

## DENOMINATIONAL ORGANSHIP.

In connection with the foundation of *The Advance* newspaper at Chicago, the question of the relation to the churches of a journal that aims to represent them, has come up for discussion.

The council which dismissed Dr. Patton from his pastorate to the editorial chair, stated that they did so in the confidence that the paper would be kept under the "influence" of the churches, and be guarded from perversion.

A member of the council in writing to the *Congregationalist*, reports that Dr. Edward Beecher argued powerfully that a body directly representing the churches, should have at least a veto power in the election of the editors, and contended that there was no more danger to liberty in this, than in the management of a joint stock company of business men. It is feared by him and some others, that the great power of a denominational press may fall into the hands of those who will use it for commercial profit alone. The "perversion" of the *Independent* is cited as a case in point.

The *Congregationalist*, in dealing with this subject editorially, contends that the only two things a denomination has a right to claim of a newspaper speaking in its name and for its interests, are these,—that its expositions of doctrines and polity shall, in the main, accord with those of the body; and that it shall set these forth with due ability; being at once "sound" and "smart." It says that there are four ways in which the required capital and skill can be procured. 1. One individual, or a very few, can furnish capital, choose the editors, and so on, as is done with the *Independent*. 2. A joint stock company may do the same things, as in the case of the *Advance*. 3. From two to four men can own and themselves edit the paper, which is the arrangement for the *N. Y. Observer* and *Evangelist*, and the *Congregationalist* itself. 4. The denominations, through some representative body, can own and control it,—as the Methodists do their religious papers, and as Dr. E. Beecher advocates that the Congregational body should do. To the first plan it is objected, that it is too individual and irresponsible, and leaves an editor at the mercy of the proprietor; to the second, that it is the first over again, only that several masters are substituted for one, while a scattered ownership is unfavourable to unity and promptitude of action; and to the fourth, that the annual choice of an editor by an ecclesiastical body would throw into it an element of electioneering strife, while it would expose him to constant temptation and cripple his strength and independence. The *Congregationalist*, of course, prefers the third plan, its own, as the most free and stimulative for editors, while the denomination, by giving or withholding its patronage, has it in its power to recognize or disown the journal as its representative.

The *Advance*, in noticing the above article, claims that, in its own case, there is greater security for the continued fidelity of the paper to denominational