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General Statement of the Problem.
Chapter 1.

General Statement of the Problem.

The cry of the day is "Conservation". When applied in its simplest, which is also its most inclusive meaning, this term covers a multitude of applications. It may be interpreted as outlining a course of individual conduct; or as directing an institutional policy; or as protecting resources, national and international. From different points of view it may mean either "preservation", "cultivation", "concentration", or "federation". It is with reference to the present religious outlook that we wish to make use of the term as an introduction to our discussion.

Not long since a very striking cartoon appeared on the pages of one of our religious weeklies. It represented a band of ecclesiastics clinging tenaciously to opposite sides and corners of a large square of pure white cloth, upon which was emblazoned the Christian symbol - the cross. The animation depicted by the scene was meant evidently to indicate a fierce struggle for the possession of the garment. Various important religious beliefs were represented by
clothing the actors with the peculiar ecclesiastical paraphernalia of some particular sect. Underneath all was the suggestive caption, "They parted His garments among them, casting lots".

The suggestion of the artist is not entirely unfaithful to fact. From the very point at which the Christian idea first became a tributary to the great stream of institutional religious life, circumstances of one kind and another have conspired to distribute the separate particles of the great inflow throughout the whole body of the general current.

Viewed from another standpoint we may say that the growth of the Christian church, as an institution, has been tree-like in its branching tendency. Crowded conditions, the attractions of a freer air, of more sunlight, or of greater possibilities of fruitage have caused so many divisions and sub-divisions of the main trunk, that the condition of to-day closely approximates that of a twig-like instability bending and groaning beneath the weight of the harvest.

Laying aside the figures we may interpret these com-
parisons with reference to their present meaning. Briefly stated this is as follows. The tree represents the fruit bearing tendency of the Christian life; the stream is that of human ideals, purified by the inflow of the Christian conception; and the contention of the ecclesiastics of the artist's fancy, portrays one of the greatest weaknesses of the system by which these two ideas are given to the world, viz: the denominationalized Christian church.

A little reflection will serve to place the factors of the problem before us. Mathematically speaking, the past has been taken up with a system of subtraction and division. Our present task is one of addition and multiplication, of addition by possible union, thereby multiplying the vitality and forcefulness of church as an institution. We say, "union" presumeing this to be desirable and possible, both of which yet remain to be proven. Before taking up this part of the discussion, however, it will be well to note the conditions as they exist to-day in regard to denominationalism, briefly stating facts with which nearly everyone is more or less familiar. The Christian church is to-day divided into several denominational branches, of greater
or less importance, each of which is pursuing its own work along special lines, oftentimes with inadequate facilities encroaching upon the field occupied by some other division having similar ideals and equal or even greater facilities for carrying on this work. As a corollary to this fact we also find in a number of cases that the excess of division besides weakening the work in some places, often absolutely precludes advancement into fields where the work is much needed. When we add to these considerations the fact that all such compromising conditions have a tendency to weaken intelligent confidence, something of the magnitude of the question is manifest.

This is the problem reduced to its lowest terms. The simplicity of its statement however, does not obviate the complexity of its solution. Any ordinarily intelligent reasoner can arrive at the conclusion that it would be much better if this division of interests could be done away, but, in advancing any theory by which they may be overcome, we are facing a more serious matter. In reaching such end several things must be taken into consideration. In the first place we must be assured from specific cases
that such a problem as we have outlined really exists.  
Secondly a somewhat extensive historical survey is in order
that we may be able intelligently to determine the valid-
ity of the causes which have led up to the present condition.
The third phase of our task is to examine suggested remed-
ies in the light of their theoretical value as well as to
examine the results of their practical workings so far as
they have been tried.  A fourth consideration must also be
taken into account, viz. to determine the force of obstac-
les which may be apparent in any of these cases.

Having satisfied our minds in regard to these things
the conclusion we reach will naturally rest upon a more reli-
able basis.  It is our purpose to investigate the problem
before us, following this suggestive order with more or
less logical consistency, in the following pages.
Chapter II.

Specific Cases.

(Illustrating the Problem)
Chapter II.
Specific Cases.

Is our problem merely theoretical or is it a concretely practical one? Are we really facing conditions of the nature outlined in the previous chapter? The burden of proof may be accepted with impunity. And while we must recognize the general inadequacy of conclusions reached empirically, yet, in the present case we must cite individual examples. Limited, indeed, must be the experience of the one who cannot multiply from first-hand acquaintance, examples of the conditions set forth in this chapter.

We shall confine our efforts to illustrating three phases of the problem, viz. the useless and weakening duplication of work, the increase in general administrative expense, and the effect on the new converts in the foreign mission field. We shall take these up in this order.

When we speak of useless and weakening duplication of work the mere statement conveys but little of the real meaning. It is only when we concrete it that we begin to see the real effect. To illustrate, then, in the matter of mere overlapping of local church work and consequent weakening of the field, let us take a particular example which
came under the writer's observation. In a little railroad town in Indiana, representing a population of less than 300, there are four different denominational churches. All four are Protestant and evangelical in character. The combined salaries paid by all four societies is about $800 and parsonage. The aggregate value of the four church buildings is about $12000. Separate facilities of all kinds are maintained, after a fashion, and the money of the community is used in supporting the four enterprises individually. To be sure the support is somewhat meagre when divided among so many but that is merely the fault of the conditions.

Four different pastors labor in the field, all but one serving from a distance and up to the last few years none of them residing in the town. Not one of these societies has a sufficient complement of workers or proper facilities with which to do the work. Their pastors find hard work to live on the divided income even when their salaries are augmented by the added support which comes from the circuit system which this condition renders necessary. They are unable to give proper pastoral care on account of distance from the field as well as owing to the division of interest and effort among the various appointments of large charges.
Doctrinally, they recite the same creed, and, from a standpoint of polity, not one in ten of the members understands the peculiar differences in church government by which their particular church is controlled. Indeed it is doubtful if many could state the most important lines of doctrinal differences. Division of financial support leaves each building poorly cared for, while the usual means of attracting and impressing are absolutely wanting. Scoffers note this inconsistency. Searchers for excuses make great capital out of the apparent weakness.

Now when we note that the town and community is so located as to make a centralized plant for religious purposes, accessible from every part, we can see argument in this particular case for union of interests. The business interests of the town have recognized the value of this principle in the way of franchise, department stores and town government, yet these same men fail to see the value of making their religious beliefs subservient to the same principle.

The four societies have enough money invested in the separate efforts to build a handsome church edifice, furnish it nicely, and pay a reasonable sum for its administration. But a difference of viewpoint as to forms of
church government and the disagreement as to the amount of water that it takes to make a Christian, when applied externally; externalities all stand in the way of its realization. The cause of righteousness suffers while those who should most advance it parley and compromise. Now some objector may assert that even in such cases as this, to say nothing of lesser ones, competition advances the cause. But a little reflection will show that the advancement caused by competition is more than counteracted by the evil resulting from lack of means of carrying on the work, not to mention the great call for additional sacrifice which it entails.

This case is only one of many such which could be mentioned did space permit. Nearly everyone at all familiar with the situation can recall many of light character. It seems that it is in this class of church work that the greatest evil is manifest, and it is in this class that we find the largest proportion of our strength as representatives of pioneering.

Larger communities and churches, however, are not at all exempt from these distressing conditions. A case in point is that of a city of 5000 inhabitants having within its limits churches of six protestant evangelical denomina-
tions, of greater or less degree of strength, each denomina-
tion having one or more societies in the city. While here
the evil is not so apparent as in the case of the smaller
place, inasmuch as each church has a fairly attractive and
suitable plant for the work, yet the problem is resolved
into one merely of degrees. Good work is being done by the
divided interests, but a vastly greater attainment would
be possible under some plan of federation. This particular
condition also represents a larger class.

Let us add one other example to the list illustrating
this particular phase of the problem. This represents a
special condition in reference to a particular denomination.
In a wealthy farming community in the Middle West is situa-
ted a beautiful little church building owned by prosperous
society of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In the same
community, less than one and one half miles from this
building is another well appointed church edifice owned by
an equally prosperous society of the Methodist Episcopal
Church, South. The two buildings represent a value of at
least $10,000, which together with other church property
amounts to something like $15,000 invested. The division
of interests makes it impossible to secure a regular and
competent preacher, with the result that each church has at
best only spasmodic service. The people of each church are neighbors, enjoy the same institutional life in the community with the exception of their church life, and in this they have the same form of government, practically, and very little difference in the way of development of originally identical doctrine. The problem is further complicated by the fact that ready sale could be found for either piece of church property, while either is sufficiently centrally located to prove available. Here, again, we have a single representative of a larger class, of which examples could be multiplied if we were to keep close to Mason and Dixon's line.

What has been said in regard to the strictly local church work applies with equal force when considered in connection with educational institutions and such enterprises as hospitals, homes for the aged, etc. In the case of the latter, particularly, is there a great text for sermonizing upon federation of effort and energy. Every day brings with it its own history of suffering and tragedy, directly traceable to inadequate facilities in these two lines. And in the case of educational institutions and educational effort a volume could be written on the subject both of inadequate facilities and insufficient help for
worthy students. It were easy to multiply instances of these but the task is unnecessary as the necessity of taking steps to overcome the attendant difficulties must appeal to every rational man.

In all of these instances we have just been citing the part played by the overlapping and weakening tendency of denominational division is obvious. Let us now consider the second phase of the problem affected by it.

Here we take up the item of general administrative expense. Though in a measure connected with the proposition just discussed, and in a measure a corollary of it, yet we need to have a separate discussion by reason of the fact that it involves a more complicated problem. Now everyone is agreed that a certain amount of administrative expense is the unavoidable contingent of the successful conduct of such a large enterprise as that represented by our more important religious denominations. Millions in money are handled each year, extensive correspondence is carried on, and indeed, the very unity of the denomination within itself necessitates a competent, well equipped and sufficiently paid board of administration. But here arises a problem, not new to us, in the multiplication of buildings, office forces, traveling expense accounts and such like which arise
from the system. It not infrequently happens that investigat-
ing committees, representing similar interests, but sent out by different denominations, cover identically the same field in the course of their investigation. General Secretaries are multiplied at large salaries when a combination of interests would make it possible for fewer higher salaried officials, with the help of an increased office force, to do the same or even better and more thorough work. Or, to advance into the field of speculation, let us suppose a case of sending $500 in money or material to help the cause at some frontier post. If sent in one lump, and under one general supervision, one man collects it; one man sends it; one man receives it and distributes it. Now suppose the same sum to be sent to the same field under five different auspices. Five men collect it; five men send; five men receive and distribute. According to the very nature of the case the administrative expense is increased five-fold. Is this Christian economy? Yet it is a transaction which is duplicated every time any special agent of any denomination makes possible any one of the many and varied benevolent activities of the denominationalized Christian church.

General Superintendency so far as denominationally ex-
ercised by any body, also leads to great waste of financial
resources when considered in the light of a federated supervision. It is, perhaps, not too much to say that the expense incurred in the general oversight of any two of the more important of the denominations would be amply sufficient to direct the ecclesiastical affairs of all Christendom were they united under such supervision. The financial economy and the added impetus to missionary effort is plainly to be seen. Of course much of the opposition, and, we may say, most of the weighty and authoritatively opposition, to any scheme of federated interests, would arise right here. Parties who hold good paying positions, so placed as to be of great service to humanity, are not liable to take kindly to any plan which would deprive them of such positions and such opportunities, even if they were assured that their work could be better and more cheaply done under the new arrangement. This would be all the more evident when some bishop, or general administrator of equal importance and prestige should have to take a position in the ranks again. And yet the effectiveness of the whole federated body would profit greatly by such concentration while the individual communities and administrators, so far from suffering by the change, would find ready market for their experience and energy in some added field the opening of which a con-
istent development of the whole plan would make easily possible. It is simply a case of wise expenditure of energy and wise occupation of the field. Just as four circuit riders of four different denominations, covering four different communities, would profit by such concentration as would assign one community to each so in administration, a like concentration would produce like beneficial results, both to the office and the officer.

When we push this feature of concentration into the field of the vast publishing interests of the various denominations the advantage is even more manifest. In this particular, well-recognized business principles are present to guide us. Two denominations unitedly could produce any particular publication cheaper than could be done by either separately, both by reason of lessened first cost and on account of a wider range of patronage. What is thus true of a combination of two, would be increased in proportion as the combination gathered force by addition of either factor.

In all these lines, then, it becomes evident that federation would decrease administrative expense, increase effectiveness, and, at the same time work hardship to no one. On the other hand it would prove a positive blessing
to those to be affected by it.

From the tendency of all these previous features there arise a third potent reason for some plan to secure greater unity. This tendency we have referred to is that of the effect the present condition of division and unrest has upon those the denomina
tionalized church desires to reach and help. Missionaries to the foreign fields say that it is a practical impossibility to explain to those with whom they labor the reasons for such divisions as exist among Christians themselves. Nor is this all. Even among our own enlightened people who have been born and reared under this denominational influence it not infrequently acts as a preventive of alliance with the visible church. To be sure it is easily possible to exaggerate these difficulties, and it is conceivable that they are in many cases only convenient excuses, but, even then, no small burden is laid upon any fact which acts as such a fruitful cause for excuse or doubt as this. Moreover, it is presumably in order to fit just such cases as these that denominational lines have any right to exist at all. Then if they are not suitable to accomplish the object for which they are intended but rather work a positive injury to it, besides inconveniencing the administrations, and causing undue sacrifice and
suffering by their shortcomings, wherein, will some one please state, do these denominational lines have any excuse for being? Certainly they are not fostered by established Christians for their own satisfaction alone. Christian grace, as well as Christian fellowship, should be immeasurably stronger than that. Christians, to be Christlike, are here, "not to be ministered unto, but to minister". Upon its ministration to others, then, and not upon its administration to itself, hangs the character of the Christian church. Therefore whatever best proclaims the truth of Christ to the world is that which we need to advocate to be in greatest harmony with our ideals. If this means union or federation of interests, even at a measurable sacrifice of traditional or personal preference, common sense and Christian obligation would forbid its neglect.

An inquiry into the historical development which has brought the present situation will greatly help us in determining the relative and absolute values of these traditional and personal preferences mentioned. This is the appropriate point in our investigation for such inquiry to be made. Therefore the next two chapters will deal with this historical phase of the subject.
Chapter III.

The Failure of Spiritual Autocracy.

(Illustrating from historical examples, the inadvisability of looking to any centralized spiritual headship or authority as a means of solution).
Chapter III.

The Failure of Spiritual Autocracy.

Lest it may be said by some that a form of centralized religious authority is needed as a solution of the distressing problem we have just outlined we wish to produce a few examples of the abuse of such authority as evidenced by this history of the Roman Catholic church. We shall be able to see from these few examples that any form of spiritual autocracy is fated to failure.

The two propositions essential to the question we have in hand relate to the misuse of temporal power and the abuse of spiritual authority. These shall, be presented from historical examples, beginning with the time when the church and state first began to be recognized as coordinate friendly powers.

By degrees the friendship between the church and state officials began to wane, until at such a distance in time from Pepin and pope Zachary, that their allegiance was forgotten, pope Adrian III struck the first open blow at placing the power of the church above that of the state. The ice being once broken, it was an easy matter to continue the conflict. How radical the dignitaries of the church became,
especially the occupants of the papal chair, the following quotation from prominent examples of pontifical arrogance will show.

Pope Paschal II, in 1099 deprived Henry IV, and excited enemies to persecute him telling them that they could not "offer a more acceptable sacrifice to God than by impugning him who endeavored to take the kingdom for God's church". Pope Gregory VII, says, "for the dignity and defence of God's holy church, in the name of Almighty God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, I depose from imperial and royal administration, King Henry, son of Henry, sometime emperor, who too boldly and rashly hath laid hands on thy church, and I absolve all Christians in the Empire from that oath whereby they were wont to plight their faith unto true kings, for it is right that he should be deprived of dignity who doth endeavor to diminish the dignity of the Church".

Pope Boniface VIII, in 1294, has a decree extant in the canon law running thus, "We declare, say, define, and pronounce it to be of necessity to the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman pontiff. One sword must be under another, and the temporal must be under the spiritual power. Whence if the earthly power go astray it must be judged by the spiritual power". Before him,
pope Innocent III affirmed, "The pontifical authority to exceed the temporal power as the sun does the moon". Applying to the former the words of Jeremiah, "See, I have set thee over the nations and over the kingdom, etc. etc." Of this power that pope made experiment by deposing the Emperor Otho IV, "whom", says Nauclerus, "he did first strike with an anathema, as rebellious to the apostolical see, then, him persevering in his obstinacy, did, in the council of prelates held at Rome, pronounce deposed from empire".

Pope Pius V in 1570, begins his bull against queen Elizabeth in these words, "He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth, hath committed the one holy Catholic church, out of which there is no salvation, to one alone on earth, namely to Peter, prince of the apostles, and to the Roman pontiff, successor of Peter, to be governed with a plentitude of power. This one hath he constituted prince over all kingdoms and all nations, that he might pluck up, dissipate, destroy, ruinate, plant, and build". And in the same bull, he declares, that, "he thereby deprives the queen of her pretended right to the kingdom, and to all dignity, dominion, and privilege whatsoever, and absolves all the nobles, subjects, and people of the kingdom, and whoever else have sworn to her, from
their oath, and all duty whatsoever, in regard of dominion fidelity, and obedience.

The bull of pope Sextus V, in 1585, against Henry, king of Navarre, and the prince of Conde, begins thus, "the authority given to St. Peter and his successors by the immense power of the Eternal King, excels all the powers of earthly kings and princes. It passes uncontrollable sentence upon them all, and if it find any of them resisting God's ordinances, it takes severe judgment of them casting them down from their thrones, etc". He then proceeds to absolve all of Henry's subjects from their oaths of allegiance, deposes the king, and forbids any obedience to him.

We next note Urban the II. He succeeded in maintaining himself against pope Clement II who was elected by the imperial party, and also in extending the influence of the papacy throughout the West. In 1089 he convened a council at Rome which pronounced a ban upon the emperor, his pope, and their adherents. He was driven from Rome by the emperor and compelled to seek refuge with count Roger upon whom he had conferred the districts of Apulia and Calabria. He retaliated by renewing his ban over his enemy, and forming an alliance with Conrad, the emperor's son, who rebelled and made himself king of Italy. Urban returned to Rome,
1093, and from that time interfered most notably with the affairs of the world. He excommunicated Philip of France, and forbade the investiture of bishops by the hands of the laity of any rank whatever, also the assumption of Feudal obligations by any clergymen to any king or other layman. In all this however his influence was less pronounced in affairs of doctrine than in matters of legislation.

During the pontificate of Eugenius, the Second Crusade was undertaken. It is believed that its mortifying failure together with the troubles caused by the turbulence of the Roman people, yet active hastened his death. Anastasius IV was his successor. The Roman difficulties continued through his administration, without prospect of settlement. At his death Adrian IV became pope. His reign was more eventful. In the year 1158, he placed under an edict of the city of Rome on account of the actions of the followers of Arnold of Brescia. The Roman thereupon expelled Arnold. Adrian also excommunicated King William of Sicily as an usurper of church property. By a conceited statement he aroused the hatred of the emperor of Germany. Great dissensions followed. Thus arose that spirit of bitter hostility between the popes and the house of Hohenstaufen which lasted until the utter extinction of the latter.
In spite of these reverses Adrian did probably as much to extend the borders and influence of the pontificate as any other pope except Gregory VII. At his death Alexander III became pope.

At his succession he had to flee to France, where at a council held at Tours he declared all the ordinances made by the anti pope sacrilegious, and condemned all the Albigenses as heretics. In this he was opposed by Frederick Barbarossa, the emperor who ejected Alexander from Rome. In turn, the pope excommunicated the emperor, being supported by a strong power in the shape of the king of Sicily. Upon hearing of the death of Thomas Becket, he put all England under the ban, and instituted an investigation which terminated in the absolution of the English king.

The chief concern of Clement III was to organize the third Crusade. It was through the combination of interests in furthering the success of this enterprise, that the aged emperor Frederick Barbarossa, made peace with Clement. However the reign of this pontiff was not without its troubles, though more favorable in result to the pope. He again secured the city of Rome to the papacy, and overcame the king of Scotland in a controversy, by threatening him with the interdict. But a change taking place in the imperial
power owing to the death of King William of Sicily, and Frederick Barbarossa these conditions were changed ending in the succession of Henry VI. The relations between the latter and the pope were not satisfactory, and trouble arose. Henry, after the death of his father was marching on Rome when Clement dies, 1191. Then Celestine III took the papal throne. His reign was marked by the zeal of the Crusades, though beyond espousing the cause of Richard I of England, and fulminating censures against Leopold of Austria and the emperor, who detained Richard prisoner, his reign had no direct influence on affairs of state. At his death Innocent III succeeded to the papal chair. He was by far the greatest pope of this name. His mind was filled with ideas of universal supremacy for his church. Aggressive in manner, firm in decision, and prudent in action, he subordinated all personal feeling to the advancement of the rights of the papacy. Twice he decided an imperial election. Irregularity and venality were repriemed everywhere as soon as discovered. Thus he excommunicated Philip Augustus of France because he had repudiated his wife and married Agnes de Merarre. "The interdict was laid on France the dead lay unburied, the living were deprived of the services of religion. Against an antagonist, armed with such
weapons, even Philip Augustus, brave and powerful though he was, was not a match". This is only an example of the methods used by the pope.

Examples might be multiplied but a sufficient number have been cited to show the methods used by the only spiritual autocrat Christianity has ever known. The abuse of power was terrible. It is beside the question to say that we have cited abuses which an enlightened age would not tolerate. The better way to state it would be that an enlightened age would not permit a return to the regime which made such abuse possible.

And besides this it is true that in so far as the Roman Catholic Church enjoys this dominion in the present day, it is just that degree that we see ignorance and superstition fostered. Freedom from autocratic bondage is essential to true religious development so we must look elsewhere than to a spiritual autocracy for a solution to our problem.

We shall next note the influence of doctrinal development upon the question we are investigating.
Chapter IV.

Lessons from Doctrinal Development.

(Historical tracing of the human finger in the development of doctrine in the early church. Recording the evolution of creeds and the effect of great personalities thereon sufficiently to reveal the human basis of much of our present day denominational division).
Chapter IV.
Lessons From Doctrinal Development.

"Parties", "heresies", "strifes", and "factions" were early prophesied in the Scriptures. In fact even in I Cor. 1:12 Paul's words give ample evidence that divisions of the Christian body existed of such marked proportions as to call forth a part of the letter to the Corinthian church. Here the divisions grew up around some unique or striking personality. Cephas, Apollos, and Paul, each had their following.

It will be seen at this point to note the fact that the heathen philosophies, as well as the remnants of Judaism played an important part in keeping the early church stirred up, partly by the injection of new or borrowed beliefs, and partly by the "tag ends" of semi-savage moral codes which culminated heresy after heresy. This condition of things obtained even after some of these old systems had been refuted beyond question. Fisher, Meander, Cieseler, McGiffert and Hatch place great emphasis upon this fact, especially the last mentioned, who made it the subject of his Hibbert lectures for 1888.

The growth of Christian doctrine in these early days constitutes an interesting and fruitful field for investi-
gation. Especially is this true in connection with the problem we are studying. No careful student can approach the facts which this process of doctrinal development furnishes without carrying away the conviction that our present system of denominalization is based in large measure upon a web of non-essentials. They had nothing to build upon such as we have. As Neander says, "Christianity *** did not deliver a new law in a distinct set of formal precepts, nor found a new society, organized from without in certain fixed and inevitable external forms; *** it did not communicate a rigid system of doctrines, settled and determined once for all, in certain ready made conceptions".

Owing to contact with Paganism and Judaism heretical tendencies early developed. Again we quote Neander, "Christianity was the new creation that pushed its way out of the envelope of Judaism. In common with Judaism, it possessed the character of a revealed religion, as opposed to the natural religion of heathenism. *** It was the dissolution and fulfilment of Judaism". How it was "necessary for a right apprehending of Christianity that these relations be rightly seized. Neither Jew nor Greek saw this, but Jews blended Christianity with Judaism, while Greeks apprehended Christianity simply as a religion opposed to Judaism."
Thus there arose two fundamental heresies, (1) the Jewish and (2) the Crecian.

From this point on, the infant church was obliged to meet and express its official opinion upon the following propositions, viz.
The Canon
Doctrines concerning God
The Freedom of the Will
Divinity of Christ
Distinction of person in God
The person of Christ
The Holy Spirit
Angels and demons
The human soul
The doctrine of sin
The Atonement
Faith and Obedience
Baptism and the Lord’s supper.
Hades, Judgment and retribution

This list is appended from Harnack’s History of Dogmas in order to set before us the magnitude of the task which confronted the early institutional Christian body.

To us for whom these doctrines are formulated and furnished...
ready made there can be no adequate conception of the struggle involved.

No less interesting than the foregoing is the privilege of tracing the individual influence of the Apostolic fathers. In an era when there was little Christian literature and when that which existed had not yet the halo of time about it, it was perfectly natural that every new epistle should be given great weight.

The Alexandrian school represented a very strong wing of the doctrinal writers. Especially was this true of the catechetical division. Here we note, "In such a community (Alexandria), as Christians multiplied the instruction of catechumens often required doctrinal explanations much more advanced than were requisite in ordinary churches. Thus the catechetical school developed itself into a theological seminary, where abstruse points of divinity were handled and young men were trained for the clerical office". Such names as Pantaenus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen suggest the controversial weight of this latter school. Others of less importance were Heraclas, Dionysius the Great, Gregory Thaumaturus, Lucian and Fœmphilus. This school introduced the philosophical viewpoint into the body of Christian doctrinal development, but this positive contri-
bution was partly offset by the tendency to allegorical interpretations of the scriptures which method led Origen especially into several absurd assertions.

In the foregoing we have sketched briefly the history of the Apostolic fathers as recorded in Eusebius, Plummer, Neander, Gieseler, and Encyclopaedia Britannica in order to show that the doctrinal development to which we have fallen heir has been largely a human interpretation. A candid historical survey of this period will clear our minds of the obsession that many of the doctrinal viewpoints will hold to-day are based upon the scriptures and a sound philosophy. If we could forget the formulation of creeds as now in our possession and let the whole Christian world approach the problem with present day facilities it is safe to say that many fences of denominationalism would be broken down. And the more we should study the works of the individuals cited the stronger would this conviction become. We have taken space for a mere reference to the names only. Each one of these represents a storm-center of doctrinal controversy from which emerged with greater or less degree of claim to truth, some of the dearest dogmas of denominationalism.

These observations are equally pertinent throughout
the whole of this historical discussion. We make the reference at this point, partly because we have cited sufficient examples to form a basis for the assertion and partly because we wish it understood that this principle is to be traced consistently throughout the remainder of the historical outline.

The struggle between the ideas of "Free-Will" and "Inherited Depravity" was known as the Pelagian Controversy. Pelagius was the champion of the former, Augustine of the latter. Pelagius was imperially and ecclesiastically frowned upon and thus the doctrine of Augustine, somewhat modified became the orthodox creed of the church.

Thus we are able to see the process of evolution by which the church gradually assumed the right to formulate creeds and define orthodoxy. This is really the line of conduct followed from this time up to the Reformation era.

Obviously anything like a complete review of the Reformation period is out of the question here. Moreover such an attempt would be foreign to the purpose we have in hand viz. the historical tracing of conditions which have tended to bring about the present state of denominationalism in the church.

However in addition to the exciting cause of the Reform-
ation to which we have referred previously, let us note that this epoch followed close upon the Renaissance. It is not beside the question to state that an intellectual revival has always resulted in more or less discredit to any system of formal ceremonialism or other externalisms. And right here we may anticipate a later statement by saying that education is one of the greatest factors to which we may look for a correction of our present system.

For a time the general stream of religious advance followed the channels specified. In the meantime the Roman church stayed the tide of internal dissenion by despotism and a counter-reformation. On the other hand the Protestant movement took on more or less of a political aspect as it sought to adapt itself to the different countries where it was welcomed, until the main divisions of it became national in their tendencies. This latter fact was largely the result of the Thirty Years War which affected the religious as well as the national characters of the people's involved. It was inevitable under such circumstances that succession and deposition of royal houses should greatly affect the religious situation as one or the other should profess allegiance to different churches, thereby changing the state religion as these royal houses
changed. It was also inevitable that counter-movements should be started which, in turn, would divide and sub-divide, causing the branches of the church tree to multiply.

And not only are these circumstances mentioned worthy of note as fruitful causes of denominational divisions but the very fact of the rise of Protestantism made possible a greater liberalism in the matter of religious views. Before the Protestant era it was almost impossible for a religious "heretic" to secure an audience, much less prestige on account of his views. But under the new conditions all this was changed. "Heretics" were in greater favor. Thus arose the Anabaptists, the Anti trinitarians, and the Unitarians of the age of the Reformation.

With the discovery of America and the consequent emigration thither more religious freedom was made possible, and, as a result, disaffected or conscientiously scrupulous personalities found opportunity to exercise their gifts of leadership in the way of gathering religious followers and instituting new religious sects. In this line the Puritans were naturally the most prominent.

No doubt the tendency towards denominational division which has marked this modern period may best be studied by means of the results attained. This purpose will determine
the subject matter of the following chapter. At this point suffice it to say that the divisions of the Christian body have multiplied beyond all natural expectation, and that the process is still going on. The singular thing is that all these divisions claim a scriptural basis.

In it all however the human finger is very manifest. It is an encouraging hope for those who are praying for greater ecclesiastical unity that Christians in general may come to recognize more fully the fact which we have thus been at pains to point out.
Chapter V.

Widening the Chasms.

(Furnishing a comprehensive view of the present situation which confronts Federation as a principle, containing a doctrinal description or resume of the principal Protestant denominations.)
Chapter V.

Widening the Chasms.

Following the last suggestion of the preceding chapter we shall now proceed to note the present status of affairs relative to denominationalism. Statistics for a world-wide investigation are not available. Now would they serve any other than a cumulative purpose if they were not at hand. We have, however, for our guidance the results of the latest U. S. census. This is generally conceded to be the most thorough and reliable investigation of its kind ever conducted. Moreover the conditions here are of such character as to make our nation a splendid type of the average conditions that exist elsewhere.

The facts furnished us by this census are astonishing. There are 186 denominations in the U. S. sufficiently strong and organized to be so considered. Of this number 154 are represented by 27 denominational families, while 32 are unrelated. Since 1890 consolidations to the number of 5 have been consummated; while 12 others have disappeared. In spite of this 48 new denominations have been added during that period, 11 of which were by immigration, 29 being entirely new, and the remainder by divisions from other bodies. There has been an increase of 924 "Independent
churches in that time.

The denominational divisions represent 164 Protestant bodies, so it is not difficult to see which wing of the church is the greatest sinner in this line. The "Protestant idea" seems to get into the blood and stay there. However, it is hardly fair to rank and file of Protestantism to lay too much of this sin to their charge. Protestant or Catholic is merely a matter of classification. If any body secedes from the Roman Catholic church it is "Protestant" in the eyes of the parent body.

The main denominational families are subdivided in the U. S. as follows:

Adventists—7
Baptists—14
Dunkers—4
Evangelistic Ass'ns—14
Lutheran—24
Mennonite—14
Methodist—12

It will shed great light upon the problem of church federation if we set forth briefly the main points of doctrine held by these and a few other of the more important Christian bodies. This outline of polity and policy is not
intended to be at all exhaustive, but merely as a means to get at the essential difficulties involved in the problem of cooperation and consolidation.

I. Adventists.

The adventists bodies were founded by Wm. Miller of Pittsfield, Mass. who was born in 1872. His study of prophetic chronology led him to make much of the proximity of the second coming of Christ. The sect he founded has no definitely formulated creed. The first constituents were mainly "comeouters" from other evangelical denominations. The pastors are itinerant evangelists. Connectionally they have conferences but are in the main congregational in polity.

2. Baptists.

The Baptist church is, in general Calvanistic. It is congregational in polity. Each local church licenses its own minister. It holds to the independence of the local church, advocates the separation of church and state, and maintains that religious freedom is scriptural and the inalienable right of every man. Its adherents believe in the gospel fellowship of the regenerated. Immersion is the baptismal form used. Infant baptism is discountenanced. The Lord's supper is mainly held to be a fellowship sacrament of an exclusive plane and is considered commemorative
of the death and suffering of Christ. The officers of the church are pastors and deacons. Connectionally these local bodies have their assemblies and conventions but the power exercised by the latter is but small.

3. Congregationalists.

The congregational church is autonomous in both doctrine and polity. It is the modern outcome of the Puritan settlement in America. Ordination is by council. There is little of connectionalism.

4. Dunkers.

The Dunkers are the outcome of a protest against the Protestantism of German Lutheran churches. They believe in forward immersion and are trinitarian in doctrine. They have no formulated creed, claiming the scriptures as a basis for their sect. Mt. 18 furnishes the law for dealing with disciplinary cases. Foot-washing (the sexes separate) is practiced, and the love feast and communion are made much of. Sometimes anointing the sick with oil is practiced. The church is Presbyterian in polity, the local council being the unit of government. Three degrees of ministers are recognized, the highest of whom is called a Ruling Elder or Bishop. The ministers are elected by ballot.

5. Evangelical Bodies.

As these are Methodist in polity and policy a brief
notice will suffice here. This sect represents the "Holiness" branch of the Methodistic movement, being composed of those who prefer a more rigid method of procedure along some lines than that followed by the main body.

6. Evangelistic Associations.

These are not properly denominations at all. They consist of numerous separate small bodies, having no formulated creed. They are strictly evangelistic.

7. Friends or Quakers.

The quakers have no salaried ministers. Monthly, quarterly and yearly business meetings are held. Elders and overseers superintend after a fashion: There are no ordinations and the church is strictly non-liturgical. Women are treated on an equality with men. Three points of peculiar significance are. (1) The absence of all outward ordinances. (2) The absolute reliance upon the leading of the Spirit. (3) Nonresistance.

8. Lutheran.

The creed of this division is known as the "Augsburg" Confession, of which the essential are as follows: (1) Justification by faith alone. (2) The Word of God is the only rule for conduct or belief. (3) The sacraments are not merely symbols of grace but actual channels thereof. (4)
Centers in the gospel of Christ for fallen man, not in the sovereignty of God or the doctrine of the church. The churches are a unit in doctrine, but independent in government. Essentially the polity is congregational. There is a local church council, the pastor being elected by the male voting members. There are connectional conferences and synods which bind the different local bodies closer together. The Lutherans are liturgical and observe the principal Christian festivals.


The Mennonites are largely autonomous in both polity and policy, protesting against liturgical, ceremonial, and ecclesiastical control. They sometimes repudiate the civil authority—a fact which has brought them into more or less disrepute. Baptism is by pouring, and they observe the Lord's Supper twice per year. They have their district and state conferences. Three orders of ministry are recognized, viz. Bishops, pastors, and deacons. In addition to these "teachers" are also sometimes recognized.

10. Methodists.

The peculiar doctrines of Methodism are:— The Trinity, The Fall of Man, Freedom of the Will, Sanctification, Justification by faith only, Future Punishments and Rewards,
Sufficiency of the Scriptures for Salvation, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, (any form of observance). In polity the main branches are episcopal, with more or less authority residing in the bishop, who is an itinerant general superintendent, variously chosen. The system of government is by conferences, taking in all phases of the church body from the local society to the representative body of the great general unit. There are two orders of the ministry, viz. deacons and elders. This church is decidedly connectional in its genius of supervision and action.

11. Presbyterian.

The Presbyterians hold to the Sovereignty of God in the Universe, the Sovereignty of Christ in salvation, and the Sovereignty of the Individual Conscience in the interpretation of Scriptures. All ministers are peers of each other. The church authority is vested in representative bodies such as the Session (local), the Presbytery, the Synod, and the General Assembly. The membership of the church consists of all who profess the true religion. The church is essentially congregational in polity.

12. Protestant Episcopal.

This body was insolated from the Anglican connection by the conditions of Colonial growth. The Apostles' and the
Nicene constitute the formulated creed. The Athanasian Creed is rejected. The 39 articles of the parent body are accepted, except the twenty-first and a modified form of the thirty-fifth, thirty-fifth, and the thirty-sixth. The doctrine of the church is largely Calvinistic. The scriptures are recognized as the ultimate rule for conduct and belief. The baptism of children is practiced and the communion is limited to those who have been confirmed.

The supervision of the church is episcopal but with limited authority and with restricted territory. The governmental divisions are: The Parish, The Diocese, and the General Convention. The officers of the parish are rector, (or priest), wardens, and trustees. A diocese must consist of more than six parishes, and is governed by a bishop and a diocesan convention. The General Convention consists of two houses, the Bishops and the Deputies. There are three orders in the ministry, Bishops, priests, and deacons.

13. Unitarians.

The Unitarians have no formal creed. They believe in one God and refuse the trinitarian construction placed thereon. In polity the church is autonomous and congregational, Local, county, state, national, and International conventions are held, but their connectional authority is
slight.


This church is congregational in government. State and local conventions are held as in Unitarianism and with like authority. Ordination is by committees of fellowship from state conventions. Baptisms are by ordained ministers. The essential point in doctrine is that of universal salvation, Christ is considered the mediator or "way" between God and man.

15. United Brethren.

This church holds the same in essential points of doctrine as the main Methodist bodies. There is some difference in polity. Only one order of ministers is recognized. Bishops are elected for a quadrennium and are eligible to reelection. A committee of presiding elders and preachers help to fix appointments by the year.

* * * * *

From the foregoing outline the polity and policy of the various Protestant denominational families of importance much can be learned. One is surprised at first to note the numerous points of likeness. And when we come to consider the fact that, side by side with the division into denominations an evolution of doctrines towards similarity
has been going on, our surprise turns to encouragement. Great minds of all the denominations are beginning to recognize these points of similarity and to make much of them. Let us outline a few of these cases which may rightfully be termed either points of similarity or examples of non-essentials.

In the first place we may note that so far as essentials are concerned the main Protestant families are divided into only three distinct groups on the matter of polity. The first of these maintain some form of the episcopate with tenure for life or good behavior. The theory is monarchical. The second class is but a step removed, having a central authority vested in a set of officers resembling the episcopacy but holding office for a shorter period and elected in a more democratic way. The theory is a compromise between the monarchy and the democracy. A third class absolve themselves from all absolute connectional bonds and act as a series of local units. Here the theory is decidedly democratic.

A few examples of each class will suffice. For instance the Lutheran, The Protestant Episcopal, and the Methodist Episcopal churches exemplify the first division. In the second class are the Methodist Protestants, The Baptists and
the Presbyterians. The Congregationalists, The Unitarians, and the Universalists are examples of the third class. This list is necessarily neither exact nor exhaustive inasmuch as different branches of the same denomination frequently belong in separate classes as to polity, while others are difficult to classify.

All this difference is more a matter of judgment than of conscience and may therefore be considered relatively non-essential. An interesting phase of this question of polity is presented in the fact that churches holding the extremes of the views pointed out are seeking a compromise either nominally or actually. For example the Methodist Episcopal Church is becoming more democratic while the Congregationalists are clamoring for more connectionalism: It is safe to say therefore that the matter of polity does not present an insuperable difficulty to a closer spirit of unity among the denomination;

When it comes to matters of doctrine, however the problem becomes more complicated. Here it is difficult to assert that a certain tenet is non-essential without appearing dogmatic. Nevertheless we can lay down two general principles the working of which would serve to lessen the number of denominational divisions.
The first is that several denominational families hold essentially the same doctrines but have split over the questions which have since been settled in some measure. These could unite. As an example of the possible working of this principle we may note that organic union is not out of the question, doctrinally speaking, for the Methodist Episcopal "North" and South, in connection with the United Brethren, the Free Methodists the Primitive Methodists, the Methodist Protestants, the Wesleyan Methodists, the Missionary Baptists the Evangelical Connections and Associations, and the Congregationalists. This alone would be a great step in advance and it is a safe assertion that like grouping along doctrinal lines could be made in numerous other instances.

The second general principle to which we referred looking to unity along doctrinal lines relates to the fact that many of the doctrinal bases which divide Christendom have been injected into the body of Christian belief through with an inheritance from Paganism. To this fact Hatch makes reference in his Hibbert Lectures from 1888. We are coming to look upon these ceremonies and formal institutions more and more in the light of their positive contribution to moral and spiritual efficiency. If we could apply this principle universally we might be able to say
The text on this page is not legible due to the quality of the image.
with all reverence that much useless lumber had been discarded without any serious loss anywhere.

It is difficult to be specific here without manifesting a trace of what may pass for arrogant intolerance. But nevertheless we shall make the attempt. To take up a very prominent example therefore we may note the fact that the form of baptism is a non-essential as proven by the results of these forms upon practical living. The same may be said with reference to the method of observing the communion of the Lord's Supper, etc. Whatever may be the outcome of biblical interpretation along these lines, the fact remains that life itself has proof at hand which cannot be refuted.

A little better understanding of the evolution of doctrine such as we have suggested previously would greatly assist at this point. We are now ready to note the actual bases which may be considered as legitimate in bringing about the divisions we have noted. This will occupy our attention in the succeeding chapters.
Chapter VI

Philosophy of Denominational Divisions.

(Summarizing the causes which are to be considered as legitimate in the process of denominationalization.)
Chapter VI.

Philosophy of Denominational Divisions.

We are now prepared to summarize the various causes which have tended to bring about the present state of denominationalization in the Christian Church. These causes are not many. It is possible to group the main reasons for division under a comparatively small number of heads. Of course each may have subdivisions or corollaries, but our problem is that of dealing only with the essential and recognizable reasons for the present branched-out condition.

When we thus investigate the causes which have in the past led to denominational divisions, and, which, at the same time, may continue operative in the future, four and only four, general reasons for separation seem to have sufficient weight to require that we should take note of them when talking of any plan of federation. Foremost among these, so far as historical import is concerned, we immediately think of those secessions from the main body of the Christian church which have been brought about in the interests of some reform movement. There are times when this may become a legitimate reason for separation of religious bodies. Circumstances have existed, and might easily exist again in which it would be positively criminal for
one body of men to continue in the sanctioning fellowship of another body whose constructions, as placed upon moral doctrines were vitally different. To every Protestant mind it is perfectly obvious that such legitimate cause for separation existed at the time of the Reformation. For Luther and men of like caliber and character to have winked at the conditions which existed at the time of their break with the main body of the Catholic Church would have been the sheerest folly. Their consciences would not permit them to countenance such practices as were being carried on at that time and the only manly thing for them to do was to secede.

In this connection too much emphasis cannot be placed upon the fact that opposition to the arbitrary and stultifying government of the Roman Catholic church has always played an important part in the process of secession for reform. The tendency of this church to place its adherents under temporal oppression, spiritual slavery, and intellectual bondage has become so intolerable to large numbers in the past that they have thrown off the yoke and have either established entirely new denominations or have allied themselves with other already existing religious bodies.

Another case in point is that of the reform movement
under the Wesleys and Whitefield which resulted in giving Methodism to the world. We may at first be disposed to question the advisability of forming a new denomination as the Wesley movement finally resulted in doing, thinking that perhaps to have remained with the mother church would have secured better results. The legitimacy of Methodism however, like that of other similar seceded bodies, has been amply proven by her history. No one would be disposed to question this statement in the light of facts. It was better for the mother church, as well as for certain constitutionally harmonious adherents that they should remain with her. In like manner it was imperatively necessary that such men as the Wesleys and their followers should secede and form another body which should be able to give their ideals to the world. A splendid result was thus obtained whatever may have been the primal motive of the separation. Of course the question arises as to the present validity of the reason for separation, providing more good be obtained by uniting with some other body, but more of that later.

Since we have spoken of the Methodist branch let us follow it a little further. Carrying out our principle of separation in the interests of needed reform we are soon
reminded of the division of the Methodist Episcopal branch into the two bodies known as the Methodist Episcopal and the Methodist Episcopal, South. While in this case it can scarcely be said that the Southern branch seceded for reform purposes as many would consider it, yet in the main, the division was effected in the interests of reform. Of course to the minds of both parties concerned the separation was absolutely necessary, but, obviously, here is a case in which it would seem apparent that the exegencies which caused the separation had been removed and with them it would appear also that the legitimacy for the separation had vanished in like manner, providing, always, that it could be shown that a reunion of the two bodies would prove desirable and beneficial. Now, if we go a step farther and speak of the bodies which have separated from these two in turn such as the Methodist Protestant, the Primitive Methodist, etc., desiring to reform some phases of polity or policy in the parent bodies, and then consider that, even in these last named denominations, there are those who are dissatisfied and desire division; something of the tendency in the line of secession for reform begins to force itself upon us. Add to this the fact that we have followed only imperfectly and not at all exhaustively, the brief history
of divisions in only one branch of the many which exist, and we can begin to imagine how unnecessarily far this principle would carry us in case no effort should be made to offset the tendency when the case exciting the reform ideal might be overshadowed or removed.

Leaving this principle with this meagre fund of illustration we will proceed to notice one second in historical importance. This would include all divisions which have arisen by reason of differences of mental constitution.

At first this would appear to be inclusive of the principle just illustrated or, at least, a corollary of its application. It is however sufficiently distinct to entitle it to separate notice. If it is true that "not all men think alike", it is equally true that not all men can "think alike". This constitutional difference in men so far as their mental makeup is concerned, of course, has its effect upon their religious thinking. It may indeed sometimes assume such proportions that it becomes practically impossible for vast bodies of men to live in harmony under one vast system. Unlike secession in the interests of reform, the situation we have just outlined might involve no serious moral consideration, or if it does so do, each might feel with equal intensity the justice of his own position.
such is frequently the case in regard to members of opposing political parties. This principle as a cause for division of church life into denominations may not properly be considered as secession for reform, but is as has been said a distinct reason, and if the principle first discussed constitutes a legitimate ground for separation this second one is equally so. It is no just basis for censuring a man if he has conscientious scruples as to the way of administering the sacraments when such scruples are firmly rooted in his mental constitution as they very frequently are. To be sure we must here make a proviso in the nature of a requirement that the person concerned has done all within his power to attain to an enlightened viewpoint and is not foisting ignorance or obstinacy upon us in the name of scrupulosity. It would be wrong to ask a man to submit to some form of church government which would prove irksome to him. He would never be satisfied and could never enjoy to the best advantage his possibilities for Christian service. Here however it must be borne in mind that the individual must endure some loss of personal freedom in order to best conserve the public welfare.

Men are differently constituted emotionally; they are appealed to, religiously, by different means; they desire
different forms of worship at times, and all these differences must be respected. Nevertheless they are not the sum of the factors in the case. Other things must be considered.

When carried to its inevitable outcome excessive attention to peculiarities of mental constitution would lead to individualism and anarchy. A small indulgence of the principle is allowable, to be sure, but it must not be overworked, a tendency which it would seem that we are facing in some cases at present. The method of applying water in the administration of baptism, for instance, has long been considered as sufficient cause for separate lines of Christian activity. Modes of communion and, in like manner mental attitude toward the Scriptural commandments as a whole, as well as methods of governing the church have each contributed its share in the way of increasing the number of divisions and subdivisions already existing until, in some cases, power of locomotion has been sacrificed for ease of emotion; and personal peculiarities have gained the ascendancy over the desire to advance the banner of the cross.

The time was, and is not yet wholly past, when differences of belief were considered heresy and thought to be sufficient ground for expulsion of the person differing
from the majority. It seems lamentable that such should be when we consider the fact that in the case of many of the petty doctrines which separate ecclesiastical bodies, the difference is slight, the point of contention apparently non-essential, and the opposing opinions equally weighty and authoritative. The case appears all the more distressing when we consider how much good might be accomplished by a federation of interests in many cases. Of course we must not expect all men to think alike. That were physically and psychologically impossible. Our contention is merely that the principle of constitutional mental differences has received two great emphasis and has led to a weakening rather than a strengthening of Christian forces. One great hope upon which we may rely in this extremity is the present tendency toward greater enlightenment. Education will remove, in fact is removing, some of these minor differences and with the progress of light less attention is being paid to non essentials. And the march is steadily going on in this line. Really the outlook is hopeful and we may expect further development to bring added light and thus greater tendency to unity.

Leaving now the discussion of this second fruitful cause of separation among religious bodies we pass to the
third in logical importance. Sometimes it becomes necessary to pursue separate lines of activity and place different construction upon religious teaching owing to local exigencies. For example China might prosper better in the direction of the Christian ideal if she had a form of church polity and a formulation of church policy differing largely from that best suiting the needs of the people of the United States. This fact would again furnish a legitimate ground for the separate existence of a church fitting the needs of the peculiar peoples. And still it would seem that there are races and nationalities which might come to such similarity of polity and policy that they might be able to federate their interests. There is, of course less reason for separate denominational existence in this instance than may be seen in the two previous cases. We merely mention it here in order to cover the field of causes for division which have importance historically or from the standpoint of logical legitimacy.

The fourth and last principle which we shall name as operating in leading to separate denominational existence has less legitimacy than the three preceding though it has been of somewhat exaggerated historical importance. Secessions, separation, or primal organizations, for the purpose
of perpetuating some personal viewpoint or delusion has played its part in the problem we are considering. Sometimes it has taken place at the instigation of some strong leader, purely for his own personal aggrandizment. More seldom the central figure has been conscientious in his inauguration of the movement. But in most cases the followers the rank and file, have been honest in their convictions. To be sure this principle has worked in ways in which we can scarcely say that it has in any very great degree affected the unity of the general Christian body. Moreover, in some cases, there is an element of truth in the peculiar belief or dogmas that caused the separation so that at times we cannot say that the new body is altogether perpetuating a delusion. However, be the victim a Millcrite a Doweyite, or Christian Scientist, the departure from the true Christian ideal is so manifest that we may safely speak of the division as a deluded separation when viewed from the Christian standpoint.

Too much stress cannot be laid upon the part played by mere strong personality in the matter of denominational division. Forceful leadership has here, as always, made possible the organization of institutional life into separate bodies.
These four principles exhaust the possible list of causes to which we may look to multiply denominations in the Christian church. In some cases we are almost inclined to think there is a safe and sufficient ground for separate existence. And yet when we consider the multiplicity of divisions each trying to do the same work in the main, and when we remember that strength lies in concentration of energy, intelligent thinkers are prone to ask if there is not some means of obviating the difficulties attending this excessive branching tendency. Certainly if it can be shown that a union of interests would eliminate some of the disadvantages attending the present system, and in addition to this that such union would be productive of positive good, no one would question its wisdom. Moreover if we are to consider that this federation is possible, to a degree, as well as desirable, it will be a great point in its favor.

This last question is so involved with some later considerations that we shall postpone its discussion till a succeeding chapter.
Chapter VII.

Suggested Remedies.

(Various suggested ways of obviating the difficulties and distresses arising out of the denominationalization).
Chapter VII.

Suggested Remedies.

When the foregoing facts are presented all are agreed that something should be done. The method is the point at issue. It would seem that it is a case in which much charity and liberality are in order that our ideal may be realized. If this means union of interests even at a measurable sacrifice of traditional or personal preference, common sense and Christian obligation would forbid its neglect.

The question may arise at this juncture whether or not there is any indication of desire or willingness on the part of the church in general to realize the ideal thus set forth. The facts make it possible for us to answer in the affirmative. Christendom is to-day feeling the impulse of a new spirit. The branching tendency is being frowned upon, while in some cases positive effort is being put forth in behalf of greater unity of church interests. As a specific instance witness the recent movement toward federation in Canada between the Congregationalists, Methodist Protestants, and the United Brethren. How successful the experiment was yet remains an open question but it is a step in the right direction. As another example we may note the case of the two main branches of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which are
just beginning to learn that the war is really over and that slavery as an institution, no longer exists under the flag whose purity both are striving to preserve inviolable.

Another case in point is the way in which the denominations are beginning to cooperate in the foreign fields, notably in the Philippines, to say nothing of the practical denominational union as carried out in Japan. All these attempts are finding their point of greatest difficulty when it comes to formulating a common creed. And this latter seems to be easier for the foreign fields than it is with the peoples who have traditional prejudice to overcome. These specific cases, instances of a wider range of facts, are made possible and accentuated by the greater liberality which has begun to characterize all forms of church activity. Superstition and ignorance having played quite a conspicuous role in religious development from the beginning, are gradually giving way to a better conception of what the great Head of the church really taught. With the greatest development of this knowledge, it is safe to say, less and less stress will come to be laid upon incidental externalities and greater emphasis placed upon the means of purifying the heart of man. In evidence of the validity of this prophecy we may take the well known fact that greater denominational
strictness is observed in less enlightened communities. Moreover, taken by epochs, we may find greatest emphasis placed upon these externalities concommitant with greatest committal to acknowledged ignorance and superstition. In fact to the less enlightened "denominationalism" has often been a fetish by which the fire of God's wrath has been invoked upon the heads of all who dared oppose, while the one so exercising trusted implicitly in the fact that he was a member of "The Church" to save him from all unrighteousness.

This cloud is at present beginning to roll away and the dawn of a more perfect day is even now visible.

We now come to the hardest part of our problem. The serious difficulty which confronts the new spirit is not one of securing converts but that of the method by which to bring about the desired result. Creed and dogma centuries old, stand in the way of the easy consummation of the purpose in hand. How to surmount the obstacles of creed and organization without arousing a traditional prejudice is in a way a well nigh hopeless task. The desirability of the end to be attained, however, renders a form of solution imperative.

If we study the problem closely its appalling features in a measure disappear. Let us remember that our purpose
does not demand an absolutely universal federation. That is the ideal. But the possible is far beneath the ideal. Universal federation is neither possible nor desirable. There are divisions in the case of which present unity were entirely out of the question. For example even the wildest dreams could not hope for anything like present unity between the Roman Catholic Church and some forms of the Protestant communion. The former would constitute a nucleus for federation of quite a considerable number of like denominations. In the case of the latter there are sufficient evidences of similarity of opinion to justify the conclusion that the number of denominations could at least be lessened without encountering insurmountable obstacles.

Among the methods which might be proposed the least satisfaction is that of the election of an interdenominational Board of Control. Upon this Board each denomination should have the right of representation, not proportionate but equal. It should be the duty of this interdenominational agency to decide questions of church location and advise or direct with reference thereto. It would also take care that the evils which have been specified in the previous part of this paper as to be avoided by wise concentration of energy.
This would in a measure obviate many of the difficulties we have to face. Yet it would not entirely remove the disagreeable features and it certainly would occasion great questioning of authority as to the manner of electing this Board as well as to the scope of its administrative authority. We need not enter into detail here.

Another still more satisfactory manner of bringing about the desired result would be to divide all consenting ecclesiastical bodies into groups centering around some representative denomination with which they might voluntarily choose to be allied. This done the next step would be to undertake a plan of external federation, sufficient to obviate the evils of the present situation, such as their representatives in council might decide upon, subject to reference to the delegating body. This plan however would be open to the objection that any external form is at best non-representative. In fact, as one writer has remarked, this form of unity may become the greatest force imaginable.

The suggestion is sometimes made that a separate organization should be formed with the ideal in view of providing a church for all who desired a greater unity. This needs little notice here as it will readily be seen that it would simply add another to the list of denominations
besides greatly weakening the bodies from which many of the members would be secured. It would seem that a system of consolidation should be possible to an extent which would greatly assist in doing away with the distressing conditions which exist at present. There are certain groups of churches which have a sufficient similarity of doctrines and government to render a union of interests possible without greatly affecting their present status.

The question of creed has been a mooted question, but there are many churches which subscribe to a common creed and whose interests are sufficiently compatible with each other to justify the hope that the great good to be gained by federation would so overshadow their desire for individualism as to render such consolidation and fusion possible. The creed would be much the same as they had always used. Or, even in an extreme case, a creedless church is to be preferred to a churchless creeds—a situation which comes dangerously near to confronting the church to-day.

As to the government of the different groups little need be said. The general form existing to-day would, of course prevail. Churches of like view on polity and policy would be drawn to each other naturally and would as naturally continue their traditional forms for a time.
The genius of this latter suggestion, however, is that of Organic Union, or rather "Organic Re-union". But as a present and available method of solution when considered alone it is beset with great difficulties. So extensive and important are these difficulties that a separate chapter must be devoted to their discussion.

It is unnecessary for us at this point to give much space to a consideration of the suggestions that either state control or universal and central ecclesiastical authority would serve to obviate the difficulties cited or and serve to unify Christendom. This was sufficiently discussed and finally settled in the conclusions reached in Chapters III and IV of this paper. Instead we will note the difficulties of the problem of Organic Union to which reference has just been made.
Chapter VIII.

Present Obstacles to Organic Union.

(Showing the impossibility of expecting help from this quarter as a present solution of the problem which confronts the denominationalized Christian Church).
Chapter VIII.

Present Obstacles to Organic Union.

In this chapter we shall undertake to point out briefly some of the obstacles in the way of an early and effective organic re-union of the denominational families, which would seem to operate in such a way as to render the hope of a solution of our problem from that quarter too remote to be depended upon in the present emergency. And if there are difficulties, at present insurmountable, in the way of re-union of church families it is evident that the case of organic union of these families with each other is still more hopeless as a present solving factor. And such seems to be the case for several important, reasons, legitimate or otherwise.

Prominent among these reasons may be mentioned the matter of title and scales of church property. This has always been a hard problem even among denominations in which property titles are held in a central denominational name, and it applies to all property held by the church,—not alone places of worship. Cases are continually coming up in which a confusion has arisen over right and title. If this is the case within these denominations, the matter would become even more complicated when steps should be
taken to consolidate property interests. Some locations would necessarily have to be abandoned, perhaps at times with great sacrifice financially. Time would be necessary in order to consummate such deals and to receive returns from sales of church property thus rendered useless or superfluous. It is taken for granted as a plain business proposition, that this last suggestion is pertinent, viz. that denominational union would render quite a large percent of present church property useless or superfluous.

The next consideration is practically a corollary of this first obstacle.

This is the fact that organic union would involve an adjustment of trust funds and bequests. Such an adjustment might, and probably would, occupy years of time and effort. Take the case of Andover Seminary as an example of this difficulty, though in a different line. It is no easy matter to avoid conditions expressly stipulated by wills or legislation. And it is safe to say that some trust funds designed for the use of even denominational boards of evangelism, charity or education and such like, have been hampered purposely. All this would have to be overcome and adjusted. No doubt but that it could eventually be done, but the process would take time.
This last suggests another obstacle which we have to consider in this connection, viz. denominational pride. Whether or not we can say that this principle plays a very important part in the establishment of trust funds, we can confidently assert that it is one of the prominent elements considered and played upon by those whose duty it is to seek and solicit these funds. And, moreover, no matter whether it does or does not play an appreciable part in this matter of financial assistance, the fact remains that denominational pride is at the root of many a case of hesitancy to enter heartily into schemes for interdenominational cooperation, as well as those insolated cases in which consolidation has been considered.

A further obstacle in the way of this much-to-be-desired consummation is the lack of any central authority having power to direct or bring to pass. Thus no tribunal is constituted or existent to which matters of difference might be referred for adjustment. Nor is it possible, or even desirable that such a tribunal should be constituted. Organic union must be spontaneous and democratic if it is to serve the purpose in hand and escape the tyranny and absolutism which is the greatest operative cause of the evils it is seeking to cure.
Again we find an obstacle in the way of union by reason of the fact that denominational divisions have rather accentuated than alleviated the conditions of distress and dissatisfaction which caused the original division.

Reference has been made in our discussion in the previous chapter to the difficulty of formulating a common creed. Therefore we need only call attention to it here as a difficulty in the way of organic union and express the conviction again that education may be locked to as the agency which shall eventually make this obstacle cease to be operative.

We now come to the consideration of a final preventing cause in the way of this desired coming together. It seems to be a shame and a reproach upon our boasted Christian charity that it needs to be mentioned at all. "Tell it not in Gath" might be a majority verdict as to the propriety of even referring to it in this connection. But existing in a way that cannot be explained by Christian zeal, or condoned by reference to denominational pride, is the evident fact that some incumbents would lose their positions in case of union. Great leaders, as men of important positions of trust almost invariably are, have it largely in their power to direct great movements like this, or to kill them at
their inception. It is nothing but a wilfully blind chairty for us to delude ourselves into thinking that such men, or any men for that matter, are going to abdicate self easily and without long consideration. And it is precisely this which organic union would render necessary. It is the prime excuse for its being at all that the executive officers should be either transferred to other fields of labor, or else their number appreciably reduced to conform with the lesser requirements of the same fields under the new arrangement. It is only fair to the secretaries, and Bishops, and Presidents of Assemblies to say that the pastors, and deacons, and perhaps even the parish officers, as well as all the grades of official importance between, would doubtless be prevented by the facts from "casting the first stone" on this question.

Lest it should appear to have been overlooked we shall notice in closing the chapter a principle which seems to be a part of the warp of all these obstacles cited. This difficulty is found in the fact that not all methods of denominational government are alike. Indeed some of them are not really denominationally operative. Especially is this true in regard to the autonomous bodies. This is not strictly a separate obstacle phase of the difficulty, but
rather a complicating element in the obstacles we have outlined.

We do not claim that any of these difficulties are actually insurmountable. No doubt all could be obviated or eliminated in time. But our contention is that they are sufficiently formidable, and of such character, as to require considerable time for overcoming them. Our problem is to ascertain what must be done in the meantime. It is a case of exigency and expediency. The ideal may be alluring and even attainable in time. We wish to continue to strive towards it, but the problem remains a present one, and therefore, demands a present solution. That which seems to be the best available thing to do will become evident in the next chapter.
Chapter IX.
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Chapter IX.

Advantages of Church Federation.

The primary advantage of some form of federation as compared with other suggested remedies lies in the fact that it is an immediately workable plan. No great length of time is necessary for its evolution into an efficient method of bringing about a union of effort on the part of the churches. Of course time will perfect its method and results in greater degree than exists to-day, but at present it furnishes a way of beginning to solve the problem. Other methods may be more ideal which may be attained. In fact we hope this may be true. Varying degrees of organic re-union may be expected as time brings denominational families into closer and closer relationship. But, as we have shown in the previous chapter, this desirable result must needs require time for its accomplishment.

Meanwhile, federation, internal and authoritative as far as possible, offers us a means of approximating the result otherwise to be attained by organic unity. For this reason any consideration of the advantages to be derived from any proper method of federation would necessarily involve a measure of the advantages to be derived from organic
unity itself.

In recounting some of these we will be merely presenting as positive propositions some of the facts presented negatively in Chapter II.

In the first place the advantages to be derived from federation of interest and effort in the way of concentration for special local evangelistic work are simply enormous. A splendid example of this fact was furnished at the time of the Chapman-Alexander meetings in Boston—a success which has been duplicated many times since. The time has passed when any one church may hope to kindle a sweeping enthusiasm along the lines of evangelistic fervor when all, or most of its neighbors are indifferent to its purpose if not positively engaged in some other line legitimate of church work, or pursuing the same ideal along different, and many times conflicting, lines.

Similarly we have in the federated church attitude towards such organizations as the Anti-Saloon League and the Sabbath Observance Societies an example of what action of the churches may mean politically and in the way of moral reform. The effect upon various other organizations such as the Watch and Ward Society or Reform Bureaus may well be noted also in this connection. These avenues of help—
fulness are rather channels of opportunity already existing through which federation may express itself than a result of its being, though, strictly speaking, we may confidently assert that these societies are virtually a form of religious federation when we consider that term in its broader sense.

Again, the economy of time, effort and expense as derived from legitimate forms of federation constitutes a form of service which is becoming increasingly important. Of course this would be greatly accentuated by a closer organic unity, but even under a more or less loose form of federation it is sufficiently evident to excite notice.

Moreover, the salutary effect of apparent ecclesiastical harmony constitutes a moral advantage of federation. To be sure it is impossible to determine the precise or even approximate amount of stress which can be legitimately placed upon this fact, but that it plays an important part cannot be denied. Perhaps the greatest sphere of its influence will be found in the matter of securing new converts both at home and in the foreign field.

Another phase of the benefits of federation is felt in the way of assistance to the weaker and independent churches. The recent census asserts that the growth in numbers of the latter since 1890 is "phenomenal". These
These lack connectional strength. It is one of the privileges of federated movements to furnish a "connectional web" for the "independent woof".

Perhaps the greatest advantage of all to be derived from federation as a method lies in the fact that it seeks to contravene no ecclesiastical polity or policy. Thus no interdenominational strife is engendered and no factionalism created. Federation seeks to formulate no creed, neither does it ask any individual questions as to methods of church procedure. It rather contains itself with a "pragmatic" view of the problem, looking rather to results than means of accomplishment.

The success of the various Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations as well as the great service rendered by the several Laymen's Missionary Movements are side lights as to the benefits to be derived from Christian Cooperation. These however do not strictly come under the head of our discussion, and are mentioned merely, as cumulative argument for great sympathy among denominations.
Chapter X.

Recapitulation and Conclusion.

(A summary of results attained by Federation as outlined in this paper, with an interpretation of the ideal toward which the movement is working).
Chapter X.
Recapitulation and Conclusion.

It now remains for us to recapitulate and draw conclusions. While, to some extent, we have summarized the reasoning as we went along, yet there are certain general results which the finished presentation of the problem sets forth, that we have not specifically noted in these detailed steps.

First of all our reasoning has led us to conclude that a problem of weakness through denominational division really exists. It is not enough for us to hide behind the strength of our own particular denomination and assert that only the weaker bodies are affected by the conditions which confront us. The problem exists for even the strongest Christian body. To ignore it in the past has indicated lack of vision as to the true meaning of the evangel. To ignore it in the future will mean practically denominational bigotry and ecclesiastical suicide. Because our mutual relations as Christians, and as representatives of Christ, are so interrelated and interdependent that the good of one involves the good of all. It is no longer possible to "pass by on the other side".
That a present beginning on the solution of the problem is imperative is also sufficiently evident. While we hesitate and ponder, seeking methods of unity and cooperation which will demand little energy, or shall preserve our denominational integrity, while "denominations full" of people, both at home and abroad, are losing the privileges and opportunities which our concerted action might insure to them. Truly there is no time to be lost! Nor is it a time for us to quibble, or flaunt our denominational traditions as a possible solution from the task. The harvest is ripe, and the gathering imperative, if we would make full proof of our stewardship.

The method of approach to the problem seems to be the vital point. Few, indeed, would deny that the problem exists. But as to how to solve it there is less marked unanimity. The Protestant churches seem to be fairly united as to the method of Federation as outlined in the previous chapters. And it is to be said in their favor that they have really shown a more "catholic" spirit in the matter than our Catholic brethren. But the real problem involves both Catholic and Protestant. However, the signs of the times would seem to indicate that we are to expect but little concession from the former for the pre-
sent at least.

We have stated that the method of federation as outlined seems to meet the approval of the leading Protestant bodies. This is true so far as the plan has been tried. The line of evolution as followed by the movement so far would seem to indicate this. But we must recognize that the plan, so far as outlined, is merely a stage in an evolutionary process, and that what is useful to-day may be discarded to-morrow. Federation is transient, and is essentially in the nature of a compromise.

Herein lies the real difficulty in the Federation problem. We are Pilgrims, and not Prophets. The goal is far away as yet. And the accomplishment of our ideal will mean the death-knell of the means of accomplishing it. That ideal is Christian Pe-Union. Many want it. A few are earnestly striving after it. None are attaining it.

The great work before the federation method is, first of all, to stop the divisions which are still going on at the surprising rate noted in a previous chapter. Until this can be done the problem will increase in difficulty rather than diminish. Having stemmed this tide, it can then proceed to try to unite the tributaries into one main stream.
Yet organic union, in the absolute sense, has been shown to be both impracticable and undesirable. In matters of opinion, absolute unity is synonymous with stagnation. We cannot expect all men to think alike, especially when it comes to matters pertaining to conduct and self-interest. Even Babel is preferable to Nirvana.

Nevertheless, all along Federation must look towards, and insist upon, as far as possible, a consummation of this ideal of approximate organic union. It cannot shirk this responsibility if it would be true to its mission. The evils which it seeks to correct are present because these divisions exist. The proper diagnosis of the case, therefore, should include a recommendation for the treatment of this disintegration. Its first, second, and third word of advice to the denominations should be, "unite, Unite, UNITE". And it is only fair to all concerned to state that that the most intelligent and the best informed of all the denominational representatives desire this result. How to bring it about in the best way, however, "doth not yet appear". Several of the most prominent obstacles in the way have been noted in a previous chapter.

Our historical review has led us to avoid most sedulously anything looking towards a state or condition of
central civic or ecclesiastical control in matters pertaining to religious belief. This review also revealed to us the fact that much of our present divided condition is due to religious tenets which either have been abandoned long ago, or else have ceased to have any practical effect upon the doctrinal attitude of those to whom the process of ecclesiastical heritage has bequeathed them.

So much of this heritage has been the result of mere human evolution since the time represented by our present accepted scriptural canon that we are really surprised that men lay so much stress upon the traditional value of them. Especially is this true of matters pertaining to polity. That the method of ecclesiastical control as it exists today should ever have been the subject of a divine revelation is absurd. The same may be said with equal pertinence in regard to many phases of doctrine. Those who manifest, either by word of mouth, or by their conduct in regard to church matters, that they think otherwise, not only reveal to us their ignorance of church history and of the history of doctrine, but also by this attitude they cast a serious reflection upon the divine revelator.

History is very explicit in her lessons at this point. All we can hope is, that sufficient importance may come to
be attached to this field of knowledge that it may be dis-
covered and explored by enough ecclesiastics and Christians
to make it common property. A historical episcopate or
historical doctrinal viewpoint is of just much value as a
historical form of civil government of civil statute — and
no more. It is a hopeful outlook that many representative
figures in the great denomination are coming to this view-
point.

And here we face a seeming paradox. It is a safe though
surprising assertion that the very divisions into denomina-
tions itself is an indication of a half-voiced desire for
greater unity. These divisions reveal a dissatisfaction
with existing conditions. This dissatisfaction is due in
many cases to real difficulties which come as the result
of divided efforts. Let Christendom become more united,as
in the one small example of the Chapman-Alexander Meetings,
for instance, and these difficulties will vanish in a meas-
ure so that Christians will be content to work together
in bringing about such grand results.

The time has undoubtedly arrived for the various de-
nominations to seek a common root-tree, or run the risk of
being dumb when asked the question, "Where is thy brother?"
So significant have become the real doctrinal difficulties,
in the light of the comparative good to be accomplished by united effort, that the excuse for perpetuating the present excessive denominationalization is slight indeed.

Viewed in the light of facts the time is at hand when denominations which fail to give due consideration to this fact shall be unworthy the name of Christian. The greatest revival which could possibly take place would be along this line. It is useless for us as churches to ask would-be-converts to break with the world when we clasp to our bosom such a full grown idol as denominationalism has grown to be with its present signification.

A generation or two hence will come to look upon this term with as much aversion as we of the present consider the words "indulgences" or "inquisition". And, if we may engage in prophecy, following the suggestion just made as to revival, it is not out of place here to assert confidently the conviction that the most sweeping evangelistic movement of the twentieth century will be a revival along the lines which we have indicated. The Reformation of Luther's time would appear small in comparison with such an ecclesiastical reform. May God speed the day!

Signs of this reformation or revival are evident to the careful student of such things. Such great enterprises
as the Laymen's Missionary Movement and the Men's Religion Forward Movement, as well as other great interdenominational organizations such as we have mentioned, all show the trend of the times. The only obstacle seems to be when the word "Church", or denominational terminology of some kind is injected into the enterprise.

We therefore conclude that the greatest problem which confronts Federation in our generation is that of bringing about a condition of approximate unity among the denominations. All its methods and results otherwise are merely a systematic treatment of the real disease. The oft-quoted phraseology still remains new by its very pertinence. "In essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things charity". Let the church inscribe this motto on her banners just underneath the inscription, "In hoc signio vinces".