

our political institutions. The Protestant churches of Europe naturally feel that the responsibility of evangelizing these countries rests largely upon the American churches.

But there is another and more cogent reason. The type of Romanism which prevails in Spanish America is far lower than that of the Continent. European Catholics themselves have spoken of it as a virtual heathenism (for example Abbé Domineck, chaplain of Maximilian). And broad-minded statesmen in Mexico have welcomed Protestant influence as a blessing to the Mexican Church.

But, making all proper discriminations, a good rule in Christian duty is that which Christ Himself laid down, "This ought ye to have done and not to leave the other undone." There are many reasons for aiding the Protestant churches of Continental Europe. America owes a lasting debt of gratitude to the Huguenots of France. After the terrible massacre of St. Bartholomew in the sixteenth century multitudes of survivors migrated to this, as to many other countries. The religious faith and life, as well as the national character of our colonies, were enriched by the Huguenot elements, and the kinsmen of those staunch exiles, wherever they may be found, should be regarded as our brethren.

There were others who in those days of terror took refuge in remote fastnesses of their native land, where they long remained shut out from the world. One of their descendants, writing recently of their history and their present needs, says, pathetically:

"When our Protestants came down from their rocky peaks or out of caverns or forests they were timid, happy to be allowed to live, more like a degenerated race than like true Huguenots—they had suffered so much and so long."

The same writer complains that much of the work that has been done for this people has been little more

than a proselyting process, which, instead of leaving the Huguenot Church a unit, strengthened in its ancient faith and order, has rather tended to break it up into the various sects.

The only alternative to this divisive process is to contribute funds in aid of these Protestant churches and allow them to apply that aid through their own missionary agencies. But it is not always easy to decide between these methods. On the one hand the churches left to themselves might preserve their unity, but on the other hand it is claimed that being won over to Baptist or Methodist communions they are quickened into a higher spiritual life, and are more effectually guarded against the prevailing Rationalism. The question is a broad one. That the Methodist and Baptist missions in Germany and Sweden have led thousands of Lutheran converts to a more vital faith and a higher life seems clear, although the thousands who have thus been won cannot be classed with converts from heathen races, yet unquestionably they constitute a more vital element in the religious life of the Continent than ever before.

We have little sympathy with the idea that missionary work is valuable just in proportion to its undenominational character. The church is the best of all organizations for the extension of Christ's kingdom, and the different churches will accomplish most for those who are brought into complete sympathy with them in doctrine and order. Whatever evils attach to sectarian zeal it is better than looseness and disorder, and organized missionary agencies under responsible management are better than the free-lance enterprises which are responsible to nobody and whose general tendency is towards transient impressions rather than established churches and self-perpetuating institutions.

There is one danger just now which may be regarded with no little app-