

At any rate it is not safe to count upon them. This is away from the subject, but illustrates very well what I mean by soul-education,

I firmly believe that religion—this soul development—is a process of learning not dissimilar to the process of intellectual learning. Not that to be religious and to be intellectual is the same thing, but that the process of learning one or the other is similar. Therefore just as our intellectual being is best cultivated by calm and thoughtful research for the truth, so our religious nature may be best cultivated by calm and thoughtful striving to know, and do, and be, that which is best and highest,—that is, striving to be Christ-like.

If this is so then the best method for a church, whose object must be to inspire others with a love for these higher ideals, to adopt, would be a method which would most readily bring all men in touch with this inspiration. It must be a method which would offer the least possible hindrance to a person at church from feeling perfectly at home. I believe that most churches as they are now managed do offer some restraint to this home feeling, and I will attempt to show wherein this restraint lies.

Religion does not depend then upon believing a certain creed or doctrine of a certain church. A person can love the truth and strive to be Christ-like and never hear of a creed or see a church. Almost every church member will tell you that he does not think it is necessary to believe in a creed in order to be a Christian. Many of them will admit that creeds are objectionable; still church management allows them to stay as part of the requirements for membership. Thus a useless barrier is kept before the world, and church people give it no thought.

Recently there has been several churches founded which have no creed. Dr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones' church in Chicago is a notable case. This plan I believe to be the correct

one. A creed is no real benefit, and is often a great hindrance; therefore churches should have no creeds whatever.

Some of the comparatively younger churches which have creeds, such as the Christian church, have them so short that they think that the objection is removed. The substance of this short creed is, I think, that one must simply believe that Christ is the Son of God. But even this, in my opinion, is objectionable, because I think it is much more to be Christ-like than it is to believe that Christ is the Son of God. The two things are not necessarily synonymous. I am very positive that a person can be Christ-like and not believe, in the same way that most church people believe it, that Christ is the Son of God. If, then, you stop to think, I am sure you will conclude with me that Christ himself would be more pleased with one who tried to be Christ-like than with one who believed that He was the Son of God, and did not try so hard to be like him. Pleasing God does not depend, I am sure, upon any belief concerning the nature of God, but rather upon our own nature whether it is Christ-like, and therefore fruitful of good deeds.

But perhaps the most important difference I would make between a church modelled after my conceptions of what is needed, and other churches, would be in the matter of membership. It seems to me that there is a very important objection in this respect to the management of most of our churches. This objection is that people in a church form themselves into a kind of restrictive fraternity. This is surely an objection, because it keeps them from being in touch with the great mass of the people. It may not be untrue to say that in some cases these church fraternities have no desire to be in touch with common people. This restricted private worship which keeps the Christian from inspiring the Christ-like spirit universally in the world is evidently not the best method of wor-