

ments into their fastnesses and in due course throw open the gates to that enemy of whom it has been all the while the emissary.

It is necessary to meet and remove this prejudice in the minds of native rulers, for in too many well-founded instances the establishment and progress of Christian missions has seemed to native rulers the precursor of political agitation and local discontent, and finally the interference of Christian governments on behalf of the missionary and mission property resulting in the loss or restriction of power or territory to the native state.

While missionaries may see and find advantages in government recognition and protection, they must also remember that in every contract there are two contracting parties and that if they receive practical benefits from their own government, this confers a right to government to look for a corresponding return. The missionary becomes all unwittingly the government agent to extend its sphere of influence, which may be followed by demands for "rectification of frontier"; for a government is often unwillingly forced to this procedure by purely political considerations. Much as the missionary may regret these consequences it is then impossible for him to detach himself from the obligations of the position, which often result in making him appear in the eyes of the people among whom he is working as an agent of the foreign power.

Many missionaries have already laboured to remove this reproach, and if we can in Central Asia dissociate our presentation of the claims of Christ from any national colouring, we shall not find so much reluctance on the part of either Mohammedan or Buddhist to listen to what we have to say. They will recognize that it is a question of the soul, and that it concerns the appeal of God to the conscience.