is the dynamic of morality; Christianity is the supreme ethical religion, and should go into every school. I mean, too, that the church as a spiritual energy should enter every school. Ecclesiastics, however, as ecclesiastics, should stay out. As citizens they may enter, the same as other citizens. This would be to the interest both of the state and church. As the state is the people energizing in the sphere of justice and objective morality, so the church is the people energizing in the sphere of piety and subjective morality. The one is concerned with the overt act, the other with the animating spirit. The one proceeds by compulsion, the other by persuasion. Whenever compulsion comes in at the door, religion flies out at the window. Both the state spiritual and the church spiritual must have organization for effectiveness within their sphere, the one as civil government, the other as ecclesiastical organization. The civil government is constantly in danger of falling into the illusion that it is the state. "I am the state," said Louis XIV. So ecclesiastics imagine that they are the church, or that they are religion, or sometimes they identify themselves with God—*Wir und Gott*. So when they are not permitted to control the schools and compel, they charge the schools with being irreligious and godless. Our public schools can be maintained only by the careful separation of the church and state functions, and in that way only can they be made truly religious and ethical. Christianity must enter the school concretely though spiritually in the person of Christian teachers.

When that Christian daughter of yours goes into the school, whether to teach mathematics or science, Christ goes into the school with her, and is present in the school in power. That is the only effectual way in which Christianity can go into the public schools, or elsewhere. Moral truth differs from mathematical truth in this that we can learn moral truth only by living it; otherwise we have not knowledge, but only theoretic dreams. So we can teach morality only as we live it; otherwise we are giving only the husks which even the swine are wise enough to reject. Moral education is dynamic. There sleeps yonder in Riverside in a sleep so deep that it is not broken by the tread of the million pilgrims who yearly visit his tomb, a man who was

of force to command a million men, who made himself felt through the great generals who stood at the head. The Sher-
mans, the Sheridans, and the Meades down to the rank and file
where I was proud to serve, felt the whole length of a battle
line stretching for twenty-five hundred miles all instinct with
life from one center and unified by one will. It was the dynamic
of a great personality. Through a like dynamic of personality
will the church as spiritual energy vivify the lessons of morality
and be examples of morality to a still mightier host, the host
of youth sixteen million strong that on this November morning
are on their way to school. From some height of vision glance
at their array. Your eyes will never behold a sight more sublime.
Let us look more closely at these eight score thousand men and
women who, each in his schoolroom, are awaiting the coming of
this host which passes beyond the power of any human mind to
comprehend. Let us mark as I have marked many and many a
time in institute and convention the great outstanding fact written
sun-clear in their faces, their moral earnestness, their conscien-
tiousness, their anxiety to learn their duty, their readiness to do it.
We will then from our mount of vision lift our eyes from that
which is before us to Him who is above us, the Father of light,
from whom comes every good and perfect gift, with a thought of
thanksgiving to Him who has called into this service the men and
women who this day are teaching the youth of America. And
yet there remains much land to be possessed.

THE PRESIDENT: The second writer on this topic is well
known among us in this city as Mr. Clarence E. Meleney, associ-
ate city superintendent of schools, New York. (*Applause.*)

DR. CLARENCE E. MELENEY: *Mr. President, Ladies and
Gentlemen:* My topic is:

HOW CAN ETHICS BE TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

In the public schools of New York City ethics as a branch of
study is not differentiated from the subjects of the required cur-
riculum, but the syllabus explicitly prescribes that principals and
teachers should aim to make all instruction and training a means

of the development of character in every child. The underlying principles are explained and the method of dealing with the problem is carefully set forth with suggestive topics which may be used in instruction on appropriate occasions.

Ethics can be taught and is taught in all the studies and activities that constitute the "life of the school," and is fostered by the atmosphere and spirit of the classroom and the school as a whole.

From the kindergarten through all the grades of the elementary and high schools ethics constitutes an essential and positive feature of instruction. Every study, every exercise, every activity in the life of the child affords the opportunity for cultivation of the principles of right living. It is the teacher's duty to keep this aim in view at all times, but the child may be unconscious of the object sought. The success of a school is measured by the degree in which right conduct and high motives are manifested, as much as by the proficiency in knowledge and efficiency in action. Teachers and pupils alike realize this result, and in the realization grow in moral power. The elements that enter into ethical training may be briefly summarized:

1. *The spirit and atmosphere of the school as a whole.*—If the school is of a high moral tone, if the spirit is one animated by right motives, if the atmosphere is morally wholesome, if the conduct of pupils toward teachers and teachers toward pupils is mutually sympathetic, helpful, considerate, if love is the controlling principle, the moral forces are most powerful.

2. *The qualities of the principal.*—The influence and power of the principal of a school in the direction of the ethical growth of the pupils should be strong. His opportunity finds play in the development of a school spirit in all the interests and activities of the school. At the assembly he has the pupils before him for moral instruction and in his visits to the classrooms and the playground occasions arise for improving the tone and character of all the pupils. He encourages games and sports designed for healthful emulation and the increase of strength, for the social and co-operative relations of all, and for establishing ideals of conduct. When pupils are brought before him for discipline and when he meets parents in the interest of their children his influ-

ence is exerted on ethical lines. In his supervision of instruction and his conferences with teachers he is expected to direct the teaching so as to promote its ethical value. His contact with the mass is limited by numbers but his bearing, his poise, his look and gesture, his dignity, his enthusiasm have an influence reaching to the remotest pupil.

3. *The character of the teacher.*—The power of the teacher's personality cannot be overestimated. The teacher is an open book to the pupils, to be read at once, to be measured and estimated at par value. The heart of the teacher as well as the intellectual equipment is revealed to the pupil at the outset and is manifested in the voice, speech, habit of action, and attitude toward the child and to the work of the school. The teacher must exemplify all the qualities of virtue that should be realized in the pupil. The child must find in the teacher the best that he can make of himself. The teacher must be true, faithful, prompt, correct, efficient, expert, just, sympathetic, appreciative, and self-controlled.

4. *The work and routine of the school.*—It is essential that the studies and duties to be performed by the pupils should be appropriate and adapted to their ability and needs. This necessitates proper grading and classification. Every class should be homogeneous, composed of pupils as nearly as possible of equal ability and equally capable of accomplishing the tasks and duties assigned, so that all may be able to do efficiently all that may be required without unnecessary stress and without embarrassment, with a proper degree of natural emulation, but without criticism or humiliation for failure. Work should be stimulating, inviting healthy effort, but without undue pressure. Force or unnatural incentives should not be employed; temptations to be dishonest or to cover up faults should be removed. Opportunities should be as nearly equal as possible, and commendation and rewards should be measured by the standards of individual ability and effort. Success for its own sake and duties done for duty's sake should be the animating principle. Success and appreciation cultivate self-respect, and success attained honestly, even by great effort, develops strength of purpose and of character. Unfavorable conditions, unequal opportunities, misplaced confidence, unmerited praise breeds false self-appreciation and dishonesty.

The presence in the same class of pupils varying greatly in ability or in attainment affords an opportunity for discouragement on one side and overconfidence on the other; for embarrassment and conscious superiority; for self-suppression and obtrusiveness; for humiliation and self-esteem. To mitigate these evils as far as possible classes are being organized to provide similar conditions and equal opportunities for the weak and the strong, the over-aged and the younger pupils, for the slow and diffident and for the precocious children.

The relation of the pupil to the school as a whole is similar to the relations he will have to sustain to the community as a social and a civic organization. The sense of authority under which a pupil acts develops into a realization of authority in the community and the state. A free citizen is free under the law when his conduct conforms to the law; the law of society and the state must be the law of the individual. The pupil must make the law of the school the law of self-control. He must develop a consciousness of his own responsibility; he must act not by compulsion but by choice; he must take the initiative in doing right and fulfilling his obligations. He must co-operate with his companions and with his teacher, carrying on the measures necessary for the success of the administration of the school and its work.

5. *Outdoor activities.*—The recess, the plays and games of the school yard, the going to and from school, the conduct of pupils in the neighborhood afford opportunity for ethical training which should not be overlooked by principals and teachers. Here the child comes into relations requiring consideration for others when the restraint of oversight and control has been largely removed, when he is free to exercise more liberty, but under self-control. The influence of the school over the pupil must extend beyond its confines and the power of its influence is measured by the unrestrained conduct of the pupils. If passengers on a street car or train are disturbed and annoyed by pupils returning from high school or college, it is an evidence of lack of moral training and the school or college should be held responsible. If fences and buildings in the vicinity of a school are marked with chalk in

language or graphic symbols it is an evidence of lack of ethical training in the school.

The organization of playgrounds and recreation centers in which our city has taken the lead has proved to be of inestimable value in cultivating right habits of conduct, an appreciation of equal rights, subordination to authority, adaptation to social conditions, co-operation in effort, and consideration for those who need assistance. Athletic games and competitive sports which have been established as a part of our system contribute much to ethical training by stimulating enthusiasm for the school, developing self-control and efficiency, effecting co-operation and subordination, healthful emulation, appreciation of ability and power in competitors, and in promoting standards of honor and justice in conducting and managing meets and tournaments.

6. *School studies are of ethical value.*—There is no subject of the school curriculum in which there are not opportunities for ethical training, whether the subject be taught for the content or subject-matter or as an art. A brief reference to the subjects as related to ethical training should suffice.

a) Nature-study. In this subject the purpose is to open a field for investigation and the discovery of truth. Observation must be exact, the records and inferences must be correct, and the expression must be true. Science is essentially ethical. The pupil is made to feel that truth is at the foundation of it. Nature appeals to a pupil as a big question mark. It says, "Find out, think, tell what is true."

b) Literature. This is of ethical value. It presents the highest ideals of life. It cultivates the best motives and stimulates the richest emotions. It furnishes the best types of character. The best literature is placed in the hands of the pupils as soon as they can make out words; in fact, the teaching of reading even in the first stage is accomplished by the use of the choicest literature. It is not a question of how to read but what to read. The pleasure and satisfaction of reading what is worth while, the consciousness of power to read intelligently, added to the ethical ideas derived from the subject, make reading one of the most valuable subjects of instruction. Every fable, myth, fairy tale,

every story or poem that carries a moral or a principle of ethical value is a text for moral instruction.

c) History. This subject presents in concrete form the lives and the deeds of the human race. Examples that characterize noble actions, self-sacrifice, persistent endeavor, love of country, undying patriotism, are held up for reverence and emulation. Moral judgments are exercised in the study of events and enactments that mark the progress of civilization. Nor is it necessary to confine to the pages of history the study of examples of moral value for we have in the acts and the events of every day life object lessons that point the moral, inspire the imagination, and stimulate the pupil to right conduct.

d) Civics. This subject occupies an important place in the curriculum. It is designed to teach the duties of the citizen to the citizen, and to the institutions of the community, the city, the state, and the nation. It is presented concretely and is studied as far as possible by observation. The everyday life of the child in his relation to home, school, society, and to organized government in its various departments is studied with the purpose of teaching the pupils their place and their duty. The syllabus in civics prescribed by the Board of Superintendents is introduced by the following note:

Pupils should be taught in all grades, as far as they may be made to understand, their responsibilities and privileges as members of society, and that as such they owe duties to the school, to the family, to the neighborhood, to the city, the state, and the nation. In this way they may be led to comprehend the principles of government and their individual duties in connection with it. The necessity for obedience to authority should be dwelt upon, as also the moral obligation of working with the various departments of the government and not against them. Wherever possible, the reasons for conduct should be explained. If the child knows the reason for any law, he will obey that law more readily.

In all grades there should be frequent discussions under these headings: Obedience to law; Why laws are made; Who makes the laws? Who enforces the laws? Why are law breakers punished?

Principles and teachers are urged to lose no opportunity to impress upon pupils the importance of city ordinances that are specially applicable to local conditions. Pupils should be led to see that even slight departures from the standard of order and good administration become

very serious matters when many persons engage in them, and that, therefore, each individual should be careful to avoid acts, such as throwing paper and fruit skins into the streets, which, though trifling in themselves, would, if they became general, tend to impair the cleanliness and health of the city. In teaching the "duties of citizens and public officials," special attention should be directed to the work of the departments that come under the immediate observation of pupils.

e) Mathematics. The content of arithmetic presents subjects closely related to the life of the child requiring truth, exactness, honesty. Problems involve the dealings of people in financial matters, commercial and industrial activities, in which values, measurements, and accounts are studied. Transactions of such a nature are based upon an ethical foundation. The work from the lowest to the highest grade deals with the fundamentals of business. It affords an opportunity to inculcate principles of honor, fair dealing, and business integrity. The commercial and financial world is the field where honesty and mutual confidence should be the guiding motives. In the school pupils can be taught these fundamental principles and arithmetic offers the largest opportunity. We attempt to teach exact values as well as practical and honest methods and to train pupils to obtain exact results. Figures should not lie and the attempt to make them lie by manipulation cannot be attributed to the school.

f) Art and industrial training. This feature of school work also contributes in large measure to ethical training of the pupils. Here again the powers of seeing perfectly, judging accurately, and reproducing truthfully are cultivated. The work begins in the kindergarten and continues throughout the course. In every grade emphasis is placed upon truth, utility, and beauty: the highest ideals to be inculcated in the child mind. Here more than in any other branch of teaching, the eye, the mind, and the hand are in unity and co-operation. Whether in the sewing-lesson or the cooking-room, in the drafting-room or the shop, the girl and the boy learn that thoroughness and exactness are the only standards of success. The seam must be straight and true; the proof of the pudding is in the eating; the drawing must tell the truth and the frame must be tried by the square; any deviation shows imperfection and failure. The model is the ideal and the product must be

measured by the model. Unthinking people characterize this branch of school work as a fad. If it is a fad to teach a child to do a piece of work correctly and by a standard that will not permit of cheating, to persevere by hard work if necessary until truth has been expressed, to overcome difficulties by patience, repetition, and determination, until the consciousness of power is acquired and the joy of mastery has been experienced, then let us have more fads.

g) Writing. The art of penmanship and of composition leads to the same ethical goal. An art requires study and patient practice. The pupil must teach himself to write, the teacher cannot do it for him. He is thrown upon his individual effort and must work persistently to attain correctness and facility. The child grows by his own activity, whether in body or mind. Self-reliance and self-mastery are essentially moral. The greatest weakness of a school is revealed when a teacher does for a pupil what he can do for himself and thus prevents the pupil's growth. Persistence in such misguided assistance produces stagnation of growth and paralysis of the will.

To enable a pupil to master the art of composition let the teacher hand back a set of papers without indicating the errors and demand that the errors be discovered and corrected and that the composition be rewritten. Let this process be repeated time and time again until correctness may be acquired and until the pupil realizes that nothing short of a correct product will be accepted. The child must be forced back upon himself until he acquires mastery. He may have help and suggestion to enable him to help himself. The degree of help depends upon the progress and strength of the child, but the teacher must draw himself from under the child and lead him on. This is moral, rational, educational.

Aside from the development of ethical ideals and ethical methods in the teaching of every subject of the prescribed curriculum, formal ethical lessons may be given when the occasion arises for pointing a moral. I take the liberty of quoting from the syllabus prepared by the Board of Superintendents and placed in the hands of every teacher, as it is proper that you should know authoritatively what our teachers are instructed to do:

The following list of topics affords subjects for many practical lessons in morals and manners:

a) Duties to parents, brothers, sisters, and playmates; to servants and other employees; to employers and all in authority; to the aged, the poor, and the unfortunate.

b) Conduct at home, at the table, at school, on the street, in public assemblies, and in public conveyances.

c) The common virtues, such as regularity, punctuality, self-control, cheerfulness, neatness, purity, temperance, honesty, truthfulness, obedience, industry, and patriotism.

In all such moral instruction and guidance the following principles should be observed:

a) The course of moral training is a development, in which the child is first led to act rightly and afterward to work from principle; he proceeds from obedience on faith to obedience on principle; from regularity to faithfulness. The child also develops from egoism to altruism. His impulse toward self interest normally develops earlier than his impulse to put himself in another's place. Upon the full development of the former stage depends the full development of the latter.

b) The culture of the imagination is a powerful aid in moral instruction; first, as the power vividly to picture consequences—to put yourself in your own place later on (foresight); secondly, as the power to "put yourself in his place" (social imagination, sympathy).

c) In using literature and similar material for purposes of moral education, the teacher should not violate the law of self-activity. The child may resent having a moral drawn for him which he can draw for himself. He is the more likely to follow the principle which he himself discovers or formulates because it is his own.

d) The most effective method in moral education is positive rather than negative. A mind filled with worthy interests, high ideals, and helpful activities has no room for evil. Approbation more than censure leads to well-doing. Love is a stronger and a better motive than fear.

e) At every stage of school life pupils should be taught that they live under inexorable laws which they cannot violate with impunity—both physical laws and moral laws. Obedience is not optional: it is compulsory. Penalty follows law-breaking as surely as night follows day, though the penalty is not always immediate.

To summarize and to answer briefly the question, "How Can Ethics Be Taught in the Public Schools?" let me say in closing:

The teaching of ethics involves the acquisition of knowledge

of what is truth and what is falsehood; the obligations to oneself and to others, duty; the keeping of a promise, keeping an engagement, being on time, completing a task; of what constitutes respect for parents and elders, obedience to authority, co-operation for the general welfare, support of important interests, institutions, and the state; the right to property, honesty.

Teaching ethics involves the awakening of the sensibilities: interest, enthusiasm, desire to know and investigate, sympathy, co-operation, responsibility.

It involves judgment, contemplation, weighing of values, appreciation of motives.

It involves the cultivation of the will, courage and fearlessness to do right, perseverance and determination to do right and to perform duty.

As I have shown, this can be done efficiently if the child is surrounded by conditions that favor education of a high standard, is placed under the direction of teachers of positive moral character, and submits to a comprehensive course of instruction and training conducted upon true principles and methods of teaching.

THE PRESIDENT: Before calling on the first of the appointed speakers, I would like to announce to the audience that this discussion, I hope, will be participated in by many, and Dr. Lawson has kindly consented to traverse the aisles and take the cards of those who may desire to participate. As you know, already Dr. Harris' part has been given as one of the written papers. I now call on Mr. John L. Alger, president of the Rhode Island State Normal School, of Providence, R. I.

MR. JOHN ALGER delivered his address as follows:

Mr. President: While our subject deals with the teaching of *ethics* as distinct from *morals*, it is impossible to limit the discussion in this way. The scientific study of ethics must be limited to the few in college grades who are really ready for it, and very little formal teaching of the subject has any place in the public schools. Child life must be spontaneous, happy, care-free. His goodness must not be a studied and calculated goodness, but one that grows into right habits of action, with his own sense of justice and right as guide and interpreter. One of the most difficult

things in the teaching of children is to make what is taught from books appear real to them. There is a sort of idealization of the printed page which makes the child seem to be living in a different world from the plain, everyday affairs of the real things around him. He would readily accept principles in a blind way, and would stick to them in this second self; but they would not touch his real self, and he would have only the distorted view of them that he has obtained from his half-appreciation of what the teacher is trying to inculcate. With him conscious study will almost surely distort. We must give him habits, and must train his impulses and his passions, until these bear fruit in a real and wholesome and happy life.

It is true that the French schools are seeking to deal with the subject in their usual thorough manner. This week they will study one virtue, and next week another, until all have been covered. The system surely appeals to one's sense of the fitness of things, but it is not merely intellectual men that we want. The vilest criminal may know most about ethics and about theology as well. I am even inclined to think that much early study of these subjects would seriously tend to make a child wish to try the wrong course to see what would result, like the case of the small boy who omitted to say his prayers, and when nothing dreadful happened felt that there was no longer any use in them.

The ethical culture schools are performing a real service in their study of what may be done, and of how far instruction may go along these lines. A former teacher in these schools when asked his opinion of the work there, now that he looks back upon it, writes as follows:

As to the value of direct teaching of ethics, I believe in it; but I believe more in the value of the teaching that Dewey formulates in *Moral Principles in Education*. And I also believe that the "moral lessons" that are taught direct will be most fruitful when taught in close connection with the other phases of school life. Even at the Ethical Culture School the direct teaching was, at times, too much instruction *brought in* from the outside.

Fortunately direct teaching and the view set forth by Dr. Dewey are not mutually exclusive. As I think of it now, the best conditions for moral growth are those in which the teacher "recognizes that moral

forces are real in the same sense in which the other forces are real, that they are inherent in community life and in the working structure of the individual," and in which the teacher draws on the ethical poses of the material being—reconstructed as the needs manifest themselves.

It must be borne in mind that this teacher is speaking of the ethical training in a particular school, especially planned and with teachers especially selected for this work. I doubt if he would go so far in outlining a course for the ordinary public school, where we must deal with the average teacher.

If we may turn at once to the more vital question of how we may teach morals in the public schools, consider the training of an ideal bank clerk, who can handle uncounted millions of money without fear of dishonesty. It is not to be supposed that a character built up by precept would endure the strain. One may believe without having power to act consistently and continually in his belief. The training must come by habits, built up a little at a time, until the belief is fully established, largely as a result of habits. Finally, with repugnance for dishonesty and with a clear conception of values in life, come a stability and a confidence that will prevent the possibility of failure. The great value of the precept is as a maxim or concise statement which helps to clarify the ideal. Something of this can come into the early training, but it cannot be made the foundation of training. Someone has said: "To make 'I believe' the basis of 'I do' for boys and girls is an attempt to make the river of God's life flow up hill."

There *are* teachers in the public schools who can teach ethics, but there are also teachers in many *Sunday* schools who do *not* teach ethics or even good morals.

Much of the value of the public-school teaching lies in its training to habits of accuracy, to love and respect for good work, to an admiration for the truth and a desire to find it. These all have a direct and vital bearing on the formation of the character. Much of the Sunday-school teaching leads to confusion, to disorder, to superficiality, and the tolerance of it in ethics; habits which are destructive to morals and which must seriously retard the best development of character. It is to be hoped that the introduction of the graded lessons may bring with it more of the

spirit of real work and more of a desire for accomplishment of substantial results.

Mark Hopkins on a log with a student means a vital and a personal element that enters his life, not by what the teacher says to the boy, but by what he is, and by the love which the boy feels and knows his teacher has for him. One of the greatest helps that can be given a boy is the feeling that you have confidence in him and in what he can and will do.

We see the folly of textbook teaching of morals in much of the teaching of temperance. In many places this was carried on in such a way as to destroy rather than to help. The success of the temperance work in the country seems to me to be due rather to the general advance in civic righteousness than to the forced teaching of the subject in the schools.

It will be impossible to deal justly with ethics in the schools until we can have teachers trained to a right handling of the subject. One of our new western states, in an attempt to introduce the teaching of agriculture in the schools, decreed that the subject must be taught, with the result that teachers who knew nothing about it in any scientific way made it and themselves ridiculous before their pupils. It was impossible to secure teachers who could do justice to it, and the whole cause was unnecessarily delayed. We shall be unable to make any large requirements of our teachers in the way of teaching ethics until they are more nearly ready for it. The present idea of the goody-goody boy, and the boy's own exalted opinion of himself, are only too easily produced by the namby-pamby methods so prevalent in moral instruction.

It seems to me that our best work at this particular time in forwarding the cause of really saving and reforming boys and girls will be that of promoting manual and industrial training in the grades. When it is so conclusively proved that many may be made useful and happy and virtuous citizens by being given something to do with their hands instead of always with their heads, we are neglecting our duty seriously if we are not helping to bring about the good time coming when our education shall be more rational as it is applied to those who show no taste for book-learning. President Eliot calls it the new gospel of education

which says, "Find something for the child to do which he can do, and help him to do it." It is said that the greatest task for the teacher of the feeble minded is that of finding something for each child to do that he can do with credit. This might almost be said with equal truth of the teacher in the regular grades. We like to do what we can do well. Children grow into self-respecting, capable men and women if they can grow in confidence in their own ability and in their power to please those whom they love and whose love they know they have in return.

There are still other ways in which we may teach good morals. We are coming to know something of our power over our own bodies, and how we may make ourselves cheerful or sad at will. We can preach the gospel of the cheerful, sunny life, and of how it may be attained. I heard recently of a club in this vicinity where the password is a smile, and where, when a member appears with a frown, his mates say, "Don't you belong this morning, John?" It seems to me that we as church members need also to emphasize more fully one other point in our talks with young people. In the Rhode Island Normal School there is a bust of Henry Bernard on which are inscribed these words: "For one, I mean to enjoy the satisfaction of the labor, let who will enter into the harvest." We are less and less concerned about the happiness of our future state, and our young people are even more unconcerned than the adults. What we need is the enjoyment of the labor of the present time, and this means as much to the boy and girl as to us. One of our greatest problems will be solved when we can find some helpful thing that each one may do, for the church as well as for the school.

Can we not also make of greater value the story hour, and must we always feel that children love to hear sermons? Stories form one of the teacher's best resources in the teaching of morals. They should convey a definite and clear ideal; the teaching must be positive, not negative, the ideals must be practicable; they must be adapted to the development of the child; they must convey their own moral; and they must appeal to the child's sense of right and justice. If it is true, as stated by James Rhoades in *The Training of the Imagination*, that: "There is no other entrance to the realm of knowledge, but through the folding gates of

pleasure and of wonder," may we not ask if on this basis we do not need to revise, not only our teaching of the regular school subjects but most of all our teaching of those things which are to lead to the formation of the characters we wish to secure?

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair has permitted the reading of papers by those known as speakers for the reason discussed somewhat in the meeting of the General Committee yesterday, that they had been requested to furnish for the printed report the substance of their remarks, and coming thus with a draft in their pockets, they naturally did not desire to give something that might be of an entirely different character as an *ex-tempore* address. For this reason the Chair has not held strictly to this rule.

Only two cards have reached the platform of those desiring to participate in the discussion. The Chair would like very much to call on some who are present, but that liberty is not given. Particularly, I should like to call on Dr. Wenner, who is well known to so many of us as an author of a plan for religious instruction in public schools. But Dr. Wenner feels that that was not included, as I understand, in the theme of the morning, and I have no permission to call upon him in the absence of his desire to speak. I call, therefore, on Rev. R. G. Boville.

DR. R. G. BOVILLE: *Mr. Chairman:* However much we might wish to see the Christian religion and the Bible introduced in the public schools and taught to every child in America, yet there are reasons, both practical and theoretical, why that is impossible: Practical, because the bulk of the population is entirely divided in religious thinking, and they could not justly be forced according to our views, to accept any definite religious training that they did not agree with. Further, it would result in complications, such as the union of the church and state in the schools; this union of church and state in the school would imperil the safety of that principle that has been reached after long centuries of conflict, and which is essential to the well-being of spiritual religion in the world today.

But while the teaching of the Bible cannot be introduced in the public school, that is no reason why Christianity should not

be introduced, and in that sense I understand the statement made by Dr. Harris this morning, and in that sense alone. In other words, Christianity can be introduced in the public schools in the person of Christian teachers, and through the influence, the unconscious influence of these, an open door awaits the recognition of all the forces of denominations of religion today. In this way can the church bring the power of religion to bear on the children of the community, through the Christian spirit of the teachers who have charge of them in the schools. And for this reason it seems to me that it is most important that the church and the boards of education should today center their thoughts and interest on the system of normal schools, for it is in the normal schools that the secret of education lies, and that the battle of education is fought.

We all of us regard the profession of teaching with the highest respect. To us the teachers are the priests and priestesses of knowledge. They should be called with the divine call, and they should be ordained with the divine ordaining, and if that thought is to enter into our public schools, and if we are to regard our public schools as great temples—beautiful temples, thank God, in New York, and beautiful even in the small country schools, where some of us may have gone—if we are to have this thought assimilated, and divine service introduced into the education of today, it must be in making it certain that when the normal schools are open, the young people that enter those schools shall have been selected with regard to their habits, their intellectual development, their type, their moral purpose, and that no person shall be allowed to enter upon the career of education without having given sufficient guarantee for their moral honesty, just as no person should be admitted into a theological seminary, without having proven that he has a divine call to the ministry. In this way, therefore, the church can influence religious education in the schools by assisting in the training of teachers for the schools, and by the elimination of the purely professional point of view in the schools, and by emphasizing in the curriculum of the normal school the great moral purpose of education, the great ethical purpose, the production of character, so that citizens may be pro-

duced that will build up the moral strength and force of this country.

But while we take that point of view, it must be obvious that ethical education, as imparted in our schools today, whether pursued by the indirect method of the American schools, or the formal and direct method of the English and French schools, does fail in giving to us the type of citizen that we should have, unless it is reinforced by other forces. Ethical education in the school will prove abortive, and to some extent, has proved abortive, unless society, as a whole, will come into the field with its co-operating force—and by this I mean that education of children in our great cities where the social conditions are such outside the school as to be destructive of ethics—you cannot have an ethical education in the true sense of the word.

I talked a year ago with the principal of one of the great Jewish schools in the east side of London that had over 2,000 boys and girls, and he said to me, "My problem is not here in the school from nine o'clock in the morning until three in the afternoon, but it is after these children go out to the slums of East London and live in contact with degrading conditions that despoil character, and counteract the influence of the school."

Now, if that is true in the east end of London, it is true in the great city of New York, and other great cities in this country where millions of children are exposed to the unethical conditions of society that counteract the influence of the school.

How would it be possible, how would it be conceivable otherwise, that 12,000 children, boys and girls, under sixteen years of age were arraigned in the children's courts of New York last year for a list of crimes that pretty nearly exhaust all conceivable phases of human depravity. It is the fact that our social conditions, our tenement conditions, our civic conditions, our civic corporations, our civic graft and landlord graft and capital graft make the existence of tenements possible, and you will never have ethical education in New York that will make the children's courts unnecessary, until you abolish the tenement house, and society as a whole must do that.

It seems to me, too, that ethical education in the schools will prove abortive, unless you have the co-operating influence of the

Christian religion as it is incarnated in the Christian church of America today. It does seem to me that a society in which the idea of God is eliminated, a society in which there is no Christian spirit, which is not molded by the benign influence of Jesus Christ, which has nothing of his shaping hand left upon it, that a society of this kind cannot enable a child to grow up under conditions that promise well for a future prosperous America, but rather promise an America of assassinated presidents and of criminal conditions that almost pass the bounds of possibility. Perhaps we are not aware that in the cities of this country the anarchistic societies and the socialistic societies have organized Sunday schools and Saturday schools in which they treat their system, and in which their system is positively opposed to Christian and ethical education, and based on atheistic principles. So when we talk about socialism as being the hope of society, some of us should be pretty careful about indicating exactly what we mean. Socialism which is teaching boys and girls down on Rivington Street, and down on Canal Street, positive atheistic principles, will inevitably produce an America of assassinations.

Last summer in Chicago, a boy of eleven years of age, of violent temper, ungovernable in every sense of the word, on the opening day of one of our vacation Bible schools, in the Methodist Institutional Church in that city, arose and created a violent scene in the first session of the school, because God's name was mentioned in that assembly. Can you have efficient ethical education which is not reinforced by the idea of God; which is not influenced and motivated by the presence of the Christian religion? Can you have it, and if you cannot have it, then it is the great duty of the church throughout the world, throughout the week, in the afternoons and on Sunday, and during the 62 days of the summer when you have millions of children playing at your church door and unemployed; it is the duty of every Christian church to open its doors and make its best ministers and its finest products the teachers of the children of America. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: I invite next to the platform Dr. Edmund F. Merriam, the editor of *The Watchman*. (*Applause.*)

DR. EDMUND FRANKLIN MERRIAM: *Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:* Some of the things that I had intended to say have already been said and I will not attempt to repeat them. I agree with Dr. Boville that the teaching of ethics will be of small effect unless reinforced by religion, by Christianity. The example of Japan has been exceedingly suggestive in this particular. Japan now entering upon new life, and in adopting appliances of western civilization, found herself deficient in the ethics, in the moral character of her people. Take the Shuntu religion and it has practically no ethical teaching connected with it in the old religion of Japan. It was first attempted to adopt the ethics of Confucianism, but after instructing the children in the schools with these ethics they were found unsatisfactory. Finally the ablest men in Japan were requested to draw up a code of ethics in accordance with the Christian religion, and while it was not desired to adopt Christianity as the religion of the country, Japan had adopted the ethics of Christianity, and they are now being taught in the schools of Japan. This has produced a certain effect and is satisfactory to some degree, but is not fully satisfactory; and the Japanese are coming to the same conclusion as expressed by Dr. Boville that the teaching of ethics needs, in order to produce satisfactory results, to be reinforced by the sanctions and motives of the religion which is behind the ethics. I think this is the conclusion of Dr. Wenner, who is a great authority on the subject and from whom I hope we shall hear and who has given very careful attention to the teaching of ethics in the public schools.

We have listened to the papers of Dr. Meleney and Dr. Alger with great interest, and they have given us the best possible idea of the present state of teaching of ethics of public schools in the United States. And in that respect we have been fully informed, but I believe it is a matter of common observation what with all the care of the teaching of ethics in the public schools in the country, results are far from satisfactory. And the reason is simply this, that it has been without reference to the fact that this teaching of ethics is, as has been pointed out by Mr. Alger, mechanical, formal, and perfunctory. I don't mean to say, however, that the teaching is of that character, but the reception of

these teachings by the pupils is simply formal and perfunctory and without proper motives. Therefore while the teaching itself is admirable, that is, the teaching of ethics, the moral effect upon the children is not strong and pervading. And as Mr. Boville has pointed out, it does not keep them in the life away from school out of the temptations which they encounter outside of the school.

Now, what I have to say this morning is just this: You have heard from Mr. Boville why Christianity cannot be taught in the public schools—it is because Christians are so much divided; it is because we cannot agree upon what kind of Christianity shall be taught in the public schools. This is just the trouble in England today, and the reason that Great Britain is having so much trouble over her educational bill and educational system is because the Church of England desires to control the teaching of religion in the public schools and the nonconformists are not willing that it should. And the effect is likely to be that the schools of Great Britain will be wholly secularized as our schools are in this country. In England, if the nonconformist Christians all could get together, then all the children in Great Britain could be taught Christianity; and in this country if our denominations—our Christian denominations of all sorts—could get together, then the small proportion of people outside would have so little effect that we could have a teaching of real religion with its sanction and motives behind the teaching of ethics in our public schools.

Now, this subject is one of the greatest importance; when we remember that the world of the future is to be the world of the children of today, I believe, as the President has already said, that there has been no subject before us of so large an importance as this one which is now before this Congress. The greatest arguments for Christian unity today come from the missionary peoples. The missionaries wish to present a united front, to teach the same thing to the pagan world; and the same sort of an argument ought to go to the Christian peoples of today of different denominations. Our duty, our duty, my friends, to the children of today and to the world of tomorrow requires that these divisions among the bodies of Christian peoples should disappear; that we should unite under the banner of Christ and

be able not only to be a united people as followers of Christ, but united to carry his gospel into the public schools, into public life, into every phase of society and life of the future.

And so, this is just what I wish to say, that our duty to the future requires that every effort should be made to unify the Christian people in a single effective body, a powerful body, a conquering body. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: Dear friends, you will be glad to learn that I hold in my hand the card of George U. Wenner; I know we shall all rejoice to hear Dr. Wenner. (*Applause.*)

DR. GEORGE U. WENNER: *Mr. President:* I think it is John Stuart Mill who says all progress is dependent upon the contiguity of opposing ideas. All that is true, and I fear we shall make very little progress because I think we are all pretty well agreed with the sentiments that have been expressed here this morning, and I felt myself very much at home in listening to these papers and thoughts that have been expressed. At the same time I did feel that President Harris' magnificent paper was better suited to Pennsylvania than to New York, because we have entirely different conditions here, where we have nearly a million Jews, and where even the Christians are not altogether agreed on precisely the kind of religion that ought to be taught in the schools, so that there is very little to be expected in the way of truth, Christian truth, in the schools—although we are all agreed that the personality of the teacher is everything in the matter of teaching either ethics or religion. But the great thing that I gathered from the very admirable paper of Superintendent Meleney is the question of authority in the matter of ethics. Has ethics any basic authority? I was talking with a leading lawyer just a few days ago in this city and he tried to convince me—I was exceedingly shocked at the attitude that he took—he tried to convince me that in the matter of law, in the matter of obedience to law, the trouble was not so much in the matter of breaking the law—that was not wrong—but it was being caught at it; that law itself was only a sequence of events; that the general conception of the present day was that there was no such thing as a principle underlying it, but it was simply a statement of some person who

assumed to have authority, and that that person really hadn't any more right to lay down the law than he or I had; and therefore the only thing that there was in all the laws that were imposed upon us was that we must try not to be caught at it when we violated them. That is, I fear, the sentiment of the people—many of the people—just as much as it is of this distinguished lawyer; for I find, in spite of all these splendid things that Superintendent Meleney has said, that the ethical results of our public schools are not such as we would like to see them. The children's courts tell the story, and, as Dr. Boville has said, it is not very agreeable. But when we see the children that come from our splendid schools in this city, we see also that the views that they have and their conduct are not what we ought to expect from them. I met a man just day before yesterday who went into the theater—I think it was some theater in the neighborhood of forty-second Street and Lexington Avenue—on a Sunday afternoon—not particularly a churchman—he took his boy in there on a Sunday afternoon and he said he was exceedingly shocked by the conduct of hundreds of boys and girls gathered there, the language they used—being children from thirteen to sixteen and seventeen years of age—that the language and conduct that was used there in the course of progress of the theatrical representation, shocked him exceedingly, although he was a man who was not very easily shocked. So I am very glad to notice that the discussion is veering around, swinging around to the fact that there is something else we must have, a basis or authority in ethics, and that is religion. But what is the use of worrying and bothering about this question of teaching ethics in the public schools? It is religion that we want. We believe in God and we believe in our Christian religion, and the great question is how can we teach that; and I am in heartiest agreement in all that has been said today. I am a thorough Baptist on all questions of relations of church and state, for we really have no place in the public schools for our religion; the churches are strong enough to take care of it; all we want is time enough to do it. And if you will pardon me for a little egotism in the matter I would say that for the last fifteen or twenty years I have been trying to do that in the weekday afternoons for the children of my congregation,

and I believe that is the solution of it. We won't stop there, but all we ask of the state is for them to give us enough time and we will do it properly.

When I go away from this meeting I shall go to my own church, and as soon as school hours are closed there I shall meet a splendid lot of boys and girls, and the little ones I meet twice a week and the older ones once a week regularly for nine months of the year, and teach the children the Bible story where we have all the elements of wonder and interest. Then leading up to the special training in church matters in our church services, we have our children bring in the sermons of the preceding Sunday, so that in that way, by regular daily training and teaching of the Bible and the Bible story, and having it constantly throughout every week of the year—or at least throughout nine months of the year—it is brought daily together—this family of little children—and they are taught daily the Bible story, and in that way we find the solution of all these questions. We simply acquire the ethical training, whether in public school or anywhere else, so long as there is an underlying basis or authority. God is our guide and Christ is our brother, and this being a part of the daily life I think we shall make progress. But the churches have the entire thing in their control. They can do this work—they are capable of doing it—but they must not be satisfied with the enjoyment of any systematic instruction that is given on Sunday, but it must be an instruction for every day and every week. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: I still have two names. I will call first upon Dr. Albert G. Lawson.

DR. ALBERT G. LAWSON: *Mr. Chairman:* My principal interest was awakened by a suggestion made by President Harris, which brought to my mind the history, as given to me, of the famous Girard School. You know on account of the will of Mr. Girard, ministers, if they are known to be ministers to the gate-keeper, are not allowed even to go on the ground. It has been commonly supposed by a great many that it was because Mr. Girard had a deep prejudice against religion. That is not true. He did have deep prejudice against the priesthood, and he had

seen the overruling, and almost, in the overruling, the destruction, of what he believed to be noble for citizenship on the part of certain priests, and that led him to make his prescription. Now, the reaction from that is somewhat extraordinary. Some of the brightest and best ministers that we have in and about Philadelphia are graduates of the Girard School, and got all their academic training there.

There is a kind of intellectual and actual revolt in a large way, all unconscious, and all without distinctive premeditation, that has come out largely from that prescription, and it leads those who are in the management to be decidedly more careful than the ordinary academy or the ordinary public school about enforcing the inner spirit and life of what we denominate broadly as ethics.

It emphasizes from another side Dr. Harris' suggestion. Truth becomes of little worth until truth is incarnate in life. It is impossible for the Christian personality, in teaching mathematics, to make sweet and lasting effect upon those about them. Many of you know the name of our revered brother who went on to his joy and reward a year ago, Dr. James L. Hodge, of Brooklyn. His daughter was a teacher in one of the higher classes in the grammar school right near to the church where I had the joy of serving for eighteen years. Of course, it was impossible for Miss Hodge to talk directly from the desk, or in handling her book in some particular application of ethics—certainly in Christian doctrine—and yet there was no term at which that young woman had the privilege of meeting her class, that she did not have from one to three of those bright young men and women come to her and say, "Give me an opportunity to go home with you, or in some way to talk more about that deeper thing than moral ethics." I had the privilege of receiving into the Greenwood Baptist Church some eighteen persons whose direct bringing to Jesus Christ came from the sweet and consistent and continuous revealing of the supreme and precious Christian character of that sainted woman as she stood there in her place as a public-school teacher.

Now, the time may never come, in view of our ideas on the subject of the suffrage in this country, when we shall have an opportunity to put into the school, whatever aspect we may call it,

of Christianity as such, and the time may never come when we can broadly decide as an ethical product upon that in which we may have such concurrence and fixed agreement as to make anything like a system, but we may constantly do just what President Harris suggested.

Now, I think in another respect, while none of us wish to make any ecclesiastical attacks, we ought not to be mealy-mouthed about what we know as facts, and when we know that the great Roman church permits its priests to make constant assaults upon our public-school system at this very point, and yet everywhere through our country is planning to secure on boards of education a sufficient majority of members to checkmate anything we may try to do, I think we ought to meet that fact squarely, and we ought not to make believe we do not know it. And so we shall come sufficiently into unity at last to make our effort there, and make it in such a way as to be permanent and effective. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: The next card I have on the list is Dr. H. W. Barnes. (*Applause.*)

DR. H. W. BARNES, of Binghamton, N. Y.: *Brother Moderator*: I know that any address of mine will be trenching upon the time which is allotted for this morning's session, and I shall not attempt to make an address, but simply to call up one fact which has decidedly impressed me, in two large gatherings where the question of religious education was considered—one of them, which I myself attended, at Philadelphia, and the other, which was reported to me from England—namely, this matter of confounding or confusing religion with theology. What is religion? There is but one religion; theology relates to it, creeds relate to it, have something to say about it, but you never can put religion into a book. It is reallegiance; the binding of the soul and the life back again to God, which sin has separated from him, and a binding of men together in all proper relationships to each other. Now, ethics we *can* teach; we cannot teach doctrinal matters concerning religion—I mean denominational matters in our schools—but may we not gather up the great central facts, growing out of our eternal relation to God as creator, and our relation

to each other as individuals, and all that concerns the principal attitude and action of men toward each other, and embody them in a book which shall be put in the public schools as arithmetic, geology, grammar, or anything else that is put into a book. We cannot teach theology there; but may we not teach the great verities on which all our Christianity is founded? The only legitimate purpose of any business whatever in this world, and the most significant results of any business whatever, is not what it accomplishes outside, but what the effect of accomplishing it is upon the man who lives within, and does the work, or is reacted upon.

Mr. John D. Rockefeller and I were schoolmates together in the academy. I have said again and again that the most important result from Mr. John D. Rockefeller's life and work is, not what is outside of him, but the influence upon him of doing his work as he has done it. The building of character in the likeness of God or of Christ is the *one great purpose*. It is God's special purpose, it is my special purpose if I am a Christian, and it must be the permanent, the central purpose of humanity, if the Kingdom of God is ever to be realized in this world. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: I should like very much myself to have spoken this morning. This topic is one that, it seems to me, has a present importance perhaps beyond almost any one of the topics which we have had on the programme. Perhaps you will permit me to say in line with what has been said by other brethren, that if we could have some book of common worship in our schools on which there could be general agreement by Jews as well as Christians, it would seem to me that we would have taken a practical step in this direction. It was long ago remarked by my father in one of his most beautiful sentences, that ethics apart from religion is but like cut flowers; they may maintain their perfume, but their life and vigor are gone, and they are but dying things. You must have a base of authority behind ethics. The lawyer who was quoted was in some respects justified. Law without sanction is but good advice. It has no weight whatever. You must have authority behind teaching to make it important.

I would like to contribute this thought of my own. Can we not at least bring this principle into the public-school system of

our country, that it shall represent not the minimum, but the maximum of general agreement? We are eliminating from the curricula in our schools anything that any considerable minority objects to, but can we not in some way or other bring about such a conciliation and understanding that the best opinion of every denomination shall be represented, and that the maximum of opinion shall control what is presented in the public schools?

THE PRESIDENT: I should like to invite you to join in a Hymn, No. 239:

Break Thou the bread of life,
Dear Lord, to me.

After the singing of the hymn REV. MR. CRAIG pronounced the benediction.

The Congress then adjourned until 3 o'clock P. M.

THIRD DAY

Afternoon Session

3 o'clock P. M.

THE PRESIDENT: *Ladies and Gentlemen and Brethren of the Congress*: The hour has arrived for the session. Let us join in the hymn very congenial to the thought of the Congress, No. 851.

The hymn was sung and prayer was then offered by REV. ARTHUR S. COLE, of Manasquan.

THE PRESIDENT: As is probably known to most of those present already, it is the custom to have the subject or topic at the closing session of a somewhat different character from those of the preceding sessions of each annual meeting. We assembled primarily for the purpose of discussion, and as discussion is best when emphasized most clearly and concisely by the expression of opinions held by those who have a distinct diversity of views, we have devoted our earlier sessions to this end. But our closing session is not for discussion. It is to emphasize anew the great spiritualities in which we are in agreement, and therefore, always, some theme of this character is taken for the closing session.

For this year the topic selected is, "Realizing the Presence of God." And the first of the speakers is Rev. G. G. Johnson, D.D., pastor of the Prospect Avenue Baptist Church, of Buffalo.

REV. G. G. JOHNSON, D.D.: *Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen:* I have been asked to write upon this great theme, and I thank God for the opportunity of presenting it before you at this time. I feel like Wendell Phillips, when he addressed himself to the newspaper reporters, and said, "At least through you I speak to our millions of people." One may feel that this closing message through the printed report may go even farther.

REALIZING THE PRESENCE OF GOD

"He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty." "God is a very present help in trouble." The Real Presence is a far-stretching theme, and I suppose I am expected to play the part either of critic or of mystic. I shall do neither. I shall take it for granted that what is wanted, and what is needed even more than it can be wanted by any one of us, is the definite, practical answering of the question implied in the subject assigned: *How may we see His face?*

A card has recently been rather widely circulated in Buffalo bearing this prayer-motto, "Enable me to understand and live the life of Christ." This prayer draws him who offers it to the feet of the One who alone fulfilled our theme. If we understand and live the life of Christ we shall constantly be realizing the presence of God. The very atmosphere of Jesus' life was the Father's presence. In that presence he lived and moved and had his being. In a way that Enoch never did, or could, *he* "walked with God." His consciousness of his own being was not more real than his consciousness of his father's attending love. Here, then, we must find our pattern, the One to show us into the "secret place of the Most High." We must humbly say,

My dear Redeemer and my Lord,
I read my duty in thy word;
But in thy life the law appears
Drawn out in living characters.

Such was thy truth and such thy zeal,
Such deference to thy Father's will,
Such love, and meekness so divine,
I would transcribe and make them mine.

And yet for us all Jesus is, and must needs be, more than the "Way-Shower," as certain ones nowadays so glibly call him; he must be *the Way-Opener* to the Father. I know this is in many quarters now denied. Even Dr. Clarke in his weighty book, *The Christian Doctrine of God*, a very reservoir of truth, crystal clear, while setting forth Jesus as the revealer of the Father, yet says, "No authority or hint of Jesus limits us to learning about God from him alone," and yet a little farther on he says, "Concerning his own acquaintance with God, Jesus uttered the profound saying, 'Neither knoweth any one the Father, save the Son and he to whom the Son wills to reveal him'" (Luke 10: 22).¹

Surely to none of us here today can it be without decisive authority that Jesus also said, "I am the Way (not the Way-Shower), the Truth, and the Life; *no man cometh unto the Father but by me.*"

We do not now deal with the question whether there is not a possible revealing of the Father by the Son to one who never heard of Jesus, but who honestly seeks for light. We are, for the most part, concerned with men who do know of Christ and might, if they would, come to him that they might have life—"and this is life eternal that they should know Thee, the only real God, and Him whom Thou didst send, even Jesus Christ" (John 17:3).

It is useless then, at the outset, to talk of realizing God's presence to people who cannot know him because they refuse to walk the only way to him, by humble obedient faith in his Son—faith not only in Jesus' character, but also in his cross, because "Christ also suffered, the righteous for the unrighteous, *that He might bring us to God*" (I Peter 3:18). Not for naught was this way opened at such fearful cost, and not to give a choice of ways, but verily because there *could be no other way* into the

¹ W. N. Clarke, D.D., *The Christian Doctrine of God*, pp. 7, 26.

holiest than the one opened by the flesh and sprinkled by the blood of Jesus Christ (Heb. 10:19).

Even as Paul wrote, "Ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ" (Eph. 2:13), and, we have "peace through the blood of his cross" (Col. 1:20). Apart from this peace no experience of the Presence! Vainly do men talk of knowing God by self-consciousness. Pathetically false is it to say, as a recent writer does, that "religion does not consist in having a God, but in having a god-making capacity" (Foster). Hopeless is it to look for a God of our own making or a way of our own devising. The "secret of his presence" is found by no one who has left the *via crucis*.

Again, as useless is it to hope to dwell consciously with the One whom Jesus addressed as "Holy Father, righteous Father" (John 17) without the aid of the Holy Spirit by whom alone can anyone call Jesus "Lord" (I Cor. 12:3) or look up with satisfying love and say, "Abba, Father" (Rom. 8:15). Now the Spirit is given to those that obey God (Acts 5:32), those who leave all to follow him who, "though he was Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered" (Heb. 5:8). And this obedience to the Lord carries with it obedience to his Word. One who rejects or neglects the Scriptures as the full and final message of the Father to his children cannot by any peradventure find and follow the walk with God.

Of these things I speak at the opening, not to be controversial, but to be clear *and to be true*. As well encourage an ignorant or disobedient child to rejoice in his father's smile as to expect one to realize the presence of God who does not ascertain or accept the will of God as revealed in his Word.

And now what does the "presence of God" mean? The Scriptures indicate three meanings or phases of the one great fact of his presence. The first is the celestial; the second, the universal; and the third, the local. Of the first, the celestial, we need not speak save to quote Heb. 9:24: "Christ entered into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us."

On the second meaning, the universal, it would be delightful and profitable to speak at length, but a few words must suffice. It is the theme of the 139th Psalm—"whither shall I flee from

thy presence?" In heaven or in Sheol, in earth or sea, "*thou art there.*" This thought glorifies Nature and beautifies Life. Thus viewed,

The meanest flower that blows can give
Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears;

and human history, with all its turmoil and tangle, becomes after all in truth "His story;" and the human family, with all its per-
versions and its shame, becomes the family of the Most High and the constant object of divine concern. Well, therefore, do we sing:

There's not a plant or flower below,
But makes thy glories known;
And clouds arise and tempests blow
By order from thy throne.
Creatures that borrow life from thee
Are subject to thy care;
There's not a place where we can flee,
But God is present there.

This view, moreover, does not glorify and deify man, but glorifies and magnifies God. Timelier and stronger words have not been recently written than these by Principal Forsyth:

What we are developing at the moment is an anthrop-centric Christianity. God and Christ are practically treated as the means to an end that is nearer to our enthusiasm than anything else—the consummation and perfecting of humanity. The chief value of religion, then, is not its value to God, but its value for the completing and crowning of life, whether the great life of the race or the personal life of the individual. Love Christ, we are urged, if you would draw out all that it is in you to be. Our eye is kept first upon our self-culture, our sanctification, in some form, by realizing a divine presence or indwelling, with but a secondary reference to the divine purpose. God is drawn into the circle of our spiritual interests, the interests of man's spiritual culture, as its mightiest ally and helper. We have many kinds of effort—some genial, some ascetic—for the development and deepening of the soul's life, in some of which the spiritual man is thought to be a stage higher than the Gospel man. Whereas, if we forgot our spiritual life after a wise and godly sort, and lived more to God, His finished Gospel, and that purpose of a kingdom for which Christ died, he would take better care of our spiritual life than all our forced culture of it. In a subtle way

this tendency is less Christo-centric than ego-centric. It is monastic. It is not theo-centric. For in any theo-centric faith man lives for the worship and glory of God and for the obedience to His revelation of Himself; which is not in man, and not in spirituality, but in Christ, in the historic, superhistoric, Christ. Christ is not the revelation of man, but of God's will for man; not of the God always in us, but of the God once and for all for us. Christ did not come in the first instance to satisfy the needs and instincts of our diviner self, but to honor the claim of a holy God upon us, crush our guilt into repentant faith, and create us anew in the act. He did not come in the first instance to consecrate human nature, but to hallow God's name in it. He came to fulfil God's will in the first place and to fulfil human destiny only in the second place and by consequence.²

Far from "pragmatic pantheism" is the true teaching of the universal presence of the Blessed God!

We come now to speak of the local (I should like to say, personal) presence of our God. It is particularly this that concerns us here: *his presence in our hearts and lives*. We are to realize *him*, for, as the Scriptures often speak of him, he alone is the "real God" (*ἀληθινός*: "We know him that is real," I John 5:20). Then, surely, he is realizable! How? That is the question.

First, let us say we are to realize, make real to ourselves, the presence of God strictly by *the psychological law of attention*, the simple and familiar law that what we fixedly set our minds upon becomes real to us. Our mental part is like a camera. It requires, as a rule, "time-exposure" in order to print clearly upon its film some object rather dimly seen. We know this is true regarding other objects of our mental vision. Why do we not understand that it is equally true of our vision of God? Paul saw it and urged plentiful prayer and much meditation—"in everything by prayer," "think on these things" (Phil. 4:6, 8), and he urged that our whole process of transformation was closely connected with doing our part by attention, "be ye transformed, by the *renewing of your mind*" (Rom. 12:2). Therefore, the prayer-life and much time with the Word, these which are one and indivisible, are indeed indispensable. If the Master

² Rev. Principal Forsyth, D.D., "Theological Reaction," *British Weekly*.

must needs take dawn-anticipating hours for the cultivation of this fellowship, who are we that we should think to snatch or catch a hurried vision of God's face, and then rush on and be conscious of his presence?

The second law governing this life, of which we are so unworthy to speak, is that of *practice*. There must be a proper commingling of waiting and of working, or we shall miss the boon and blessing. The vision may be rare and rapturous, but

This is what the Vision said,
"Hads't thou *stayed*, I must have fled!"

So, when the time of actual service has come, we are to go, confident of his promise made first to Moses, "My presence shall go with thee." Hence we find the great apostle in the thick of the fray, as well as in the place of quiet prayer, and in both conscious that "the Lord stood by him" (Acts 23:11). So we find the Lord himself serenely confident in the hour and power of darkness surrounded by his foes, and saying, "He that sent me *is with me; he hath not left me alone; for I do always the things that are pleasing to him*" (John 8:29). Truly here is given to us hal- lowed light upon the way into "the secret place of his presence"! It is doing always the things that are pleasing to him. Moreover, it is doing these things in the consciousness of his love. It is "walking in the light as he is in the light." It is obeying the blessed command, "*Keep yourselves in the love of God.*" As patients on a sanitarium piazza move round from side to side of the building to keep all day in the sun, so we, if we are to realize his presence, must keep ourselves, by attention and action, by thought and deed, by constant prayer and painstaking practice, in the warm and glowing radiance of his everlasting love. It is just here we most often miss the blessing, do we not? We think our first duty is *to do*, while really it is *to be*, and the foremost duty and privilege of Christian being is *to be happy in the love of God.*³ Truly the joy of the Lord is our strength!

Now one of the most precious agencies whereby we are

³ But in no forced way. "Christianity," says President King in his helpful book, *The Seeming Unreality of the Spiritual Life*, "sets aside all strained, and sham, and passive emotions."

brought into this deep well-spring of joy is the tribulation which worketh steadfastness, which worketh approvedness, which worketh hope, "and hope putteth not to shame because the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit who was given unto us" (Rom. 5:3-5). Remembering that "whom he loveth he chasteneth," we learn as in no other way to know and joyously realize the Father's tender, constant love, and whisper,

Still by my woes to be
Nearer my God to thee;

while we are jubilant to discover that neither tribulation nor anguish can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

But all this, particularly in the humdrum of daily duty, without the excitation of pain, we must learn by constant practice, so that, actually, realizing the presence of God comes in a very true sense to mean *practicing the presence of God*, and here as everywhere it is practice that makes perfect.

Admittedly, apart from the Bible, there is one book supremely helpful upon this subject, a book well known, I assume, to many of us, a book to be accepted as the classic on our topic, the little book entitled, *Practicing the Presence of God*. Brother Lawrence, the monk of three hundred years ago, may well be now our teacher. His experience he thus sums up:

If I dare use the expression, I should choose to call this state the bosom of God, for the inexpressible sweetness which I taste and experience there. . . . The time of business [he says again] does not with me differ from the time of prayer; and in the noise and clutter of my kitchen [he was cook in the monastery], while several persons are at the same time calling for different things, I possess God in as great tranquillity as if I were upon my knees at the blessed sacrament. . . . [He held] that we ought to give ourselves up to God, with regard both to things temporal and spiritual, and seek our satisfaction only in the fulfilling of his will, whether he lead us by suffering or by consolation, for all would be equal to a soul truly resigned. . . . [His testimony is] that in order to form a habit of conversing with God continually, and referring all we do to him, we must at first apply to him with some diligence; but that, after a little care, we should find His love inwardly excite us to it without any difficulty. . . . [His secret of peace was]

that when he had failed in his duty, he confessed his fault, saying to God, *I shall never do otherwise if you leave me to myself; it is you who must hinder my falling, and mend what is amiss.*

After this he gave himself no further uneasiness about it. It was his opinion

that useless thoughts spoil all; that the mischief began there; but that we ought to reject them as soon as we perceived their impertinence to the matter in hand, or our salvation, and return to our communion with God.

His controlling principle was

that all consists in *one hearty renunciation* of everything we are sensible does not lead to God. . . . That our sanctification did not depend upon *changing* our works, but in doing that for God's sake which we commonly do for our own. . . . In fine [he wrote in a letter] by often repeating these acts, they become *habitual*, and the presence of God rendered as it were *natural* to us. . . . Hold yourself in prayer before God like a dumb or paralytic beggar at a rich man's gate. Let it be your business to keep your mind in the presence of the Lord. . . . I make it my ordinary business to abide in the Presence of God with the humility of a useless, though a faithful, servant.

And, finally, let me quote this suggestive paragraph:

We cannot escape the dangers which abound in life without the actual and *continual* help of God. Let us, then, pray to him for it *continually*. How can we pray to him without being with him? How can we be with him but in thinking of him often? And how can we often think of him but by a holy habit which we should form of it? We must know him before we can love. In order to *know* God we must often *think* of him; and when we come to *love* him we shall then also think of him often, for our heart will be with our treasure. This is an argument which well deserves your consideration.

My brothers, is it not so? Has our new psychology brought us beyond this principle? Is it not the same which we find so richly expressed in Andrew Rykman's "Prayer"?

Let me find in Thy employ
Peace that dearer is than joy;
Out of self to love be led
And to heaven acclimated,
Until all things sweet and good
Seem my natural habitude.

And now, lest Brother Lawrence and his principle and practice seem distant and monastic, let me refer you to a present-day example of the realized presence of God in a most wholesome and happy combination of the contemplative and the active, the mystical and the practical. I have in mind Dr. Grenfell. In an editorial of the *Outlook* of recent date on "The Path to God," the writer says:

We long for a great and final vision of God. At the beginning of the journey we want the enlargement, liberation, and certainty which can be found only at the end. We forget the significance of the divine commendation, "Well done, good and faithful servant!" We change it to read, "Well thought," or, "Well felt, good and faithful servant." We want to feel the presence of God. We want to be able to think our way to him in perfect clearness. We want peace, but we are not willing to set our lives in order. This gospel of education by doing, of gaining the vision and learning the truth by doing the will of the Father from day to day, is being preached by Dr. Grenfell, not only to Labrador, but to Canada, to America, and to England. Here is a man who, day by day, with childlike simplicity, without theories either of theology or ecclesiasticism, does the work of Christ with modern tools, and preaches his gospel in modern speech; and no man who hears him or comes in contact with him fails to take away from his presence a wonderful sense of his faith in the invisible God and his sense of the presence of the unseen Christ. *Dr. Grenfell always speaks of Christ as if he were in the next room.*

Inspiring words these! But I ween there lies back of this rare personality and unique activity more persistent practice of the Presence, by means of prayer and the Word and habitual thought, than is hinted at by the above writer.

For all—the Master himself, the great apostle, Brother Lawrence, Dr. Grenfell, and for us—the one law holds true; we are to realize the presence of our gracious God by steady practice. We are to keep ourselves in his love, and learn by humble obedience and patient perseverance to say, "In thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures forevermore." Thus, and thus only, shall life be fitly lived, and we shall dwell in his presence, both here and there.

THE PRESIDENT: The last address of the announced pro-

gramme, and of the Congress, is to be given by our honored brother, Dr. J. F. Elder, who for so many years has been a leader among us, especially in this portion of this country. (*Applause.*)

REV. J. F. ELDER, D.D., of New York, then read as follows:

REALIZING THE PRESENCE OF GOD

We are always in the presence of God, whether we realize it or not. In him we live and move and have our being. The question of the Hebrew psalmist still grips us—"Whither shall I flee from thy presence?" Heaven is his abode. Hell cannot shake him off. The wings of the morning cannot bear us beyond his outstretched hand. We flee into the outer darkness to escape him, only to find that the night shineth as the day—darkness and light are one to God. God is not merely transcendent but immanent. He does not press a button, as the President in Washington may, in order to set in motion the machinery of some distant fair; but he is present among all the whirring forces—the life of their life—to which is due the order, the beauty, and the bounty of Nature. He not only gave the initial impulse that set in motion the stars of heaven but, night after night, the celestial shepherd brings out these hosts by number. He calls them all by name—not one is lacking. The great mountains proclaim the stability and the unsearchableness of his judgments as he walks among the children of men. Every such mount is a holy mount. Coleridge's rapture over the vision of Mt. Blanc is but the emotion of every normal soul in its presence:

O dread and silent Mount, I gazed upon thee
 Till thou, still present to the bodily sense,
 Didst vanish from my thought; entranced in prayer
 I worshiped the invisible alone.
 Yet, like some sweet, beguiling melody,
 So sweet we know not we are listening to it,
 Thou the meanwhile wast blending with my thoughts,
 Yea, with my life, and life's own secret joy,
 Till the dilating soul, enrapt, transfused,
 Into the mighty vision passing, there
 As in her natural form swelled vast to heaven.

If "the undevout astronomer is mad," even more so is the undevout husbandman. In this realm the presence of God is palpable. In the varied phenomena of life, alike in the vegetable and the animal world, is found unfailing help toward realizing the presence of God. *Life* is the light of men. Its mystery is unfathomable, no mortal has ever originated it. It is the monopoly of the living God. Its manifestations proclaim his presence. When Israel in the days of Hosea averred that her lovers, the false gods of the Baal worship, gave her the fruitful seasons, God smote her with famine. But in view of her repentance he comforts her with the promise that he "will answer the heavens, and they shall answer the earth, and the earth shall answer the grain and the new wine and the oil and they shall answer Jezrael"—tracing by unbroken links the bounty of their fields to the open hand of God.

Let us not belittle natural religion. It has been said that it is all the religion the vast portion of mankind have to depend on—the more shame to those who hold idly in their hands Christ's great commission till it is almost moldy from neglect. Nor are we who have the supreme revelation of God in Christ blameless for not making more of this primitive and compelling evidence of the divine presence in Nature. To a Christian above all others the contemplation of Nature should bring a closer fellowship with his pre-existent Lord; for all things were made through him and without him was not anything made that hath been made. One of my most conspicuous memories of the comforting power of Nature was when, under the stress of fear of impending trouble, I lifted up my eyes, as I sat by the open window at midnight, and called on the Lord of those heavenly hosts for his succor; and he heard my cry. My appeal was inspired by the power that was manifest through those marshaled hosts.

But if the heavens and the earth declare the glory and the presence of God, much more does He who came forth from God and dwelt among us full of grace and truth. As Dr. Van Dyke has put it, "His was the human life of God;" and through him we enter into a fellowship and communion with God that is human in its reality and in its essence divine. He offers himself as our Friend who reveals to us the secret thoughts of God. He

promises to abide in us. He declares that he knows us and we may know him even as God knows him and he knows the Father. He promises another Paraclete who will explain his person and work. One of his apostles, who had a vision of his risen glory that the noonday sun could not dim, entered into fellowship with him so close and vital that he could say "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Another declares that though now we see him not, yet believing we rejoice greatly with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

Truly here is a goodly basis for a most profound and rational and abiding realization of the presence of God in Christ through the ministration of the Holy Spirit. And in all ages have been found saints of the most high God, both men and women, who have entered into such devout and personal fellowship with him that they have closely approximated the fulness of Christ in his love and his joy in God. Nor may anyone say how intimate and complete this fellowship may become. There are no limits to its fulness that we may define. God and man are of one nature essentially, and may become one in a spiritual union so real and true, that deeps in the one call to deeps in the other and are answered with pulsating tides of joy in both man and God. The joy of the marriage feast is only a faint, if scriptural, symbol of the resultant bliss. Of course there will sometimes be extravagances of language in describing these ecstatic experiences and some of them may indeed be indescribable. Those who are caught up to the third heaven, until they know not whether they are in the body or out of the body, may be excused for lack of human language that will adequately describe their experiences. Such heavenly emotions call for a divine vocabulary.

And yet in attempting such rapturous realization of the presence of God there is a peril both real and grave. Icarus rushing into the face of the sun on wings of wax is but a feeble illustration of the folly and peril of many who have sought to achieve such an experience without due regard to sane and scriptural conditions. The stream of mysticism which, under different names, runs through Christian history and on which so many of these presumptuous souls have embarked is strewn with many a wreck on its shoals or beneath its cataracts. To

many of these daring speculators God might have said, as to the wicked man whom he rebukes in the fiftieth Psalm, "Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself." In many respects we have a right to think of God as one who is such as we are. We have the same affectional nature enabling us to appreciate the love of God and to love him in return. We have a correspondent intelligence so that we can comprehend his instructions and his purpose and can search out the secrets of his universe. We have from him a moral nature that leads us to accuse or excuse one another and approve his own moral judgments. We have a will which he respects and which we can submit or oppose to his own sovereign will. His Spirit has an affinity for our spirit, as the acid for the copper plate, and can bite into our natures with indelible results. So there is ground and hope for our realizing his presence in intimate communion, as real as our most familiar fellowship with one another. But while there is so much in common we are not to forget that we are not *altogether* such a one as he is. He is infinite and we are finite. He is holy and we are sinful. He only has immortality; we return to the dust. He can enter into our estate and under our limitations of finiteness and temptation live a normal and perfect human life. But it does not follow that we can equally enter into and appropriate his perfect divine nature. But some of these philosophical dreamers, ignoring all rational and scriptural tests and conditions for realizing the presence of God, claim that by direct intuition they enter into union with the divine; and sometimes in such pantheistic fashion as to come perilously near to the extinction of the human personality. Mme. Guyon says:

The essential union is the spiritual marriage, where there is a communication of substance, when God takes the soul for his spouse, unites it to himself, not personally, nor by any act or means, but immediately reducing all to a unity. The soul ought not, nor can, any more make any distinction between God and itself. God is the soul and the soul is god.

When the drop has slipped into the ocean, we might ask, what becomes of the drop? Some have gone so far in this inward contemplation that it has become a sort of self-hypnotism and

differs but little in its outcome from the Buddhist Nirvana. The peril arises from the divorce of the contemplative and the practical, the intuitive and the intellectual, the speculative and the scriptural. As John Wesley says of Mme. Guyon, while acknowledging her as a pattern of true holiness: "The grand source of all her mistakes was this—the not being guided by the written Word. And in truth, any attempt to realize the presence of God apart from the conditions laid down in the Scriptures will be futile and disastrous. Christ's language, as to the revelation of God through him alone, is too explicit to be neglected by any man who wishes to draw nearer to God. "No man knows the Father save the Son and he to whom the Son wills to reveal him." "He who hath seen me hath seen the Father." If we are to find perfected life in the realization of the presence of God, we must not ignore the teaching of Christ as to his mediatorship of that perfect life to men. What we need is not to turn the eyes within in a complete self-absorption, whose fruit may be self-delusion, but to look away to Jesus and contemplate him who "was made unto us Wisdom from God and Righteousness and Sanctification and Redemption." "I am the Way and the Truth and the Life: no man cometh unto the Father but by Me." The Holy Spirit was sent that he might take of the things of Christ and reveal them unto us. And he will not go contrary to his mission by helping to bring men unto God or into God through intuition and speculation, apart from the truth as it is in Jesus. The contemplation of Jesus Christ in his person and works and especially the self-surrender of our lives to him in loving and self-sacrificing service is the true path to fellowship with God. The experiences that come to us through some form of ecstatic reverie, apart from the intelligent recognition of Christ as the path to peace, will be likely to end in a frothy joy that has little depth or staying power. One can but wonder how permanent was the ecstasy of the good Methodist sister who, when under the influence of the "power," declared that she felt "like a barrel in mid-ocean with both heads stove in and the surges of God's everlasting love rolling through her soul."

But Christ by his life as well as his teachings should be our guide in this matter. He had the Spirit without measure and

his fellowship with God was profound, complete, and uninterrupted, save for three hours on the cross. And yet how sane his spiritual experiences were. How absolutely free from anything that savored of the hysterical or rhapsodical. Nowhere is there evidence of any abnormal experience of the divine fellowship, differing from that which any child of God might have who would fulfil the same tests of loyalty to truth and duty. What oneness of affection and will in that confession at the grave of Lazarus, "I know that thou hearest me always." How completely welded with God he became in the white heat of Gethsemane's furnace. How calmly he looked down through the fathomless but crystal depths of eternity as he prayed, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." His oneness with God manifested itself rather in silent streams of joy than in geysers of ecstasy.

And for him the immediate path to this peace and fellowship with God was simple loyalty to present duty. His wish "to fulfil all righteousness" in his baptism was followed by the fulness of the Spirit, as typified in descent of the dove upon him as he came up from the waters of consecration. At the Pentecost the Holy Spirit came down in divided tongues of fire, one on each. But Jesus' enduement of the Spirit was represented by the descent of a dove, a distinct bodily organism, as if the wholeness of the spirit was to be his from that hour. The approving voice from heaven, "I am well pleased," was but the outcome and the echo of: "I do always the things that please him." And every loyal soul who can truly say, "Lo, I come: I delight to do thy will, O God," flies straight into the outstretched and welcoming arms of everlasting love. There is no mystery in Christ's formulary for enjoying the presence of God. "If a man love me he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." This involves no fusion of personalities or confusion of consciousness, but rather the emphasizing of the human personality by bringing it to a wider and truer self-consciousness as its powers are disclosed and energized by the divine fellowship it enjoys. As Griffith John naïvely put it to a party of friends, in detail—his experience in

coming into a fuller and abiding consciousness of Christ, "There are always two of us now."

I believe that grace, like nature, abhors a vacuum. And just as the ocean rolls into every bay that is open to its tides and seeks every crevice and pool along the shore, so God seeks a place in every willing soul who truly longs for him as the hart pants for the water-brooks. He seeketh such to worship him; and when one is found he fills him, after his measure, up to all the fulness of God. He craves souls that are *en rapport* with himself, that share his love of truth, that are interested in his kingdom and his righteousness more than in any form of self-aggrandizement whatever, that reflect his spirit and purpose in their own lives; and such he makes his closest friends and gives them his fullest confidence. It was in recognition of Abraham as his friend that he said: "Shall I hide from Abraham that which I do?" But the destruction of Sodom were a small matter in which to give Abraham his confidence. God had a secret locked in his bosom from eternity and had found no created being with whom he could share it. But when Abraham had so far surrendered his will to God as virtually to sacrifice his only son, then God found a human soul that could understand his own eternal and heart-breaking purpose to give up his only-begotten and well-beloved son that all the families of the earth might be blessed in him. You can almost detect the choking in the voice of Jehovah as he says to Abraham: "Take now thy son, thine only son, whom thou lovest, and offer him for a burnt offering." How vividly it anticipates the "only-begotten and well-beloved son" of John's gospel. And if ever there was one particular hour when Abraham rejoiced to see Christ's day, and did see it and was glad, why may it not have been the very hour when he showed himself so thoroughly *en rapport* with God that God took him into his confidence as regards the offering-up of his own beloved Son, when there would be no higher voice to stay the sacrificial blow? The gladness of Abraham was the gladness of a soul that has entered into the very recesses of the divine. It was not by foresight into Christ's earthly career but by insight through perfect sympathy into the heart of the eternal that he was able to see Christ's day and

rejoice in it. And is it not, when, in some act of self-surrender or self-sacrifice, we enter into the spirit which dominates Christ's life, that we most naturally and forcefully draw him into our lives with fulness of blessing. What did not that rich young ruler miss when he turned away from Jesus, very sorrowful because very rich. The conditions seemed hard, but Christ was not merely imposing a test but offering an opportunity, an opportunity to do precisely what he himself had done when, though he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might become rich. It would have made him a kindred spirit with Christ and the passing love which Jesus felt for him for his sincerity would have deepened into a divine and eternal fellowship.

It is said that we live in a busy, rushing age with few opportunities or inducements to cultivate the meditative spirit or to realize the presence of God. Doubtless we need devotional helps, such as meditation and prayer and study of the word, but may we not graft our busy lives into the divine after the Pauline fashion of doing all our business to the glory of God? Is Kline's method of getting "in tune with the Infinite" any more rational or effective than to come into such hearty sympathy with the idea of giving the gospel of Christ to the world in this generation that it shall become an absorbing passion and we consecrate all that we are and have to bringing the kingdom of God to pass? May there not be as grand possibilities and incentives for realizing the presence of God in the cordial support of the Layman's Missionary Movement as in a week's retreat for meditation and prayer? Perhaps this hustling age may yet develop a spiritual side by devoting its energies to practical methods for securing the doing of the will of God on earth as it is done in heaven. Let St. Siméon Stylites come down from his ridiculous perch and devote himself to the needs of suffering humanity around the base of his pillar. Let the anchorite come in from the desert and breathe the fetid air of the tenement house till he is moved to cry aloud in the streets for better conditions for the poor. Here he will oftenest touch the hand of him who went about doing good and who gives his warmest smiles to those who follow closest in his steps. He himself hastened from the celestial intercourse of

the Mount of Transfiguration to answer the cry of suffering that rolled up from its base. Profound spiritual experiences are not necessarily to be divorced from the plain duties of everyday life.

Without limiting, then, the power or the freedom of the Holy Spirit in leading men into the realization of the presence of God by his direct influence on the soul, through meditation and prayer, I wish also to submit whether just as direct a path to this fellowship and peace may not be found, under the influence of the same spirit, in yielding ourselves to the divine will in the ordinary calls of daily duty and in the doing of the commandments of God in love for his holy name. Surely the one method of realizing the presence of God will be ineffective unless it is supplemented by the other; for the latter contains "the core of Christ's moral philosophy": "Whosoever loseth his life for my sake, the same shall find it."

THE PRESIDENT: I take pleasure at this time in reading a telegram received by Dr. Rivington Lord, member of the Executive Committee:

Explaining to the President of the Baptist Congress, that my absence is unavoidable. Have written Dr. Lord.

JOSEPH W. MAUCK

President of the General Conference of Free Baptists

We welcome very cordially this brotherly word from the president of our Free Baptist friends, and I will ask Dr. Lord to make a suitable reply to the writer.

You will notice on the programme that "Closing Words" are to follow the addresses of the afternoon, and these are to be given in four brief addresses of which the President is instructed to give the first.

The words then, that I shall address to you, dear brothers, will be with especial reference to what I understand to be the functions that our Baptist Congress should seek to subserve in our denominational life. And in tone with the devotional character of the afternoon, without directly taking a text, I will seek to follow the theme that has been so beautifully brought before you.

In the first place, I am reminded, by the address of Dr. Elder,

of an address given many years since by my honored father, entitled "Puritan and Mystic," in which he dwells lovingly and appreciatively on both these ideals developed in Christian history, and while, with Dr. Elder, he rather inclines to the Puritan ideal, he realizes that both are worthy expressions of the Christian life, and neither is actually exclusive of the other, but rather are they supplemental one of the other.

I thought as I listened to the address of Dr. Johnson, of the text quoted in his remarks: "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life." There our Lord presents himself distinctly as the channel of salvation, and not in one, but three terms, the way, the truth, and the life, and it has occurred to me many times—it is no new thought to me—that in the development of Christian theology and life, the emphasis has passed gradually, but certainly, from the first to the second, and in our time, rather from the second to the third of those terms; that during the early Christian centuries the emphasis was distinctly on the "way," and the church presented itself as the expression of the way, and that this churchly sacramental notion was only very gradually displaced by the recognition that behind all symbols the great thing for which the symbol had worthiness was the truth it embodied and expressed, and that of all symbols the Bible expresses that truth the most clearly, and that it is most easy of comprehension. Therefore, the Protestant Reformation, particularly, lifted up the Scriptures as the great expression of Christ in the world, and thus we had, as it were, a loss of emphasis on the churchly idea, and a supersession of it by the scriptural idea, which still so largely obtains. The question would then naturally suggest itself, whether this is the ultimate, and whether in the will of the Master this was to be the ultimate of religion, and since the days of John Wesley, this question finds not a hopeless, but a very hopeful answer, in the evident conscious possession of life, spiritual life, by the recipient of the truth, and of the work of the spirit. And so truth no longer is so objectively thought of or exclusively objectified, it becomes more and more distinctly a conscious, subjective possession, and we therefore, find it easy, comparatively easy, for us, who are evangelical, to realize that while we share

in the Protestant protest against former errors, for us the substantive of our belief is, still more, this conscious experience.

Now, then, we have life. We can then, I believe, boldly say the very contrary of what was said by a distinguished Presbyterian minister who, in an address some years ago, said: "If I were asked to choose between the formula, 'Christianity is a dogma,' or 'Christianity is a life,' I would regret the necessity of choice, but I should say unhesitatingly 'Christianity is a dogma.'" As unhesitatingly I would venture to say if I had to choose, "Christianity is a life," and I would suggest to my Presbyterian friend, could he read such a text as, "I am come that they may have life," and paraphrase it, "I am come that they may have dogma," or "In him was dogma, and the dogma was the light of day." Any such statement of the idea suggests its incongruity.

Now, then, to apply this directly to the thoughts and the attitude of our Baptist Congress: We believe that in our Baptist Congress we serve a very useful purpose to our denomination, by bringing up views that are under present discussion, for the very purpose of discussion. We do not believe that it is the purpose of the Congress simply to take, for instance, such a theme as "The Attributes of God," and give us a careful summary of the positions of some admirable theologian like, I will say, Dr. Hodge, of Princeton. Those who desire to be well informed on those doctrines and positions of our faith find them in the proper treatises, but we believe our purpose is here to treat of topics under present discussion with reference to our faith, and practice, and in a way which will bring out the error or the truth which may be in them. We believe that both the position of the conservative and the liberal, or radical, are very necessary in a living church. There is a heritage from the past that must be conserved in every life, and there is a new growth that must be carefully watched and cultivated. These two sets of truths will not be equally seen, and in their full balance, by each individual. A certain individual, or a certain group of individuals, will realize the preciousness of the heritage to them of conservative opinions as natural and congenial; others of them will realize the power and energy and vigor of the new life, and to them

radical views are most congenial. Both these are valuable; both are necessary in the Baptist Congress. We can see that it is well to call these groups together in order that thus we may have, as it were, the pruning of the living vine, the consideration of whether the new view that presents itself is error or truth, or the mingling that is there of both truth and error, and out of the discussion of both truth and error we may be better able to discriminate between the two.

We do not, as Baptists, hold, as the Roman Catholics do, to the idea of a *deposit of faith* to be carefully handed on to a future generation. We look rather, as I have already suggested in this text, on the Christian position as the conscious possession of an inner life, and as that inner life develops, it necessarily, and perfectly normally, ought to increase in self-conscienceness, and with the increase of self-conscienceness there ought to be an increasing clearness of spiritual vision. Thus what the Fathers held was true, will still be deemed to be true, but perhaps something more than the Fathers saw will also be deemed to be true, so the discrimination, as I say, will become clearer. Now, this will not imply at all the loss of authority. It may seem to imply sometimes a carelessness with regard to certain standards of authority, but that will rather be because the transference of authority has been or is being effected to the common source of authority. And so further, just as an illustration: In the latter part of the eighteenth century, the French physicists realized that the standards of length and weight were not, after all, scientifically accurate, and they therefore proposed the metric system, which has since been progressively extending its way among all European people. Now, their movement was not intended to discredit the old ideas of length and weight; it was not a carelessness of accuracy in those respects. It was an increased discrimination with regard to real accuracy that led them to feel that the old English system of pounds and ounces was not sufficiently accurate; that the old method of miles and leagues was not sufficiently accurate; that we must have the meter and the kilometer, and the decimal system, founded on the earth, and its qualities and measurements. So I would suggest, my friends, that the attitude of suspicion that sometimes and in some quarters

has prevailed with regard to such discussions as these is an unworthy attitude. I recognize that it has to be, and therefore, I never do feel any irritable feeling toward it, but I distinctly feel that it is an unworthy attitude of Christian people, and that it is one they ought to learn to yield up. It never has been the attitude of the best leaders of our denomination. It can never be the attitude of those who look hopefully forward toward the future.

I remember a young lawyer once speaking to me regarding some matters in his own profession, and making this remark which lingered in my memory with regard to young men. He said: "I have noticed that older men will forgive rashness in younger men, but they will never forgive their lack of courage." I have noticed the same thing in the ministry: that rashness is forgiven in a young minister, but lack of courage is never forgiven. Perhaps it will not be definitely and sensibly realized, but the man who has lacked courage in his ministry will certainly more or less distinctly fall out of the ranks as life advances, while the man who has been rash will sometimes overcome his rashness, and become one of the safest and most widely accepted of leaders.

I may perhaps close with this anecdote: One of the leading conservative theologians of the country, one of the most honored of the retired professors of theology connected with any of our Baptist institutions, told me that he was very much in the habit of haunting my father's study, and it was said to him by some elderly men of that day: "Mr. So-and-So," as he was then, "be careful how you receive the instructions of William R. Williams. He is a good man and a spiritual man, but he is not sound." Now, I would not tell that story were it not for the fact that he did accept the advice of William R. Williams until he came to feel himself the exponent of those views, and thinks himself today the exponent of those views more than any other man, and is himself regarded as the very pillar and standard of orthodoxy. What has happened? Evidently the conception of orthodoxy has moved on in our denomination, and what has once happened may happen again and must happen in every growing institution.

Now, those who feel the fear of such discussions as these, of what are they really afraid? They are afraid, of course, of error and heresy; but let them realize that what really they may be

hindering is the very tendency that is the life and development of things. Against all that the Baptist Congress has stood, all these years, not itself undertaking in any way to express views, or say what is the proper view, or what is the false view, but simply affording a forum where these views could be discussed, and their merits thus tested. Now, my friends, it was said by the late Dr. Elias H. Johnson, that we find in our conferences that conservative men are not always readily induced to take their positions here, and that, he used to say, was the reason why sometimes it seemed as if the Congress definitely stood for radical or heterodox opinion. Dr. Elias H. Johnson was called the father of our Baptist Congress. The position that he took was felt to be the position of the Congress. His own life was an illustration of these tendencies. He died a most honored man among us. He had come to be respected as a man who was safe, who was loving, who was true. I trust and believe that the Congress has achieved the same reputation, and will worthily maintain it.

These closing words from your Chairman, I hope, will be admitted in the spirit with which they are given.

I will now call on the pastor of the church, Dr. Eaton, to speak for the local committee.

REV. CHARLES A. EATON: *Mr. President and Friends:* I am at a disadvantage in being asked to speak for the local committee since there is no local committee.

Dr. Gessler requested me to say a few words at the closing hour, and suggested that I say what I thought of the conference or Congress. I cannot say that I have been passionately in love with the Congress as it has gone along, nor had I become wildly enthusiastic over it. This is my first privilege of enjoying the discussions of this body. I have learned a great deal. I have understood some things that I have heard, and sometimes I thought the speakers understood what they were talking about! (*Laughter.*) Sometimes I must confess—well, I won't make that confession.

THE PRESIDENT: Why not?

REV. EATON: Well, that they did not exactly just know

where they were going to come out when they went in, and when the speech was through they were still in.

I think one of the most delightful things we have had today, or any day of this Congress, is the address of our honored President, to which we have just listened. Personally, sir—you will forgive me if I say it in your presence—I was charmed with it. I think it sets forth ideally the conception of a gathering like this. I am glad on behalf of this church that this Congress did us the honor to meet with us in this place. I was glad to see standing in this pulpit this afternoon our honored brother, Dr. Elder, so long a pastor here, a true man of God.

Brethren, we younger men—because while I am gray-headed, I am not very old—we younger men rejoice in the conflict of opinions, when back of this conflict there stand loyal, loving, faithful hearts. The only way that we can discover truth is for each side to express itself fully and frankly, not with personal animosities, or harsh criticisms, but with utmost manhood and frankness, and have every man say his say, in the fear and love of God, and in the love, but not the fear, of his fellows.

I have rejoiced in that spirit here, and I feel under deep obligations to some of the brethren, for whose personalities I have the deepest affection and admiration, and for whose opinion I have not the slightest regard in the world. I have enjoyed hearing them speak at this Congress.

And, now, in closing, permit me to say that I feel that the Baptist denomination, and the other Christian bodies, are under a profound obligation in this modern age. If we fail to send forth a clear and easily understood message, if we fail to hold aloft the lamp of divine truth, if men cannot find God through the way which the churches of Jesus open in their presence, then dark indeed is the outlook for the future. The truth, sir, is more than any man's creed, or any man's opinion; it is more than the dogma of any church. Truth is God; truth is a universe, and the spirit of man is more than the reasoning power; it is a universe like the universe from which he has come. So that the man who is in advance in his thought, and the man who is conservative, the man who loves, the man who feels, the man who is optimistic, and the man who reasons, these are all needed, and after we have

all said our say, and fought our fight, and made our contribution, we have only touched the outer fringe of the great universe of God's self-revelation through the darkened spirit of his lost children. Bye and bye we shall know as we are known, but here we know in part, and for that reason I welcome with a deep sympathy and joy the opinions of any man, provided he is honest and good, whether I can understand them or agree with him or not. I rejoice to hear him say his say, and undertaking to kindle as far as he can a light to guide the footsteps of men home to their Father. I welcome you once more to this place, and when the Congress is over we would be glad to welcome you personally. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: I am sure that we feel a heartfelt response to the brotherly words of the pastor of this church, by whose hospitality we are meeting here, but a more fitting word is to be spoken for the General Committee, first, by Dr. Addison Moore. (*Applause.*)

REV. ADDISON MOORE, of Jersey City, N. J.: *Mr. President:* On behalf of the General Committee, it gives me great pleasure to express to you, Sir, our appreciation of your very graceful and courteous and dignified conduct in all the sessions of this Congress, and also, on behalf of the General Committee, it affords me great pleasure to extend to the members of the Executive Committee, through their officer, our presiding secretary, our appreciation of the efforts that have been put forth to make the programme on this occasion such an interesting, inspiring, and instructive programme as we have received.

We have come to believe in the Baptist Congress as the force among us that makes possible the broadening of our denominational views; and we appreciate the opportunity that the meeting of the Congress affords us to become better acquainted with one another.

We feel as members of the General Committee that some of the statements made from this platform have been of such tremendous import, and have had such seriousness in their trend, that if they were thrown out on the sea of life, they might readily be expected to sink in that sea. We also feel that some of the

things that have been said from this platform have been said so carefully, have been phrased so wisely, that they will float on any sea. And we have in both of these statements, the corks that float on the top of the net, and the leads that drag the net down, while both together, corks and leads, make the net so comprehensive that with it we can become efficient fishers of men.

It is interesting to know that during the last five years there has been a gain of 40 per cent. in the membership of the Congress. We have 173 members of the General Committee; we have 175 annual subscribers; we have 348 contributing members of this Baptist Congress. And this marks the prosperity of this organization as an institution among us; and we do well to remind ourselves of the value of the fellowships that we find here; fellowships in the search for truth certainly bringing us into the closest sort of relationship.

In the church in New Haven of which I had the pleasure of being pastor for a few years, it was thought best to change the communion service from the old form of the two or three cups, to the individual communion service. The first time that we used the individual cups I noticed the widow of one who had been an honored deacon in that church, who sat glaring at me through that service, and at its close, she came forward without any hesitation, and she said, "Well, I have sat under close communion, but this is the closest communion under which I have ever sat." I think somehow in this Congress of ours we get into the closest sort of fellowship, because it is the fellowship in which we seek to relate ourselves to the truth of God, who is the Truth.

After all then, it is a matter of relationship, and nobody can tell us unto what that relationship shall eventually lead. We know what some sorts of relationship do for us. If I am related to the sons of Italy, it gives me the olive complexion, eyes like the midnight, and raven black hair. I know that if I am related to the Anglo-Saxon, it gives me eyes the color of the blue sky, and a skin that is fair in hue, and hair that is golden in its color. I know that if I am related to the sons of Africa, it gives me the complexion of ebony, and kinky hair; and if I am related to God, nobody can really tell what that means; a prophet of old failed utterly when he tried to tell it; only we know that ears

have not heard, nor eyes seen, neither has there entered into the heart of man, the things that God himself, the Truth, has prepared for them who love Him. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: The anecdote relating to the communion service, that Brother Moore has given us, recalls one in my experience that came to my mind during the discussion yesterday evening. I was called to officiate at a communion service in a Baptist church in the country, of which a friend of mine, whose views are more conservative than mine, had been pastor for many years. The old man had died, and I was asked to conduct the communion service there. I invited his widow, a Presbyterian, down to commune with us. She did so, and after the communion—she loved her husband dearly—with trembling lips she said, “This is the first communion I have ever been able to take in this church, and it has been a privilege inexpressibly dear.” We now have a word from a representative of the Executive Committee, my dear friend, Dr. Rufus P. Johnston. It is to be explained that Dr. Sanders, the chairman of that committee, is in enforced absence, due to the funeral of a relative.

REV. RUFUS P. JOHNSTON, D.D., of New York City: This session of the Baptist Congress, like all earthly fellowships, must have its formal close, and I am to speak in behalf of the Executive Committee the closing words.

I should like to remind you that while the session closes in one sense, it does not end. For messages have been uttered, convictions have been expressed, visions have been caught, fellowships have been enjoyed, which constitute an influence that shall continue to be operative in our individual lives, as well as in the larger life of the denomination, when you and I are forgotten. “Their echoes roll from soul to soul, and live forever and forever.” Some of us can never be the same as we were before. There have come into our minds and hearts forces which shall make us more valiant and resolute and effective in our life and work.

Dr. Williams has set forth something of the purpose of the Baptist Congress. I agree with him entirely, and it only shows how different minds view the same thing from different angles,

when I say that, in my opinion, the purpose of the Baptist Congress is most beautifully and accurately set forth in the phrasing of the last subject of the session: "The Realization of the Presence of God," realizing his presence that we may attain unto his vision, that we may achieve his purpose. This, I am convinced, has been the throbbing aspiration and the yearning prayer of every member of this Congress, that we may know him, and be conformed unto his image, and achieve his purpose in our own lives, and in the work that he has given us to do. I have come to feel that there are many avenues leading to the heart of God. Thebes had a hundred gates through which the tides of commerce and of travel poured into that ancient city, and I think there are more than a hundred portals through which we may come unto his presence.

We have been emphasizing in this Congress the importance of the truth, because we believe that truth is of God, and that God is truth. In our intellectual efforts to grasp the truth, and to state it, we have been seeking for the realization of the presence of God. And not through our intellects only, but through our affections, through our yearnings, and our aspirations; for the utterances of this Congress have not been the product of merely cold intellectual processes, they have been the products of the processes of the entire man. And while they have been stated in intellectual terms, they embody the prayer and the yearning and the struggle and the aspiration, not of the mind, but of the heart and of the will and of the soul. We believe, therefore, that in striving to find the truth, we are striving to find God. In constituting us as he did, our Father flung us out into the universe and said, "Find the truth; it is to be sought; it is to be realized; it is to be achieved; it is to be experienced." And we are trying, in God's world, to come into fuller fellowship with him, by discovering and putting ourselves into harmony with the processes of his eternal being. Truth in one sense is the mode of divine activity. And when we discover it we may say with the old astronomer, "O God, we are thinking thy thoughts after thee."

You remember the word of Lessing, that if there were offered to him the alternatives of truth perfectly revealed and perfectly formulated on the one hand, and the privilege of seeking for

truth on the other, that he would say, "Give me the privilege of seeking and finding the truth." And that is what we are trying to do in our discussions, in our thoughts, in our yearnings, in our aspirations. This Congress stands for the freedom of search for truth, and also, for the freedom to express the results of that search. It has been said—I think I have been guilty of saying it myself—that sometimes one is impressed that the Baptist denomination stands for freedom of thought, but not for freedom of conclusion. The Congress aims to give a platform from which a man may have the freedom of stating his conclusions—not that the Congress endorses his conclusions, but it does endorse his right to think and to reach conclusions.

There is something of the spirit of Lowell's "Man" in the spirit of this Congress.

All honor the man who is willing to sink
 Half his worldly repute, for the freedom to think;
 And then having thought, be his cause strong or weak,
 Will sink t'other half for the freedom to speak.

In my opinion, one of the results of this Congress has been a broader spirit of freedom within the fold of the denomination. If the Congress has done nothing else, it has contributed a little to a broader standing-ground, and to wider freedom of thought and utterance, within the limits of the denomination. I do not care to be specific in details, but I dare say that if some of the utterances which have been made at this Congress had been made ten or fifteen years ago, there would have followed a great deal stronger protest from various parts of the country than is likely to result at this time.

Now, it is not that the brethren have come to the conclusion that we are freaks, and that freaks are not responsible; but it is due to a larger realization of the fact that we are all searchers after truth, that all truth has not yet been apprehended and expressed in any creed or formula, that new truth is constantly breaking, not only out of God's world, but out of human experience, and out of the understanding of Nature, and that we are but learners after all in God's great world.

Behold, we know not anything,
And yet we trust that somehow good will fall,
At last, far off, at last to all,
And every winter turn to spring.

and we are turning our faces toward the balmy air of that happier day.

Before I close, and I am not sure that I have performed the orthodox function of the representative of the Executive Committee in these remarks—the censor censorum sits to my right; he has been here since the days of Abraham, and I fancy he has never heard such a speech as this by the representative of the Executive Committee—before I close, I am to say, in behalf of the Executive Committee, that it has been a great pleasure to present to the Congress such a programme of subjects, modern, vital, practical, devotional. The Committee would want me to express their thanks to all who have participated in the programme, to all who have attended the sessions of the Congress, and to all who, in any way, have contributed to its success. I am sure that I voice, not only the sentiment of the committee, but the sentiment of all who have attended the Congress, in expressing our appreciation to this noble church, and its honored pastor, for the cordial welcome they have given us to their beautiful church home. We were strangers and they took us in, and thus fulfilled one of the most beautiful injunctions of our Master.

I am sure also that the Executive Committee, that the General Committee, and all the friends of the Congress are praying that out of this rubbing of mind against mind, out of this fellowship of spirit with spirit, out of the sessions of brethren thinking and praying together may come a more vivid realization of the presence of God, a higher and sweeter consciousness of his fellowship, and larger and richer results from our ministries as we go out into the world of active work and of service again. May God's blessing abide with you, and bring forth rich fruit in your ministry and in your lives. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: Now, Brethren, we are going to sing and pray together as we close, in which we will all have a part. You remember Father Ted says that there is a trinity on earth; Christ,

one's self, one's brother. In that spirit of brotherliness, let us sing the hymn of our good Baptist, John Fawcett, No. 1,003, the first two verses and the last two. You know the story, that the good man had decided to go to London, and leave his Yorkshire parish, and so great was the lamentation, that he, with his good-bye and friends congregated to bid him adieu, recanted his resolve, remained with his people, and wrote this hymn. I think the larger usefulness proved to be the producing of this hymn.

The hymn was sung as announced.

THE PRESIDENT: I will ask Dr. Farnum to offer the closing prayer and the benediction.

REV. DR. E. P. FARNUM: O Thou divine Master, and Teacher of us all, we desire to be very grateful in Thy presence this moment for Thine own confession of the purpose of Thy coming, that to this end wast Thou born, and for this cause didst Thou come into the world, that Thou mightest bear witness unto the truth. O, Thou great Revealer of truth, we pray that we may be Thy willing disciples, that we may be teachable in the presence of our Master, and that we may also be willing fellow-helpers to the truth among men. We beseech Thee, fill us with the love of the truth, and with hunger for it, and with fearlessness in its presence, and so we will dare to ask that the fellowship and the inspiration and the resolves and the visions of these hours may gird us all for better service, and for nobler doings in the days that lie before us.

And now, unto Him who is able to do for us exceeding abundantly, beyond all that we may ask, or think, according to His mighty power, that dwelleth in us, unto Him be praise in the church in Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. *Amen.*

THE PRESIDENT: The Congress stands adjourned.

MEETINGS OF THE BAPTIST CONGRESS

DATE	PLACE	PRESIDENT
1882.....	Brooklyn.....	George Dana Boardman, D.D.
1883.....	Boston.....	Alvah Hovey, D.D.
1884.....	Philadelphia.....	Henry G. Weston, D.D.
1885.....	New York.....	Thomas Armitage, D.D.
1886.....	Baltimore.....	William E. Hatcher, D.D.
1887.....	Indianapolis.....	Hon. William S. Holman, Jr.
1888.....	Richmond.....	Hon. J. L. M. Curry, LL.D.
1889.....	Toronto.....	Hon. David Mills, M.P.
1890.....	New Haven.....	Hon. Francis Wayland, LL.D.
1892.....	Philadelphia.....	Colonel Charles H. Banes
1893.....	Augusta.....	Governor William J. Northen
1894.....	Detroit.....	President A. G. Slocum, LL.D.
1895.....	Providence.....	President E. B. Andrews, LL.D.
1896.....	Nashville.....	President J. T. Henderson, A.M.
1897.....	Chicago.....	Adin A. Kendrick, D.D.
1898.....	Buffalo.....	Mr. H. P. Emerson
1899.....	Pittsburg.....	D. B. Purington, LL.D.
1900.....	Richmond.....	A. P. Montague, LL.D.
1901.....	New York.....	Professor A. S. Bickmore, Ph.D.
1902.....	Boston.....	President D. W. Abercrombie, LL.D.
1903.....	Philadelphia.....	Russell H. Conwell, D.D., LL.D.
1904.....	Louisville.....	Jos. Benson Marvin, M.D., LL.D.
1905.....	Cincinnati.....	Gershom M. Peters, A.M.
1906.....	St. Louis.....	R. H. Jesse, LL.D.
1907.....	Baltimore.....	Mr. Eugene Levering
1908.....	Chicago.....	John L. Jackson, D.D.
1909.....	New York.....	Rev. Leighton Williams, D.D.

NOTE.—The fall session of 1891 was transferred to the spring of 1892. This left the year 1891 without any report.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BAPTIST CONGRESS

FOR 1907

TOPICS:

- The Virgin Birth
- The Church and the Wage Earner
- The Organic Union of Baptists, Free Baptists, and Disciples of Christ
- The Ethics of Present-Day Fiction
- Fear in Religion

Price 57 cents, postpaid

FOR 1908

TOPICS:

- Does the New Testament Contemplate the Church as an Institution?
- What Are the Legitimate Limits of Free Speech in a Republic?
- The Doctrine of Atonement in Terms of Modern Thought
- What Definite Steps should Be Immediately Taken Toward the Organic Union of Baptists, Free Baptists, and Disciples of Christ?
- Is Psycho-Therapeutics a Function of the Church?
- Christ's Prayer for Unity

Price 59 cents, postpaid

Address Orders to the Publishing Agent

The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois

89076985027



b89076985027a