

fight in the church and the church would have split or something. But the Bishop there saw that this man in church A had the qualities and temperment and personality that would do an excellent job in church B, and he saw that the man in B would do an excellent job in C, and he saw the man in C would do an excellent job in A, and he just ~~w~~ switched the three. And 5 years later you had three strong excellent healthy churches because there was a man who could investigate, make a wise decision, and act upon it. I've seen church after church in which they get a man in, and once he's in the people in general, if they don't like him, they drift out. And if a few want to get rid of him, as a rule they have to have a fight and split. But for development and growth there is nothing like the Methodist system. It's wonderful.

But the trouble was that the Methodists didn't put much stress on education. They would take men with practically no education if they were good exhorters and put them out. And those men, a lot of them, did a wonderful work for the Lord. But then some of these Methodists began to go to schools where they got the higher criticism and they came in and at first the bishops kicked them out. There were a number of men who were kicked out from the Methodist church for becoming modernists. But eventually they got some men who were very clever talkers who became bishops. And once the bishops became modernists, then they kicked out the believers. So the wonderful system for development and spread, changed more quickly than any other. The modernists got control of it much sooner than any other group. Now the opposite extreme from the Methodist is the congregational. The congregational church historically was excellently independent. Each church was a law to itself. Though they used to have in New England groups of ministers who would meet and discuss things together. They exercised very considerable