

obey the laws of the State when these laws do not contravene the laws of Christ. In this last case they must disobey and suffer. If this attitude of the Church towards the State and their respective functions affords a refuge for iniquity, the Church may console itself with the fact that its Saviour and King placed himself in the same attitude even when moral issues were involved.

Q. 5. "In slavery times" Christians in the United States were divided in opinion as to the righteousness of negro slavery; though no Church, so far as I am aware, ever proposed to exclude from its communion any Christian simply because he maintained that such slavery was essentially wicked. This division of opinion was undoubtedly a factor in bringing on the war between the States. It was not by any means the only factor. If our Brother Moomaw thinks so, I venture to suggest to him to read a little book by Albert Taylor Bledsoe, entitled "Is Davis a Traitor?"

The answer to the statements in the first part of Q. 6 must needs be one of opinion about which I have no zeal to contend. But I frankly admit that the total silence of the Church respecting any great moral question would be a very great evil; among other reasons, because, in such a case, it would fail to exercise the authority given it by its King. This last remark serves as an answer to Q. 7. But our brother and all other Christians should understand that the maintenance of the crown rights of Christ has brought, and henceforth will bring, physical evils to his faithful followers.

Q. 9. I fraternize with other Protestant denominations when it is agreed that common ground is to be occupied, but not otherwise. I know of a series of union services broken up, not at my instance, by a Church Session because one of the co-operating ministers attacked the deity of Christ and his vicarious death.

Q. 10. Such co-operation on common ground has nothing to do with the justification or condemnation of divisions in the Visible Church, on grounds which are not common and deemed important. Shall parents who believe that they are required by Christ to devote their infant children to him in baptism join and support a church which requires them to leave their children outside of the Visible Church?

Q. 11. The answer is an emphatic No. Does our King command us to be always preaching and teaching all the facts, doctrines and duties of his religion?

Q. 12. The phrase "without the war" renders the question somewhat obscure to me. I have never advocated the perpetuation among Christians in foreign lands of the Church divisions which obtain in the United States. But I assert that they have the same right to divide as we have, and that it is their duty to divide when any considerable proportion of them are persuaded that a united Church will insist upon invading the crown rights of Jesus Christ, and in maintaining a go-as-you-please society.

Q. 13. The answer to Q. 12 may appear "ridiculous to intelligent people over there." If so, it is because they have never considered what is involved in an invasion of Christ's crown rights. Dethrone our King, deprive him of his right to rule his own Church in his own way, and we can only say, with Mary Magdalene: "They have taken away my Lord and I know not where they have laid him."

Saint Louis, Mo.

Never strike sail to a fear—come into port gently, or sail with God the seas.—Emerson.

### REPRESENTATION IN THE ASSEMBLY.

By Rev. Jno. V. McCall.

A short time ago the writer called the Church's attention to the rather gross inequalities of the present Presbyterian representation in the Assembly and suggested the remedy therefor. Some exception was recently taken by our good friend Dr. Law, to minor things in the article. That article was written before the Assembly Minutes of 1916 appeared and hence it was based on the figures for 1915 and it had in addition this error that the author failed to notice that in estimates the number of ministers was to be added to the number of communicants reported by Presbytery. This latter item, however, would make a scarcely appreciable difference. The figures for 1916 and the application of the present method show quite as glaring inequalities as in 1915. To illustrate, Tuscaloosa has two representatives for an overplus of 21 members, Albemarle for 28 members, and Upper Missouri for 43, and the whole Assembly shows 30 Presbyteries would have 60 representatives who would stand for only 21,596 members, an average of 359, while the remaining 326,627 members have but 200 representatives, each one of these standing for 1,633 communicants. As our previous article stated, the United States Congress has given us the solution, in that in case of fractions, a majority fractional unit alone should entitle to additional representation. It was suggested at the time to a member of the Assembly's Ad Interim Committee that if 3,000 were made the unit with the fractional unit as over 1,500, the membership of the Assembly would remain about the same and the inequality spoken of here avoided. In some way this was overlooked. Certainly there is an inequality; for 21 members, or 28 members, or 43 members ought not to have the same representation that goes theoretically to 4,000, and actually on an average, to 3,266. "The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." Let us learn a lesson from the United States Congress.

### DE GUSTIBUS NON EST DISPUTANDUM.

By Layman.

If he will pardon the obtrusion of one of so much lower scale in the ecclesiastical world, this writer would like to say a few words by way of comment upon a recent communication from Rev. E. C. Gordon, D. D., appearing in the September 20th issue of the Presbyterian of the South, and especially upon the last sentence of the last paragraph of that communication, where its author concludes a long list of historical incidents relating to divisions among Christians, from the days of the Apostles down to the present time, with the statement that all this "abundantly" justifies the action of the Southern Presbyterian Church in maintaining itself as a separate denomination of Christians.

In all which, as it seems to this writer, Dr. Gordon has resorted to an extreme of special pleading to prove his case, for, in truth, this writer "has not so learned Christ."

Just what is the concensus of opinion on the subject in the Christian world I do not know, but that the would-be followers of the Prince of Peace should be divided into so many denominations, or schools of thought, and that there should be such a variety of views held as to what Christianity is, or means, as now obtains in civilized lands, has ever been considered a regrettable condition of affairs in every Christian and social circle in which this

writer has ever found himself, and it is with some degree of astonishment that I read the conclusion to which Dr. Gordon brings his labored article, continued through two issues of the paper, though its conclusion was manifest from the beginning, as he evidently does not like his position to be questioned, and is determined to maintain it.

But Dr. Gordon seems oblivious of the fact that there are thousands, aye millions of men, and women, too, who feel that they are just as capable of judging what is a correct estimate of Scripture, and what are the "Crown Rights" of Jesus as he is, and amongst them are members of "The Church of Latter Day Saints of Jesus Christ," Christian Scientists, Holy Rollers, and many other extremists who can quote abundance of Scripture texts to prove, not only the propriety, but the necessity for their existence as a means of maintaining pure Christianity in the world, which seems a "reductio ad absurdum," with which we hardly expected to find Dr. Gordon allying himself, even seemingly, in his effort to prove that the Southern Presbyterian Church, as a separate denomination, had its origin in anything else than the political differences between the two sections of this country.

It may be, after all, only a matter of "taste," hence the heading of this communication, to which Dr. Gordon may object, and it may all be just as he claims, viz: that Jesus Christ is thus working out the cleansing, and ultimate purification of his Church on earth, by dividing his followers into a multitude of societies, warring against each other. But somehow I cannot so understand it, and do not feel that the Apostle Paul so understood it, when he wrote the first eleven verses of the second chapter of the Epistle to the Phillipians, where he shows very plainly what he thought the "Crown Rights" of Jesus Christ, and the passage would be transcribed here but for a feeling that for those who are interested in this subject, and who are not familiar with the text, it would be better for them to get their Bibles and read the words in which the Great Apostle there laid down the foundation principles of Christian Unity, no matter what may have been the conduct of professing Christians since that time.

### A CORRECTION.

By Lila Ripley Barnwell.

In the Presbyterian of the South, issue of August 9th, there was a communication from "Layman," in which he states that the suffrage movement had its origin in infidelity. He altogether condemns the pioneers, as also the women of the present time who are striving for equal suffrage.

Having been an ardent worker for this cause for more than twenty years, I was amazed that such an unkind, unfair criticism should be made, and immediately took it upon myself to carefully investigate the statement.

As a matter of fact Susan B. Anthony and Lucretia Mott were Quakers, the Grimke sisters, Episcopalians, Julia Ward Howe and Rev. Olympia Brown, Congregationalists; Dr. Anna Shaw, a Methodist minister.

Almost without exception all of the pioneer women in the suffrage movement were truly devoted Christian women.

In my own experience of years I have never met a woman suffragist who was not.

It is true, as he says, that Mrs. Stanton did prepare a Woman's Bible in which the well-known quotations from St. Paul and several others were translated differently from the King James version.