

and divided meetings, the loss of all unity of impression, and of that peculiar *cumulativeness* of impression, which is even more desirable than such unity. To have had fewer meetings, and to have arranged them so that essentially the same body of auditors might have attended them all, so far as they chose, would have served to secure from beginning to close a continuous, growing, climacteric interest. But, as it was, the conference was cut up into several minor conferences, which, for all unity or continuity, might almost as well have met in different halls or even cities. It was very noticeable that, so far as unity and continuity of assembly were conserved, the richest results were realized. The interest and enthusiasm touched floodmark only in those large evening assemblies where, without the diversion or distraction of having rival meetings at the same hour, essentially the same audience met from night to night, and felt the power of every new accretion of argument and appeal. In our judgment, it had been better either to have appropriated more days to the discussions, or else to have attempted to cover less ground, rather than to have split up the body into so many parts. Section may sometimes be vivisection. Those who attended the Evangelical Alliance meetings at Washington, D. C., the year before, will remember how by continuous sessions in the same assembly chamber, the very ends, sacrificed at Exeter Hall, were admirably served and conserved.

IV. It was, we think, a mistake for the committee of the conference to *hamper themselves and the body with needless restrictive rules*. Laws are the servants, not the masters, of intelligent bodies; otherwise they turn human beings into mere automata. Even Sabbathic regulations, however strict, are "made for man," not man for rules and regulations. The human mind is too great and grand for any parliamentary matrix, and all regulations, not based upon immovable essential moral principles, must be elastic and flexible.

For instance it was determined in advance by the committee that *no resolutions* should be introduced into the conference. The restriction was well meant. To have put up no such barrier would have left open door for every religious "tramp" or "crank" to find his way into the field of discussion and inflict on helpless ears his resolutions upon his favorite topic. But that such a body should meet as never met before, and never may again, and not be free to act in such ways as to make its power felt and its effects lasting, was to resort to the strait-jacket. The committee themselves felt the awkward constraint of their own restrictions. When the giant evils of rum in Africa, opium in China, and licensed vice in India called for vigorous remonstrance, they felt the need of a series of resolutions, ably advocated, and adopted by the conference. But there was that *rule* against resolutions! To "save their constitution" they held the great public meeting for protest, on the night after the conference closed; but, as