

the story. The fact remains that we are once more settled on strictly denominational lines, with the most hopeful in doubt as to the utility of further experiment. Everything favored success. There was personal friendship among the leaders on both sides. There was past association in united work. There was harmony of tastes. There was a strong perception of the folly and wastefulness of present methods and the imperative need for union in the face of overwhelming unbelief. There were no strong inherited traditions and prejudices to be cast aside. There was general agreement in outline as to the terms of union. There was the repeated acceptance of the plan for union in its details by the strongest men, Japanese and American, on both sides. It did not seem possible that there should be a failure. But as the treaties have failed at the last moment through contingencies wholly unexpected, so was it with the union. And the history of the two failures have many striking points of resemblance. The union of Presbyterian and Reformed bodies is now complete. The churches and missionaries of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church mission have entered the United Church of Christ. Seven missions are now co-operating with this church. The union projected between the Methodist Episcopal Church mission and the Canadian Methodist Church mission has advanced a step. The difficulties are fully as great as those which existed between Presbyterians and Congregationalists, but we trust that they may be overcome. Were the question left to the missionaries, there would be no question as to the result, but the consent of the churches in America must be obtained.

Perhaps this union of Presbyterians with Presbyterians, and of Methodists with Methodists, is all that we can expect for the present. Sectarianism is not yet dead. The last year has demonstrated that fact. Certain associations in the United States, and one Presbytery, were moved to protest against union. There were even threats of withholding contributions from the American Board if denominational peculiarities were yielded for the sake of union. Certain Congregational ministers and newspapers used their influence to hinder this movement. There are thus ministers in the United States who deliberately set themselves against union even on the foreign field. So, too, there are a few missionaries who value sectarianism above Christian unity. With our small force and with the tremendous pressure of an unconverted empire, they are still ready to insist upon the petty details of inherited polity. Such men are a small minority, but they must not be forgotten in plans for union. Then, finally, it must be remembered that the Christians themselves cannot wholly and at once put aside party spirit. We cannot educate men for a decade on strict denominational lines, and expect that all will prove ready for union when the day has come. It was party feeling among the Japanese that finally prevented union last year. Let us see to it