to the Revolution, it has now its continuation and adherents, so that the question of its destiny in the new liberated Russia is opportune.

Will Russian culture be religious in the sense of Gogol, Tolstoi, Dostoyevsky, Vl. Soloviev, the Trubetskoys, Leontiev, Rosonov, Merezhkovsky, Berdyaev, Novgorodtsev? Can there be any doubt that it will? But this is not to say that the country of Russia will be converted into a compulsory, police-guarded Orthodox monastery. Some of our young nationalists, ignorant of science and the experience of the past, talk nonsense about denominational autocracy. This is a nightmare, fortunately quite impossible in the atmosphere of contemporary life, and frankly, from the Christian point of view, a mockery of sacred things. There will simply be free competition in the arena of cultural creativeness among Orthodox, non-Orthodox, and non-religious groups. Allow me personally, as an Orthodox believer, to express in conclusion, the hope that we shall be victorious in this competition. What grounds are there for such hope? They are there already. When the filament of ascetic Orthodox idealism, like a sort of negative electricity, was led from the 17th through the 18th to the middle or end of the 19th century, and united with the filament of positive electricity coming from Europe through Peter and Pushkin—you yourselves know what a blaze of light and splendour there was!

THE PAPAL ENCYCLICAL AND THE LAUSANNE CONFERENCE.

By Prof. S. Bulgakov.

DURING the summer of 1927, a Conference met at Lausanne and discussed questions of Faith and Order. This Conference would appear to be the most striking and vigorous expression which has hitherto occurred of that inclination towards unity which has been displayed by the whole Christian world in recent years and in a particularly active form since the War.[1]

It was a solemn manifestation, not yet indeed of unity, but in any case of inclination towards unity, and an inclination which existed throughout the whole of Christendom. Its direct *dogmatic* results—in the sense of abolishing divergencies—were not of essential importance; these divergencies were simply stated, and no attempt made to arrive at agreement upon them. But the positive *religious* result was considerable. It was felt once more and with a new strength of conviction that the Christian world,

[1] Bell: *Documents on Christian Unity*, 1920-4. London 1924.

as an entire whole believes in the Lord Jesus Christ and loves Him, that it finds its Spiritual nourishment in the Holy Gospel and the Word of God, thanks to the Holy Spirit who lives in that Word and "*bloweth where it listeth*" without any man knowing "*Whence it cometh or whither it goeth.*"

That is the good and lasting "panchristianity" of the Conference—to adopt the cruel phraseology of the papal encyclical *Mortalium animos,* which warns Roman Catholics against participating in this movement. For, for all Christians, Christ is truly One. He is the alpha and omega, the beginning and the end, and the fundamental significance of this fact cannot be concealed by any division; not even by the Roman Catholic "panpapalism" which in the Encyclical is plainly set over against the "panchristianity."

Certainly, in the conscience of the Church there is no place at all for any distinction between truths of the faith as *fundamentalia* or *non-fundamentalia,* for all alike are truths and equally essential. Nevertheless, a difference exists in the degree of manifestation of these truths (*dogmata explicita* and *implicita*) and also in the relation they bear to one another at the outset. The seed from which all Christian dogma springs, slowly and little by little, by a historic process which is not without its waverings and deviations, this seed is in a word the confession of the Apostle Peter on the road to Cæsarea Philippi: "*Thou art the Christ; the Son of the living God*" (St. Matthew xvi, 16.). That faith is the foundation stone of the Church and it is precisely that which was preached by the Apostles. *Without* that faith, there is no Christianity, and it includes within itself already the possibility of accepting *all* the dogmas. These latter, once brought to light, are all seen to be equally essential.

But up to that moment it is possible that they were absent from the consciousness of the Church, just as to-day they are lacking (as the result of error or narrowness), in many Protestant communities. That primitive Christian simplicity which pious Protestants seek after, is precisely the *initial* state of dogmatic faith. It would be wrong, certainly, to manifest the faith in this initial stage, but none the less the first foundations must not be depreciated. And at Lausanne there was something of that primitive Christian enlightenment in the quickened feeling that all Christians believe in and love and adore Jesus Christ, the Lord of Heaven and Earth, and that one single Gospel of the Kingdom embraces them all.

It was expressed formally in the acceptance with unity of heart and voice of the first Report, the Mission of the Church in the World—the Gospel. It sometimes happens in the Spiritual life, that one has a quickened experience, not only of new truth, but

of truths already known, but which in practice had been forgotten and so had lost touch with life. It was in that way that the Lausanne Conference also on its part was aware of a quickened collective experience of faith in Christ, and the enlightenment and blessing which comes from nearness to Him. "*Did not our heart burn within us while He talked with us by the way?*" (St. Luke xxiv, 32). Men who were strangers to each other, remote from one another, of different races and languages, were, *by that experience* brought near to one another; something *was achieved;* and those who took part in that Spiritual *event,* preserve a memory of it which lays a responsibility upon them. Nor must we under-estimate the psychological and religious importance of personal contact and bonds of friendship which were formed among representatives of different denominations hitherto more accustomed to accusing and condemning each other than to listening with a view to understanding one another. Here is what Cardinal Mercier wrote to his clergy on this subject in connection with the Malines Conversation: "Men are made to love one another. Not rarely does it happen that the hearts of strangers, who from a distance believed themselves enemies, on understanding each other experience an intimate delight which they would not have suspected. It is perhaps the first time for four hundred years, said one of them, that studious men, Protestants and Roman Catholics, have been able to converse with entire frankness for hours and hours on the very grave subjects which separate them intellectually, without the cordiality of their relations being for an instant impaired or their confidence in the future disconcerted. Assuredly the drawing together of hearts is not unity in faith, but it makes for it."[1] "Why these conversations?" asks Cardinal Mercier, and he gives this answer: "First of all because I have no right to avoid an opportunity offered me of performing an act of brotherly love and Christian hospitality."[2]

To set over against these declarations the *prohibition* of taking part in meetings (*conventus*) with non-Catholics which the Encyclical lays upon Roman Catholics, is an adequate measure of the divergence between these two lines of action. The present declaration *apostolicæ sedis* was particularly unexpected from the lips of a Pope who envisaged the unity of the Christian world (in the Roman sense), as the task of his pontificate. The gist of the Encyclical is this: Roman Catholics are forbidden to meet non-Catholics in the field of dogma; unless the non-Catholics,

[1] Bell: *loc. cit.* 354-5. Later on Cardinal Mercier refers as an example to the Encyclical *Ecclesiam Dei* of Pope Pius XI., in which the Pope exhorts Latins and Easterns to mutual understanding and the laying aside of prejudices.

[2] *Loc. cit.* 357. Later on the Cardinal refers to Pope Leo XIII.'s letter *Amantissimæ Voluntatis* (*ad Anglos*), April 14th, 1895, where the following passage occurs: "*In rebus enim magnis atque in arduis si modo sint sincero et bono animo susceptæ, adest homini Deus.*"

repenting of their errors, enter the Roman Catholic Church, and in particular, unless they accept the Vatican decree and submit to the Pope. The encyclical is distinguished by this extreme exclusiveness not only regarding the possibility of union (of which up to this point nothing has been said), but also even regarding those extra and intra-ecclesiastical relations which in our time are acquiring such a vital importance. The conversations with "Protestants" which quite recently took place at Malines are as it were prohibited by the last Encyclical; not to speak of the various relations with the Orthodox authorized by Rome so short a while ago—the Velehrad Conferences which were officially encouraged, as well as the personal contact of Orthodox and Roman Catholic theologians which apparently gave much spiritual satisfaction on both sides and seemed to be desirable and fruitful. (Non-Catholics, notably the Heads of the Orthodox Churches, had even been invited to take part in the Vatican Council.)

Certainly, such exclusiveness bears most heavily, and with all its weight, on Roman Catholics themselves, who are placed in a position of unnecessary isolation, and prejudicial to Christian activity. We hope that life will rectify the situation; but, so far as the Conference of Lausanne is concerned, evidently there can be no going back on the decision. Nevertheless, the Lausanne Conference itself was filled with the desire to have representatives of the Roman Catholic world in its midst, not in the least as a party, but as representing the most powerful branch of Western Christianity.

They would have set forth their own doctrine, and their presence would have allowed a spiritual *rapprochement* among the persons concerned. In a word, their presence would have served the same ends as those which led Cardinal Mercier to bless the Malines Conversations. As it has been pointed out on several occasions on the platform and in the press, it is beyond doubt that the *rapprochement* of the Christian world which has begun, will be one-sided and incomplete so long as Roman Catholics hold aloof. And, however irreconcilable the Vatican may be, from the other side, everything possible must be done, as it has been in the past, to bring Roman Catholics into participation in the world-wide movement now set on foot. Unhappily, we must once more state plainly that the western ecclesiastical world has not yet got beyond its divisions and that spiritually it suffers from the fact.

The strength of the Encyclical *Mortalium animos* lies in the fact that it raises the question of the bare possibility of such an enterprise as the Lausanne Conference—the question of the dogmatic meaning and the antecedent conditions of the enterprise. In this respect, an analysis of the Encyclical is of an interest all the greater from the fact that a similar exclusiveness is characteristic of

Orthodox circles of Roman Catholicizing tendency, although fundamentally the difference between Roman Catholicism and Orthodoxy is seen with particular clearness in this matter.

II.

What then is the effective basis of the Lausanne Conference and of the inter-denominational movement towards unity? What are its dogmatic pre-suppositions? How is this movement possible if one considers the profound dogmatic divergencies which exist? It is understood that here there can be no question whatever of any doctrinal *amalgam*, or of a new confession of faith based on an agreement which is arrived at by throwing into prominence beliefs held in common and rejecting all the rest. It is just in this way that the papal Encyclical puts the problem. But such a relativity would satisfy hardly anyone, unless it were some small Protestant sects which readily come into being by a process like the picking of grapes from a bunch and disappear with the same facility by joining up again. Doubtless the unifying of these sects is in itself a visible good, and it constitutes a certain gain. But relativity of that kind, foreign indeed to most denominations, is supremely incompatible with Orthodoxy, which sees in herself the one true Apostolic Church, holding the tradition in its entirety and unchanged purity, and possessing the apostolic inheritance of the hierarchy. In this sense the absolutism of Orthodoxy is not less than that of the Roman Church, although their paths are different. And in a word, the union movement can, for Orthodoxy, have no other task than the re-uniting of all men in the bosom of the Orthodox Church, that there may be one flock and one Shepherd. In other words, as the Encyclical says, "*Christianorum enim conjunctionem haud aliter foveri licet quam fovendo ad unam veram Christi Ecclesiam reditum.*"

It goes without saying that the participation of representatives of the Orthodox Church in the union movement is only possible on condition that the fulness and purity of Orthodoxy is safeguarded. Solemn testimony was borne to this by a special declaration signed without exception by the Orthodox delegates who took part in the Lausanne Conference. Only, this doctrinal *maximizing*, supremely essential and unquestionable for the Church as it is, does not compel the Orthodox to infer from it those consequences which the Roman Church deduces from the same doctrinal *maximizing*. No doubt the most direct deduction from it appears to be abstention from all intercourse with heretics, as the canons themselves enjoin. This logical result, which is not foreign to certain Orthodox circles also, answers but little to the example of the Apostle Paul who desired to be "all things to all men" if by any means he might save some. It is true that the

canons forbid prayer for heretics and intercourse with them, but the meaning and force of this prohibition consist in this—the avoidance of that shows itself to be an insensibility to religion or even a will to heresy. When such a will does not exist, and when, on the contrary, there is an effort towards unity in Christ, the rigid application of these canons would be to strain out a gnat and swallow a camel like the Pharisees. It is on this account that the strict letter of these canons is, quite properly, not put into operation, and that just as much by Orthodox bishops when for instance they associate, even for common worship, with Anglicans, as by Roman Catholics when they meet for the Conversations of Malines and Velehrad and bless them with their prayers. The united prayer even constitutes the particular strength of such gatherings. It need hardly be said that this sort of union has its limits, and what is more, fairly narrow limits. For Churchmen, the possibility of sharing in the sacraments at the Lord's Table with the heterodox is excluded; they cannot take the step which is, in comparison, so easy for Protestants. At the Lausanne Conference, representatives of Protestant communities previously separated from each other, yielded to their inclination towards unity and made their communions together. Sacramental Communion, pre-supposing the unity of a hierarchy of apostolic succession, is no doubt a matter of a still distant future. It is on account of dogmatic differences that such communion does not yet exist between Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism in spite of the mutual recognition of both their sacraments and their orders by the two Churches.

Militant heresy and schism which rend the Church do no doubt call for defensive action on her part, self-protection is unavoidable. That is what is still taking place to-day in reference to the warring sects. But a community which has overcome, or is overcoming, its actual will for separation, and wherein on the other hand there can be perceived an effort for union *in spite of* the separation, which was already brought about and which was inherited—does such a community deserve to be brusquely repelled by an unreasonable and rigid demand to repent and submit? Why must one repent and submit before one realizes that that is necessary? Perhaps a method which is suitable at times is this—to be all things to all men that one may save some.

Communion among Christians is necessary and possible, not only among those who live within the Church but also between these latter and those who are separated from the Church and who even do not yet notice separation which they are unaware of as an accomplished fact.

The Church is a whole, not only in the sense of that Catholicity which is opposed to all spiritual provincialism, but also in the

sense of a gathering together of hearts in love and unity of thought. And the whole is realized in *the fact of the gathering together*, a fact which may be produced very often and in very different ways. At the time of the first Œcumenical Council, even pagan philosophers were admitted to the discussions, and in this respect the picture with which the first Œcumenical gathering presents us is most significant.

The fact of members of different Christian denominations meeting together, once it has become spiritually possible, and even necessary, opens up vast possibilities of *rapprochement* and of grasp of each other's doctrinal position. Previously, that could take place only through the medium of cold print, with no personal mutual understanding in love. Hence objective differences became still greater from the fact that each side failed to understand the other.

How many of the injuries that history records, how many misconceptions in the sphere of doctrine, have been due to one-sidedness of expression and the inexactitude of human language! These injuries and misconceptions may be treated remedially and perhaps even got rid of, and thus knowledge of the one ecclesiastical truth which conquers by its irrefutability, will be brought nearer to hand. Of course, we must give up any premature ideas of making all psychologies and all local traditions uniform and on the same level; and as a matter of fact, speaking generally, the unity of the Church does not require that.

The Lausanne Conference is not an ecclesiastical council, in the exact sense of the word, for a council can include in its midst only members of the Church; but on the other hand neither is it a purely secular extra-ecclesiastical assembly, or a congress. It is, so to speak, an assembly "near the Church," and even to a certain extent an ecclesiastical assembly. It is well known that catechumens, though not yet baptized, are admitted to the Liturgy of the Catechumens, and it is a plain fact that they are not strangers to the Church. How then can it be shown that these Christians who have received baptism (baptism in the Name of the Holy Trinity, which is always valid), are *outside* the Church? And *a fortiori*—what is to be said of those who, by maintaining a valid ministry have all the other sacraments also, although they remain in separation? It is clear that the customary dogmatic and canonical conceptions which know but two positions—belonging or not belonging to the Church—are inadequate for the present state of things, they must be made more subtle and complex. Baptism, a living faith in the Lord, a love for Him, the Holy Gospel—these do not remain powerless and ineffective.

It is a mystical, but a real, soil for the germination of union,

and this latter contains the possibility of growth. The re-union of the Christian world will not be achieved by a "pact," an agreement, and a human contrivance. It can be accomplished only by the inspiration of love for Christ and by the operation of the Holy Spirit. It is a miracle, which transcends human powers; but Christians should pray for the miracle and believe in it. We must not *make peace with* the divided state of Christendom; we must always feel our hearts wounded by the fact of its division. And the Orthodox "gathering" (*soborovanie*), throws open its heart in love even to the heterodox, because of the genuine and sincere love of the Lord which they possess and in spite of the many things they do not possess. And the blame for what is lacking in many cases does not attach to those who are living now, but is to be found in past history. Orthodoxy is not only static; not only a secured condition of plenitude, the treasury of the true faith maintained unchanged to the end of the ages; but it is also dynamic, operating in the Christian world, it is, so to speak, the leaven of it—it is the interior logic of Christianity.

To remain aloof from this great and holy activity, which is taking place in the world, would be, for Orthodoxy, to sin by lack of love and want of earnestness. Doubtless that lays upon us a burden hard to bear, weak and feeble as we are, but the power of God works even through weakness. In the light of what has just been said, Orthodoxy, while abiding in all her unchangeableness and in no sense putting herself in the position of one of the contracting parties, is entirely able to *gather together* with Christians of another denomination and to help them in their search for the only true "Church life."[1] This requires of the Church maternal care and love for the dispersed children of God, to the end that they may be one in the Lord and in His Church.

But why could not these considerations have the same force for Roman Catholicism also? Is it possible that Roman Catholicism was held back by a sense of humiliation, external and purely imaginary, at coming into the Conference as one of many "Churches" and not as *the* only Church? But such a touchiness would be contrary to the spirit of pastoral love and the readiness to be all things to all men. Could the Protestant Churches have been asked at the same time, to abandon their position and decide their mutual relations in some other way? Has the Roman Pontiff never called himself *Servus servorum Dei?*

It would seem that the real cause of the negative attitude of Rome is deeper and more general in character, and lies in the fact that the Roman Church is *before all else* the ecclesiastico-legal organization of a hierarchical *dominion* which has its centre in the Pope and that it relegates unity in love to a second place only.

[1] "*ecclésiasticité.*"

It is not for nothing that the Encyclical speaks so much of the Vatican decree, which it puts on a level with fundamental Christian dogmas, and in general of the authority of the Roman Pontiff. Recognition of this authority and submission to it are the *prius* of a gathering held in common with the Roman Church. The Vatican decree has here come before the Nicæan; Papal infallibility has disguised the Gospel.

Such an obstacle is absolutely lacking in Orthodoxy. To her, Canonical Communion is not the preliminary condition, but the result and the realization of achieved unity of the Church; and to her love is higher than law. For this reason she advances *freely* along the path of assembly in common, a path which for Catholicism is seen to be barred by the Vatican decree. That is the main conclusion we come to as we leave the Encyclical of Pope Pius XI., of the Pope who began precisely with an appeal to unity and for meeting on the common ground of conciliatory approach and reciprocal understanding. These conciliatory inclinations are seen to-day to be vanquished by the tendencies of the Vatican.

There remains the hope that even this Encyclical will not destroy the possibility and close the avenues of intercourse with representatives of Roman Catholic theological thought. I know that in spite of all I have been saying, all the real danger of inter-denominationalism can be pointed out. But the time is passed already when one could shut oneself up and hold aloof from the world, as if in a monastic cloister. To-day the Church is surrounded by tempests, the waves of which dash unceasingly against the ship. And in face of the aggressive anti-Christian movement, the ill-sorted forces of the Christian Army must close their ranks, and look for and determine to find mutual comprehension. "Seek and ye shall find." But certainly, to that very end, we must maintain a strong and living bond with the Church, we must know our spiritual fortress, we must know the gate by which we can come out of it, and by which we can return within for purposes of defence. That fortress is our holy, universal, apostolic and Orthodox Church.

III.

The work of the Lausanne Conference must be continued in the world. But along what lines? Evidently a simple repetition of the Conference is not desirable, nor even possible; *non bis in idem.*

After the first step, longer steps should follow. What was accomplished at Lausanne was the common confession of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God; and on this rock His Church must be consolidated. At Lausanne faith was professed in the Holy Gospel as the book of Eternal Life; and now that

faith must be put into evidence. At Lausanne the confessions of faith of Nicæa and of the Apostles were proclaimed; now their full content must be developed. At Lausanne the principal task was to establish the indispensable unity of faith and the unity of thought which derives from it, before examining the points of divergence and attempting to get rid of them; now it is time to pass on fearlessly to the scrutiny of the matters wherein differences exist, and that in a spirit of edification, patience and love; above all, with the desire to understand each other and to grasp the direction and the strength of our divergencies.

The one general current should be separated out into canals; the "œcumenical urge," should be actualized in detailed labour. We must set on foot education in comparative Christian doctrine, only it must not bear the character of "accusatory theology," its purpose must be not attack and defence, but conciliatory dealing with questions upon which controversy has arisen and schisms have been formed. Such a relation of love and peace with a doctrinal opponent by no means implies indifference to doctrine (the indifference which the Encyclical makes into a bogey for us), for steadfastness in the truth and fidelity to the truth are not by any means synonymous with hostile intolerance. It often happens that errors are half-truths, and one-sidedness of truth, or even just of its expression in words. They are, in Vladimir Soloviev's phraseology, "abstract principles"; and in the light of the whole truth, these partial truths can find the place which is proper to them.

It follows that controversies must not be feared, we must even meet them half way. Such is the path that opens out before us now. The success or failure with which this work meets will at the same time indicate the degree of maturity which the enterprise as a whole has reached. But all the same the enterprise cannot remain in the stage of irresolution and semi-explanation.

But on a level with this negative method of controversy, a positive method must also be applied. And that is, to learn from one another what is the real treasure and what are the spiritual gifts peculiar to the religious life of each.

From this it follows that labour upon doctrinal studies and upon comparative knowledge of the religious life of the various Christian communities, should be for a prolonged and indefinite period, the principal undertaking in the movement for unity. We must set about realizing this "conciliar atmosphere"[1] as an effort of long duration which will prepare for the *Council* of Œcumenical Christendom. With such an effort in view, suitable institutions should be planned and founded. Hence above all I support with Professor Heiler the idea of founding a permanent institute or

[1] *Conciliarité.*

academy, "for Œcumenical research." Competent theologians belonging to the different streams of Christianity, would share in the labours of this institute. It would be necessary then, of course, to make a fresh attempt to draw in Roman Catholic theologians also. Such an establishment would organize theological Congresses and prepare materials for a future Conference, though this should only be held after a long interval of time. The second task of the institute would seem to be to create an Œcumenical literature: journals, collected extracts, books on the fundamental questions from which the divergent confessions of faith have arisen.

The aim of this literature would be, not so much to produce "conviction," as to provoke doctrinal discussion and even controversy, to assist in bringing about mutual understanding. The lack of literature of this kind is no small hindrance to further *rapprochement*. "Love believeth all things and hopeth all things."

The usual thing in the case of doctrinal differences, is to make the essential presupposition that one's opponent is an obstinate and ill-willed heretic. But with such an institute one might hope effectively to discover the paths which lead to the opponent's reason and heart.

The Stockholm Conference has already embarked upon a corresponding enterprise—an international social institute with its periodical publications. Such a foundation is imperatively needed for the Lausanne Conference also.

What are the questions which come to the fore in Œcumenical deliberation, or universal "conciliar atmosphere" ?

They are first of all ecclesiastical questions: the Nature of the Church; the priesthood; the sacraments and in particular the Eucharist. With this is naturally associated the question of redemption. But absolutely in the very front rank must be placed a matter which springs directly from acceptance of the Nicene Creed, that is to say, what are the meaning and value of the *culte* of the Mother of God. I pointed out the necessity of this at the actual time of the Conference. That subject more than any other has divided the Christian world, and the attitude one adopts towards it should be settled with absolute clearness.

All this pre-supposes a long and difficult path, of study, deliberation and controversy. Only the controversialists are already no longer enemies, but friends who seek to understand each other. They are, above all, brothers in the Lord, though hitherto they have been *fratres separati*.

Assuredly what has been said does not exclude the possibility and even desirability of holding congresses both on a general scale and privately. Such congresses would arouse brotherly feeling, they would provide opportunities of personal contact, in them particular isolated subjects would be dealt with, which were already

prepared and ripe for discussion though not at that moment constituting the centre of gravity. I would desire to put forward the suggestion that the first of these congresses should be devoted to the subject of Mariology.

ROMA LOCUTA EST.

By Prof. Hamilcar Alivisatos.

ROMA locuta est! Rome has spoken. The highest authority in the Roman Church, Pope Pius XI, has issued his celebrated encyclical *De vera religionis unitate fovenda,* or, as it is known from the first two words of the text, *Mortalium animos.* This encyclical has been occasioned by the Pan-Christian Conference at Lausanne and by that general movement towards unity which is such a marked feature of our day amongst all Christians except the Papalists, particularly since the end of the world war. And it was right and proper and generally expected that the voice of the Roman Pontiff should be heard on the occasion of such a truly world-historical event as the World Conference at Lausanne. Because, independently of the recognition or no of the authority claimed by him, it was his duty to speak as representing that authority; granted of course that this event was to be regarded as important and worthy of attention. And actually it seems the Conference at Lausanne was regarded as a remarkable event and consequently the Roman authority has spoken. But how?

Everyone expected the Roman Pontiff, from the height of St. Peter's watch tower, to explore and appraise the situation successfully and that the criticisms and arguments which he would subsequently bring forward would fit the circumstances and be in every way worthy of the famous and accredited Roman tradition, "And thou, when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren." Unfortunately Rome has spoken and again in a negative way, and the whole world is perplexed and astonished at the negative utterances of the Papal encyclical. Papal authority demands obedience to its utterances, but only when these utterances are irrefutable can they ensure obedience.

Otherwise it is open to criticisms and censures which are the more objectionable in proportion as they refer in any way to some higher authority. It is astonishing how His Holiness, Pope Pius XI, following the bad tradition of his predecessors, has spoken so unseasonably, contrary to all expectation and once again in opposition to what the Christian world was looking for. Because, either the Assembly of representatives of all the Christian Churches in Lausanne is a historical fact worthy of the Pope's attention, and