

Zeitschrift: Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift : neue Folge der Revue internationale de théologie
Band: 6 (1916)
Heft: 4

Artikel: The Garden City Conference : notes and impressions
Autor: Wells, Benjamin W.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403892>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

Download PDF: 15.04.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

THE GARDEN CITY CONFERENCE.

Notes and impressions.

Men came to Garten City with hope, they left it with vision. It was as though many primary colours, each a translation of the one vivifying light, had been brought side by side and had thus suggested to each one the glory, as yet unseen, that would come from the infinite blendings and shadings of these broken lights, when Christian unity should give scope in brotherly fellowship to every type of devout mind and every habit of reverent thought. Glimpses of that vision came more and more frequently as the sessions advanced and the conviction gathered force that what had been so high-heartedly conceived, so generously undertaken, so unselfishly furthered, could not be without a divine fruition and blessing. There were moments when it seemed as though one knew that the Spirit of God was then imparting to the counsels of men the spark of a diviner life.

How may one chronicle such experiences? What was done may be told, and ought to be told, for it was great; but the spirit in which it was done was greater, so great at times as to quite transcend recording of ours. He who would understand must keep his imagination ever alert, as he must when he reads the story of any vital and cardinal moment, or the essence of it all will elude him.

At the invitation of the Joint Commission appointed by the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1910, representatives of fifteen other Commissions or Committees of Churches in the United States and Canada gathered at Garden City on Jan. 4th. The Episcopalians were represented by Bishop Anderson of Chicago, Bishop Vincent of Southern Ohio, Bishop Brewster of Connecticut, Bishop Weller of Fond du Lac, Bishop Greer of New York,

Bishop Rhinelander of Pennsylvania, the Rev. Drs. William T. Manning of New York, Alexander Mann of Boston, Francis J. Hall of New York, B. Talbot Rogers of Fond du Lac, H. E. W. Fosbroke of Cambridge, and MMrs. Francis Lynde Stetson of New York, Edward P. Bailey of Chicago, George Zabriskie of New York and Robert H. Gardiner of Gardiner, Maine, the Secretary of the Commission. The Church of England in Canada was represented by the Secretary of its Commission, Mr. L. H. Baldwin of Toronto; the Northern Baptist Convention by the Rev. Dr. W. C. P. Rhoades of Brooklyn; the Seventh Day Baptist General Conference by President Boothe C. Davis of Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y., Rev. Edwin Shaw and Rev. Theodore L. Gardiner, both of Plainfield, N. J., and Rev. Dr. Arthur E. Main of Alfred, N. Y. From the Congregational Commission, came Rev. Dr. Newman Smyth of New Haven, Conn., Rev. Dr. Raymond Calkins of Cambridge, Mass., Rev. Hubert C. Herring of New Haven, Conn., and Professor Williston Walker, D. D., of New Haven, Conn. In the strong delegation of the Disciples of Christ, were Rev. Dr. Peter Ainslie of Baltimore, Rev. F. W. Burnham of Cincinnati, Rev. E. B. Bagby of Baltimore, Rev. Dr. Finis Idleman of Des Moines, Rev. Irving S. Chenoweth of Philadelphia, Rev. J. M. Philputt of New York and Rev. M. M. Amunson of Brooklyn. The Society of Friends sent Professor Rufus M. Jones of Haverford College, James Wood of New York and David M. Edwards, President of Penn College, Oskaloosa, Ia. From the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the U. S. A., came Rev. Dr. Junius B. Remensnyder of New York, Rev. Dr. Frederick H. Knubel of New York, Professor Bauslin of Springfield, Ohio, President J. A. Singmaster of Gettysburg, Pa., and the Rev. Frank P. Manhart of Selinsgrove, Pa. From the Methodist Episcopal Church, came Bishop Hamilton and John R. Mott, LL. D.; from the Moravians, Bishop Leibert of New York and the Rev. Dr. Paul de Schweinitz of Bethlehem, Pa. From the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., came the Rev. Drs. W. H. Roberts of Philadelphia, Reuben H. Hartley of Quincy, Ill., William McKibbin of Cincinnati, Charles R. Erdman of Princeton, James D. Moffat of Washington, Pa., William H. Black of Marshall, Mo., Edgar A. Elmore of Chattanooga, J. Ross Stevenson of Princeton, N. J., and George Reynolds of New Rochelle, N. Y.; Judge George H. Shields of St. Louis and

Mr. Henry W. Jessup of New York. The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. sent the Rev. Drs. Russell Cecil of Richmond, Va., and W. H. Marquess of New York; the United Presbyterian Church of North America, the Rev. James S. Walker of Chicago and the Rev. Dr. T. H. McMichael of Monmouth, Ill. From the Reformed Church in the United States, came the Rev. Dr. James I. Good of Philadelphia, and from the Alliance of Reformed Churches, Gen. Ralph E. Prime of Yonkers and the Rev. Dr. R. T. Roberts of Rome, N. Y.

These sixty-one had come, at the invitation of the Protestant Episcopal Commission, as a North American Preparatory Conference to plan for a world conference and to kindle and deepen public interest in it with something of their own quickening fire. They had gathered in the quiet freedom from distraction of Garden City in a hotel that was, for the occasion, at once their home and their place of meeting. There, they considered what, here in America and now in days of political stress and a war that is rending half the world, they could do to help to realize the prayer of their Lord that they all might be one.

A movement, that has that prayer for its watchword, itself moves in an atmosphere of prayer. No impression of this Conference will remain longer in the memory than that of the devotion that preceded every session and brought them all to an uplifting close. From men of many communions and most varied spiritual training, came the common petition for wisdom to perceive and know what they ought to do, and for grace, power and courage to do and to renounce, as the Spirit might guide; from all, came the common call to recollect the words of revelation; their hymns of praise were their common heritage. In these services, there was a veritable consecration.

THE OPENING SESSION. THE SECRETARY'S REPORT. The main steps by which the Conference attained to unanimity of declaration and to the constructive plans, ecumenical and local, with which it closed, were these. Its first meeting, held on the evening of Jan. 4th, was called to order by Dr. Roberts, who asked Dr. Ainslie to lead the first devotional service. It was, said Dr. Ainslie, a striking coincidence that, on this very day sixty-two years ago, the Presbyterian, Thomas Campbell, had closed his life-long search for Church unity. Thousands

were calling now where he had lifted a solitary voice. The worst infidel, Dr. Ainslie thought, was not he who said there is no God, but he who said, God is for me and not for you. In the belief that the same God was Father of us all, was the hope of our day. Every Christian needed all the others. Where brotherhood was marred, all were the poorer.

What was in the hearts of all found equal expression in prayers by Bishop Weller, Bishop Hamilton and Dr. Stevenson. Then, when they had sung "Blest be the tie", Dr. Roberts presented Bishop Anderson as Moderator for the session, recalling the history of the movement, which, he said, made such a selection eminently fitting. Bishop Anderson, remarking that he had never been a Moderator before, recognized that, in this enterprise, he was likely to become familiar with new things. After the usual preliminaries of organization, the Conference got quickly to work, its task being greatly furthered throughout by the wise guidance of a strong and representative Business Committee. First came the Report of Secretary Gardiner on the World Conference Movement. From this report it appeared that there were now fifty-seven cooperating communions. Though the Roman and Eastern Churches were not among these yet, in those bodies too, men in influential position had given cordial expressions of sympathy. There was good ground to hope for the cooperation of the Russian Church and this would have great influence with the other Eastern National Churches. Before the outbreak of the war in Europe, it had seemed certain that Protestant Churches on the Continent would accept the invitation, when they had had the matter fully explained. In the West Indies, Archbishop Nuttall had got in touch with the leading communions. Possibly, a joint commission might be appointed for them all. Correspondence embracing twenty-five countries had been conducted to prepare the way for a deputation to the Continental Churches. Responses of especial cordiality had been received from the Roman Catholic Primate of Servia, from Archbishop Johansson of Finland and from Dr. Söderblom, the present Archbishop of Upsala. There had also been encouraging response from the officials of the Evangelical Churches in Germany, the Reformed Churches in Holland and the Church of Norway. An itinerary had been arranged. Almost everywhere there had been an expectant cordiality, but the outbreak of the war had interrupted all.

In a general view of the outlook, Secretary Gardiner noted an increasing desire for family reunion among some leading groups of Christians. Publicity had been actively promoted, but the demand for the Commission's Manual of Prayer for Unity had been disappointingly small. Progress toward unity would not be made till the communions were willing to pray for it. Why might there not be special weekly services and a daily prayer? If all might not yet pray together, at least they might all pray at the same time and for the same purpose.

Since the outbreak of the war, correspondence had been conducted as occasion offered. From the Vatican, Cardinal Gasparri had written to express the interest of the Pope in this "project of examining, in a sincere spirit and without prejudice, the essential form of the Church". Many foreign journals had published sympathetic articles on the proposed Conference. Archbishop Antonius of Kharkov, Russia, had modified, essentially, his earlier opposition. A still wider publicity, the Secretary felt, was needed that the great body of Christian men and women might come more earnestly to desire unity and to believe in the possibility of it. This could be achieved only through boundless patience, through loving and sympathetic consideration of differences as a preliminary to active reconstruction. A voluminous correspondence had revealed much misconception of the difference between unity and uniformity, and much impatience. Fundamental principles would have to be stated over and over; even the appearance of an attempt to convert each other must be avoided. The spirit in which they should approach the Conference was that of an anxious desire to comprehend. Premature discussion of the principles of Faith and Order between members of different communions was to be deprecated. The formulation of questions for the Conference should result from the consultation of many minds. And individual formulation, however excellent, would gain enormously in value if, before its promulgation, it were approved by many representative men.

In recording his impression of the mass of correspondence received, the Secretary noted an increasing desire for unity, but very little agreement as to what it was, and little realization that each communion might have something to take as well as to give. Some had mistaken federation, or cooperation,

for unity, a few had even thought denominationalism desirable. There seemed little understanding that the Conference would be called to consider not agreements but differences. Questions of Orders loomed large in the letters. There was little agreement about the nature and function of creeds or of the differences in the conception of unity implied in belief or unbelief in Christ as God made man. Committees, outside the United States, had not yet fully realized that they were asked to be full partners and expected to offer suggestions and active assistance. This present Conference might, he thought, do well to make it clear that the American Commissions were inviting criticism and were not proposing a plan for acceptance or rejection as a whole. The Conference should not forget that they still lacked the cooperation of communions embracing the majority of Christians. They must avert their eyes from inherited barriers and lift them to a world vision of a vital and fundamental task that could not be fulfilled by any mere human concordat. They must seek to prepare the way for the Spirit to create a true communion of Christian life. The old world was swept with war, the new world drifting in self-complacency. Neither would listen to any but a vital message. Until they could show the world the glory of the visible unity of the Church, the Good News would never be so heard as to establish Christ's kingdom.

The deputies had listened to the report with close attention and seemed deeply stirred by its conclusion.

Bishop Anderson followed with "Address of fellowship", speaking very effectively of the purpose and character of this Conference and of the great Conference to follow, and of the spirit of hope, faith, freedom and large expectancy in which they should undertake the task, mindful always of the definite instructions that had accompanied their appointments. They were to open their hearts and minds, as the agents of their communions, to confer and to consider not questions of faith and order, but how they could further a truly ecumenical conference of all races, nations, peoples, tongues and organized Churches that recognized allegiance to Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. The Conference was to be not pan-Catholic or pan-Protestant but pan-Christian, ecumenical in reach, but without authority to bind, involving no risk of embarrassment or compromise for any, but inspired by a holy hope of manifesting

the corporate unity that should exist between all who profess and call themselves Christians. Such a conference would be unique in the world's history. Its scope lifted it above the spirit of the age into the spirit of the ages. The absence of a national limitation to its all-embracing sympathy and love of the whole brotherhood promised freedom from inherited prejudice and made a world conference practicable, where national conferences would not be. It rose above racial types, national phases, the incidents, the accidents and the tragedies of history, into closer vision of the universality of Christ and His Church. Multitudinous difficulties automatically disappeared before the thought of a world-Saviour saving the world through a world-Church. This Conference represented but one nation, one race, one group of Churches. The cooperation of all must be sought. They must not unwittingly build their prejudices into the preliminary steps. In our divided Christianity, all lived in a sort of isolation. He claimed no competence to lay foundations on which others should be asked to build. So far as possible, all must be called in council, all given opportunity to get in on the ground floor. So long as there was a ray of hope, the full ecumenical character of the Conference must be maintained. Each communion would enter the Conference on its own estimate of itself. Personal association, exchange of ideas, united prayers would advance the unity toward which the times were ripening. The war was making men ask, has Christianity failed? But civilization had never been, was not yet, corporately Christian. Might not a united Church have preserved the peace of the world? Religion was now largely individualistic. There were rich spiritual values in the isolated communions, but their lack of integration was imperilling the realization of the world's need and prayer. Who, facing the conditions of today, could stand aloof from a movement so thoroughly filled with mutual trust and confidence, so charged with loyalty to Christ and His Church?

This noble appeal and the benediction by Bishop Leibert brought the first day's session to a close.

On Wednesday morning, after devotions under the lead of Dr. Calkins, Dr. Newman Smyth gave some genial reminiscences of Presbyterian and Congregational relations in Chicago in his younger days, as a prelude to the introduction of Dr. Stevenson to be the Moderator of the second session. In taking the chair,

Dr. Stevenson paid a hearty tribute from his communion to the Episcopal Church for the initiation of the movement and for carrying it forward in a way so satisfactory to all. No Presbyterian Church in all the world but had identified itself with the cause. The assurance that a World Conference would take place laid all under bonds to preserve present peace. Results could be expected then only when preparation, through long consideration, had taken definite form.

THE BASIS OF INVITATION. THE NEXT STEP.

The first part of this session was given to an address by Dr. Remensnyder on "The Basis of the Invitation to the World Conference" and to four addresses "A World Conference As the Next Step toward Unity", Bishop Hamilton speaking for the Methodists, Dr. Moffat for the Presbyterians, Bishop Vincent for the Episcopalians, Dr. Main for the Baptists. Dr. Remensnyder was grateful that he had lived in the morning breath of such a movement as this. The basis of the Conference, he said, must needs be a common faith, for religion was not philosophy. The underlying theme of the world's history had been the struggle between belief and rationalism. Not human but divine reason asserted the authority of revelation. The ages of faith had been the ages of power. The first article of the Christian faith in every age had been belief in the unification of God and man in the divine Person of Christ. Whoever held less than that was not a Christian, every one who held that was of the common faith, no matter in what else he might differ. The primary purpose of the Incarnation was salvation. This, too, was of the common faith, and the Cross, therefore, the universal symbol of Christianity. Efforts to harmonize Christianity with reason could only weaken it, for Christianity had given the world a sense of sin, and the creative factor in this was the Cross. Of the common faith, too, was belief in the Risen Saviour, and, as its consequence, in our own resurrection from the dead and in immortality. A fourth article in this common faith was the belief in One Holy Catholic Church, of which Baptism was the gate and the Lord's Supper the pledge. The Church could not pass away and Christianity survive. But it did not follow that humanly instituted rites must be unchanging. Some, for instance, held Orders primary and others held them secondary. These two views must agree to consist or they could

not both subsist. This common faith should produce unity. The spiritually united would not be content to dwell apart. Schisms had come alike from demanding too little and too much. Only by avoiding both extremes, with faith and yet with charity, could they dwell in one Christian home until the One Holy Catholic Church should be realized.

The addresses that followed were more informal. Bishop Hamilton, with characteristic fervor, urged that they should begin with their agreements and aim at a common platform. The only possible unity would be by the direction through the Holy Ghost of the minds of those who believed in Him. There had been more differences in the Apostolic Church than there were now, yet they had met "with one accord in one place". They must seek to get the idea of the Church that was in the mind of Christ. They could not expect uniformity; spiritual unity they could attain. The evidence of salvation was love of the brethren.

Dr. Moffat thought the Conference would be especially useful for the consideration of differences. They would not discuss not defend, but they would explain. Debate did not foster unity. It was more apt to deepen division. But conference might bring them to a common aspect of the truth, which all held to be one. They might get new points of view without the surrender of anything and so get nearer to one another. The causes of division had been not so much differences of doctrine as in regard to authority in the exercise of government. Of this, he gave some pertinent illustrations from the history of the Eastern Church and of the Presbyterians, from the story of Hus, who might have kept his views, if he had kept them to himself, and from the life of Luther. He would not pray for entire harmony in doctrine. Indeed, he found it more interesting to walk with one with whom he was not perfectly agreed. They should put away the idea of abolishing differences. They had better let them alone. Orders presented difficulties but he had often found that, when he had squarely faced what seemed insurmountable, there had proved to be no precipice. Some might be following Christ closely, others, like Peter, "afar off". If they would talk, with frankness and mutual confidence, of their difficulties, they would see them in a new light. He did not expect harmony of belief even in heaven, but he could work together, even with

Roman Catholics, to realize Christ's purpose, "that the world may believe and know that Thou hast sent me".

Bishop Vincent reviewed the early history of the movement from the "nervous tension" at the Edinburgh Conference to Bishop Brent's Cincinnati address, Dr. Manning's resolution and the creation of the Episcopal Joint Commission. The Conference was to be for better mutual understanding. The beginning of unity would be found in real knowledge of wherein the differences as well as the agreements lay. What was the idea of the Episcopal Church about unity? Their hope was for realization of Christ's ideal, that all might be one that the world might believe. It was not with the Roman ideal, nor with the Greek, nor with the Protestant ideal of cooperation, nor in the hope of a return to the original organic unity that they would enter the Conference, and none knew where they might come out from it. The Episcopal Church had committed itself absolutely to the guidance of the Spirit of God in this matter. God might give them all a new vision of unity, larger than any other, possibly in the spirit of the Lambeth Declaration. They desired not compromise but comprehension, or, in the words of Bossuet, not retractions but explanations. The synthesis of thought in the Conference would realize Newman's hope and discover larger truth through many minds working together freely.

Dr. Main, speaking for the Baptists, welcomed discussion in Bishop Vincent's spirit and from the basis of agreements. Spiritual unity was the fundamental fact but it ought to find a visible expression, as one body with its many functions had yet an organic unity. There had been much progress in the conception of unity. He noted a tendency to great change among Baptists, in their view of the Church. They no longer objected so much to the capital C. For him, all the churches in Chicago made up the Church of Chicago, of which he would be glad to help make Bishop Anderson the official head. He believed in the Conference as a visible witness to unity which, even on practical grounds, was to be urged for the sake of efficiency. The Churches should not seek uniformity but to march with a common front as a common mediator of salvation. The Baptists wanted the Conference, for they saw in it the hope of a more united Church.

DECLARATION AND PLANS. Then followed the presentation of a paper by Dr. Smyth and of two papers by Mr. Zabriskie, the first a declaration of principles, the others embodying plans for the organization of work preliminary to the World Conference by the American Churches, as well as by all the bodies that were now enrolled or might later desire to join in the movement. The discussion and perfecting of these proposals was the work of the rest of the Conference,—the adoption of them in a form that fully satisfied all was its final and great achievement. Paragraph by paragraph, they were examined by the Conference, ambiguities were clarified, difficulties explained, improvements suggested, cautions heeded, all in a most fraternal spirit. What was finally adopted appears at the close. Dr. Smyth, in presenting his paper, said it was offered by the Congregational deputation as a help to attaining some definite result. He had himself made first drafts of it and had been “a bountiful benefactor of the waste-paper basket” but, in its present form, it was the work of much conference within and without his communion. In the new age, when the war should have burnt itself out, the World Conference would seem timely. It was for the united Church to make the rule of Christ the law of the nations. A Christian reconstruction of society would then be called for. Our primary obligation was in humility and with breadth of vision to begin the work of preparation at home. Dr. Smyth then read the Congregational proposals and at the close, recalling the child who feared God might get his kite if he let it fly too high, “Let us let our kite fly so far”, he said, “that the Lord may get it and return it with His blessing”.

This paper was referred to the Business Committee, as were also the two papers presented by Mr. Zabriskie for the Episcopal Commission. In offering these, Mr. Zabriskie noted the early precedents for this World Conference, beginning with the Council of Nice, when already division was beginning to create fissures in the Church of Christ. But the new ecumenical conference would differ from any in the past in that it would have no power to legislate. For each, of all the delegates gathered here, those old councils were councils of “my Church”. Our purpose was not identical with theirs but our task, too, was to convoke all sections of Christendom that each might mani-

fest itself to all. Such was the dignity, importance, magnitude and burden of the task that the situation in 1916 was not unworthy to be compared with that in 451. Then, after laying before the Conference the scheme of the Episcopal Commission for convoking the World Conference and preparing the material for its consideration, which, as he said, viewed the whole Christian world as the constituent body to make the preparation and had provided for those who should come after an equal place with those first enlisted, Mr. Zabriskie turned to his Commission's second paper which undertook to suggest an answer to the question. What are we in America to do now? All felt, he said, that they ought to be at work. The proposed Preparation Committee was to provide work that should both satisfy impatience and employ opportunity, while guarding against the possibility of future embarrassments.

With a prayer by Dr. Mann for courage, wisdom and humility in the future consideration of these vital matters, the morning session closed.

The session of Wednesday afternoon was opened with devotions led by Dr. de Schweinitz, who noted how the Moravians had never been willing to surrender the ideal of unity. They had laboured for it long ago in Poland and with Zinzendorf in Pennsylvania in the eighteenth century. Bishop Greer, in introducing the Moderator for the session, Dr. Rhoades, said felicitously that he was a "blind leader" for he had broken his glasses, but he felt he did not need them now. The expression of their views was to be free and frank, not controversial, with prejudice to none, with charity for all.

Dr. Rhoades called the Conference at once to business and, when Secretary Gardiner had read a telegram of greeting and sympathy from the Ministers' Association of Atlanta, Mr. Zabriskie spoke further in support and explanation of the proposed Council of the Commissions of participating communions to arrange for the World Conference. Some such arrangement was, he said, necessary on practical grounds. The present Advisory Committee was too large for frequent meetings. There should be some small body of peculiarly qualified men to make the preliminary arrangements. So a Board of Advisers had been proposed to do the serious work of preparing matters for discussion, with large discretionary power in matters of administrative detail.

After some discussion, it was determined first to consider generally the whole matter of the papers and of a series of resolutions submitted by Dr. Hall, for which he afterward substituted a resolution "that no action taken by this conference should be considered as in any way limiting the power of the Council of Commissions, when it is appointed, to arrange for and conduct the proposed World Conference". In the course of this discussion, which was very informal and sometimes almost conversational, a very interesting parallel was drawn by Dr. Smyth between the proposals read by Mr. Zabriskie and those made in 1647 by John Durie in his protracted efforts to bring about peace among the Evangelical Churches of England and the Continent. Dr. Hall, in support of his resolutions urged the expediency of emphasizing the liberty of the Council that the cooperation of communions, as yet unenlisted, might be facilitated. The door should be left wide open, he said, and the hesitating should be assured that nothing would be done prematurely. Let there be a campaign of mutual education and no speedy final action. The main thing now was to deepen interest. The war was a test of their patience.

When the general discussion had proceeded as long as was well, Bishop Vincent, asking the Moderator for the state of business, moved to consider first the Episcopal proposals, then the Congregational and the resolutions and to refer all with the suggestions of the Conference to the Business Committee for harmonizing, adjustment and final report back to the Conference for action. In the course of a discussion of this proposal, Bishop Greer explained that the several papers were in part supplemental but not wholly. He thought it better, therefore, to consider all together somewhat further. Dr. McKibbin said Mr. Zabriskie's papers were commended to him because they came from the Episcopal Commission, which had seemed to him led by the Spirit of God in this whole matter. Finally, Judge Shields, deprecating desultory discussion, said that, as Dr. Smyth's paper dealt with what the Conference would do when it should meet and Mr. Zabriskie's with preparation for it, the latter had better be considered first. The previous action was then reconsidered and Mr. Zabriskie's first paper taken up in detail.

Regarding its first paragraph, Bishop Anderson raised the question whether, if some Church should decline to appoint a

commission, it would under this plan be possible to give recognition to representative individuals from that Church. To this, Mr. Zabriskie replied that nothing limited the freedom of the convening committee and that the matter would rest ultimately with the world Conference itself. They would not be excluded by this plan. The provision that each communion should have an additional delegate in the Council for each half-million communicants was criticised by Bishop Vincent, who thought 100,000 a better limit. Dr. Hall and others thought it unwise to lower the number and Mr. Zabriskie said that, in view of the size of some of the, as yet, not participating communions, the unit of representation might better be raised than lowered lest the Council be unwieldy. Bishop Vincent's proposal was not favoured. It had been proposed that the Council be formed "as soon as convenient". These words were by general consent omitted.

The second paragraph of the plan proposed that the convener of the Council should be the delegate or, if there were more than one, the senior delegate of the Episcopal Commission. Bishop Weller thought the provision might ultimately be found inconvenient and that it would be better to leave the matter to the discretion of the Council. Mr. Stetson met the difficulty by suggesting the addition, "unless otherwise ordered by the Episcopal Commission", and took the occasion to express his deep appreciation of the attitude of the Conference in regard to the part taken hitherto by the Episcopal Church in promoting the World Conference idea. Both Dr. Calkins and Dr. Roberts thought the official responsibility to convene the Council or allow others to do so ought to be vested in the Episcopal Commission and Mr. Stetson's amendment was adopted.

It had been proposed that members might "attend meetings and vote by proxy". This occasioned much discussion. Mr. Mott thought following the line of least resistance would weaken the Council. He would prefer a provision for alternate delegates. Mr. Zabriskie said that only by provision for proxies could the representation of distant commissions be secured. Dr. Hall, too, thought the proxies must be retained since the ecumenical character of the Council obviously depended on them. Mr. Mott suggested that proxies might be allowed for Churches outside North America. Others thought a cumulation of proxies in a

single person might prove a danger. Mr. Stetson said it would be better to make no fixed rule now, but to leave the matter to the Council to determine from time to time the method of proxy representation. To this, it was objected that each Commission ought to have the right to determine this for itself. Gen. Prime thought the proxy might be not for the individual but for the body. Dr. Roberts urged that there should be no aggregation of proxies that would reduce attendance. He would provide that proxies must not be members of the Council. Mr. Stetson accepted this addition and his amendment was then adopted.

The provision that the Council should "organize, appoint officers", *etc.*, was changed to "organize, elect and appoint". In the third paragraph, another, "as soon as convenient", was omitted. The fourth paragraph provided for a Board of Advisers. The name was thought unfortunate in view of the existing Advisory Committee but the matter was, after discussion, left to the discretion of the Business Committee. To this Board, the propositions, formulated by the several commissions, were to be referred according to the plan and the Board, it continued, "shall then deduce from them the points that appear to be held substantially in common and those which appear to be regarded as grounds for separate organization". Were these propositions, asked Dr. Herring, to be the Board's sole source of information? Would it not be better, said Dr. Calkins, to say "shall the formulate" instead of "shall deduce from them"? Mr. Zabriskie thought the limitation wise. Mr. Stetson preferred "deduce" to "deduce from them". Dr. Manning would prefer "collate" or "tabulate" to "formulate" in Dr. Calkins' amendment, which he then withdrew and the whole matter was turned over to the Business Committee.

The time set for adjournment had come, but the Conference was in the mood for work and extended its session a full hour in the hope—vain as it proved—that it might complete its consideration of this report at that session. In the sixth paragraph, it had been provided that questions stated by the Board, on invitation of the Council, for the consideration of the Conference "shall be referred to the several Commissions, Committees or other official representatives for criticism". Dr. Roberts thought this failed to vest proper authority in the Board, which should itself be authorized to appoint a committee to prepare questions

for the Conference. Bishop Weller thought this would curtail the power of the Council, which might ask the Board to do so if it pleased. Mr. Zabriskie thought Dr. Roberts' objection could be met by simply striking out the words under discussion. The Council should certainly be the final authority. The omission was made. In the seventh paragraph, in place of "invitations to the Conference", there was substituted "The call and other communications as to the Conference".

Representation in the Conference was, according to the eighth paragraph, to be limited "in like proportion" to that in the Council. This occasioned much discussion. Why not leave it to the Churches? asked Dr. Roberts, and Dr. Manning agreed with him, since this was not a legislative gathering. Dr. Herring thought the same maximum of representation not suited to Council and Conference. Dr. McMichael favoured proportionate representation, but thought some limit was necessary. Dr. McKibbin agreed with him. It was finally resolved, on motion of Dr. Herring amended by Dr. de Schweinitz, that the Business Committee be asked to arrange that flexible and ample representation be provided on a basis to be determined by the Council at the time of the issuing the call. The plan said "allied communions" might appoint common deputies. What were "allied communions"? asked Dr. Roberts. They were generic groups, said Mr. Zabriskie. Dr. Roberts thought this was getting perilously away from the basis on which they had been working. If he might judge from Presbyterian experience, they had better say nothing about "allied communions". Dr. Manning seconding his motion, the offending clause was omitted.

Paragraph nine was stricken out bodily on motion of Dr. Talbot Rogers. It provided that "where a Communion is established by law, as the State Church in any country, the head of the State shall be invited to send one or two personal representatives to the Conference, in addition to those who shall be appointed by the ecclesiastical authority of the Church". Bishop Anderson, Dr. Hall, Dr. Good and some others thought the Provision calculated to prevent prejudice and, possibly, to secure participation that might not otherwise be had. On the other side, Dr. Herring thought it might well be left to the foreign communions themselves to provide personal representation for the sovereign, if they desired. Mr. Baldwin thought the paragraph conceded too much

of Faith and order to the State and Dr. Roberts recalled that the King of England was head both of the Church of England and of the Church of Scotland. Finally, Bishop Anderson asked why it was necessary to raise the question at all, and no one seemed able to tell.

In paragraph eleven, it was provided that the questions formulated for the Conference "shall there be discussed with a view to ascertain whether the doctrines of Faith and Order, which they severally embody, stand in the way of an organic union". On this, there arose a long and animated debate, some wishing to omit the paragraph altogether as limiting the liberty of the Conference, others wishing, with Mr. Zabriskie, to keep it, to show what the Conference was for, while still others thought the world was waiting for this article more than for any other. The session came to an end with the discussion still pending.

The session of Wednesday evening was opened with devotions led by Dr. Cecil who, in a little address, said that very probably the Apostles had sometimes grown impatient and yet they had remained together praying until the Spirit had come with power to help them to bear their witness to Christ. That Spirit was still with us and only by His power had anything yet been accomplished or would hereafter be. Dr. Manhart, in introducing Dr. Mott as Moderator of the session, said the Lutherans had always held to a consciousness of the unity of the Church. There was nothing new in the Augsburg Confession and all the Councils were "ours", so far as they were in harmony with Scripture. Lutheran services embodied ancient piety; Lutherans sang the old hymns, revered the old saints. The Churches of today had many notes of the Universal Church, but they did not manifest the unity it ought to show in Faith of Order. To attain this, was the great need of today and it was a divine commission.

Dr. Mott said that, holding this Catholic vision in mind, the Conference should get promptly to work. It was agreed, in compliance with the suggestion of the Business Committee, to complete at this session, if possible, the consideration of the plans and pertinent resolutions and to commit them to the Business Committee, which should report them back for final action on Thursday. The discussion of paragraph eleven was

then resumed. Dr. Erdman proposed, in place of "the Conference shall discuss", etc., to say "the Council shall suggest, for the consideration of the Conference, such measures as shall seem best to promote organic union". This was opposed by Dr. Hall for it implied, he said, that the Conference was to be on unity while it was to be on Faith and Order. It was pointed out by Dr. Black that, whatever was done with this paragraph, its place, logically, was after the invitation to the Board of Advisers to state questions for the Conference, the subject of paragraph six. Dr. Cecil would have it omitted altogether, as being a direction to the World Conference, which was out of place. Dr. Roberts agreed with Dr. Hall and objected, especially, to the words, "organic union". Further objection to Dr. Erdman's amendment was made by Dr. Rogers and Mr. Zabriskie, on grounds akin to Dr. Hall's. The Conference was to be preliminary. Its task was to discern the obstacles to community in Faith and Order and to determine their character.

Mr. Zabriskie, however, would willingly join Dr. Roberts to substitute "unity" for "organic union". Dr. Manning and Mr. Stetson also opposed the amendment. The strength of the movement, said Dr. Manning, was in its modesty and restraint and simplicity, as well as in its greatness. The World Conference was conceived only as a first step. If through it difficulties were removed or lessened, it might be left to the several communions to arrange for union and communion. At length, after some further discussion, Dr. Hall proposed, as a substitute for Dr. Erdman's amendment, to say that, in the Conference, questions should be discussed with a view to "bringing about the most effectual mutual understanding of the existing agreements and differences between Christian communions concerning questions of Faith and Order". This met with the approval of Dr. Manning and of Dr. Rogers but, after much somewhat wandering discussion, brought at last to order by Mr. Stetson's parliamentary experience, did not prevail. The substitution of "unity" for "organic union" was earnestly advocated by Dr. McKibben and Mr. Jessup. It was, they said, the key-note and text of the whole movement, the objective point toward which they were working. Mr. Jessup thought discretion might well be left to the Council to say what the

programme of the Conference should be. Dr. Roberts, too, objected to the direction implied in "shall be discussed". But Dr. Hall said that they ought now to make clear the purpose of the movement to quicken and direct education and growth in unity. Finally, after further explanation by Mr. Zabriskie, at his suggestion "The unity" was substituted for "an organic union", Dr. Cecil's amendment was withdrawn and the paragraph adopted as an extension of paragraph six. The last paragraph occasioned no discussion and the whole was then tentatively adopted and referred to the Business Committee.

The second paper, presented by Mr. Zabriskie for the Episcopal Commission, proposed a committee of five, representing the North American Commissions, who should appoint a Preparation Committee of theologians, canonists and other scholars, who should study the doctrinal standards of the North American participating communions, compile a bibliography of the subject, prepare a digest of differences and agreements, enlist cooperation and report the result of their labours, with their suggestions, to the Advisory Committee, at whose disposal should be placed all material collected by the Preparation Committee.

In opening the discussion of this second plan, Dr. Roberts said he would prefer to say "persons" rather than "scholars". To this there was no objection. Mr. Bailey asked if the preparation Committee's work was not already provided for in the Council of Advisers. Mr. Zabriskie thought not, but that it would help the present world organization in its preliminary work. Dr. Smyth emphasized the correlation of all the three papers and told how they had been prepared simultaneously in consultation. There was no discrepancy or inconsistency among them. Dr. Main still feared that they might be losing an ecumenical vision. Mr. Zabriskie said that, rather, they were preparing for that vision. The foreign committees had urged America to begin to blaze the way. Mr. Gardiner said that, in taking this action, we should be following rather than taking the lead, for just such preliminary work had been already initiated in England and was contemplated in India and Australia. Bishop Hamilton noted that the Methodists managed similarly in preparing for their ecumenical conferences. Dr. Smyth said that obviously each country must organize its own work. The English were already before us. There was surely

no danger of haste. Quite the contrary. Judge Shields still thought the Preparation Committee superfluous in view of the Board of Advisers. But Dr. Smyth said no work would be duplicated. The larger committee, when it was formed, would find its material already prepared here as in other countries. Dr. Shields still demurred, but the plan was accepted without further change and committed to the Business Committee. Benediction by Bishop Vincent closed the session and the day.

The devotions of Thursday morning were led by Mr. Baldwin. Dr. James E. Walker, in introducing Dr. Calkins as Moderator, said that the one need of the day was supernatural religion and that they ought to begin to do what they had been praying might be done. Men would believe their practice sooner than their preaching. He paid high tribute to the work for unity of the Episcopal Church, but wished it could see its way to go, what seemed to him, further and join in the Federation movement.

At the beginning of the session, the Business Committee presented a resolution that the Episcopal Commission continue its initial responsibility. This was gladly voted. A recommendation that the name Advisory Committee be changed to "Co-operating Committee" was approved and the Business Committee was authorized to consider the continuance of the North American Conference.

Dr. Roberts then read an address on "The Open Door", remarking, in his dry way, that, for him, writing had proved the secret of brevity. There was today an open door, he said, for never had there been such a desire for larger fellowship. This desire had a secure doctrinal basis, the world had never been so in touch in all its parts, even the war was giving men a better appreciation of one another and there was an unparalleled advance in the evangelization of the world. The door was open to us because we had not denied Christ's name. Believers ought to move forward, for the open door was a sign of His will. All efforts to close the door would fail. To obedience, let them add brotherly love, and to brotherly love, patience and courage. Let them realize that they were part of a divine plan, co-workers with God, rejoicing together in the Lord. As yet, they could see the plan but dimly, but they believed that one day the Church would be one on earth as it was in Heaven. This

was their hour of opportunity. Let them enter through the door, knowing that, whatever their limitations, God's will would prevail.

After a resolution on world peace by the open door had been referred to the Business Committee, which did not report on it, the Conference considered the paper presented by Dr. Smyth, which had two parts, the former, a declaration of the basis of the proposed Conference and the conviction of the "essential and indestructible wholeness of the one Church" to which the invitation appealed as "the call of Christ's love for a whole Church to save a whole world", a call to each communion to think and act in the terms of the whole that, through each determining its relations to the whole, all might determine their relations to one another. The second part dealt with the work to be undertaken by this preliminary conference, which was, the paper said, to be initiative and preparatory, not determinative for other communions or final. Dr. Smyth, speaking in behalf of the paper, said its purpose was to let the people know what God had already wrought and was preparing in this matter. Pastors realized that, if they would accomplish anything, they must keep in touch with their people. Without this, they could not hope to realize the possibilities of a super-national Christianity that lay in the present political situation. Till now, since the first noble invitation of the Episcopal Commission, there had been hardly a word that would authorize them to take an official stand and say what was in their minds and hearts. This declaration was meant to supply that want, to declare the method, the policy, the order of topics that they had in mind for the World Conference. Reading this, men would say: They have the manliness to face problems and find the answers, if they can. None were more eager for unity than the Congregational Council. Schisms had been due to the accidents of history; the cure was from the essentials of Christianity. Their conviction of mutual sincerity was deeper than any public declaration. But they must now have some official declaration of purpose, if they were to go forward, or the public would misunderstand them as it had already misunderstood. Already, more than once, Dr. Manning and himself, in their conversations with others, had found themselves compelled to be "rivals in the art of dexterous ambiguity" and

had felt the need of some such declaration as this. Much would depend on the ordre in which matters were considered by the Conference. He had seen how, in clearing away brushwood, so long as one took hold of the small branches, one did but create new entanglements. If the branch were taken by the big end, a child could carry it away. They must try to get hold of their problems by the big end and treat them in wisdom and manliness in a large way.

Dr. Smyth's words moved the Conference to unwonted applause, but not for that did the delegates lay aside the purpose of careful and systematic examination of his proposals. Bishop Anderson, in extending his enthusiastic and cordial support, said that these statements and some put forth by his own communion, when set side by side, gave admirable illustration of the value of conference and of trying to think in terms of the whole. He found it dignified, worthy, acceptable and progressive. Dr. Hall said that he had felt at first that the paper opened out courses of action which would be premature at this stage but, in view of the omission of certain portions, he now felt that the Congregational proposals did not go an iota beyond the Episcopal. Dr. Manning believed they were all substantially of one mind and found it most admonitional of hope that such a paper could be so received. Bishop Hamilton showed himself profoundly moved. This was, he said, an ecumenical hour such as had not been since Wesley had left the Church of England. Here, at last, was promise of a return in which they could be one again. Where two such extremes had met, surely they had been led by the Spirit of God. Never had he known before such testimony of sincerity, in men of extreme positions, in seeking to build a common platform.

Dr. Roberts, temperamentally judicial, took exception to a single word in the Declaration. It had spoken of "the sin of continued schism". He would substitute "fact" for "sin". Dr. Smyth said the sin he had had in mind was not "original", and readily accepted the suggestion. Dr. Roberts said the Business Committee would coordinate the papers and thought the Declaration should be issued as soon as possible, that they might go forward with united front. Dr. McKibbin thought Dr. Smyth's paper had better be referred to the Business Committee, without approval, for the clarification of its phraseology,

but, at the request of Mr. Jessup, withdrew his opposition on the assurance of Dr. Roberts that the reference would be for revision and coordination, while the Episcopal Commission, with the Advisory Committee, would have editorial discretion with regard to the Declaration. Dr. Rhoades was still disposed to demur. There might be ambiguous statements. Mr. Baldwin questioned the phrase, "American obligation for international Christianity". He would rather say "for the Christian Church" and would substitute "one communion" for "complete inter-communion".

These discussions of phraseology were given new direction by a few heavily weighted words of Bishop Anderson. The danger adverted to by Dr. McKibbin and again by Dr. Rhoades was, he said, very real. He had himself delivered identically the same address to ministers of other communions and, later, to his own clergy and both had thought it an adequate statement. Was he gratified? No, but rather profoundly troubled. It had shown him that some familiar words and phrases did not mean the same thing to all. This was a real difficulty in their problem and would long continue to be. He knew it, and yet he favoured the adoption of the Declaration.

Dr. Hall said they could not hope, then and there, to amend the phraseology of the paper to common satisfaction. As it stood, it was at least not inconsistent with what any of them would like to say. Then, after the situation had been succinctly stated by the Moderator, the paper, with Dr. Hall's substituted resolution, was referred to the Business Committee. Dr. Hall, in support of his proposed addition, said some such assurance would be needed to enlist the cooperation of Roman Catholics and others, among them the conservative Episcopalians. A resolution, offered by Dr. Roberts, to record the high appreciation by the Conference of the work of the Secretary, Mr. Gardiner, was passed by a rising vote and the session adjourned.

UNANIMOUS CONCLUSIONS. The rest is soon told. Hearts and minds had been so enlarged in the atmosphere of the Conference that no room was left for jealous fears or counsels of timidity. At no time had the devotions seemed to sink so deep or rise so high as now in the intense earnestness and absolute sincerity of the petitions for wisdom and for courage.

Professor Williston Walker was the leader. Professor Jones, in introducing Dr. Singmaster, the Moderator for the closing session, in the little story that he told of the stranded derelict that had resisted every effort of the great tugs, but had yielded to the lifting power of the tide, put in prosaic but not inapt simile what was in the thought of many. The Friends were, he said, small in numbers but strong in their faith in the power of the Spirit. He hoped that they might, in Quaker phrase, "be favoured" to put themselves in the sweep of the tide that the Spirit of God in its flow, might carry them to the completion of their task.

Under Dr. Singmaster's leadership, the Conference got quickly to work. A resolution to publish the Declaration was referred to the Business Committee with power, and that Committee's main report, embodying in five sections the three papers and Dr. Hall's resolution, to the satisfaction of all was adopted, section by section, unanimously and without discussion, even where wholly new phrasing had been introduced, as when, in the former paragraph eleven, now nine, of the World Conference plan, the much discussed passage about the questions to be formulated for the Conference was changed so as to define their purpose to be to arrive at "an effectual mutual understanding of existing agreements and differences of Christian Communions concerning questions of Faith and Order, as the next step toward unity", a phrasing which, with admirable exclusiveness, met the wishes of each and yet of all.

These plans, as adopted, are to be transmitted to each of the Commissions and Committees, who are to send their responses to the Cooperation Committee.

The Moderator then congratulated the Conference and the Business Committee, whose part in the success of the meeting all felt had been very great, and suggested that they should not separate without prayer and praise. The Conference then formally adjourned, subject to the call of the Cooperation Committee.

Dr. Singmaster had suggested that they sing "Blest be the tie", when Bishop Vincent interrupted to ask if they might not first read, in responsive couplets, the wonderfully apt hymn by Francis Ridley Havergall, "From glory unto glory, be this our joyful song". When this had been said with great feeling,

they sang the old hymn of Christian fellowship. Those words, "Our fears, our hopes, our aims are one; our comforts and our cares", seemed fraught that day with new meaning and, with a blessing invoked by Bishop Vincent, they parted.

DECLARATION¹⁾. Five years ago, the plan of a World Conference of Christian Churches was first proposed. We did not dream then that nation was about to rise against nation and that there would be the present great tribulation, such as hath not been from the beginning of the world until now. The catastrophe, which has fallen upon modern civilization, may be hastening the time for a united Church to come forth as one power and with one obedience to make the rule of Christianity the law of the nations.

For this end, we may devoutly trust that beyond all foresight of men a higher leading may prove to have been in the call for a gathering of representatives of Christian Churches of every name and from all lands as the next step towards unity. Its appointed hour shall come when the war shall have burnt itself out. In the new age, born of the travail of the nations shall be found the new occasion for the Christian reconstruction of society. The vastness of the opportunity is the measure of the obligation of the Church of Christ. It is now the bounden duty of organized Christianity, in repentance for its sins and with an entire devotion, to make ready the way of the Lord. For the American Churches this supreme obligation begins at home. To do our full part we must study seriously, as we never have done before, the things that make for peace. In the profound humility of the highest and hence broadest vision of the Church of God and its world-wide mission in this generation, as representatives of our respective communions we would here renew our mutual assurances of co-operation in promoting the ends of the World Conference, and declare our earnest expectation that through the way of conference, which we have entered, we may be led to know what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God for His Church throughout the world.

SPIRITUAL BASIS OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE.

I. The basis of the proposed World Conference is the faith

¹⁾ Deutsche Übersetzung vgl. Heft III, S. 343 ff.

of the whole Church, as created by Christ, resting on the Incarnation and continued from age to age by His indwelling Life until He comes.

II. The invitation of the World Conference appeals directly to the Christian conviction of the essential and indestructible wholeness of the one church of God throughout the world. "I am the vine, ye are the branches", said the Lord to His disciples. "Christ's Body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all", said the Apostle to the Gentiles. "Fellowship with us in the life that was manifested", declared St. John. This primitive Christian consciousness of the oneness of the Church found expression in the earliest use of the word Catholic: "Wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church" said Ignatius at the beginning of the first century after Christ. This abiding consciousness of the oneness of the Church was confessed in the creed of the ancient Catholic Church. It remains alike in the faith of the Eastern Church and the Roman Church. Notwithstanding the controversies of the period of the Reformation, these great words are ever repeated throughout the confessions and declarations of faith of the different communions "One holy universal Church, the communion and assembly of all the saints.... the unity of the Catholic Church"¹⁾; "One catholic or universal Church"²⁾; "Which Kirk is catholic, that is, universal"³⁾; "The catholic or universal Church"⁴⁾; "One Church in the world"⁵⁾; "The holy universal Christian Church"⁶⁾; "The visible Catholic Church of Christ"⁷⁾; "We believe in the holy catholic Church"⁸⁾; "Also they believe and teach that one Holy Church is to continue for ever"⁹⁾.

III. The call of the Spirit of Christianity for a World Conference at this epochal hour is given in our Lord's new com-

¹⁾ First Helvetic Conf. (1536).

²⁾ Belgic Conf. (1561).

³⁾ Scotch Conf. (1560).

⁴⁾ Westminster Conf. (1647), also Conf. of the English Baptists (1677).

⁵⁾ Conf. of the Waldenses (1655).

⁶⁾ Easter Litany of the Moravian Church (1749).

⁷⁾ Savoy Declaration, Cong. (1658).

⁸⁾ Declaration of the National Cong. Council (1871).

⁹⁾ Augsburg Conf. (1530). The Methodist definition of the Church is the same as that of the Church of England. Similar citations might be added from the various catechisms and other minor or repeated declarations of faith.

mandment of love; it is the call of Christ's love for a whole Church to carry salvation to the whole world.

IV. The Method of Conference. It is simple as it is most Christian. It is for each communion to think and to act in terms of the whole. It is positive; for in and through our relation to the whole Church may we rightly and finally determine our relations to one another. It is negative only in so far as it protests against the fact of continued schism.

THE PLACE AND FUNCTION OF THE NORTH AMERICAN PREPARATORY CONFERENCE. This work is initiative and preparatory, but not final or determinative for the North American Preparatory Conference or other Conferences. No action taken by this Conference should be construed as in any way limiting the power of the Council of Commissions, when it is appointed, to arrange for and conduct the proposed World Conference.

THE PREPARATION FOR THE WORLD CONFERENCE.

The measures which require determination and the means to be adopted for the ends desired may be summarized as follows:

1. The Preparation of the Subject Matter for the World Conference.

We have to consider what we may do to secure the contributions to it from all the communions participating in the World Conference. It will comprise statements of the general agreements and chief divisive differences, the reconciling principles and all possible working plans and approximations towards unity.

In general, the larger questions for conference in them are related to these subjects:

I. The Church, its nature and functions.

II. The Catholic Creeds, as the safeguard of the Faith of the Church.

III. Grace and the Sacraments in general.

IV. The Ministry, its nature and functions.

V. Practical questions connected with the missionary and other administrative functions of the Church.

We are not prepared to discuss these problems until diligent search shall have been made in all directions for the

ways and means of reconciliation. Not to set our most competent men at this work together would be for us to be found wanting in the church statesmanship which existing conditions require. For the World Conference to meet without such preparation might be for it to end in confusion of tongues. It is desirable that some initiative in this direction should no longer be delayed.

NORTH AMERICAN PREPARATION COMMITTEE. The members resident in North America of the Co-operating Committee, in conjunction with the Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church, shall appoint

I. A committee of five or more of its members who shall appoint as soon as possible a Preparation Committee of theologians, canonists and other persons, who need not be members of the Co-operating Committee. The Preparation Committee shall be deemed a sub-committee of the Co-operating Committee. Vacancies may be filled and additional members may be appointed by the Chairman of the Co-operating Committee on the recommendation of the Preparation Committee.

II. It shall be the duty of the Preparation Committee to secure from each of the Commissions in North America the following data:

(1) a formulation of questions touching Faith and Order, in accordance with the provisions of Section 3 of the General Plan, which reads as follows:

3. Each Commission, Committee or other official representative shall proceed, with such expert assistance as it may think fit, to formulate the propositions of Faith and Order which it considers to be

(a) held in common by its own Communion and the rest of Christendom, and

(b) held by its own Communion as its special trust, and the ground upon which it stands apart from other Communion.

Two or more Commissions, Committees or other official representatives may unite in formulating propositions.

(2) to compile with respect to each Communion a bibliography of works of recognized value tending to expound its teachings;

(3) to prepare a report exhibiting the agreements and the differences between the several Communion;

(4) to enlist the co-operation of each Commission;

(5) to report to the Co-operating Committee, from time to time.

III. The Preparation Committee shall be at liberty to suggest such topics, propositions or questions touching Faith and Order as, in the light of its studies it may think suitable for consideration by the World Conference.

IV. The material collected by the Preparation Committee shall be at the disposal of the Council of Commissions whenever it shall be organized.

The Preparation Committee may also appoint such committees as it may deem advisable.

V. The Preparation Committee may promote conferences of representative men of different Communion in the interests of the World Conference.

VI. The Preparation Committee may appoint a publication committee.

VII. The Preparation Committee shall convene meetings of the North American Preparatory Conference whenever it shall deem it expedient.

The North American Conference meeting at Garden City, January 4-6, 1916, adopts the following plan of procedure in preparation for the World Conference on Faith and Order.

1. A Council of the Commissions or Committees or other official representatives of the participating Communion shall be formed.

Each Commission or Committee or other authority shall be entitled to appoint one delegate, and, in the first instance or from time to time, to appoint one additional delegate for each half million communicants of its own Communion, not to exceed fifty delegates in all: provided, that the common convenience be consulted by appointing no more delegates than are deemed necessary to adequate representation. Each Commission or Committee or other authority shall provide for filling vacancies in its own delegation.

2. The Convener of the Council shall be the delegate, or, if more than one delegate be appointed, the senior delegate of the Commission of the Episcopal Church in the United States,

unless otherwise ordered by that Commission. Whatever number of delegates respond to the call shall be competent for the transaction of business. The Council shall organize, elect officers and appoint committees, and adopt rules of procedure, as it shall think fit. Any Commission from time to time may appoint any person, not a member of the Council, to act in place of any representative of such Commission not able to attend any meeting or meetings.

Absolute unanimity shall not be necessary to the determinations of the Council; but, after the analogy of the ancient canons, it shall endeavour to act, so far as practicable, with substantial unanimity.

3. Each Commission, Committee or other official representative shall proceed, with such expert assistance as it may think fit, to formulate the propositions of Faith and Order which it considers to be

(a) held in common by its own Communion and the rest of Christendom, and

(b) held by its own Communion as its special trust, and the ground upon which it stands apart from other Communions.

Two or more Commissions, Committees or other official representatives may unite in formulating propositions.

4. The Council shall select a Board of Advisers. Care shall be taken that the several families of Christian Faith and Order be adequately and justly represented on the Board: not necessarily that one or more Advisers be chosen from each Communion of Christendom, but that one or more shall be chosen from at least each of the general groups into which Christendom is divided.

The propositions of Faith and Order, formulated by the several Commissions, Committees or other official representatives, shall be referred to the Board of Advisers, who shall deduce the points that appear to be held substantially in common and those which appear to be regarded as grounds for separate organization. The Council may also appoint such other Committees as it may deem advisable.

5. As each successive Communion associates itself with the movement for a World Conference, its Commission or Committee or other official representatives shall proceed to formulate its own propositions. The Council (which from time to time

will be augmented by the addition of representatives of other Communion as they come in) will increase the number of members of the Board of Advisers as circumstances require; and this Board shall continue to co-ordinate the propositions of the several Communion as they are received.

6. Whenever the Council shall deem it opportune, the Board of Advisers shall be invited to state questions of Faith and Order for the consideration of the World Conference. Upon their reports the questions shall be formulated by the Council, subject to revision and amendment by its authority as circumstances shall require.

7. The Council shall have power to designate the time and place for holding the Conference and to make the necessary arrangements. The Call of the Conference and other communications, relative to it, shall be issued to the participating Communion by the Council, or under its authorization.

8. Each participating Communion shall appoint its own deputies to the Conference in its own way. The basis of representation in the Conference shall be determined by the Council at the time of the call thereof.

9. The questions formulated for the consideration of the Conference shall there be discussed with a view of bringing about an effectual mutual understanding of existing agreement and differences between Christian Communion concerning questions of Faith and Order, as the next step towards unity.

10. Amendments to this plan may be proposed to the Council by any Commission or Committee or other official representative; and if approved by the Council either in the form proposed or with variations they shall take effect and the plan shall thereupon be amended accordingly.

The North American Preparatory Conference directs the Secretary to transmit the above plan to the several Commissions, Committees or other official representatives of the several Communion, either already or hereafter appointed, with the request that they take such action as is provided for in the plan. All communications from the several Commissions, Committees or other official representatives shall then be transmitted by the Secretary to the Co-operating Committee until the Council is fully organized.

Benjamin W. WELLS, Ph. D.
