

AC901

P3

no. 1232

C.2

— 2 —

people were using their real names. In any case, no one could reasonably expect that, if I noticed it at all, I should do more than make a brief remark or two supplementary to what was contained in my two pamphlets—which is just what I did.

Now let us see what the crushing arguments were that I evaded. In the conclusion of my first pamphlet I had said that the priesthoods of the world—I spoke generally, and had in view, as any one might see, their collective work—were engaged in “putting back men’s thoughts,” so that all that was credible to our forefathers might remain credible to us. How did “Vindex” meet this statement? Strictly speaking he did not meet it at all; and had I chosen to charge him with evasion at this point, I should have had good reason for doing so. He abstained from any expression of opinion as to what the “priesthoods” were doing, but told us what “the mass of intelligent, thoughtful, reading Christians” were doing—a thing that was no way in question. I had confined my remark to “priesthoods” purposely; because I wished to signify a class of men who are bound by creeds, and whose special business it is to see that the beliefs of the past do not lose their hold on the men of the present. There was nothing in my original statement about priesthoods on the one hand, and the representatives of “modern thought” on the other, which excluded the existence of a middle class. On the contrary, the very conditions of the case manifestly required that there should be such a class, for it would be nothing short of a miracle—and I don’t believe much in miracles—to find the world divided between extreme conservatism and the most advanced liberalism.

What I had to deal with, therefore, was in reality “Vindex’s” evasion of my statement that—to put it briefly—the priesthoods were reactionary. He apparently claimed a progressive character for himself, and I therefore observed that, if it was distinctly understood that any progress which he hoped to achieve was “within the limits of the Westminster Confession, the force of my (original) remark would not be much impaired.” And so I say now; and I say further, that when an honest man *means* progress within