

case. A blockade of a coast is never respected so long as it remains a paper blockade. Unless war vessels are stationed along the coast, no one pays any attention to it. So with a proclamation of missionary occupation. The district must be actually occupied, not merely at one point, or even three or four points, but practically throughout. That is, every man in the district ought to be able to reach a gospel messenger without walking more than ten miles. If there is a place twenty, thirty, or perhaps fifty or sixty miles from the mission station, which does not receive a visit from a gospel messenger more than once a year, it ought to be considered open to any one who can actually give the gospel to the people.

6. This policy annoys and harasses men who love unity and concord, and seek peace and pursue it, and yet who are constantly put in the wrong by accusations of interference with the work of others. A single instance will illustrate this point. Less than ten years ago, an agent of a new society came to India, and wrote to me asking advice about the selection of a field for his mission. He was particular in saying that he wanted a field in which there was no missionary. He was full of the traditional idea of not building upon other men's foundations, and anxious to go where Christ had not been named. I had some correspondence with him, and this wish seemed uppermost in his mind all the time. After a year's delay, he at last fixed upon a district in a remote part of India, containing a million of people, and without any Christian agency of any kind within its borders. He took his family and removed to the field of his choice, but had hardly crossed the border line before he was warned off by a missionary from a distance, who assured him that his society had pre-empted the field in question, and in due time intended to occupy it. The new missionary had his eyes opened, and began to view the policy of non-interference in a new light. All over India instances of this kind can be found. Men who are loving Christians, who love peace and hate discord, who love all Christ's servants and would delight to live in peace with all men, are made to appear transgressors, and the complaints alleged against them are often made by parties who themselves decline to recognize the very rule to which they appeal.

7. This rule ignores the fact that within a given field there may be different races, or castes, or languages,

and that one society may not be able, or may not choose, to do all the work to be done. For instance, Santhals and Bengali people may live side by side. One missionary may wish to work for the one people, and another for the other. If the society in occupancy will do all the work well and good; let no one interfere with its agents. But if a tribe or a caste, or a separate people of any kind, are wholly neglected, outside people should certainly be permitted to come to these neglected people with the gospel. This is a practical question at the present time. Some are giving their exclusive attention to the aboriginal tribes, some are working among low caste people, while others avoid the lowest castes altogether; and in the nature of the case, vast multitudes of people in India must be overlooked, if this rule is rigidly enforced, or if it is applied as many missionaries in the country interpret.

8. The rule ignores the freedom of converts. As generally interpreted, it assumes that all natives who become Christians within a given area, shall be assigned to the missionary working within the area in question. It is taken for granted that the converts will do as they are told, but as a matter of fact they are by no means always willing to obey such directions. Any one who has observed the course of events in other countries ought to be wiser than to expect that such a policy could be enforced in a country like India. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, sincere converts will wish to follow those who first bring them to Christ, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred they will do better under the care of these persons than under any others. It is said, I know, that Mr. Moody sends his converts to all the churches represented in his meetings, but Mr. Moody would not, and certainly could not, send his converts to churches out of sympathy with himself. He could not, for instance, send them to parties who would teach them as their first lesson, that what Mr. Moody considered conversion was a delusion, and yet, if he were a missionary in India, and tried to apply his evangelistic policy, he would meet with this very difficulty. Again I must beg to protest that I am not drawing upon my imagination. Less than twenty years ago I knew a Scotch minister, anxious to avoid every appearance of what he incorrectly called sectarianism, to send the names of forty converts of a union meeting to a clergyman in Bengal. Not the slightest notice was taken of the letter, and