

# Third Anniversary Number

# CHRISTIANITY TODAY



||| A PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL DEVOTED TO STATING, DEFENDING |||  
||| AND FURTHERING THE GOSPEL IN THE MODERN WORLD |||

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

Published monthly by  
THE PRESBYTERIAN AND  
REFORMED PUBLISHING CO.,  
501 Witherspoon Bldg., Phila., Pa.

MID-MAY, 1933  
Vol. 4 No. 1

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE  
Entered as second-class matter May 11, 1931, at  
the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the  
Act of March 3, 1879.

## Editorial Notes and Comments

### THREE YEARS



WITH this issue CHRISTIANITY TODAY begins its fourth year. To its many readers and friends, scattered over the face of the earth, it sends greetings. The Editors believe they are developing a paper second to none in its sphere. Its world-wide news service is being brought to fuller completion each month. No other American religious periodical is, so far as we know, attempting anything like it. We have recently added other special features. The Editors pledge anew their determination to contend militantly for the faith, and, in so doing, to keep their readers informed of what is happening in the Church, either above or beneath the surface. They will try to "hew to the line and let the chips fall where they may."

### 57 TO 16



THE title of this comment is the poll of the vote on the "Machen Overture" on Foreign Missions when it was passed in the Presbytery of Philadelphia at an exciting session held on May first. A complete account of the action is found in our news pages. The decision of the oldest Presbytery in the Church in thus passing the same overture that was rejected by the Presbytery of New Brunswick under the pressure of officialdom, means that the issue is very much alive,—so much so that it will perhaps over-

shadow all other issues at the approaching Assembly. And so it ought. We believe that the action in Philadelphia, showing the greatest conservative majority in years, portends a great evangelical reaction. Elders and lay people are in revolt against Modernism and those who, while giving lip-loyalty to the faith, have supported and permitted anti-Christian propaganda in the Church. Judgment is beginning at the House of God.

### MRS. BUCK OUT



EARL S. BUCK, famous novelist, has resigned as a missionary of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Her resignation has been accepted (see the next comment). There have been suggestions, one even attributed to Dr. CHARLES W. KERR, Moderator of the 1932 Assembly, that this will end the controversy over foreign missions in the Presbyterian Church. Nothing could, of course, be more absurd. Objections were not mainly to Mrs. BUCK, but to the Board of Foreign Missions for continuing Mrs. BUCK as a missionary long after it knew of her rad-

ically anti-Christian views. Mrs. BUCK's novels had little or nothing to do with the matter, contrary to some newspaper reports. The resignation of Mrs. BUCK does not absolve the Board of any responsibility,—in fact the manner in which the Board accepted it rather increases knowledge of its looseness in facing its responsibilities to a degree hitherto unsuspected by most. The Board was only ungracefully forced, by a rising tide of indignation, into an awkward situation from which it emerged with even less grace. And it should also be remembered that the case of Mrs. BUCK is only one of many matters and policies for which the Board must give an accounting. For example, in Dr. MACHEN's printed brief, the incident concerning Mrs. BUCK took up only six out of one hundred and ten pages. This should dispose of the idea that the whole protest revolved around this one missionary. Even had the incident of Mrs. BUCK never arisen, the responsibility of the Board would be essentially the same.

### WE CANNOT SUPPRESS THE TRUTH



HERE are some requests that no man has a right to make, and to which no man has the right to assent if they are made. The Editors of CHRISTIANITY TODAY issue this paper with one dominant purpose: to bring to their readers, and to the whole Presbyterian Church, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so far as in them lies, about what is going on in the Church. No one has the right to give to the Editors of this paper information that belongs to the whole Church and

then to ask the Editors to be a party in suppressing that information in such fashion as that the Church may gain an erroneous impression of what has occurred. Therefore, as our solemn duty, and as in the presence of the great Searcher of all hearts, we publish below two letters recently received from Dr. CLELAND B. MCAFEE, a secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions. No doubt there will be those who will criticize us for publishing these letters. To them we only reply that we had to choose between assenting to a request for confidence which the writer had no right to make as against the Church he serves, and the claims of truth. Knowing what these letters told us, we could not be a party to suppressing that knowledge. The letters themselves need scarcely any comment. They speak for themselves. Intelligent readers will be appalled at what they reveal. That a secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions should wish to be quoted accurately, is natural. But that he should consider it his right to forbid quotation while making absolutely no effort to correct, publicly and through the same sources, reports that he himself described as so "erroneous that they need correction" is almost unbelievable. The second letter convicts the Board through the mouth of its spokesman of desiring to conceal from the Church its exact action with regard

(A Table of Contents will be found on Page 36)

to Mrs. BUCK. It also shows clearly that the Board accepted the resignation unwillingly. Knowing these things we would be breaking faith with our readers if we did not print them. The letters, which were sent to the Editors of the four Presbyterian papers, follow:

"Dear Brethren:

"I have received recently a large number of newspaper clippings purporting to give quotations from myself or reference to my utterances, many of which are so inaccurate or directly erroneous that they need correction. The process of correcting or undertaking such interviews has always proved to be hopeless. I am, therefore, making no public reference to them. Most of the references are to the criticism passed by Dr. MACHEN on the Board of Foreign Missions or to the relation of the Board to Mrs. PEARL S. BUCK.

"On the extreme off chance that you may devote any of your valuable space to such expressions of mine, let me say that I trust you will verify these before using them or commenting on them, and that I will give prompt attention to any inquiry regarding any one of these expressions which seems to you to deserve attention.

"I am sorry to trouble you about such a matter, but I do not know any other way to protect the Board in the mind of the Church.

"Sincerely,

"CLELAND B. MCAFEE."

"May 2, 1933.

"Dear Brethren:

"At the meeting of the Board on Monday, May 1st, the following action was placed on the Minutes:

"A letter was presented from Mrs. J. LOSSING BUCK, of the Kiangnan Mission, requesting to be released from responsible relationship to the Board. The Board had hoped that this step might be avoided but in view of all the considerations involved and with deep regret it voted to acquiesce in her request. The Board expressed to Mrs. BUCK its sincere appreciation of the service which she has rendered during the past sixteen years and its earnest prayer that her unusual abilities may continue to be richly used in behalf of the people in China."

"It is the desire of the Board that this Minute shall not be given publicity in its present form though its substance is now public knowledge. At the request of Mrs. BUCK the only publicity which we are giving is identical with her own and she has proposed that the following sentence be used in publicity:

"After various friendly conversations and without appearing before the Board, Mrs. J. LOSSING BUCK has requested that she be permitted to retire from active connection with the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, and at its meeting on Monday the Board accepted her resignation with regret."


"I am troubled to observe in the New York *Herald-Tribune* of this morning a sensational account which is difficult to credit, describing the meeting of the Board as 'stormy' which is the very last word that could have been used. The Board accepted the resignation of Mrs. BUCK at her earnest request. She was not under pressure of the Board to present it, but offered it voluntarily and urged that it be accepted, as was done.

"We have reason to be grateful to you brethren for the kindly way in which the matter has been given to the Church for the most part and we will appreciate the continuance of that courtesy. May I renew my suggestion of April 21st that before accrediting any newspaper quotation from anyone connected with the matter it be verified. Our newspaper men intend to be thoroughly honest, but much of the language with which we are familiar is strange to them and they tend to describe things in the sharpest possible outline, as of course you know.

"Sincerely,

"CLELAND B. MCAFEE."

## THE APPROACHING ASSEMBLY



IN the interest of economy the 145th General Assembly will be held at Columbus, Ohio, instead of Fort Worth, Texas, and will be limited to four working days—two less than usual. It is estimated that the change of place will mean a saving of about \$25,000, the shorter session about \$8,000. We fully approve the change of place but are not so certain about limiting the Assembly to four days. We fear it will bring it about that the next Assembly even more than previous Assemblies in recent years will be dominated by the platform. We trust the commissioners will insist on their right and duty to "consult, vote, and determine, on all things that may come before that body" whether or no the Assembly adjourns on May 29th.

The first matter to come before the Assembly will be the election of a Moderator. While it ought not to make much difference who is made Moderator, yet as a matter of fact it will. Not only is there a growing (though unwarranted) tendency to look upon the Moderator as the official spokesman for the Church at large but the Moderator, especially through his power to make appointments, wields immense influence over the deliberations of the Assembly. Various names are being mentioned and no doubt various names will be presented for consideration. It is our hope that the Assembly will choose a working pastor and one not identified with any of the Boards or agencies of the Church. At a time when so many of these Boards and agencies are under fire, it hardly seems fair or fitting that one of their representatives should preside over the Assembly.

Possibly the most important matter to come before the next Assembly will be the Overture from Philadelphia relative to the Board of Foreign Missions. This Overture which was adopted by a vote of 57 to 16 is, as we have already pointed out, the same as that which was rejected by New Brunswick Presbytery where it was presented by Dr. MACHEN. It would be carrying coals to Newcastle for us to present reasons for its adoption by the Assembly in view of Dr. MACHEN's printed argument (which is reviewed on another page of this issue) and which may be obtained free by applying to its author at 206 S. 13th Street, Philadelphia. An effort will doubtless be made, is already being made, to make it appear to the Commissioners that the resignation of Mrs. BUCK has emptied this overture of significance. As a matter of fact, as we have observed before, it has given it added significance. If there was occasion to judge the Board unworthy of confidence on the part of evangelical Christians previous to its acceptance of Mrs. BUCK's resignation, there is much more occasion for such lack of confidence today. Incredible as it may seem the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. accepted her resignation "with deep regret" despite the fact that Mrs. BUCK in commenting on her action is quoted as saying: "I wish to make it quite clear that in resigning I did not recede an inch from my position. I have neither reinterpreted, amplified or qualified anything I have said or written." However, even if the Board had dismissed Mrs. BUCK for cause there would be little change in the general situation. The attitude of the Board toward Mrs. BUCK only supplies one reason among many why we lack confidence in it as at present constituted. More need not be said in this connection in view of what is written elsewhere in this issue. A solemn responsibility rests on the commissioners to the next Assembly. They may either render a great service or a great disservice to Christ and His cause.

The perennial question of our membership in the Federal Council of Churches will again be up for consideration inasmuch as Hudson Presbytery (other presbyteries concurring) has overtured the next Assembly "to sever all connections with the Federal Council including financial support." It will be recalled that the last Assembly was restrained from taking such action only because of promises that the Council would be reorganized

along evangelical lines. It is contended by Hudson Presbytery and others that while a reorganization has taken place yet that the aims and policies of the Council remain almost as objectionable as ever. We share that belief. More particularly we believe that the Council is under the control of Modernists rather than Evangelicals and as such misrepresents rather than represents the evangelical churches. It seems to us that there is about as much likelihood that the Federal Council will change its character and aims as there is that the leopard will change its spots. Separation seems long overdue.

It is not probable that the Plan of Union with the United Presbyterian Church will figure largely in the next Assembly. In the first place, to meet the wishes of the United Presbyterians, who celebrate their 75th Anniversary at their next Assembly, action will not be asked until the 1934 Assemblies. In the second place, changes in the proposed Doctrinal Basis of Union have been agreed upon that go a long way at least toward removing the chief objection to the Plan of Union as originally proposed. It is now proposed to confine the Doctrinal Basis of Union to that now in effect in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. with the following: "The Confessional Statement of the United Presbyterian Church and the brief statement of the Reformed Faith adopted by the 1902 General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. have been made a part of the Plan of Union as 'historical interpretative statements.'" We confess we would like to be authoritatively informed as to just what is meant by calling these statements "historical interpretative statements." Pending such information we express our sense of satisfaction over the fact that the Joint Committee on Organic Union reports such progress "toward the formulation of a Plan of Union which will commend itself to the ministers and members of the negotiating Churches as altogether worthy of their whole-hearted approval."

Lack of space forbids further comment. Much of the time of the Assembly will be taken up with routine matters. While these routine matters will figure little in newspaper reports they may concern the things most important for the well-being of the Church. Whether the matter under consideration be of a routine nature or not, commissioners should not be unmindful of their right and duty to utter the decisive word relative to whatever may come before the Assembly.

#### DOES IT MATTER WHETHER JESUS EVER LIVED?



HAT MRS. BUCK intimated in an article in *Harper's Magazine* for January, she expressly states in an article in the *Cosmopolitan* for May, viz., that what is essential to Christianity would remain even if He be a product of "men's dreams," "the personification of the highest we human beings can know." She puts the question and answers it thus:

"And what if he never lived? What of that? Whether Christ had a body or not, whether He had a time to be born in history and a time to

die as other men have is no matter now; perhaps it never was any matter. What lives today is not the ephemeral body of flesh and bones. If once it lived, then well enough; if not, then, well too" (p. 170).

It is not to be supposed that there is anything particularly new in what MRS. BUCK says relative to the historicity of Jesus. It is merely a popular statement in widely read magazines of that "Christless Christianity" which, as DR. B. B. WARFIELD pointed out some twenty years ago in the *Harvard Theological Review* was even then "springing more and more into view . . . and being exploited about us." In that notable article—reprinted in *Christology and Criticism* (Oxford University Press)—DR. WARFIELD showed that what he strikingly called "Christless Christianity" exists not only when men calling themselves Chris-

tians deny that Jesus ever lived but equally when they affirm that Christianity is not bound up with the question whether Jesus actually lived. When DR. WARFIELD wrote, "Christless Christianity"—at least in America—had found little expression outside of academic circles. Here, however, and in this lies the main significance of MRS. BUCK's article, we find this Christless Christianity given attractive literary expression by a then missionary of the Presbyterian Church and printed in a magazine that is read by millions.

Lack of space forbids any extended discussion of this question in this connection. Suffice it to say that it is inextricably bound up with the question, What is Christianity? There is nothing surprising in the fact that MRS. BUCK holds that it is not a matter of life or death to Christianity whether Jesus ever lived. We would take the same position if we shared her conception of what constitutes the essence of Christianity. According to MRS. BUCK, as to most modernists, Christianity is essentially a way of life. But if Christianity be primarily not a way of life but a way of salvation from the guilt and power of sin through the expiatory death of the God-man and by the aid of the living Christ—as is taught in the New Testament—we can assert that it is a matter of no vital importance whether Jesus ever lived only at the cost of repudiating what until the rise of Modernism was all but universally known as Christianity. It may be a comfort to Modernists, especially to those who think that history affords us only probable truth, to be assured that essential Christianity is independent of the question whether Christ ever existed. It is no comfort to us, however, because what we call Christianity would be little more than "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing" unless it be true that the Jesus of the New Testament not only lived but lives as Saviour and Lord.

The main reason why it is vital to Christianity whether Jesus actually lived is that otherwise it is a matter of indifference whether Jesus died for our sins. A Christianity without an actual expiation of human sin through the atoning death of Christ lacks what is most essential to historic Christianity. "Expiation, in its very nature," to cite from Dr. Warfield's article referred to above, "is not a principle, but a fact, an event which takes place, if at all, in the conditions of time and place. A valid religion for sinful man includes in it, accordingly, of necessity an historical element, an actually wrought expiation for its sin. It is the very nerve of Christianity and the essence of its appeal to men—by virtue of which it has won its way in the world—that it provides this historical element and proclaims an actual expiation of human sin." It is hardly less important to note that if it is a matter of indifference whether Jesus ever lived it is also a matter of indifference whether He lives today. Obviously it cannot be maintained that Jesus lives today, in any proper sense of the word, if He did not live in the past. But as we pointed out in the last issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, under the title, "Christ as our Contemporary," the secret of Christianity's influence in the world is inextricably bound up with the fact that it brings men into contact with the living Christ as one from whom they obtain not only the forgiveness of their sins but strength to live as He lived.

If it is a matter of no vital importance whether Jesus bore our sins in His own body on the tree; if, moreover, it is a matter of no vital importance whether Jesus lives today as one who breaks that dominion that sin has over us and enables us to walk in newness of life; then, we may admit that it is a matter of relatively small importance whether Jesus ever lived. But otherwise all our hopes for time and eternity are groundless unless Christ—we mean the Christ of the New Testament—actually lived and died and rose as the Scriptures record. We submit that what MRS. BUCK calls Christianity is just no Christianity at all.

# Why Does Our Board of Foreign Missions Approve and Commend Modernist "Mission Study Books"?

By the Rev. Joseph A. Schofield, Jr.  
Minister, First Presbyterian Church, Gouverneur, N. Y.

[The Editors consider this article to contain material of great value, which is of extreme importance to every Presbyterian. It is an examination of "Living Issues in China," by the late Henry T. Hodgkin, the interdenominational study book for 1932-1933. The significance of this whole matter, of course, lies in the fact that the book is recommended by the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.]



THE entire Christian world was shocked when, in the late fall of 1932, there appeared "Re-Thinking Missions," the book which contains the report of the Commission of Appraisal of the so-called "Laymen's Inquiry" into foreign missions. And well Christian people everywhere might be shocked. For the book, as Dr. Machen has pointed out, "constitutes from beginning to end an attack upon the historic Christian Faith." So much so, indeed, that the *Sunday School Times* has called the group of men and women who wrote the report, "The Betrayal Commission." At once Presbyterians in large numbers began to ask themselves a question which for many months had been troubling certain members of our church, but which had not come to the attention of any considerable number until "Re-Thinking Missions" came into their hands. This question was whether our own Board of Foreign Missions has taken any part in the sort of mission work that this dangerous report advocates; whether our Board has been engaging in or encouraging any Modernistic work on its fields; whether, in a word, Modernism has begun to enter into the work of our Board. The answers that have been coming from various quarters to this question have not been reassuring. The rank and file of the church is beginning to realize what certain men in the church have long known that our Board has permitted Modernism to enter into its work in various lines of activity both at home and abroad. Dr. Machen has marshalled in masterly fashion much evidence and has presented it to the church in his 110-page brief, containing the argument in support of an overture he introduced in the Presbytery of New Brunswick, and printed under the title, "Modernism and the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A." There is one bit of evidence which is not touched upon in Dr. Machen's argument and which has had little or no consideration up to the present time.



THE REV. J. A. SCHOFIELD, JR.

This has to do with the interdenominational mission study books, which our Board aids in preparing and which it commends to the church. It is my purpose to present this evidence of Modernism in our Board of Foreign Missions in the present article.

As everyone knows, Mission Study Books are prepared by interdenominational committees for a united study of foreign missions, and are widely used in churches of many denominations. In recent years these books, as least those prepared for adults, have been, almost without exception, modernistic in their point of view. It is therefore difficult to see how our Board can co-operate in their preparation, can urge the churches to use them and can advocate their wide distribution and still escape the charge of favoring Modernism in missions. And many devout Christians are asking themselves the question

how they can continue to support a Board which advocates and promotes the study of such books. But let us make clear, first of all, the connection the Board has with these books; and then let us examine a typical specimen and see just how Modernistic they are.

First, then, let us note the relationship our Board has to these interdenominational mission study books. (1) Our Board of Foreign Missions co-operates in the preparation of these books. In the 95th Annual Report of the Board as printed in the Minutes of the 1932 General Assembly, page 24, we read the following: "In co-operation with the Department of Missionary Education of the Board of Christian Education, the Board of Foreign Missions has had a most successful year in promoting foreign missions throughout the Church. Secretaries of the Board serve on the committees of the Missionary Education Movement, and on Central Committee of the United Study of Foreign Missions, and help in the planning of the interdenominational study books. . . ."

(Continued on Page 21)

# Samuel G. Craig, Editor of Christianity Today

His Record and The Work at Hand

By the Rev. Frank H. Stevenson, D.D.

[The Managing Editor has taken the responsibility of the publication of this brilliant piece of writing. In doing so it is only fair to say that he has not sought the consent or advice of Dr. Craig, whose modesty, in such an event, would doubtless have caused him to forbid its appearance. The Managing Editor hopes that he will be forgiven. Dr. Stevenson needs no introduction to the international constituency of Christianity Today.]



**C**HILDREN, according to an imperfect adage, should be seen and not heard. Editors reverse the precept, which remains imperfect however, and endeavor to be heard and not seen.

Usually the very editors we want to know about are most scrupulous in observing this unwritten law of journalism, printing columns about ditch-digger and king, but never a word about themselves.

Two contemporary magazines, *Time* and *Fortune*, offer an example of the peculiarity of many of their kind. One is a news weekly candid to the point of excess about matters and people; the other a magazine *de luxe* whose jewelled pages display, in a wealth of illustrations and text, the romantic personages of the world's business and commerce. Mr. Henry Luce presides over both publications with such originality and ingenuity that if either *Time* or *Fortune* were to vouchsafe a few words about his walk and conversation every subscriber would be interested. But although they describe men and women of all degrees of importance and news value, neither magazine spares a line for the slightest hint of the character and habits of Mr. Luce; he is sacrosanct.

Editors of leading newspapers are equally sensitive to publicity. How many readers of *The New York Times* know even the name of its editor? I do not refer to Mr. John H. Finley, the member of the staff whose duty it is to make public addresses, but to the editor-in-chief. He is the Rev. Rollo Ogden, once a prominent Presbyterian pastor in Cleveland, Ohio, and subsequently a rather well known missionary in Mexico. When he entered journalism he dropped out of sight completely. On the powerful *New York Herald-Tribune* the chief editorial writer happens to be a Mr. Geoffrey Parsons who is that phenomenon in Manhattan, a native New Yorker in command of a paper in his own city. But in a remote room of the *Herald-*



THE REV. SAMUEL G. CRAIG, D.D.

*Tribune* Building on West Forty-first Street he molds the opinions and judgments of half a million people, very few of whom will learn what manner of man he is before his obituary is printed at some, let us hope, distant day. Several years ago it was the writer's privilege to meet a professor of history in a university near New York City. I knew him in a casual way for months before discovering that from 1918 to 1923 he had been an editor of *The New York Sun*. The career of the best editors is a tunnel of oblivion with rare exits to the light.

There is no guarantee therefore that the editor of *CHRISTIANITY TODAY* will violate the custom of his profession and permit the use of his story and his portrait in his own paper. He was not consulted when the article was prepared and when he sees it he probably will recall how Charles A. Dana said that

a forehead of brass is necessary to an editor who features himself in the news columns he controls. But an exception can be made even in the sacred traditions of the press, and for the sake of a cause which he always has valued above convention, Dr. Craig may be induced to yield this one time.

He ought to yield. Defenders of the old Faith and the old Book are too few in number to stand on formalities with each other. Following the violent controversies and misrepresentations of recent years, some of the men and women who are his friends will be reassured if they are given a glimpse of his frank Cromwellian face and it will be helpful to others if they are furnished with a more intimate knowledge of his background, motives, and attainments than they can find in his extremely impersonal writings, self-revealing as these occasionally are. I am submitting this sketch largely on the assumption that the sound wisdom of the staff of *CHRISTIANITY TODAY* will avail to see that it is printed unabridged, with a not too inconspicuous photograph attached. Together we may render a considerable service to the Presbyterian Church.

## II.

Dr. Craig is a son of the prairies of Illinois and Missouri and his youth was spent on the farm. He is as familiar with seed-time and harvest, with hazards of weather, uncertainties of markets, over and under-production and the rest of agricultural economy good and bad, as he is with the troubled progress of Christianity in this perplexed and cynical generation, and that takes in an unusual amount of territory.

Tales such as he might tell of boyhood experiences on the plains of the Middle West are the stories of rugged pioneering to which countless popular books testify. Distinguished citizens brought up in the same region continually are laying claim to virtues secured from the prairie soil, or failing to make the claim for themselves, their biographers do it for them, as Carl Sandburg did for Lincoln. General Pershing ascribes a portion of his prowess to a boyhood spent in a Missouri rural community where the environment taught him to meet recurring emergencies, and to endure hardness, as a patriot and Christian should. A volume of ex-President Hoover's campaign speeches shows the effectiveness of allusions to the blacksmith shop and farm at West Branch, Iowa. The open spaces of the country are commendable places for Presidents and Generals—and Editors to come from. Dr. Craig hails from this hardy hinterland and has had occasions to thank God for it. At times he has needed the patience and persistence which only the most rigorous discipline in youth could give him.

From the farm he went to college; first in Missouri and then in Princeton, New Jersey. Quite accidentally this winter I found an article on intercollegiate football at Princeton University in an issue of *The Cosmopolitan* magazine. In the center of a picture illustrating the article is the figure of Samuel Craig, unmistakable in proportions, appearing as resolute and dependable in the football armor of 1899 as he does in a business suit at his desk in the office of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. That picture really suggested the writing of this attempted appraisal of his life.

The article compares the modern game with the style of play used thirty years ago, and contrasts the open and closed methods of attack. Yale and the other universities were as hard to beat then as now, but the Princeton eleven of 1899 went through to victory with the flying-wedges and the bone-crushing devices in vogue in football's Homeric age. According to old graduates' accounts, those fabulous players had the strength, speed and skill which are commonplace among athletes; but in addition they had qualities which are not commonplace among athletes or elsewhere.

They had a willingness to bear pain without undue display of wounds, and a do-or-die determination available for desperate situations.

If it is interesting to see the Princeton pictures and to read the record, it is especially gratifying to associate hard-earned victory with Dr. Craig. The arena's corruptible crown is not a chief objective in life; its lustre is temporal and its glory passes away. But there now must be substantial cheer for a man engaged in a struggle seemingly endless, to be able to recall far-off happy days and battles long ago when contests were neither draws nor defeats, but were won. In early manhood God was preparing His servant for his future just as surely as He prepared him when a boy.

After completing five years of study at Princeton in the University and Theological Seminary and enjoying a share of play, the academic education of Dr. Craig was concluded in the rigid intellectual atmosphere of Germany, at the University of Berlin. His pastorates were in Ebensburg and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. From the North Presbyterian Church, the neighborhood church of Western Theological Seminary in Pittsburgh, he was called in 1915 to be associate editor of *The Presbyterian*, at the time the militantly conservative journal of our denomination. Since then with scarcely an interruption he has been a Presbyterian journalist.

## III.

Dr. Craig's home is in Princeton, New Jersey. His residence is the old-fashioned red brick house on Stockton Street which was built many years ago for Francis Landey Patton as an inducement for him to leave Chicago and take a professorship in Princeton Seminary. He wanted to stay in Chicago and the new house may have been a lure that persuaded him eventually to enter the scene of his great achievements. When Dr. Patton in 1888 was elected President of the University (then a college), and moved to the campus, the residence was occupied by a succession of other eminent men, among them George T. Purves, the famous preacher and New Testament teacher, and Robert Dick Wilson, the authority in Old Testament languages, both titans in the realm of evangelical scholarship.

The house, of course, is so located in Princeton that from the tall windows of his study Dr. Craig, if he chooses, can cast a reflective eye across the street to the spacious grounds of the Theological Seminary with which he used to be associated as a student, as a close friend of the Faculty, and finally as a member of the Board of Directors. While it might be natural for him to waste himself in meditating upon what that magnificent and venerable seat of Christian



THE REV. MAITLAND ALEXANDER,  
D.D., LL.D.


learning once was, what its builders and givers of endowments intended it forever to be, and what it now is, he seldom indulges the melancholy contemplation. Christians are out of place at a Wailing Wall.

Much of Dr. Craig's work is done at his home. On all sides of his study shelves are lined with books from floor to ceiling, and tables fitted to corners and alcoves of the room are piled with magazines. Over the fire-place is a portrait of Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield. Near the east windows is a desk covered with correspondence, and on the corner of the desk is a worn typewriter plainly accustomed to hard usage. The editor's working hours are from eight in the morning to an indeterminate time of the night.

Actual labor involved in preparing material for a magazine making pretension to authority in the field of Christian literature is prodigious. It means a painstaking effort to select the best of a vast array of church news, discussions of preaching and teaching, sermons, articles on Bible interpretation, and correspondence from America, Europe, and foreign mission fields; beside writing volumes of editorials, book reviews and accounts of current events as they relate to Christian faith and life. Such labor is unremitting and yet it is far from the total of a publisher's task.

Repeatedly Dr. Craig has faced the inevitable problem of paying bills when due, and of raising funds to meet perennial deficits. When necessary, and this has been often, he himself has furnished the funds to insure the printing of the next issue. He has given much and received little, and if the papers under his direction have been a success it has been because, ungrudgingly and unhesitatingly, he has put both his time and whatever money he could command at their disposal. Some devoted people have stood by him financially through the years, but many times the number ought to be sharing the burden willingly. There is no better investment for the Lord Jesus Christ; no contribution to the protection and projection of the Gospel more direct and productive.

Fortunately Dr. Craig has assistance in his editorial work. A competent Managing Editor has come to the staff of CHRISTIANITY TODAY in the person of Mr. H. McAllister Griffiths, a young Presbyterian minister from California, who has a reporter's insight and a natural gift for clear, concise and spirited writing. His reports of recent General Assemblies and of the current Laymen's Appraisal of Missions have been exceptionally fine. Mr. Griffiths is a Calvinist of the Covenanter type, with no love for compromise either in doctrine or in practice. By talent and inclination he is admirably adapted to further the paper's policy.



THE REV. DAVID S. KENNEDY, D.D.

#### IV.

The motives and results of Dr. Craig's career possess a significance beyond any personal interest we may have in him. They summarize for us important principles at issue today and are a catalog of most of the accomplishments of the whole company of contenders for the Christian faith during two decades of upheaval within our Church.

Motives are mentioned first, for a majority of Presbyterians may now be numbered among those unpredictable Christians who refuse to be convinced that journalism as exemplified in Dr. Craig has a legitimate place in the shifting streams of modern thought. It is common knowledge that a few Presbyterians have gone out of their way to denounce such journalism as worse than futile, and as essentially wicked. On both counts they are wrong. Certain varieties of religious papers indeed may not be needed, and if they conform to the fashion of the world, unquestionably they are wicked. But the journalism Dr. Craig expresses, for all its disturbance to our complacency, is so absolutely right and so immeasurably valuable that the Christian Church must have it in some form within its wide frontiers or risk the surrender of its corporate testimony and invite degeneration into religious tribalism.

It should be remembered moreover that criticism which once was aimed at the old *Presbyterian* and now finds a target in CHRISTIANITY TODAY, can be applied to the New Testament itself. When Dr. Craig announces the purpose of "stating, defending and furthering the Gospel in the modern world," he is following a pattern. Read the prologue to Luke's writing, or the first chapter of Paul's letter to the Galatians, or the last two verses in John XX, or the Second Epistle of Peter, or the concluding words of Revelation XXII, and see the pattern. It runs all the way through the New Testament. The proclamation of the Gospel in the early Church encountered opposing views. They were met and dealt with in the Apostles' vigorous and widely circulated writings until the churches were delivered from danger.

By a form of journalism, the Apostles built up and preserved primitive congregations as churches of Christ instead of churches of a hundred varying allegiances. Therefore a Christian editor in the tumultuous twentieth century who persists in the duty to "reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering and doctrine" is actuated by motives derived from the commands and example of the Word of God.

This must be the explanation of antagonism to Dr. Craig. When he went to *The Presbyterian* the editor-in-chief was the able, resourceful and lovable Dr. David S. Kennedy.

They were of one mind in standing unflinchingly for the Christian belief as that belief is Scripturally stated in the Westminster Confession of Faith. The motive that marked their association together, and upon Dr. Kennedy's retirement, the motive that was to distinguish Dr. Craig as he went forward alone, is solely a tenacious loyalty to consistent and Biblical Christianity. To the natural man such a motive is exceedingly offensive, and has been always. Some men who are prominent in Christian churches find it difficult to forgive the calm assurance that is based on a mere "thus saith the Lord," and whenever controversy grows warm, or lines of division have to be drawn between out-and-out believers in the Gospel and advocates of popular and plausible substitutes, their attitude has to be reckoned with.

#### V.

Results of the seventeen years of Dr. Craig's journalism are to be seen primarily in help given to thousands of pastors, Sunday School teachers, Missionaries, parents, churches, and homes. These results can be taken for granted; they testify to themselves. What we are to review are the extraordinary results of an editorial policy that did not falter during a series of gravest emergencies affecting the doctrinal integrity of the Presbyterian Church. Although the emergencies and everything connected with them are fading from the recollection of evangelical Christians, we need to remember them. One thing the matter with us is, we are entirely preoccupied with the stupendous drama of current developments and we rarely look back even to the very recent past. We have forgotten the promise that "thine ears shall hear a word behind thee saying, This is the way; walk ye in it."

The word behind us that speaks here, issues from the journalistic experience of Samuel G. Craig. For younger ministers and students in theological seminaries this particular word not only is a means of guidance but it will help solve the problems of two decades of important history. Theological students and recent graduates are more bewildered by the doctrinal disruption of the Presbyterian Church than most of us imagine. They have a legitimate claim upon any facts that may bring them into touch with reality. I shall try to state these facts briefly, avoiding the danger of over-simplification as much as I can. God grant the truth may "have free course and be glorified."

When Dr. Craig joined the staff of *The Presbyterian* in 1916, the Church faced a critical situation in which he at once was involved. We might call it the opening engagement of the present controversy; certainly it contained all the elements which were to be extended into the general conflict.

For several years Presbyterians in New York City had been licensing a procession of candidates for the ministry. These candidates had been recommended for qualities that were obviously engaging; they had well-trained minds and were attractive individually. Everybody liked them. It was the examination of their belief that revealed the one thing lacking in their fitness to preach the Gospel of Christ. Asked, for example, if they believed the Gospel narrative of the miraculous birth of Jesus, the answer was: "We neither affirm nor deny." Asked if they thought several other of the essential doctrines of Christianity were true, they would answer again: "We neither affirm nor deny." The reply was repeated until it began to sound like a prepared countersign to a fixed challenge. Holding to one of the prime theories of Modernism, namely that Christian doctrine is relatively unimportant in the equipment of a minister, these men had determined to introduce the theory to the Presbyterian Church by becoming ordained to teach it.

A small minority in New York Presbytery stood with Dr. W. D. Buchanan, pastor of the strong Broadway Presbyterian Church, and refused to approve applicant after applicant whose faith was abysmally negative just where the New Testament is most positive. The majority overruled objections with appalling regularity. They were splendid young men, and since they were sincere, let them preach. Union Theological Seminary, a fountain of unbelief, sent many a graduate into Presbyterian

pulpits during the period when New York Presbytery opened wide the gate of entrance. In they came. They may have turned out to be mystics, pragmatists, skeptics or agnostics; but in they have remained.

*The Presbyterian* warned the Church. Editorially and through news correspondence, week in and week out, the record was unfolded. Eventually the paper's vigorous hammering home of responsibility made an impression. Presbyterians were beginning to wonder why the government of the Church had grown suddenly helpless when relief came. Cincinnati, Fort Wayne, and Northumberland Presbyteries submitted overtures to the General Assembly in May, 1916, demanding action. Cincinnati actually suggested that New York Presbytery be excised from the Presbyterian Church unless some indication of obedience to the Constitution could be given forthwith. Other Presbyteries sent up overtures. Only Nashville Presbytery resorted to the protest that it was "discourteous, unwarranted and un-Christian" for one Presbytery "to assert" that the ministers of another Presbytery were "untrue to their ordination vows." Out in Cincinnati a great Southern and Western paper, *The Herald and Presbyter*, replied to the arguments



THE REV. W. D. BUCHANAN, D.D., LL.D.



of Nashville. Its editors, Drs. Frank C. Monfort and E. P. Whallon, never for a moment failed to contend earnestly for the faith.

The General Assembly convened in Atlantic City. Considerably embarrassed and anxious to be diplomatic, the Committee on Bills and Overtures arranged hearings.\* Out of prolonged conferences came a form of covenant known as "A Gentlemen's Agreement." In the relative quietness of a room in the Hotel Chalfonte, a quarter of a mile distant from the uproar in the auditorium on the Steel Pier, a compact was drawn largely at the dictation of representatives from the Presbyteries of Cincinnati and Fort Wayne, pledging the Presbytery of New York to explicit fidelity to Presbyterian law. It was a drastic document, but one by one the New York Commissioners signed it from the least unto the greatest of them. Two representatives from Cincinnati witnessed the signatures. For a number of years the agreement was carefully observed.

That was seventeen years ago. Presbyterians in the main acted as Christians should act when avowed doubters of the Gospel of Christ take possession of the Church's pulpits. Even *The Presbyterian Banner* rejoiced at the outcome, the editor writing characteristically: "This unanimous action, crowned with the prayer and song of thanksgiving and brotherhood, was a historic scene, and it was universally felt that it ushered in a new day of peace for the Presbyterian Church." When *The Presbyterian* received congratulations for pressing hard for the verdict, Dr. Kennedy wrote simply: "The action of the Assembly on the New York case is one of the weightiest and most important conclusions reached without judicial process, ever recorded in the history of the Church." Thus ended a preliminary skirmish, a mild foretaste of major engagements in store.

#### VI.

The Great War is blamed with many disasters. How it broke down the standards of sound management in nearly every human enterprise is the commonest of daily recriminations. The Presbyterian Church was not to escape. Restlessness was everywhere after 1918. The Inter-Church World Movement, born in 1918, was our Church's star exhibition of post-War eccentricity.

Here was an attempt to do away with New Testament missionary methods and substitute for them the practices of Big Business in the evangelization of the world. It was advanced by full-page advertisements in the press, by spec-

\*A vivid recollection of the position of four men (mentioned later) at the opening of the General Assembly of 1916 may warrant a footnote. Dr. Courtland Robinson, the present editor of *The Presbyterian* was angered by the zeal of representatives from Cincinnati and gave one of them (myself) a scathing lecture, ascribing the defeat of Dr. William L. McEwan in the election for Moderator directly to the Cincinnati overture. Dr. Charles R. Erdman, it is a pleasure to record, told the writer that the Church could not do otherwise than proceed resolutely with disciplinary action. Dr. J. Ross Stevenson, Chairman of the Committee on Bills and Overtures, seemed to be alternately annoyed and unconcerned, nothing more. It was a minister from Northumberland Presbytery, Dr. William C. Hogg, who galvanized the Committee on Bills and Overtures into action.—F. H. S.

tacular outdoor displays on billboards, by public teas, dinners and banquets, and by whirlwind drives for the funds of "friendly citizens." Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., approved it and spoke for it. Among Presbyterians Dr. Robert E. Speer and Dr. William Hiram Foulkes were its sponsors. Doomed as it was to quick collapse from wild extravagance and over-expansion, the Movement was not detached from the Boards of the Church without heroic efforts at rescue, and most of the Boards were entangled in the wreckage.

A year's running commentary in *The Presbyterian* and the two speeches by Dr. Maitland Alexander addressed to the 1920 General Assembly in its sessions at the Academy of Music in Philadelphia, proved sufficient to take the Church out of the organization. The debts would have to be paid, but there would be no additional liability. These debts, colossal in size, are a memorial for posterity's inspection. In addition to demonstrating the ease with which money can be spent before it is collected, they go far to show that efficiency is decreased with the pooling of management in the great Protestant Churches. The Inter-Church World Movement was impressive in magnitude, but unwieldy, ungovernable, and in the end, grotesque.

*The Presbyterian* played a part, possibly the most effective part, in steadying the Church in this and similar upheavals during the rash days following the War. Elementary Christian convictions and ordinary prudence usually prevailed in the General Assemblies and when the votes were counted the Church's views and *The Presbyterian's* views as a rule coincided. Conservative sentiment was strong and came to the front invariably.

#### VII.

How far one paper went to rally Presbyterians to the defense of their heritage probably is still better shown in the events of 1922 and 1923. It was then that Drs. H. E. Fosdick, W. P. Merrill and H. S. Coffin, with a co-operating press within and without the Church, formed an apparently invincible leadership that threatened to break down permanently the Presbyterian Church's corporate testimony to God's Word. It is difficult to describe the turmoil and passion that culminated in this onslaught.

*The Presbyterian* focused attention upon reports of the ebb and flow of opinion. The words of evangelical pastors like John F. Carson, Maitland Alexander, Clarence E. Macartney and W. D. Buchanan were printed, imploring the Church to stand firm; and space was wisely given to the replies of their at last confident opponents. There was good news from mass meetings held for the defense of the faith, and bad news from sections of the Presbyterian Church which turned to Drs. Fosdick, Merrill and Coffin as the Children of Israel turned to Aaron at Mount Sinai. Letters from aroused and devoted Christians were as polemic as the Epistles of Paul and they were published in every number, five and six a week. Editorials were on fire with messages of faith and courage.

Both sides looked to the General Assembly of 1923 for a decision that should determine the question put by Dr. Fosdick, "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" By "Fundamentalists" he meant orthodox Christians who believe the Bible,

and by "win" he meant particularly the enforcement of Presbyterian standards upon ministers like himself who thought fragments of God's Word contained the truth but considered a great deal of it, perhaps most of it, to be pious folk-lore and myth. We are not boasting of an understanding of the conscience of Dr. Fosdick and his champions but only their outstanding purpose. That purpose was ecclesiastical anarchy.

Dr. Fosdick was not a Presbyterian minister. Strictly speaking, he was a "guest-preacher" at the First Presbyterian Church in New York. But by reason of the notoriety usually attaching to shouts of defiance he had attracted a following and his pulpit had become a sounding-board, a national broadcasting station which Presbyterians throughout the nation were compelled to heed whether they wanted to or not. His supporters contended for Dr. Fosdick's right to preach as he pleased to the constituency they had established for him. This was the Liberal proposal in 1923 and the prospect of securing for it at least the tacit approval of the General Assembly, was favorable. Strong influences were working in its behalf; against it stood *The Presbyterian*, immovable, unbending; backed by evangelical churchmen.

When the decision came at last, it was a sweeping vindication of Gospel preaching and teaching, and was all that earnest Christian people had prayed for. The General Assembly solemnly enjoined the Church to a strict observance of its basic law and reaffirmed every article in the Confession of Faith which Dr. Fosdick had disputed. When Dr. Merrill, a Fosdick leader, subsequently sought re-election to the Board of Foreign Missions, Dr. Carson was chosen in his stead and Dr. Fosdick himself presently withdrew to the welcoming and congenial fellowship provided by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., where he belongs and whence he needed never to have strayed. The crisis had passed.

The summing up of results in 1923 might stop with this resounding Presbyterian answer to Dr. Fosdick's rhetorical question. It is the proper climax of the episode. A great denomination had been saved from open default to the most formidable and consequential invasion of unbelief in our times. If *The Presbyterian* owned a Covenant flag, and if that flag floated from the office window on a certain afternoon in May, 1923, there was justification for it. On our earthly pilgrimage there are occasions when

" . . . Strife is fierce, the battle long,  
Steals on the ear the distant triumph song,  
And hearts are brave again, and arms are strong."

It is right to make the most of them.

One minor incident, however, marred the ultimate results of the otherwise satisfactory General Assembly of 1923. Two ministers were candidates for Moderator in 1924, Dr. Clarence E. Macartney, who had honored the Church and distinguished himself in the Fosdick discussions, and Dr. Charles R. Erdman, who then was estimated as a man opposed to meeting the thrusts of Modernism with anything approaching Dr. Macartney's positive action. Individually the two men were regarded with esteem by all evangelical Presbyterians; in policy they were accounted leagues apart.

Dr. Fosdick's adherents and some staunchly orthodox Commissioners gave their voice and vote to Dr. Erdman's candidacy, but Dr. Macartney, as unpliant in the situation as John Knox, manifestly was the man for the hour and he was elected Moderator. Sad to relate, the victory was bought at a price. From that day the friends of Dr. Erdman walked no more with the friends of Dr. Macartney. The next crisis in the Church was to find the former group aligned with President J. Ross Stevenson in the re-making of Princeton Theological Seminary. Upon this almost incredible contingency a tragedy was to take root and bear bitter fruit. The tragedy's prelude was the rise of *The Auburn Affirmation*, and the white-washing of that heretical pronouncement by the Committee of Fifteen appointed by Dr. Erdman when he attained the Moderatorship in 1925. Its aftermath is a weakened Church.



THE REV. CLARENCE E. MACARTNEY,  
D.D., LL.D.

#### VIII.

It is profitless to thresh over the old straw of the Princeton controversy. The field is gleaned and the grain garnered. But Princeton Theological Seminary looms so large in Presbyterian history and Dr. Craig came so close to prevailing upon the Presbyterian Church to continue the maintenance of Princeton in its former glory, that considered simply as a feat in journalism the achievement deserves a thorough-going examination.

*The Presbyterian* now stood practically alone among other papers. In all the prolonged struggle newspapers and magazines in general realized no more than that at Princeton was a flourishing theological school, very famous, very old, very rich and most influential; and that its President was in disagreement with the Board of Directors, with the Faculty and with a large majority of the students. Because of the Seminary's prominence various accounts of current developments were published, as reporters understood them. But the reason for President J. Ross Stevenson's campaign against his colleagues never was made quite clear in the newspapers. An ordinary reader had to guess at causes; and one guess was as good as another.

Religious papers were more illuminating. They presented an occasional idea of the issue involved. But the religious press as a whole was so deeply sympathetic with Liberalism, and editors were so enthusiastic in anticipating the overthrow of a stronghold of Calvinistic theology that references to Princeton took on the finality of a sentence upon a convicted prisoner. In *The Presbyterian Advance* and *The Presbyterian Banner* the case was settled almost before it began. Princeton's prestige, and Princeton's aggressive advocacy and defense of the Reformation Faith had been irritating them for years. If President Stevenson wanted a different Seminary they were glad; if he desired to discipline Professor Robert Dick Wilson and Assistant Professor J. Gresham Machen, they were delighted; if his purpose was to neutralize Princeton for the duration of the Church's conflict with Liberalism, that suited their plans precisely. They were for anything that was against the time-honored position of Princeton Seminary in the van of contenders for the faith. So they joined the hue and cry for complete reorganization.

Unhappily much of the Presbyterian Church's opinion of Princeton was formed without the aid of Journalism. Stories which the tellers were careful to keep out of print attacked the reputation of members of the Board of Directors and the Faculty until it appeared that the President of the Seminary had understated his case. These tales had no guarantors; they were a by-product of the intensity of men's feelings and were repeated with blind and unreasoning prejudice, and as might be expected, they also were repeated with progressive exaggeration. Contradiction did not overtake them. Only the perspective of time would be able to demonstrate their absurdity, and meanwhile they ran their baleful course.

Dr. Craig and Dr. Kennedy addressed themselves to the defense of the Seminary. They could not deal with whispered slander, but they were resolved to meet every responsible statement with full information. If they could publish the facts they thought the Church would not act with the instincts of a mob clamoring for frontier justice. With humility and a sense of their own inadequacy, once more they put on the armor of God and enlisted as Christ's soldiers in love's battle for the truth. Both of them knew they would suffer before the battle was done.

*The Presbyterian* was printed accordingly. And for three years the Church did refuse to re-make Princeton despite the activity of every agency of persuasion and emotion known to church politicians. Princeton was safe in the debates of 1926, 1927 and 1928. Three years of assault, and the institution was standing like an impregnable rock.

Christians who remember only that "Fighting Fundamentalists" (a designation of honor, by the way, as the term was applied) lost Princeton may have forgotten why they lost. Princeton certainly was not lost as long as Dr. Craig was given a reasonable opportunity to print the truth. The old Seminary had more friends in 1928 than in 1926; on the other hand supporters of President Stevenson steadily decreased in number. In 1928 the Reorganization's Chairman, Dr. W. O. Thompson, was ready to quit, and said so.

It scarcely could have been otherwise. With *The Presbyterian* to consult, a substantial proportion of Commissioners at each Assembly knew: (1) That President Stevenson's definite objective was a complacent Seminary conforming to, not opposing, the drift of the times, and suggesting some model in his mind which may have been McCormick Seminary in Chicago where he himself had studied and taught. Whatever the model, it was very unlike the doctrinally aggressive Princeton of the Alexanders and Hodges and their successors. (2) That the Board of Directors was under fire because the majority of its members were adhering loyally to the Seminary's purpose and design. (3) That Professor Wilson as Student Advisor occupied a position created by the students themselves, and that they appreciated to the utmost the difference in attitude of Dr. Wilson and President Stevenson toward Princeton's standards. (4) That Dr. Machen was within his rights in pointing out a breakdown in faith in the pulpits, boards and schools of the Presbyterian Church. (5) That the League of Evangelical Students was obnoxious only to those who disliked its straight-forward evangelical stand. (6) That President Stevenson, Dr. Erdman, Dr. Mudge, Dr. Speer and Dr. Thompson represented a pronounced minority opinion on the Board of Directors, Faculty and Student Body and had a majority opinion in their support only on the Board of Trustees. And (7) that the plan of reorganization, in the judgment of qualified lawyers, was illegal. These were telling facts. And they were prevailing as facts have a way of prevailing ultimately, when press and speech are free.

Success was in sight in 1928, and then came one of the strangest bi-partisan measures ever agreed to on this earth by a body of men who have contended for the truth. In Tulsa, in 1928, the conservative forces who dominated the General Assembly voted to postpone action on Princeton for yet another year. Bad though this was, it was not the worst. Indeed it sounded fair enough, for at the rate at which the friends of Princeton were multiplying, victory was probably more certain a year ahead, and meanwhile steps could be taken to deal with President Stevenson and his revolutionary plans through Princeton's own authorities. But in addition to the postponing resolution was the fatal provision of another resolution. *Presbyterian papers were asked to withhold comment on Princeton during the intervening twelve months.*

When the veterans in the long struggle for a great cause fell into the double trap which we must hope was set for their feet unwittingly, their gallant fight was over. They had surrendered. Absolutely to prevent adjustment of the internal differences at Princeton, all President Stevenson and his associates had to do, and did, was to refuse to co-operate. Internal troubles were to be accentuated, piled mountain high, before the year rolled around. The faithful Board of Directors had been chastised with whips; now they were to feel the lash of scorpions. Informing publicity was shut off; nothing could be written about it. The bare disclosure of confusion and deadlock was all that was to be exhibited to the next General Assembly.

Dr. Craig had been prompt to announce that a General Assembly resolution could not bind privately-owned papers

and that he considered himself free to print whatever news would promote the welfare of the Church. Shortly before the twelve months had elapsed he did publish several reports. But the pledge of secrecy hung over Princeton like a thick cloud and no publicity was possible in time to do good.

Removal of a Board of Directors apparently unable to direct, was a foregone conclusion at St. Paul in 1929. Platform debate, limited to a few minutes, was perfunctory. Commissioners were impatient. If ever they had known the real meaning of reorganization as it had been explained to other Assemblies, they had forgotten it. They acted as wisely as men could act in the circumstances.

Would the same Commissioners vote today as they voted in 1929? Of course, not. In justice to them we cannot write on the tombstone of the old Princeton, "This institution died because the General Assembly of 1929 condemned her witness to the Westminster Confession of Faith." To use one of Dr. Machen's penetrating phrases, Princeton's death sentence was pronounced by men who were compelled "to think with an empty mind."

#### IX.

Four months after Princeton was reorganized, Westminster Theological Seminary was established in Philadelphia. Twenty-nine young men left the two upper classes at Princeton Seminary to become the nucleus of its student body; four teachers from Princeton volunteered to start the Faculty, and a fifth soon joined them. The new Seminary prospered, thanks to an outpouring of prayers and gifts. Seventy-nine students, seven professors, and not a dollar of indebtedness, March 1st, 1933, revealed an assuring stability in the unparalleled conditions of the fourth year of the new institution's life.

Dr. Craig was a founder of Westminster Seminary. He made *The Presbyterian* its unofficial press representative; gave the Church every paragraph of news about the ministers' and laymen's first meetings in its behalf; and printed a complete account of the opening exercises which some day may have historical value. The response to the publication of the truth again confirmed his faith in the inherent worth of a free press that reaches the homes of God's people.

Meanwhile there were developments on *The Presbyterian*. After the St. Paul General Assembly Dr. Craig became aware of a shift in attitude on the part of the paper's majority stockholders. They did not say a great deal, but he felt that they no longer approved the editorial policy he had consistently maintained. Dr. William L. McEwan, the President of *The Presbyterian's* Board, soon was to be

elected President of the coalition of widely varying elements that constitute the new board of control of Princeton Seminary, and he surmised that, too. He was not deterred. He had a duty to perform, a cause to plead, and his was Esther's stout motto: "If I perish, I perish." It was impossible for him to praise the re-made Princeton without sheer hypocrisy; and as an evangelical editor he was under the plainest obligation to promote Westminster. He followed a straight course; was perfectly open about it, and took the risk of dismissal. Six months passed before he was summarily removed. In June, 1930, he began the publication of *CHRISTIANITY TODAY*. On *The Presbyterian* he was succeeded by Dr. Courtland Robinson.

#### X.

Experiences of seventeen years fairly well prove four points.

First, every controversy dividing the Church has been doctrinal. Carefully calculated and far-seeing efforts to change the Presbyterian Church into an organization that would countenance an unbelieving ministry were on the march. Such forces as were available opposed them. This was the reason for conflicts of such moment that they set ministers at variance against ministers, elders against elders, churches against churches, shattered the unity of mission stations in every foreign field, and left us at war in the House of God.

Second, having a paper capable of taking the lead, Bible-believing Presbyterians overcame the defection of the Presbytery of New York; resisted the Inter-Church World Movement; stood steadfast during the Fosdick invasion; and were on the threshold of victory at Princeton.

Third, a conscientious and fearless journal made history; sound, honest, Christian history. Until the journal was silenced, Princeton did not succumb. And until Dr. Craig was dismissed as editor and placed, as his adversaries trusted, beyond the pale, the doctrinally indifferent section of the Presbyterian Church did not reach its present political ascendancy.

Fourth, the record is encouraging. Conservatives may be too innocent to match wits with skilful Church politicians and they may be helpless in the arts of strategy and intrigue, but they have yet to lose a case when the laity and eldership of the Church have been informed fully of the issues. The problem is to get the information to the people.

#### XI.

Is there a prospect that *CHRISTIANITY TODAY* will approach the record of the old *Presbyterian* in upholding the standards of the Presbyterian Church? Some observers are



THE REV. J. GRESHAM MACHEN,  
D.D., Litt.D.

pessimistic. Writing along this line just three months ago, a paper in another denomination prophesied dismally: "Will the Presbyterian Church set up its ancient banners again? We fervently hope it will, but we know nothing in history which furnishes ground for hope. When Churches decay they seldom, if ever, return to their original purity. One might point to the Established Church in the Netherlands where the forces of orthodoxy are stronger and more numerous than fifty years ago, yet even in this Church heresy thrives in the congregations and councils. Conservatives seem to be fighting a losing battle in the Presbyterian Church. The establishment of Westminster Seminary by several former leaders of Princeton was a heroic effort to create a new educational stronghold for orthodoxy, but . . ."

All of which is indubitably true. Conditions in the Church are bad and the precedent cited is against hope. Moreover any influence which CHRISTIANITY TODAY may have, perhaps is less exercised horizontally over this period than vertically over coming years. But ten years hence, if God spares him, Dr. Craig's labor and fidelity may show rewards like those of 1916, 1920, 1923, and 1928. Historically the Presbyterian Church is a faithful Church and certainly within ten years should respond again to the call of its own blood. God repeatedly has healed backslidings worse than ours and re-established His people in other generations. Some indications of His purpose seem to be manifesting themselves even now, demanding attention and work.

Professor Henry P. Van Dusen, of Union Theological Seminary in New York, who ought to know, says that Liberalism is done for. He is quoted as follows in the *New York Herald-Tribune* of January 21st, 1933: "Liberalism stands condemned. Its premises are being subjected to devastating criticism. . . . It is significant that those who stand somewhere between radicalism and traditionalism, are today as loath to be labeled Liberal as they were to be called Modernist some years since." This authority may not wholly represent the body of ideas he presumes to voice but Liberalism, a foe familiar to Presbyterians, can be subdued, and there is no better instrument to help finish the needful work as far as Presbyterians are concerned than CHRISTIANITY TODAY. Dr. Machen regularly contributes to CHRISTIANITY TODAY and Dr. Machen is a man the Liberals have yet to answer.

How shall Presbyterians deal with Buchmanism, the so-called Oxford Movement? Print the facts. CHRISTIANITY TODAY in its February issue had illuminating articles on the fascination of Buchmanism for its disciples, with endorsements from two conspicuous Presbyterians, President

Stevenson of Princeton Seminary and Secretary John A. Mackay of the Board of Foreign Missions. Another side is described by Dr. A. C. Gabelein and Dr. W. M. Rochester. We read of its fashionable convocations at luxurious hotels, the intimate meetings at house parties, and the insistence upon the interchange of confessions that shall have no reserves.


Two truths emerge. The social embellishment of the fellowship is a new departure in Christian practice. By the widest stretch of interpretation it cannot be said to be

derived from Apostolic example notwithstanding the Oxford Group's claim to First Century authorization. And new is the theory that it is wholesome for young people, or older people, to share confessions bound to lead to topics which Paul declares are "not once (to be) named among you . . . for it is a shame even to speak of those things." Mr. Edward D. Duffield harshly calls Buchmanism soul-baring, "Christian nudism," and until a more delicate metaphor is provided it will warn unwary enthusiasts of the danger to their minds and memories in the "sharing" factor of the cult. A sinner may and must go straight to God with his sin (Psalms XXXII and LI), and the safeguards limiting human interchanges are specific (Matthew XVIII, 15; Acts XIX, 18-19; James V, 14-16). Print the facts and Buchmanism will cease to operate in the fold of Christ.

This year our Board of Foreign Missions may be constrained to resume first principles. For months Dr.

Craig has been publishing news of a crusade for the purification of our missionary enterprise that will restore confidence to the Church if it can be carried to a length that will show the Board how in earnest we are about it. An unswerving faithfulness in the proclamation of the Gospel as it is contained in the Word of God, and an utter unwillingness to make common cause with any other Gospel, whether it goes under the Name of Christ or not, soon must become the announced principle of our Board of Foreign Missions or the Board's activities will defeat their own purpose on the mission fields of the world. Mergers with Modernists, Liberals, and Buchmanites; and compromises with heathenism, are suicidal missionary measures. The race is between orthodoxy and catastrophe in the mission stations of China and Japan and India, and the Board of Foreign Missions has not a great deal of time to halt between two opinions. Why should we falter in an honest attempt to restore the missionary enterprise to its elementary task?

Indeed can there be any discharge from the war against false teaching while it prevails in the Presbyterian Church? One would devoutly hope that at least some Presbyterians will be sufficiently intolerant never to tolerate it in pulpits



THE LATE REV. ROBERT DICK WILSON  
D.D., Ph.D., LL.D.

and mission fields. Outside the Church, false teaching may be comparatively unimportant. It is the strong man armed guarding his own court, and his goods are in peace only until a stronger than he shall overcome him and take from him his whole armor wherein he trusteth. But within Christ's Church, even the shortest reign of heresy is ghastly in destructiveness.

Our ministers and missionaries are urged simply to preach the Word. CHRISTIANITY TODAY's appeal for a revival of old-fashioned Gospel preaching is the root of the matter. Ministers are spokesmen for God's Word or else they are nothing, just as the Presbyterian Church is a Church separated from the world, or nothing. Glossing over the miracles which tell of God's power lest some biologist raise his eye-brows in incredulity, does no honor to a Christian minister, and an honest-minded biologist probably would be the first to tell him so. Omitting the warnings of Christ about hell for fear of wounding a congregation's sensibilities is not a brave performance. Prevailing notions that the blood-bought atonement of the cross is a discredited tradition, have ruined much preaching and many a preacher. The Bible, as it is written, has satisfied generations of men. People are entitled to hear it today, and they want to hear it. Let us ministers have done with the idea that we must have a new thing to attract and hold people. Learn the Bible; proclaim it; let eternal truths ring out! Such preaching does not empty the pews of a Church but widens the Church's walls. Preaching the Word, the whole Word, and nothing but the Word, will demonstrate the power of God. When Paul told Timothy how to make full proof of his ministry, he said, "Preach the Word."

CHRISTIANITY TODAY is convinced that the key to the future peace, usefulness and prosperity of the Presbyterian Church is with the theological seminaries. Put young men under professors who themselves are believers and can give a reason for the hope that is in them. Build up theological students in their most Holy faith. Keep them in the love of God. Send them forth like Paul, not primarily with excellency of speech or of wisdom, but declaring the testimony of God. Results will take care of themselves.

## XII.

Thoughtful Christians are not minimizing the signs of the times. Days of increasing apostasy may be upon us, and ours may be the age of which Jesus asked the pathetic question, "When the Son of Man cometh shall He find faith on the earth?" Devout students of the Scriptures are among those who think so. They are not fanatics; they are awaiting the return of Jesus with an expectancy like Simeon's.

It ill becomes any reader of the New Testament to ask, "Where is the promise of His coming? for all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." Jesus is coming. The Gospels and Epistles glow with the definite promise. Upon one of our long night-watches the day will break and the shadows forever flee away.

But whether He comes today or tomorrow, or tarries because He "is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance," we have much to do. In order to teach this, Jesus told the parable of the man who buried his talent in the ground, and was found idle when his lord returned. Wicked and slothful, he was cast into outer darkness. We are to be occupied. We can be occupied as Christ's witnesses individually. We can be occupied as witnesses in our Church's activities. And we can be occupied by making a paper like CHRISTIANITY TODAY the means of placing our united testimony before the world. The editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY has proved that he will not falter because men mock. What can be done, he will do. On such an assurance evangelical Presbyterians can sustain him to the limit of their ability. Great revivals come when Christians pray, and then speak boldly.

## XIII.

While the Reformation was slowly gaining headway in Germany, Martin Luther often turned to his friend Melancthon with the abrupt command, "Come, Philip, let us sing A Mighty Fortress is Our God." Is there a

hymn like the Forty-sixth Psalm to suit our need today? Some might select Frederick W. Faber's familiar lines:

O it is hard to work for God, to rise and take His part  
Upon the battlefield of earth, and not sometimes lose heart.

But right is right, since God is God, and right the day must win;  
To doubt would be disloyalty, to falter would be to sin.

This is a good choice, but not the best. Two hundred years ago Isaac Watts wrote a Song of Zion that takes us into the presence of Christ. Thus far it has escaped the attention of modern hymn tinkerers in spite of its resounding call to maintain the honor of the Word of the Lord. Sung to the sonorous, swinging cadences of the tune in the old Scottish Psalter, it is pre-eminently adapted to the crisis we are experiencing.

I'm not ashamed to own my Lord, or to defend His cause,  
Maintain the honor of His Word, the glory of His cross.

Jesus, my God! I know His name; His name is all my trust;  
Nor will He put my soul to shame, or let my hope be lost.

Firm as His throne His promise stands,—

Christians who sing this hymn with a believing heart will know how to meet whatever tests the future holds.



THE REV. FRANK H. STEVENSON, D.D.

*Author of this Article*

# Dr. Robert E. Speer and His Latest Book

By The Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.

Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary



THE author of the book, *The Finality of Jesus Christ*,<sup>1</sup> as I pointed out in CHRISTIANITY TODAY for October, 1930, in my review of his earlier book, *Some Living Issues*, is not only one of the most distinguished missionary leaders, but also one of the most truly eloquent men, in the whole Christian world. Whatever may be thought of the direction in which he exerts his influence, it cannot be doubted at least that that influence is vast. Dr. Speer possesses a truly amazing power over the hearts and minds of men.

There are many evangelical Christians, moreover, who think that this vast influence is exerted truly to the advancement of belief in the Bible and of the clear propagation of the Christian Faith. With persons who think that I disagree. I disagree with them not because I desire to do so but because I am compelled to do so. I began with strong prejudice in favor of Dr. Speer. From my student days on, I stood under the spell of his eloquence; I admired him with all my soul; I agreed with what he said. But during the past fifteen years or so I have been obliged to reverse this attitude. My admiration for Dr. Speer's eloquence remains, but my agreement with him has given place to profound disagreement. That change has not been due to any personal likes and dislikes; but it has been due to the stern impulsion of the facts. The plain fact is that in the great issue of the day between Modernism and Christianity in the Presbyterian Church Dr. Speer is standing for a palliative, middle-of-the-road, evasive policy, which is in some ways a greater menace to the souls of men than any clear-cut Modernism could be.

## Evasion of the Issue

The issue between Christianity and Modernism has found expression during the past month in a new fight for honesty in the missionary affairs of the Church. In that fight I tried to take my part—humble part though it was—by the introduction of an overture in my own presbytery, the Presbytery of New Brunswick, looking to the reformation of the Board of Foreign Missions. Dr. Speer was asked by the Presbytery to be present. I urged him to do so, and I further begged him, in my correspondence, to engage with me in a full and open discussion of the whole question.

To this last request he declined to accede. At the beginning of his speech before the Presbytery he announced that he did not desire to engage in any controversy. His speech itself evaded almost altogether my specific charges against the Board, and soon after the set speeches were over, the previous question, in obvious deference to Dr. Speer's expressed wish, was moved, and debate was shut off.

From one point of view, I do not wonder at Dr. Speer's unwillingness to answer my charges against the Board. When a man has such an exceedingly weak case as Dr. Speer had on that occasion, and as he still has in his defense of the Board, it is quite natural for him to avoid controversy. But such a policy is regrettable all the same. I had longed for the opportunity to meet Dr. Speer in an open, friendly, man-to-man discussion. Such discussion might, indeed, have seemed to put me at a disadvantage. I can lay no claim to anything like eloquence; Dr. Speer is one of the most eloquent men in the whole bounds of the Christian world: I represent an unpopular cause;

Dr. Speer represents a popular one: I was in the presence of a Presbytery overwhelmingly dominated by the new Princeton Seminary, by signers of the Auburn Affirmation, and in general by the opponents of the cause that I represent; Dr. Speer was in the presence of his friends and supporters. Yet I longed for an open and free discussion; for such discussion would serve to promote, if not agreement, yet at least mutual understanding.

Moreover, I cannot believe that the evasion of discussion was to the ultimate advantage of the Board of Foreign Missions. Facts remain facts; and the facts included in my Brief and presented publicly at the Presbytery cannot be put out of the world because they are unpalatable.

## The Case of Mrs. Buck

What do I mean by saying that the Overture which I presented was part of a fight for honesty in the missionary policy of the Presbyterian Church? I mean something very definite, and something that I am quite sure the man in the street, and the man in the pew, can understand. What I mean may be made clear by one example. It is only one example among many, many examples; but it will serve. It is the example of Mrs. Pearl S. Buck.

Mrs. Buck is the author of an article in *Harpers Magazine* for January, 1933, which attacks the Christian Faith at its very roots. In a subsequent article, in the May number of *The Cosmopolitan*, she says plainly, what she implies in that previous article, that to her it is a matter of small importance whether "Christ" ever lived as in a "body of flesh and bone" upon this earth.

This popular exponent of unbelief was until Monday, May 1st, a missionary in good and regular standing in the Presbyterian Church. The Board was deeply involved in her destructive views. It had tolerated her for years; it had until recently recommended one of her books as a missionary textbook. Two of its leading secretaries had been reported in the newspapers as expressing themselves just recently in very favorable terms with regard to her. I am not asking whether those newspaper reports were altogether correct; indeed I understand that one of the gentlemen in question has pronounced them inaccurate. But suppose they were inaccurate; suppose they were even seriously incorrect. Still they had made their impression, and they placed upon the Board, in even clearer fashion than it already rested upon it, the bounden duty of saying plainly to all the world that it would not tolerate for one single moment such anti-Christian polemic as that which Mrs. Buck was carrying on.

Did the Board so speak out? Did it make perfectly plain where it stood? Not at all. On the contrary, it accepted Mrs. Buck's resignation "with regret."

The policy represented by that action—I say it deliberately—is a fundamentally dishonest policy. I am certainly not charging individual members of the Board with conscious dishonesty; I am certainly not charging them with unworthy motives; I am certainly not charging them with any misuse of trust funds for personal reasons; I am certainly not charging them with anything like what the law calls obtaining money under false pretences. But I am most emphatically charging the Board with adherence to the policy which dominates many of the larger Protestant churches. It is a wide-spread policy; it is a deeply entrenched policy; but it is a dishonest policy all the same,

<sup>1</sup>New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1933.

and there will never be any real blessing of God upon the churches until it is given up.

What is the policy to which I refer? It is the policy of appealing for support to Modernists on the implied ground that the Board is tolerant of Modernism—either clear and blatant Modernism like that of Mrs. Buck, or the sugar-coated but equally destructive Modernism of the Auburn Affirmation—while at the same time the Board appeals to Bible-believing Christians on the ground that it is true to the Bible and to the Confession of Faith.

What would have happened if the Board had said plainly to all the world that it would not tolerate for a moment any views resembling those of Mrs. Buck. It is perfectly plain what would have happened. A great outcry would have arisen from the Modernists against the "intolerance" of the Board; Modernist contributions would have been cut off. But something would have been preserved that is far more important than dollars and cents. Honesty would have been preserved—that deeper honesty upon which the Board has now turned its back.

### The Right and the Wrong Method of Appeal

This question of honesty arises in the case of every institution appealing for funds. It arises, for example—if the readers of CHRISTIANITY TODAY will pardon me for referring to what lies nearest to my personal knowledge—in the case of Westminster Theological Seminary. Westminster Seminary in these days is in urgent need of funds. How shall those funds be obtained? One way would be to appeal to different donors on different grounds. There are men in the Church who dislike controversy and will not support a "controversial" institution. Yet they are impressed with the fact that the graduates of Westminster Seminary, on the average, know the Bible far better and are, in general, far better grounded than the graduates of most other institutions. They might be appealed to successfully if we should only keep in the background our clear-cut stand in the great issue in the Church.

But as a matter of fact we have avoided making any such appeal. We have made it perfectly plain that we are carrying on the tradition of the old Princeton Seminary as it existed before the reorganization, and that at the very heart of that tradition, as at the very heart of the Bible, there is the duty of speaking out just as clearly against error as one speaks in defense of truth. That method of appeal may lose us funds here and there; but it is the only honest method.

Very different is the method employed by the Board of Foreign Missions. That method is the "Yes-and-No" method. It is the method of sending out a dust-throwing brigade of secretaries who denounce *Re-Thinking Missions* in the presence of Bible-believing Christians, as Dr. Speer denounced it in the Tioga Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia on the evening of December 1, 1932, while at the same time the Board carefully refrains from offending the Modernist forces in the Church by speaking out officially against the central thesis of that broadside of unbelief, unconcernedly retains a signer of the Modernist Auburn Affirmation in the exceedingly important position of Candidate Secretary, and refrains from dismissing even so vigorous an opponent of the Bible and the historic Christian Faith as Mrs. Pearl S. Buck.

The climax of this policy was reached when the resignation of Mrs. Buck, on May 1st, was accepted by the Board "with regret," without a word of disagreement with Mrs. Buck's views.

Of that evasive action Dr. Speer and Dr. McAfee are said to have been active protagonists. Certainly they have given no evidence of disagreeing with it. And with regard to it the Moderator of the last General Assembly, according to *The New York Times* of May 3rd, has made a typically Moderatorial utterance. He has said that he believes this action of the Board "will end the whole controversy." Such an utterance

is to be expected from a Moderator who at the last General Assembly appointed a signer of the Modernist Auburn Affirmation to the chairmanship of the Assembly's Committee on Foreign Missions.

But the Moderator is wrong. The action of the Board in accepting the resignation of Mrs. Buck does *not* end the whole controversy.

In saying so, I am not referring merely to the fact, which the Moderator seemed to overlook, that the Presbytery of Philadelphia, by an overwhelming vote, has sent up to the General Assembly an overture identically the same as that against which, in the Presbytery of New Brunswick, Dr. Speer had launched the whole weight of his attack. Certainly that action of the Presbytery of Philadelphia is extremely important, and profoundly encouraging to Bible-believing Christians. But I am referring to something far deeper than the action of any presbyteries or courts. I am referring to the blessing of God which does, despite men's opposition, rest upon the cause of truth.

### The Battle for Honesty

Weak, no doubt, are the human instrumentalities in this battle for truth and honesty in the Presbyterian Church; powerful are the forces ranged against it. It is a battle waged against the entire current of the times, and against a policy deeply entrenched in many of the Protestant churches of the world. We might be regarded as presumptuous in attacking what is so firmly established. But must evil always remain untouched just because its roots are so deep? Must the Church forever go on at the poor dying rate at which it has been going during these latter years? Must it forever continue to stand in contempt of honest men; must it forever depend upon policies of worldly wisdom? No, God is calling the Church back from her folly to the ways of truth and righteousness; He is calling her, by the very distresses of the time, back from the world unto Him.

The battle against the present policy of the Board of Foreign Missions is only one phase of a far larger battle. And the hopeful thing is that that battle is being carried on by young men. Professor Allan A. MacRae, of Westminster Seminary, who (entirely without suggestion from me) introduced the Overture in the Presbytery of Philadelphia is a young man, and other speakers in favor of it were young men. A new conscience is making itself felt in the Presbyterian Church. And leading spokesmen for that new conscience are young men upon whom God has laid His hand.

Whence do these men receive their warrant for entering into this conflict? Whence do all of us receive our warrant, if we seek, no matter how humbly, to do our part?

The answer is plain. We receive our warrant in the Word of God.

It is true, even common grace should be sufficient to lead a man to see that the policy of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions is wrong. Even an unregenerate man should see that a Board has no right to appeal to Modernists on the implied ground that it is tolerant of Modernism and to Christians on the ground that it is intolerant of Modernism. To see that one needs only a small modicum of common sense.

But Christian men have a far higher and far clearer warrant for the contention in which they are now engaged. Their real warrant for opposing the policy of the Board of Foreign Missions is that that policy is contrary to the Word of God.

Two forces are contending against each other in the Presbyterian Church. One is Christianity; the other is Modernism. Two Christs are being proclaimed. One is the blessed Saviour presented to us in the Bible—God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever, virgin-born, worker of miracles, raised from the tomb on the third day, ascended into heaven,

(Continued on Page 22)



# This Changing World

By  
"Calvinist"

SOMEONE properly equipped ought to write a "History of Controversy In the Christian Church." Your columnist has urged the task upon several of his erudite friends, but the idea was so simple that they haven't seen it yet. Perhaps I will have to do it myself some day, and poorly equipped as I am, try to keep my head amid the fame and fortune that will assuredly follow. Such a short history (grouped around the dramatic, fascinating figures of Paul, Athanasius, Augustine, Luther, Calvin and others) might perhaps bring home to the popular mind the pathetic and ludicrous nature of modern opposition to controversy, as such, by men who ought to be intelligent enough to know better.

~ ~ ~

From whence does it come, this opposition to controversy? Not from the plain man. The average man enjoys discussion on almost any subject, especially religion, when there seems to be any chance at all for him to express his own opinion. Thousands of country stores and city dining rooms bear eloquent witness to that. The real opposition to controversy in the church comes from two main sources: from the intellectually lazy, who dislike the labor of thinking too much, and from those who "sit pretty" on the top of the heap of "things that are" and who are afraid that controversy in the church will shove them off their perch. "He who stands on pinnacle," said Charlie Chan, "has no other place to step but off." The history of churches and all kinds of human organizations from governments to racket gangs may be pointed out as illustrative. The beneficiaries of any prosperous organization usually develop a sudden and intense love of "peace." If there is such hatred against controversy as to make its forbidding an unwritten eleventh commandment, it is only because the powers-that-be know they stand to lose by controversy. And the mentally indolent, who worship office-holders and bureaucracies, some of whom have an eye on crumbs from their masters' tables, follow suit enthusiastically.

~ ~ ~

What is this terrible thing called "controversy"? From the point of view of the powers-that-be, it is simply anything that raises "harmful division"—that is, which threatens to divide the ecclesiastical organization or reduce its revenues. From that point of view, also, anything these "powers" may do to dissident minorities, no matter

how repressive, is *not* controversy. God forbid! It is simply "carrying out the mind of the whole church." No, that is not controversy! *But resisting it is*, as the defenders of the Old Princeton found out.

~ ~ ~

I confess that I did not begin with the idea of writing more than a paragraph about controversy. But now I am in for it, and might as well round it out. In the short history of controversy of which I spoke, one foolish modern idea would be punctured forever, I hope. This idea is that the best way

to combat error is to leave it strictly alone until it dies (no matter how many precious souls may be lost in the process!). These people will tell you that "the church has always had these errors, and yet has survived." They will talk vaguely about the "wheat and the tares." Dear readers, it is true that the church had those errors in past ages and survived. Yes! *But it never survived without a struggle!* Where the church did not struggle with unbelief, the church died out! The history of controversy in the church is simply the record of the church's will to remain alive—alive to the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, and dead to error. A church unwilling to contend for the truth, desiring only outward tranquillity and temporal prosperity, always dies. And any church that is not willing to engage in controversy for the crown and covenant of our Lord Jesus Christ, which values its own contemptible "peace" more than that, deserves to die.

## The Comfort of the Scriptures

A Devotional Meditation

By the Rev. David Freeman, Th.M.

"... *By Him all things consist. . . . That in all things He might have the preeminence.*" Col. 1:17, 18.

OUR eternal well-being depends upon what we think of Christ. It is not enough to pay Him our compliments for His superlative virtues. For salvation we must accept Him and cling to Him with the confession, "My Lord and my God."

When the Apostle Paul thought of Christ he thought of Him in just that way. Christ was nothing less than God to him. He gave to Jesus the highest place in the universe. His Name was above every name. All things would collapse apart from Him.

To think of Christ and His glorious attributes was to the Apostle the highest form of worship. How different this from the worship that centers around man—the kind of worship that seeks the enjoyment of man forever instead of enjoying God forever. No, not so, is true Christian worship. That which is able to save our souls and build us up in faith is to contemplate the glories and the excellencies which are His. And so we sing:

"Jesus, the very thought of Thee  
With sweetness fills my breast."

How the true Christian loves to think of Him and hear of Him! To what lofty heights such contemplation brings us! There is no higher place in this world. It is with rapturous joy that the Christian contemplates the virtues and perfections of Christ in whom it pleased the Father that all ful-

ness should dwell! How the heart of the Christian burns within him as the wonders of His redeeming grace come to view!

"Peace through the blood of His cross." "Reconciled in the body of His flesh through death." It is these gracious disclosures of His love that make the Name of Jesus sound sweet in a believer's ears.

"It soothes his sorrows, heals his wounds,  
And drives away his fear."

Pre-eminent is Christ upon His eternal throne. He reigns without a peer. Should He who is above all principalities be given a secondary place in Paul's affections? No, He must reign without a rival in the heart. He loved Christ supremely. It is not strange that he could endure the reproach of the cross.

Paul lived in Christ. No other place was near enough to Him. He could then do all things—even what at one time he thought he could never do.

What a low place we give Him whom the heavens cannot contain! Is that not why we serve Him so poorly? There are things we say we cannot bear and cannot do.

The enmity of men. The self-sacrifice to which He calls us. The yoke of Christ. Can we bear it? Others have been made more than conquerors through Him. Nothing is too hard when in all things Christ is given the pre-eminence.

"Jesus, our only Joy be Thou,  
As Thou our Prize wilt be:  
Jesus, be Thou our Glory now,  
And through eternity."

# Unto All the World

A Missionary Page

By Elizabeth Willet Thompson

*"Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off . . ." Jer. 31:10*

## FOREIGN MISSIONS

### Philippine Islands

THESE islands were named in honor of Philip II of Spain and were under Spanish Rule until 1898, when they were taken over by the United States. Before the advent of Protestant Missions white men on the Philippine Islands deceived and exploited the natives and were guilty of the grossest excesses and cruelties. "The saddest thing is for a heathen people to come into contact with civilization without Christianity." The natives, in spite of the darkness of their lives, maintain a bright and sunny disposition. Through offerings, sacrifices, charms, and ceremonies without number, they seek to bridge the gulf that separates them from God. The record of Roman Catholicism in the Philippines is practically the same as in Latin America: a hollow farce of external rites, devoid of reality and saving power.

The Presbyterian Board sent the first Protestant missionaries to this field. It established the first Mission Hospital, and the first Mission Boarding School—the now prominent Silliman Institute at Dumaguete on the Island of Negros. To these have been added more hospitals, educational institutions, churches, and itinerant evangelism.

Other denominations have taken up their share of the task. The Association of Baptists for Evangelism in the Orient (not under the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions) is not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, the power of God unto salvation. A unique part of their work is a motor and sailing schooner named the "Gospel Ship of the Philippines" which travels about spreading the Word among the hundreds of little islands which have never before been reached. A large number of these people have never had any written language—have never seen the Word of God. We are reminded of the ministry of Our Lord as He preached from a boat, and went about in a boat with His disciples.

In the providence of God the privilege and responsibility of ministering to the spiritual need of these 10,000,000 bright, respon-

sive Islanders has been entrusted to the Christians of America. It is not enough to give them education and autonomy, high and worthy as these objects are. They need to know the only true God and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent to be their Saviour. And from what do they need to be saved? From the evils of gambling and cock-fighting—so prevalent and ruinous in Filipino life? From sickness, and filth, and disease? Yes, from all these and more; but are not all these the rotten fruits of that "soul-destroying monster, Sin"? And if men will be bold in sin, missionaries must be bold to reprove. It has been truly said, "He that hath slight thoughts of sin never had great thoughts of God." As we reviewed the reports of the Presbyterian Boards, which we received, we found scant mention of the word sin. Rather, we were reminded of those lines of Timothy Dwight:

"There smiled the smooth Divine, unused to wound  
The sinner's heart with hell's alarming sound.  
No terrors on his gentle tongue attend;  
No grating truths the nicest ears offend.

His Christ and Bible placed at good remove,  
Guilt, hell-deserving, and forgiving love.  
'Twas best, he said, mankind should cease to sin.  
Good fame required it; so did peace within.

There is no engagement more entirely spiritual in its nature, nor one whose success is more immediately dependent on God than that of the missionary. May they be "called, chosen, and faithful."

## NATIONAL MISSIONS

### West Indies

AFTER reading through many pages of the work of the Presbyterian Board in Cuba, Santo Domingo, and Puerto Rico, we found ourselves greatly confused. Again and again we had to remind ourselves that we were reading Missionary Literature, and not the report of some Government statistician, or a page of geography. Now and then one of those vague phrases such as, "the Christian point of view" or "Christian idealism," made us wish for someone to explain these mysterious terms. References which are, to our mind, inextricably bound up with the subject of Missions, were absent entirely. There was no mention of the

Atonement, no Holy Spirit, no Regeneration. In Chapter XXXV of our Confession of Faith, regarding the Love of God and Missions, we read, "In the Gospel, God . . . by His Spirit accompanying the Word, pleads with men to accept His gracious invitation." However, throughout the pamphlets before us were accounts of goodly numbers joining the attractive little mission churches; so we tried to feel cheerful about that.

A little booklet entitled "As the Missionary Sees It," contained this:

"The Reverend E. R. is carrying on a program of social work in the Dominican Republic. He teaches the boys sports, taking them camping, and tries to interest them in the development of sound bodies and clean minds, along with good morals.

"What do your young people need more than anything else?" We wanted to be sure how this minister of the Gospel analyzed his own job.

"'God. They need God,' was his brief answer.

"He then went on to explain how religious ceremonies have always played a large part in the lives of his people, specially on occasions such as births and deaths, but that their need is for a God who is interested in their everyday life, in their relations one with another, in the hum-drum monotony of the usual day.

"I call it the need for a social gospel,' he interpreted, 'but in the most fundamental sense it is just God.'"

We thought of Paul's words: "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel; which is not another . . ."

It will be objected that we have not described the Presbyterian work in the West Indies. Frankly, we were at a loss to know what to say about it. But God will not leave the West Indies without a witness. We read in the Sunday School Times of April 22nd:

"A quiet but truly evangelistic work has been carried on in Cuba for thirty-two years by Mr. and Mrs. E. L. Pain and their three sons. Eighteen native churches, self-supporting and self-governing, have been organized, with eleven native pastors. In each of these places is held a daily prayer-meeting, praying for revival throughout Cuba."

However much some may affect to dislike controversy, it can never be of ultimate disadvantage to the interests of truth, and no great advance has ever been made without it, in religion, or any other field. Missions is the greatest living issue before the world today. It is our fervent prayer that the present controversy, with its saddening and sickening disclosures in our Boards, may be the means of purifying them, and returning them once more to the true New Testament basis.

# Sunday School Lessons for June

(International Uniform Series)

## Lesson for June 4, 1933

### JESUS FACES BETRAYAL AND DENIAL

(Lesson Text—Mark 14:17-31. Also study Matt. 26:20-29; 10:16; Luke 22:17-20; John 13:1-35; I Cor. 11:23-26. Golden Text—Isaiah 53:3.)

"THE night in which He was betrayed!" How the Christian heart turns back toward the events of that last evening. Here for the final moment, Jesus sits with His disciples. And among them is Judas. When one thinks of what Judas had planned, that he had already bargained away the life of his Lord, one wonders that he ever had the effrontery to mingle in that company. No doubt his presence was a source of keen pain to our Lord. Yet the mind of our Saviour on that night was lifted far above even Judas' black treason. He was thinking of the morrow, of the cross. And to impress upon the disciples at the last that it was for the Cross that He had come, He gave them the first Lord's Supper. It might have been natural for Him to have done otherwise on that night, to have spent hours in tender and wistful reminiscence of the years they had walked together. Or He might have gathered together the substance of His many discourses, and catechised them, so that they would remember His teaching. He did nothing of the sort. First He prepared them for the Cross and sought to make them understand its centrality; second, he spoke to adjust their minds to the changes that were bound to come. Then He left them, for what He must needs do in the garden and on Calvary must needs be done alone.

## Lesson for June 11, 1933

### JESUS ON THE CROSS

(Lesson Text—Mark 15:22-39. Also study Matt. 27:32-61; Luke 23:26-56a; John 19:16:42; Romans 4:25 to 5:11; I Cor. 15:1-C; I Peter 2:21-25. Golden Text—Romans 5:8.)

Here we have come into the very Holy of Holies of our faith. Here all the lines of history, in God's great purpose, converge. This is no mere unexpected incident that climaxed a blameless life. Here is something that was done in the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. And when one views it, not only as it is described by the writers of the gospels, but as it is explained in the rest of the Bible, then one sees that only one word covers what happened. That word is, *substitution*. "Himself bare our sins in His own body on the tree." This sufferer hung there, not because he was guilty, but because He was innocent. Yet guilt brought Him there: the

guilt of those for whom He came to die. His words, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" have haunted the minds of men through the ages. What do they mean? Do they have the clue to His death? Some have thought that here the Saviour confessed, at least temporarily, defeat. The mind of the natural man sees nothing else but that. Yet the Christian, who has been "crucified with Christ" knows differently. To him these words of despair are the very promise of forgiveness and life. For he knows that our Lord spoke them as the sinner's substitute. Taking the sinner's place and bearing the sinner's guilt and shame, the awful aloneness of separation from the Father's face came upon Him. He did not cease to be the eternal Son of the Father. Such a disruption in the blessed Trinity is unthinkable. Yet just because He was always the eternal Son, the separation was the awful thing it was. In it He perfectly, for ever and ever satisfied the justice of the Father (which is not separate from the justice of the Son who in dying thus paid a penalty He Himself exacted from Himself). His death for us furnishes us with an only way of life: for only as men are reconciled to God through Him do they ever live. The object of our faith is Christ crucified: "as He is offered to us in the Gospel."

## Lesson for June 18, 1933

### JESUS RISES FROM THE DEAD

(Lesson Text—Mark 16:1-11. Also study Matt. 28:1-20; Luke 23:56b to 24:12; John 20:1-25; I Cor. 15:1-58; I Thess. 4:13-18; Rev. 1:17-18. Golden Text—Mark 16:6.)

The Resurrection of Jesus has been called "the best attested fact in human history." Yet there are thousands of people today who laugh at it without ever examining the evidence for it. All the evidence that there is, of course, is for a *real, bodily* resurrection. Not only is a spiritualized non-bodily "resurrection" no resurrection at all, but there never is and never has been a scintilla of evidence for such a "resurrection." Anyone who believes in it does so simply because he likes the idea. Only those who hold to the historic, bodily resurrection have any proof, and they have plenty. Several lines of evidence may be briefly indicated: (1) *The unbreakable documents*. In spite of all the penetration and persuasiveness of unbelieving scholarship, the New Testament accounts have remained unbroken. No man needs to be ashamed of believing in them. (2) *The change in the disciples*. Nothing but a true resurrection would account for the alteration in these men. Not only did

it change them temporarily, but for all time. They were willing to die as witnesses to its truth. Try accounting for this on any other basis you wish: at the end you are brought back to the recognition that only the resurrection could have produced it. (3) *The empty tomb*. Here is the fact upon which everyone agrees. Nobody denies that the tomb was empty on the third day. What happened to the body? Again you will find it a fascinating study to explore what seem at first glance to be the possibilities. When you have done so, you will again be brought to the former conclusion: only one thing *could* have happened—only one thing *did* happen: Christ arose with the same body with which He suffered. Unbelief is unreasonable.

## Lesson for June 25, 1933

### REVIEW: JESUS OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR

(Golden Text—Matthew 28:18-20.)

For this review it should be possible to read over the lessons for this quarter; they appear in the March and April issues of CHRISTIANITY TODAY and, being brief, may be readily studied.

## Two Significant Letters

Orlando, Fla., April 26, 1933.

DEAR BROTHER:

As a mistaken signer of the Auburn Affirmation, I want to thank you for the vigorous stand you are taking on "Modernism and the Board of Foreign Missions." Either the Word of God is worthy of all credence or it ought to be frankly abandoned as an outgrown superstition. I tried to be mildly liberal, but was brought right back to II Tim. 3:16. The Presbyterian standards are true to that Word. Modern Liberalism is not and pacifism is cowardly. The "inclusive" policy will presently prove exclusive.

Faithfully,

REV. W. A. CARRINGTON.

Orlando, Fla., May 2, 1933.

DEAR DR. MACHEN:

If my words in your estimation have any weight in helping to stem the tide of a false liberalism which is now running high in the Church, I shall be glad to have you publish them in CHRISTIANITY TODAY. Every one who stands squarely on the Word of God ought to be willing to show his colors.

Faithfully yours,

W. A. CARRINGTON.

These two communications recently received by Dr. J. Gresham Machen, will be of wide interest to the Church. Few men would have the humility and courage to repudiate their former position. Many hearts will rejoice in this brave statement by an Honorably Retired Minister.

# The Evidence in the Case: A Review

*MODERNISM AND THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.* By J. Gresham Machen. Published by the Author, 206 South Thirteenth Street, Philadelphia, Pa. Copies free upon request.

CONTAINED in this pamphlet of one hundred and ten pages is the factual dynamite released by Dr. Machen in his campaign to let the light in on the policies of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Originally prepared as a brief to be sent to all members of the Presbytery of New Brunswick prior to its consideration of the overture on Foreign Missions on April 11th, the work has now been issued in a revised form with an explanatory note added.

Dr. Machen has set out to prove a certain thesis, namely that the policies of the Foreign Board have become so vitiated by modernism as to call for reform. The charge, of course, is easy to make but might have been thought to be harder to prove. Does Dr. Machen succeed in proving it? This reviewer has come to the conclusion that he has proved it. Further, this reviewer believes that the proof is so definite as to be convincing to all intelligent and fair-minded men.

What, then, is this proof, and where is it found? Dr. Machen has cited nothing that is not a matter of record, and therefore subject to verification. His first line of proof has to do with the attitude of the Board of Foreign Missions toward the "Laymen's Report." Quoting the official action of the Board, the author shows that the Board failed to condemn in any definite way the attack upon the very heart of the Christian faith contained in the report mentioned above. "What the Board did do," he writes, "was to issue a vague statement about 'the evangelical basis of missions'—a statement so vague that it could be acquiesced in, presumably, even by the two members of the Board who were members of the Laymen's Inquiry and even by certain unnamed members of the Appraisal Commission itself." Such an allegation as this certainly demands an answer. If the Board has ever publicly and definitely repudiated the Laymen's Report it owes it to the Church to tell when it was done. If not, it should confess that the charge is true. But it has no right to ignore the charge.

The second charge has to do with Mrs. Pearl S. Buck. Only six pages out of the one hundred and ten which the brief contains are devoted to this charge. It is important; but to give the impression that it is the only charge, as some of the newspaper report-

ers have done, is highly misleading. The charge against Mrs. Buck is not so much a charge against her as it is a charge against the Board for what it has revealed of itself in dealing with her. He shows her extremely evident Modernism by several quotations. Then he asks what courses are open to the Board. There are, he says, two: it may do nothing and hope that Mrs. Buck will eliminate herself, "without intensifying yet further the charge of intolerance which already rests upon the Christian Church." "That course of action may be financially profitable," writes Dr. Machen. "It may conserve the gifts of the host of people in the Church who agree essentially with Mrs. Buck. From the worldly point of view, much is to be said in favor of it. But it has the disadvantage of being dishonest." The second course open to the Board was to dismiss Mrs. Buck. "It is obvious that such dismissal, to be of the slightest use, would have to be public and for cause. Mrs. Buck is not an obscure person; she is one of the most famous women in all the world; her attack upon the Christian message has been conducted in the most widely read magazines. Her challenge to the Board, in other words, has been public; and the answer to it would have to be equally public. Nothing whatever, indeed, would have to be said to impugn Mrs. Buck's character or motives; but the Board would have to say plainly to all the world that it is irrevocably committed to the message which Mrs. Buck has attacked, that it does not solicit a single penny from those who agree with her, and that it cannot tolerate among its missionaries any such anti-Christian propaganda as that which she is carrying on. That course of action might entail financial loss. It might mean the elimination of gifts coming from the Modernists who now support our Board. From the worldly point of view, much could be said against it. But it would have the advantage of being honest."

Since these words were written, Mrs. Buck has resigned. The resignation was accepted, "with deep regret." Did the Board think that the resignation would satisfy conservatives and that the "regret" would mollify the Modernists? This reviewer wonders. But at least the act of the Board had removed from the realm of doubt its attitude toward Mrs. Buck. It was sorry to see her go, did not put pressure upon her to go. Its own subsequent acts have thus proved Dr. Machen's contention that it was not willing to repudiate her attack on the Christian faith.

In the third place Dr. Machen charges that the Candidate Secretary for Men, the Rev. Lindsay S. B. Hadley is a signer of the Auburn Affirmation, the notorious Mod-

ernist document which declares acceptance of the full truthfulness of the Bible, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection and the miracles of Christ to be non-essential even for ministers. This charge is, of course, easy of proof. Mr. Hadley's name does appear as a signer of the famous modernist manifesto. So far as known, the only answer attempted to this allegation was by Dr. Speer at Trenton on April 11th, when he declared that Mr. Hadley was a minister in good and regular standing whose standing might only be impugned by having him tried by his Presbytery. A letter was read from Mr. Hadley at the same time, in which he declared, "I am a conservative in theology." The fact of the Auburn affirmation and Mr. Hadley's signature were ignored by Dr. Speer. We cannot say anything else, then, than that Dr. Speer has had his proper moment to answer this allegation and has sidestepped it. It should be borne in mind that what was said about "good and regular standing as a minister" was quite irrelevant. Dr. Machen was not preferring heresy charges against Mr. Hadley, he was properly questioning his fitness for the position he occupies.

In the fourth instance, Dr. Machen proves that the Candidate Department of the Board has carried on anti-evangelical propaganda through the books that it has recommended as devotional reading to a thousand young men and women who are considering missionary service. The propaganda referred to was contained in a letter dated July 15, 1932, and has been admitted as genuine by the Board. The three books recommended therein as guides to the devotional life of the prospective missionaries (in addition to the little series called "Today") are: "The Devotional Diary," by Oldham; "The Meaning of Faith" (and others), by Dr. H. E. Fosdick, and "Marks of a World Christian," by D. J. Fleming. All these books are well-recognized Modernist propaganda. The Board has yet to justify this letter. Its authenticity has been admitted.

In the fifth charge, Dr. Machen alleges that the staff of the Board in an official communication has commended as though it were Christian evangelism the religious propaganda of the radical speaker, Dr. Sherwood Eddy. This commendation was given in the body of a communication from Board headquarters in New York to the committee on Foreign Missions of the Presbytery of Philadelphia. It is quoted in the news story in the current issue of this paper which describes the last meeting of the Presbytery of Philadelphia. Again the genuineness of the quotation is not denied. This point seems then to be definitely established.

Dr. Machen also shows by copious quotations and citation of other acts of an objective nature that the attitude toward the Christian gospel of the Board, its secretaries and the agencies with which the

Board is co-operating, is, to say the least, extremely unsatisfactory.

In the sixth instance, Dr. Machen charges that the Board is co-operating with union enterprises in China which have been implicated in anti-Christian activities of the most thorough-going kind. This charge is documented with a great deal of material sent by Dr. Albert B. Dodd, of the North China Theological Seminary, and Chancellor Arie Kok of the Netherlands legation in Peiping. The material is so overwhelming that it can hardly be seriously denied.

Here then is the case against the Board. This reviewer, at least, must confess that to him it is simply overwhelming, both in detail and cumulatively. Unless the Board can answer it frankly and fairly, the Board is doomed. This reviewer recommends to his readers that they secure this pamphlet, which is sent free upon application to Dr. Machen at the address given above, and read it for themselves. There is much in this pamphlet that could not even be noticed in this review.

J. A. G.

## The Laymen's Report, the Foreign Board and the New Hymnal

By The Rev. Prof. Oswald T. Allis, Ph.D., D.D.

THE Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. has just issued a leaflet, "Human Hearts and Hands in the New Hymnal," which gives advance notice of the new Presbyterian Hymn Book, which is to be presented to the General Assembly at Columbus for final approval. The announcement of a new Hymnal is always of interest, but this one acquires more than ordinary significance because of the wide and vigorous discussion of "Rethinking Missions."

It is noteworthy that the only representative, if he may be called such, of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. on the Appraisal Commission is Dr. W. P. Merrill of New York City: noteworthy, but in no wise surprising to those who are conversant with the events of a decade ago. After serving as a member of the Board of Foreign Missions for about twelve years, Dr. Merrill retired because of the opposition to his continuance on the Board aroused by his vigorous advocacy of the doctrinal position of Dr. Fosdick, then guest preacher at the First Presbyterian Church of New York City. Dr. Fosdick is the pastor of Mr. J. D. Rockefeller, Jr., who financed the Laymen's Inquiry. The choice of Dr. Merrill was hence an obvious and natural one. He had fought and suffered for the modernist cause, he had a wide acquaintance with missions and missionaries; no better advocate of the new conception of missions was to be found in Presbyterian circles than he.

The leaflet, above referred to, gives the names of Dr. Erdman, President of the Board of Foreign Missions; Dr. McAfee, a secretary of the same Board, and Dr. Merrill, as three of the eight members of the "Content Committee" on the new Hymnal. In view of Dr. Merrill's membership on the Appraisal Committee of the Laymen's Inquiry and the failure of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions to repudiate "Rethinking Missions" in clear cut and vig-

orous fashion, it will be strange if the new conception of missions urged by the Appraisal Committee is not reflected, to some extent at least, in the new Hymnal. It was announced as "news" by the metropolitan press last summer that Dr. Erdman and Dr. McAfee had been appointed a special subcommittee to edit "From Greenland's Icy Mountains" with a view to eliminating from it such features as give offence to the growing national spirit and pride of the non-Christian nations. What progress has been made in the revision of this grand old missionary hymn has not yet been disclosed.

In view of the close connection which thus exists between the Laymen's Inquiry, the Board of Foreign Missions and the New Hymnal, it is to be hoped that it will be carefully scrutinized before it receives the approval of the Assembly. Next to the Bible, the hymnal is probably and perhaps properly the greatest factor in forming the beliefs and arousing the enthusiasms of Christian people. No effort should be spared to make it conform fully to the teachings of the Scriptures and to our Standards.

### Why Does the Board of Foreign Missions Approve Modernist Books?—(Continued)

"The theme for foreign mission study for 1932-33 will be CHINA. The following books have been prepared to meet the needs of all age groups:

"For adults—'Living Issues in China,' by Henry T. Hodgkin" et al. This is the book that we are to examine.

By its own admission, our Board has a part in the planning of these books.

(2) Our Board of Foreign Missions commends these books by every possible method to the churches, and urges most strongly that they be used as study books. Turn

again to page 24 of the Board's report as contained in General Assembly minutes and read, "It is hoped that every church will plan for study classes, and schools of foreign missions in connection with the zoning periods of 1932 and 1933." In addition to this, our Board, together with the Board of National Missions and the Department of Missionary Education of the Board of Christian Education, issues yearly a little pamphlet which lists these study books and urges the churches to use them. Further, charts are sent out to Presbyteries, Presbyterian Societies and Synods, which list the study books in display form and which Directors of Missionary Education of Presbyteries and Secretaries for literature of Presbyterian Societies are told to use in urging every church to study these interdenominational books. Besides all this, the Board sends out a packet of leader's helps to be used in connection with the study books by the leader. This packet contains usually several pamphlets prepared by the Board of Foreign Missions which are thought to illustrate the teaching of the study book. In these and other ways, our Board of Foreign Missions urges every church in our denomination to study these approved books.

Now the regular study book for 1932-1933 (the 1933-34 material is not yet available at this writing) was "Living Issues in China," by Henry T. Hodgkin. This book, while entertaining and instructive, is a thoroughly Modernistic book. Whole pages of it read like "Re-Thinking Missions." It is absolutely unthinkable that our Board could be ignorant of its character or that our Board could imagine that a careful reading of this book could do anything other than promote the destructive and Modernistic view of missions that is the message of the report of the Appraisal Commission. Let us examine some typical statements made by Mr. Hodgkin in his book. Our objections to this volume might be summarized under six heads.

(1) The book suggests, like "Re-Thinking Missions," that education should be thought of, on the mission field, as an end in itself and should not be used as a preparation for evangelization. He says that mission schools used to be "a kind of bait for bringing boys and girls to Christ, although that conception has been transcended long ago in most cases" (p. 34) and he complains of the "tendency to subordinate education to proselytism" (p. 59). Bible-believing Christians used to suppose that education was a means to evangelization on mission fields. Modernists think differently.

(2) The book treats Christianity and Pacifism as synonymous, its author apparently holding to a very mistaken view of "the gospel of peace" (p. 148).

(3) The author of "Living Issues in China" holds the view that it should be the aim and purpose of the missionary to unite with adherents of the heathen religions in

holding to any religion against materialism and atheism. Rather than to bring Chinese out of their ancient, heathen religions into Christianity, he thinks "the task of the missionaries is how to hold for any faith in God those who are fast losing or have already lost any faith they ever had" (p. 157). And again he says, "It is becoming ever more clear that the struggle for this generation is far less between one religion and another than between a religious and a secular or materialistic view of life" (p. 168). Again these passages read like "Re-Thinking Missions" and our Board urged the use of this book months before "Re-Thinking Missions" was published! The old-fashioned Christian always thought that the duty of the missionary was to present Christ to the heathen. How surprised he will be to learn that the missionary's task is rather to confirm the heathen in his errors and bid him hold to them against materialism and atheism.

(4) The book, "Living Issues in China," treats all religions, including Christianity, as if they were on the same plane and as if they were of practically equal value. This very serious error that so much discussion of comparative religions makes, is patent in this book. Thus it says, "this religion (Buddhism) is sincere and simple. Who shall say that it is not found worthy in the heart of the Eternal?" (p. 155). It speaks of "Confucianist, Christian, and Buddhist" in the same breath (p. 103). Again, speaking of Confucianism, it says, "To see such profound truths cast aside as irrelevant today is almost to make one a propagandist for Confucianism" (p. 169). It quotes with more or less approval the presiding officer at a world conference of Buddhists, "T'ai Hsu . . . made a memorable statement: 'Jesus Christ is the incarnated Tao. This I now understand. But for us the chief thing is that the Tao can also be incarnated in us.' It cannot be too emphatically stated that it is this incarnation in us for which China waits" (p. 171). Once again it says, speaking of modes of worship, "Some feel that Buddhism has something to offer, and the attempt of Dr. Reichelt to combine the forms of the two faiths (Buddhism and Christianity) in a single approach to the living God has been watched with deep interest" (p. 192). Bible-believing Christians know that Christianity is the one and only, the final and absolute religion. The Modernism of this book, approved and urged for study by the Board of Foreign Missions, teaches that any religion is good enough!

(5) This book, like "Re-Thinking Missions," teaches that the Christian missionary should work with heathen religions in a common search for God. He does not have the unchanging truth of God Himself to present to the heathen, but rather he should seek, with the heathen, to find truth and to find God. Thus we read, "East and West need each other in the search for truth and right" (p. 76). "We may still see the ele-

ments of superstition in it (ancestor worship) and yet see elements of permanent value which we wish to retain" (p. 77). Christianity will wish to retain the ancestor worship of heathenism! Again the book says, "Whatever religion or religions the world may at the long last follow, . . . the form taken must, it would seem, be that which the races of the world together work out. . . . For perhaps it is true that not China nor America nor Europe can find the answer to the religious problem which is theirs today save as they work at it together in the intimate fellowship of groups concerned to find not simply a philosophy, important as that is, but a working faith that will make men more divine. . . . We need all that we can learn together in humble search and bold experiment" (pp. 175, 176, 177). This book teaches that Christianity is a search for truth and light, that it is a groping with heathen religions after God. If this be true, then why send out missionaries at all? Let us grope at home! The true Christian knows that his faith is not a blind search for truth. It is a Revelation of God!

(6) Finally, this dangerous book belittles the Bible, the pure and holy Revelation of God. It does this in several ways. For example, it misquotes the Word in a manner that dangerously verges on blasphemy and at the same time places the religions of China on the plane of the religion of the Old Testament: "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke to the fathers through the prophets, has surely come to China through such avenues (her ancient faiths), even when his name is not used and his voice is but faintly heard" (p. 170). Again it suggests that the New Testament is not to be relied upon, that its picture of Christ is mistaken: "The study in recent years of the sources of the Christian faith has led to such a rediscovery of Jesus as has bewildered many people. Various accretions of the ages have been looked at fearlessly" (p. 172).

We have examined this particular book at some length because it is the latest interdenominational study book available and because it is typical of the sort of teaching that these books have set forth for years. The situation would not be so bad if this book were unique and if this year were the only year in which a Modernistic book has been commended to our churches for study. But this situation has been noted almost every year in the past decade. We shall not take time nor space to give details of books recommended and used in former years, but it may be of value to list some of them and the pages on which Modernistic teaching is to be found. The approved mission study book for 1931-32 was "The Rural Billion," by Charles M. McConnell. Some of the statements in it to which we take violent exception are to be found on pages 21, 27, 28, 35, 37, 91. The book for 1930-31 was "India Looks to Her Future," by Oscar Mac-

Millan Buck. See pages 187, 189, 192. The book for 1929-30 was "Roads to the City of God," by Basil Mathews. Note pages 44, 56, 57, 112. The book for 1927-28 was "New Paths for Old Purposes," by Margaret E. Burton. See pages 141, 147, 167, 168, 173, 184. The book for 1926-27 was "The Moslem Faces the Future," by T. H. P. Sailer, Honorary Educational Adviser of our Board of Foreign Missions. See pages 13, 24, 83, 131, 178, 179, 180, 210, 212, 213. The study book for 1925-26 was "New Days in Latin America," by Webster E. Browning (a Presbyterian). See pages 87, 210, 163.

There is a question that will not down. Why does our Board of Foreign Missions approve and commend Modernist mission study books? And another question comes fast upon that. Can the Board, unless it changes its ways, continue to expect humble, old-fashioned Christians in our churches to support it?

### Dr. Robert E. Speer—(Continued)

seated on the right hand of God till He come to rule and to judge. The other is the Christ of the Modernist Auburn Affirmation—the Christ who possibly was and possibly was not born of a virgin, possibly did and possibly did not work miracles, possibly did and possibly did not die as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God, possibly did and possibly did not rise from the dead in the same body in which He suffered.

The Board of Foreign Missions seeks to evade this issue. At best it seeks to present truth without attacking even the most blatant forms of error. It reiterates vague positive statements, but refrains from speaking out against *Re-Thinking Missions*; it claims to be a Christian Board, yet expresses no disagreement with the radically anti-Christian teachings of one of its missionaries and even accepts her resignation with regret; it presents itself as faithful to the Bible and to the Confession of Faith, yet retains a signer of the Auburn Affirmation as Candidate Secretary and permits the Candidate Department to carry on the most outrageous Modernist propaganda through the books that it recommends to the young people looking to it for guidance.

What is our ultimate warrant for disagreeing with this policy? It is simply that the policy is contrary to the Word of God.

That appears not merely in this passage of the Bible or that. No, it appears in the whole Bible. From beginning to end, the Bible is contrary to this notion that a man can make his preaching positive without making it negative, that he can be a soldier of the Cross without engaging in controversy, that he can proclaim the truth without attacking error. From beginning to end, the Bible teaches every man to say "No" to error just as earnestly and just as

clearly as he says "Yes" to truth. The Bible is above all things entirely clear. In a great conflict like that between Christianity and Modernism in the Presbyterian Church, it bids a man definitely to take sides. If a man does not take sides, he must give up all thought of being true to the Word of God.

### The Position of Dr. Robert E. Speer

Appealing, therefore, to the Bible, we have entered into a campaign for the reform of the Board of Foreign Missions. What is the chief obstacle in the way of that campaign?

I have little hesitation in saying that the chief obstacle is found in the fact that Dr. Robert E. Speer supports the present policy of the Board. There are many Bible-believing Christians in the Church whose confidence in Dr. Speer is unbounded. They know nothing of the Auburn Affirmation. They do not know that the Board is commending radically Modernist propaganda through its Candidate Department. They do not know that an official communication from its staff commends the teaching of the radical speaker, Dr. Sherwood Eddy, as being virile evangelism and as making God real to people. They do not know that the Board is officially connected with union institutions in China and elsewhere that are engaging in propaganda of the most destructive kind. But they only know that Dr. Robert E. Speer endorses the policy of the Board. That is enough for them. They refuse to examine the facts for themselves. Dr. Speer assures them that the Board is worthy of their support, and that is all that they desire to know.

In saying that, I know that I am paying the highest possible tribute to the eloquence of one who is my adversary in this debate. I pay that tribute gladly. I admit fully that Dr. Speer has an enormous power to sway the minds and hearts of men. But when I think of that power, I am appalled by the responsibility which it places upon its possessor. How glorious it would be if that power were being used for the upbuilding and the right guidance of the Church; but how sad, on the other hand, it is when it is being used to lead the Church astray!

An increasing number of Bible-believing Christians are coming to see that it is in this latter way that Dr. Speer's influence is being used. They began by being prejudiced in favor of Dr. Speer as I began. They could not believe that he would endorse a policy which is contrary to the Word of God. Yet facts are facts. It is a fact that in the report of the Committee on Coöperation in Latin America "the securing of the publication by well-known Spanish publishing houses of several books by Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick and other American authors" is celebrated as one of the outstanding "accomplishments of the Book department"; it is a fact that the

name of Dr. Robert E. Speer, as Chairman of the Committee, is signed to that report.<sup>1</sup> I presented these facts to the Presbytery of New Brunswick in Dr. Speer's presence. He did not deny them, and he could not deny them. They are lamentable facts; they are to many persons unexpected facts; but facts they are all the same. There are many other facts like them; and no Bible-believing Christian, who examines the facts, can possibly help seeing that Dr. Robert E. Speer is leading the Church away from the paths of truth.

An increasing number of Bible-believing Christians are examining the facts for themselves, and are thus obliged to part company with the policies advocated by Dr. Speer. But many of them still cling to their confidence in Dr. Speer's own doctrinal teaching. He is unduly complacent, they say, toward false teaching by others; but his own teaching is thoroughly sound, and he has a clear understanding of what the gospel is.

What these persons do not see is that in defending Dr. Speer's teaching they are casting the most terrible aspersions on his character. If Dr. Speer's knowledge of the gospel were as clear as these persons think that it is, then how great would be his guilt in lending aid and comfort to that "other gospel" which is doing such irreparable harm to men's souls! If Dr. Speer's own convictions were as clear as these persons think that they are, then when he belies those convictions by his entire conduct as a Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions the devastating picture in the Epistle of James of the man whose works are at variance with his faith would seem to apply in considerable measure to him.

### Dr. Speer's Latest Book

I for my part do not hold any such low view of Dr. Speer's character; and the reason why I do not do so is that I can see clearly that his confusing conduct has its roots deep in the underlying confusion that is in his mind. That appears, for example, in his latest book *The Finality of Jesus Christ*. I can deal briefly with that book because I dealt at considerable length with the previous book, *Some Living Issues*, in CHRISTIANITY TODAY for October, 1930. The new book is much longer, but exactly the same confusion appears in it as that which has appeared in all of Dr. Speer's recent works, so far as I have examined them.

There are very many things in this new book, as in the other books, which are true. An advocate of Dr. Speer could fill many pages with quotations of splendid Christian utterances, especially from the earlier part of the book. I should like very much indeed to quote such passages now, if only there were time and space. Dr. Speer says quite

<sup>1</sup>See Report of the Thirty-ninth Annual Meeting of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, 1932, pp. 92, 114.

correctly, for example (p. 52), that "Christianity conceived as the faith of Jesus, or as the religion of Jesus, or as sharing or reproducing the religious experience of Jesus, is a mere invention." That strikes against the very heart of Modernism.

Yet the same writer who here inveighs against a Christianity that seeks to reproduce "the religion of Jesus" can write a commendatory preface to the book, *The Religion of Jesus*, by Toyohiko Kagawa! The reader is led to ask himself the question how deep Dr. Speer's opposition to the modern "religion of Jesus" can be, and whether he really differentiates that religion quite clearly from faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Nevertheless, there are many things well said in Dr. Speer's book, and we are glad that he does not by any means go all the way with the destructive Modernism of our time. He believes in the virgin birth of Christ and in His bodily resurrection; he tries, at least, though hardly, we think, with complete success, to hold on to the teaching of Paul as well as to the Sermon on the Mount; he believes that the New Testament account of Jesus is true.

Yet the book as a whole is a confused and harmful book. We say so with sorrow; but we are obliged to say so in order to be of whatever help we may be to those who are seeking truth.

In support of this estimate of the book, we may, perhaps, single out three features for special mention. They are (1) the lack of clearness about the Bible, (2) the wrong notion of the nature of a creed, (3) the indiscriminate and commendatory quotation of Modernist writers.

### The Natural and the Supernatural

Certain other things, indeed, might with perhaps equal propriety be pointed out. We might point, for example, to the confused notion of the distinction between the natural and the supernatural. Dr. Speer does speak against "the modern world view which knows only an immanent God, part of and identified with and enclosed within His own creation" (p. 40); yet almost in the same breath (and still more clearly on p. 271), he gives comfort to the deadly error which identifies the supernatural with the spiritual and regards the supernatural as standing merely over against the material world. "The word 'supernatural,'" says Dr. Speer, "is a clumsy and confusing word. We need first to define what we mean by 'natural.'" In reply, we are bound to say that the word "supernatural" as Dr. Speer uses it, is indeed a clumsy and confusing word; but we are also bound to say that until he learns to use it not in a clumsy and confusing way but in an altogether clear and illuminating way as designating the creative acts of God in sharp distinction from the work which God carries on through the course of nature, he can hardly be a competent teacher of the Church. When Dr. Speer, in

order to show that the early Christians, as we also today, were believers in the supernatural, says (on p. 271) that "the physical and material world does not exhaust reality" and that "mind and will are not for us resolvable into any physical and material base," and when he then quotes Miss Underhill with approval in this connection, he is, to say the least, playing with fire. By implication, though no doubt he is unconscious of it, he is going a long way with that modern denial of the living and holy God which is often coupled with ascription of "deity" to the reduced and merely human Jesus of modern reconstruction.

Thus, on p. 240, in a truly amazing passage, Dr. Speer cites in proof of the fact that "the early Church believed and we believe in the deity of Christ" the contention of Dr. A. C. McGiffert in *The God of the Early Christians* to the effect that "Jesus alone was that God" in whom the early Christians believed; and then he remarks that "if we cannot go as far as Dr. McGiffert it is still absolutely clear to us that the primitive Church worshipped and prayed to Jesus Christ and classed Him, man though they recognized Him to be and rejoiced that He was, with God." Just what was that contention of Dr. McGiffert which Dr. Speer here seems to treat as a testimony to the fact that the early Christians believed in the deity of Jesus, and to which he seems to object merely on the ground that it goes too far? The answer is plainly given in Dr. McGiffert's book, of which I wrote an extensive review in *The Princeton Theological Review* for October, 1924<sup>1</sup>, and upon which I commented also in my little book, *What Is Faith?* Dr. McGiffert held that the early Gentile Christians were not theists; they did not necessarily believe at all that there was a personal God, Creator and Ruler of the world. They were not necessarily monotheists. They did not ask any metaphysical questions as to the relation between Jesus and a transcendent God. But they merely held Jesus to be their own Saviour-God. It is that non-theistic view, that view which is really diametrically opposed to any real ascription of deity to Jesus, which Dr. Speer treats with such favor and apparently regards merely as going a little too far in its zeal for the deity of Christ! We do not mean that Dr. Speer is fully aware of the destructive implications of what he is saying. But still we do think that the fact that he can involve himself in such confusion is due to a profound fault in the whole starting-point of his thinking. The true starting-point for a Christian is not the human life of Jesus, but it is the majesty and holiness of God, the Creator and Ruler of the world. That is clear in all the Bible, but it is particularly clear in the teaching of Jesus Himself. The first verse of the Bible is really the foundation of all the

rest, and unless a man makes that verse the foundation of all his thinking, his ascription of deity to Jesus is the most un-Christian thing that could possibly be imagined. To worship and glorify as God the Jesus of the Bible, the Jesus who is "God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever," is the highest exercise of man, but to worship as God a Jesus who is not one in nature with the Creator and Ruler of the world is to worship and serve the creature more than the Creator, and that is a dreadful sin.

This indifference to the first verse of Genesis, this indifference to the basic theism taught by Jesus, is one of the root errors of modern missionary endeavor. Dr. Speer has given comfort to that error. He has not done so with understanding of what he is doing; but his doing so does reveal a very serious confusion of mind.

In the second place, we might remark that Dr. Speer is vague and unsatisfactory, in this book as always—so far as we have observed—in his recent writings, when he speaks of the Cross of Christ. He seems to bring us to the threshold of the great truth; but he never brings us into the Holy of Holies, and he never brings us clearly, in this connection, into the presence of the great High Priest.

But we come now to the three features of the book which we singled out for special comment.

### The Bible

In the first place, then, we may speak of the lack of clearness about the Bible. That lack of clearness—if we may not use with regard to it some still more unfavorable term—is particularly evident in the passage in the first part of Lecture II where the author sets forth the relation between Christianity and "Judaism." Here Dr. Speer speaks in the typical Modernist way. He points out, indeed, that "the Old Testament was the only Bible of the Church at the outset, and the first Christians fed upon it and talked from it, as the Church does to this day." But he says that "the new not only grew up out of the old," but also "came down from without and above upon the old" and that "the unlikeness eclipsed the likeness." He says further:

"He [Jesus] did not exclude Himself from Israel, but He so faithfully and explicitly proclaimed Himself and His message that Israel rejected and crucified Him. Why? Because in reality He was shattering the old forms and introducing a new and different and distinctive faith, a new thought of God and of humanity, of life and destiny" (p. 66).

He fails altogether to distinguish from the false Judaism of the Pharisees and of the Judaizers the true Judaism that understood the Old Testament Scriptures. He says:

"The breach appeared between Jesus and Judaism because it was there and must inevitably appear. All that Christianity and Judaism held in common, and a rich common treasure it is, as Paul never tired of pointing out, was outweighed by their radical and fundamental difference" (p. 67).

He quotes with approval the Modernist, T. R. Glover, when Glover says that it "was a new thing when Religion in the name of truth and for the love of God, abolished the connection with a trivial past." He classes Judaism with non-Christian religions<sup>2</sup>:

"If between Christianity and Judaism there were this deep generic breach, declared with such vehemence on the side of Judaism that it set Christianity off in utter separation and effected the crucifixion of Jesus, *a fortiori* it is impossible to equalitate Christianity and other religions, all of them vastly farther removed from Christianity than Judaism with its pure monotheism, its noble ethics and its theocratic solidarity. Christianity began thus at the outset as a new and incommensurable religion, belonging in a classification by itself alone. The whole New Testament bears witness to this. And the Fathers follow it. If at first the Church sought to hold fast both to the new and to the old, it was not long before, as Jesus had foretold, the inevitable cleavage came. The Christians were expelled from the synagogues as an alien element, and came themselves to see with ever clearer vision that something better and different had come, so different that it could only be described as a brand new creation, not one more unfulfilled, wistful quest of men for God, but the one conclusive, adequate and final outgoing of God Himself for man" (p. 69).

In these passages, Dr. Speer is dealing in a very unsatisfactory way, not with the superstructure of Christian missions and of Christian work, but with the foundation. He is dealing in a very unsatisfactory way with the Bible. It is difficult to see how a man can write as Dr. Speer here writes and at the same time hold, if he is at all consistent, that there is just one true religion based on a supernatural revelation from God. I cannot see how, if he is consistent, he can really hold to the equal authority of the Old and New Testaments. Does that mean merely giving the Old Testament up? No, it means something even more serious. It means giving the New Testament up as well, because the New Testament stakes the whole weight of its authority upon just that high view of the Old Testament Scriptures which is held by despised Bible-believing Christians lately—that high view of the Old Testament which is certainly undermined, by implication if not consciously, in what Dr. Speer says.

We desire particularly at this point to be fair. It is perfectly possible for a man to hold a high view of the Old Testament and at the same time to use some unguarded expressions that would logically destroy that view. I did just that, if I may take myself as a humble example, in my course lessons, *A Rapid Survey of the Literature and History of New Testament Times*, which was first published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication in 1914. In that course of lessons, especially in the first printing, I used some expressions, in describing the relation between Christianity and "Judaism" which were erroneous in a way similar to that for which I am now criticizing Dr. Speer. Yet in that same course I presented a very high view of the authority of the whole Bible.

<sup>1</sup>In this quotation, as in some other quotations from Dr. Speer, we have omitted his footnotes, including references to Biblical passages.

<sup>1</sup>Vol. XXII, 1924, pp. 544-588.



I have regretted the errors in my course, and I am glad to correct them. I hope that Dr. Speer will not take it amiss if I point out errors in his latest book which seem to me to go very much further in the same direction.

The great trouble is that I do not remember in this latest book of Dr. Speer, or in his recent books, any clear presentation of the doctrine of supernatural revelation or of the inspiration of the whole Bible which would counterbalance the unfortunate passages to which I have referred. I cannot remember any clear-cut statement of the authority of the Bible as such. It would be difficult to imagine a more serious difference of opinion than that which here *seems*, at least, to separate us from Dr. Speer. Men may differ about the superstructure in many details, and still go on in essential harmony; but unless they are agreed about the foundation, it is difficult to see how anything like real agreement among them can be attained. The foundation of mission work, and of Christian work in general at home as well as abroad, for us Bible-believing Christians, is found in the absolute authority of the whole of God's holy Word. I do not know how far Dr. Speer understands the implications of certain things that he has said. But the matter is so fundamental and so serious that even confusion with regard to it, to say nothing of positive error, is disastrous to everything that the Church is endeavoring to do.

#### The Nature of a Creed

In the second place, Dr. Speer has a wrong notion of the nature of a creed, and thus he gives comfort to what is perhaps the central error in the modern Church. Thus he says:

"Christianity did indeed cover over and weave around its original simple message many involvements, and it inevitably thought out the implication of its teaching, and did so of necessity in the thought forms of those whom it sought to reach. In part these developments confirmed and fortified the essential, central convictions, and in part they confused and burdened them. But this development came for the most part in the third century and afterwards" (p. 98).

Does Dr. Speer mean to include in this utterly derogatory presentation of the very nature of a creed the Westminster Confession of Faith which the ordination pledge presents as containing the system of doctrine taught in infallible Scriptures? I do not see how any reader can very well help answering this question in the affirmative.

On page 104, the great creeds are presented as being necessary to guard Christianity's "simple and essential historic centralities." That is a Modernist view of a creed, rather than the Christian view. Certainly it is very difficult to establish its agreement with the constitution of the Presbyterian Church. Dr. Speer says:

"That connection [connection with the mystery religions] had to be broken and Christians must come clean and stay clear of all complicity or

relationship to all other faiths. This gave Christianity its power. It was not its absorptiveness, its later syncretisms, its adoption of the thought forms of the world, its generalized philosophy and world view, its great creeds, necessary as these were to guard its simple and essential historic centralities. The permanence and success of Christianity were not secured by any of these, 'but by the simple New Testament creed, "Jesus is Lord," which permitted no compromise' " (p. 104).

These last words are quoted—quite characteristically, we are sorry to say—from the Modernist writer, Dr. S. Angus, whose propaganda has given such distress to Bible-believing Christians in Australia.

Dr. Speer contrasts the "primitive view of Christ" with "the elaborate verbiage of the creeds of the Councils," and says that "neither the creeds nor all the subsequent theologues of the Church have been able to see more in Christ and to claim more for Christ than is found in the Epistles of Paul, which, let it be remembered, antedated all four Gospels and which are the earliest statement of the faith of the Church about Christ" (p. 204). We agree, of course, that the creeds of the Councils do not contain more than that which is contained in Holy Scripture, though we decline to single out one portion of Scripture from the rest, and though we certainly prefer not to speak of the Epistles of Paul as being a "statement of the faith of the Church about Christ." But we certainly do not think that the great Ecumenical Creeds are to be charged with "elaborate verbiage." On the contrary they are admirably succinct and pithy statements of what the Scriptures teach. If one wants elaborate verbiage, he has to turn to the inordinate verbosity of the statements of the Lausanne and Jerusalem Missionary Conferences, which Dr. Speer holds in such high honor. The reason for that inordinate verbosity is that those statements are seeking to please both the Christian and the Modernist element in the Church. In order to do that they are concealing their lamentable poverty by a veritable torrent of words. The purpose of the great creeds of the Church was exactly the opposite. It was not to make room for error, but to set the truth off from error in ever greater distinctness.

Dr. Speer loves to speak of the simplicity of "the elementary faith of the first disciples and of the primitive Church" (p. 205) and of "the simple Gospel of the Primitive Church" (p. 137) in contrast with this supposed "elaborate verbiage" of the great creeds. At this point we disagree with him in the sharpest possible way. There is a true simplicity, we hold, in the great creeds, including the Westminster Confession of Faith. Those creeds contain mysteries, because they merely set forth what the Bible teaches, and wonderfully rich is the revelation which God has recorded for us in His Word. But in a profound sense they are simple. There is nothing confused about them. If we really want to find something that is confused, something that is the very reverse of simple, we have to turn to the

vagueness of Modernism, with its use of Christian terminology in an un-Christian sense; and we could turn also to the elaborate attempt of Dr. Speer, in his present book, to mediate between things that are as opposite as the poles.

But is simplicity, in this modern sense, which equates simplicity with doctrinal poverty, really to be desired? A great many people seem to think that it is. Church unionists of today are devoting their best efforts towards seeing how little of Christian truth they can get along with. But a man can never engage in any such effort as that if he is true to the Word of God. The truly Christian effort is that of searching the Scriptures to learn more and more of what God has so graciously revealed. I can find in the Bible from beginning to end no trace of this anti-creedal, anti-intellectualistic, anti-doctrinal tendency which is found so distressingly in Dr. Speer's book. That tendency really cuts much deeper than the Westminster Confession, much deeper than the great Ecumenical Creeds; it is really opposed to the whole temper of the Bible from Genesis to Revelation.

#### Dr. Speer and Modernist Writers

In the third place, Dr. Speer's book is filled with indiscriminate and commendatory quotations from the most destructive Modernist writers. I cannot take space here to exhibit that fault in detail. To do so with any adequacy would fill whole pages of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. Dr. Speer has the habit of making some Christian utterance and then, in support of it, quoting Harnack or someone else with the words "as Harnack says," or the like. When he does that he takes back by implication almost every good thing that he has said; because when he equates his good utterance with what Harnack says he is asking his readers to interpret his good utterance in Harnack's way. These writers whom Dr. Speer loves to quote in this fashion—Harnack and a great host of others—are opposed to supernatural Christianity at its very roots. How can the result be anything but utter confusion in the minds of the readers of the book?

Perhaps it may be said that the fault to which we are here objecting is a fault merely in Dr. Speer's understanding of these modern writers and not a fault in his own understanding of the Bible or of the Christian religion. There may be a certain measure of truth in this way of looking at the matter. It is quite true that on certain occasions Dr. Speer does show himself to be amazingly unaware of the real views of the writers whom he is quoting. Thus on p. 35 he says that "those critics who are adverse to our view of Christ . . . regard as the most trustworthy history in the New Testament . . . the opening chapters of the book of Acts." It is certainly surprising that one who seems to have read so much

of the work of the writers in question should be so totally unaware of what their critical position about the New Testament is.

But we do not think that this explanation by any means goes the whole way. We cannot believe that a man whose own views of the basis of the Christian religion were really clear could quote with the utmost approval, on page after page of his book, what is said by the most vigorous opponents of the real Christian faith. Does this not give us an object lesson to show what utter folly is the notion that a man can ever hold fully to the truth if he does not stand bravely and clearly against error?

In what I have said about Dr. Speer's book, and about his teaching, I desire not to be misunderstood. I do not mean that his book contains nothing that is good; I do not mean that his life work in my judgment has been altogether in vain. I myself obtained great benefit from his preaching in my youth, and I know that countless others have obtained great benefit from it. But what I am saying is that in the great issue of the present day Dr. Speer is standing on the wrong side. He is standing on the wrong side because he is standing on neither side. Never were our Lord's words, "He that is not with me is against me," more completely to the point than they are at the present moment in the Presbyterian Church. In the great conflict between Christianity and Modernism, the actual result of Dr. Speer's influence has told powerfully and generally on the Modernist side. He has commended to us the middle-of-the-road attitude with great eloquence, but just because of that eloquence with which he has commended it, he has shown with renewed clearness that that middle-of-the-road attitude, that attitude which Dr. Frank H. Stevenson has aptly called the "yes-and-no attitude in the Presbyterian Church," is the worst possible obstacle in the way of real Christian testimony.

It is only when the Church turns away resolutely from that attitude that she will regain the power that has been lost. God grant that she might turn away from a miserable minimizing apologetic—with its stereotyped phrases, "no doctrinal issue," "no divisive theology," etc.—and might get back to the true, intolerant, offensive, glorious, powerful gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ.

One thing is clear. If we are to have the old power, we must pay the price. We must make a clean breach with all entangling alliances; we must make a clean breach with Modernism. We must return to the true simplicity of the gospel—the true simplicity of the great theologians, the true simplicity of the Word of God.

Modern advocates of a non-doctrinal simplicity are not truly simple at all. Dr. Speer is not truly simple when he makes conservative utterances and then quotes page after

page of Harnack, Schweitzer, and other opponents of the Faith, in support of what he says. No plain man can make head or tail out of such a self-contradictory position as that. Instead of such false simplicity, which is really a very subtle, self-contradictory thing, men and women are longing for the true simplicity of God's Word, for the full-orbed gospel that the Word contains.

It is in the interests of such true simplicity that the present movement for reform of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions has been begun. We do not know in detail how that movement will end. Some

devout Christians think that the Board of Foreign Missions can really be reformed. If that is to be done it is quite clear that the membership of the Board must be changed. Others think that the formation of a new Board that shall be true to the Bible and to the Confession of Faith of the Church should at once be undertaken. One thing at least is clear. Truth and honesty will not fail. The present situation can have no real blessing of God. But what a glorious opportunity there would be at the present moment if there were a faithful Presbyterian Board of Missions to send the true gospel to the ends of the earth!

## News of the Church

### Correspondence, General

#### Washington-Oregon-Idaho Notes

By Dr. Roy Talmage Brumbaugh

**I**F our Boards came out clean-cut for evangelical Christianity, I believe that there would be a revival of the grace of giving. Middle-of-the-roadism and modernism make negligible contributions to the work of evangelizing the world. True evangelicals cannot consistently give to causes which seem to specialize in education and medication and neglect the first duty of evangelization. Of course, it would not be good politics to eliminate middle-of-the-roadism and modernism, but the separation would be blessed by God.

The Rev. William Faucette, pastor of the Millard Avenue Presbyterian Church of Portland (Ore.) had the largest Easter crowd in the history of the church. Many attended on Easter who will not be seen until next Easter, but they heard the Gospel in the Millard Avenue Church. Mr. Faucette preached on the full meaning of Christ's resurrection.

The First Church of Hoquiam (Wash.) of which the Rev. Leonard R. Patton is pastor, celebrated its fiftieth anniversary last month. This church was host to the Presbytery of Olympia in April.

On April 27th the First Church of Belingham celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the church and the twentieth anniversary of the dedication of the present church plant. The pastor emeritus, who was pastor at the time of the founding of the church, and Dr. John R. Macartney, the present pastor, who was also pastor when the church was erected, participated in the services.

Sixty-two new members were received into the First Presbyterian Church of Tacoma (Wash.) last month. Two thousand four hundred and eighty-nine persons at-

tended the two Easter services. Twenty new Deacons were ordained and installed in April. One hundred and twenty-five officers and members assist in the visitation of every member of the congregation every month. This church broadcasts four times a week. The morning service is broadcast over KMO from 11.00 to 12.15; Tuesday and Wednesday nights over Station KVI from 8.00 to 8.25, and Friday nights over Station KVI from 10.00 to 10.30. This church will celebrate its sixtieth anniversary in July. In the meantime it is enjoying a revival under the Holy Spirit.

TACOMA, WASH.

#### California Column

**T**HE spring meeting of Los Angeles Presbytery was, as usual, very largely attended. More than three hundred ministers and elders taxed the capacity of our Euclids Heights Church. . . . Among the larger items of business were the request of several of our ministers for the Presbytery's sanction of salary reduction, the average amount being about twenty-five per cent. . . . Easter Sunday saw exceptionally large congregations at all of our churches, and the Immanuel Church, Dr. H. B. Smith, pastor, said to be the largest in the United States, was forced to arrange two identical morning services, one at nine o'clock and the other at eleven to accommodate the crowds. It is unfortunate that so many people do their church-going for the entire year on Easter Sunday, unfortunate for the church, but more so for the people. . . . Resolutions requesting Presbyterian Churches of the Pacific Coast to contribute \$70,000 for rehabilitation of churches damaged by the earthquake were adopted by the Presbytery. Dr. Guy W. Wadsworth, moderator of the synod of California and secretary of the

Board of Church Extension, will be in charge of the campaign. . . . Regarding the recent action of Presbytery in its ousting of Rev. Milo F. Jamison for asserted insubordination, Rev. T. H. Walker of Anaheim and Henry Schaffer were appointed to defend Presbytery's action before the synod. . . . The Federated Church of Whittier was enrolled in the Presbytery, bringing the number of churches to one hundred ten, and the enrollment of ministers, active and retired, to three hundred forty. . . . The Pacific Sociological Society will be conducted at Occidental College during the last week in April. Speakers include Drs. Paul Papehoe, William Kirk, L. D. Osburne, Constantine Anunzio and many other social and religious workers. . . . A sensation was caused in California church circles recently by the suicide of one of its most brilliant young United Presbyterian ministers, Dr. John S. Stover, who suffered a nervous breakdown some months ago through overwork, and left his home recently to attend a church conference. His body was found two days later in the neighborhood of Lake Elsinore.

California ministers are looking forward to the General Assembly at Columbus with the prayerful expectation that our parent body will enjoy the Holy's Spirit's special blessing, as they review the accomplishments of the past year, and outline the plans for the coming days. There is an earnest desire on the part of the Western Churches for a more definitely Evangelical note throughout our denomination and we are believing this Assembly can do much to bring it about.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

## Denver and Vicinity

By the Rev. H. Clare Welker, Th.M.

**T**HE Rev. William Gordon Kiery, stated clerk of Pueblo Presbytery and pastor at Penrose, Colorado, reports an unusually helpful and inspiring meeting of the Presbytery. One part of the program which was especially heartening was a two-hour consideration of the important subject of "spiritual emphasis." The Board of Christian Education was represented by Dr. Gerritt Verkuyl and the Board of Pensions, by the Rev. J. C. E. Fry. The Rev. William Orr, pastor at Canon City, was elected Moderator.

Gunnison Presbytery held a two-day session in the Grand Junction Church of which the Rev. George F. McDougall, D.D., is pastor, on April 26th and 27th. The Rev. W. F. Fulton of Salida was elected Moderator. The Rev. R. B. Norton, pastor-at-large for Gunnison and Pueblo Presbyteries, was elected ministerial commissioner to the General Assembly and Elder Earl Murphy of Loma was chosen lay commissioner.

The Brighton Church of which the writer is pastor had the very enjoyable experience

of entertaining both Denver Presbytery and the Women's Presbyterial Missionary Society on Tuesday, April 18th. About 350 out-of-town guests were present. The two bodies held a joint service of worship at 9.30 at which the Rev. John Knox Hall, D.D., retiring Moderator of Denver Presbytery preached the sermon. Just before lunch the two bodies again met in joint session to enjoy a brief program of sacred music presented by the choir of the entertaining church. During the lunch hour Dr. Calvin H. French, president of Hastings College briefly addressed the commissioners and delegates. The Board of Foreign Missions was represented before the Presbytery by the Rev. A. R. Kepler, D.D., of Shanghai, China, and before the Presbyterial by Miss Mary E. Moore of the New York office. The Rev. Benj. F. Judd, pastor of the North Church, Denver, was elected Moderator. The Rev. Thomas Murray, D.D., pastor of the First Avenue Church, Denver, and the Rev. Lewis S. Hall, pastor of the Littleton Church, were elected ministerial commissioners to the General Assembly, and Elder R. D. Marthens of the Montview Boulevard Church, Denver, and Elder L. E. Skinner of Otis were elected lay commissioners. A call from the Westminster Church was found in order and placed in the hands of the Rev. P. R. Keplinger who has been serving the church as stated supply. The Rev. Chas. P. Leeper, formerly pastor at Otis, was dismissed to the Presbytery of Carthage. The pastoral relation between the Rev. Geo. R. Edmundson, D.D., and the Berkeley Church was dissolved at the request of Dr. Edmundson who was appointed stated supply. Presbytery concurred in the overture from Chester Presbytery which would require that the Westminster Standards be made the doctrinal basis of all negotiations looking to organic union.

BRIGHTON, COLORADO.

## Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky News Letter

By the Rev. Gerard H. Snell

**E**ASTER accessions and Easter enthusiasm gave to this month's correspondence a decided note of optimism. Out of the fulness of our Easter experience arises a two-fold message: one of encouragement, that despite the depression and modernism the Church-at-large is very much alive; and one of warning, that the high pitch of religious feeling must be guided and directed lest it die out and become as the plant whose seed was sown in thin soil. The coming summer will test the depth and validity of the Easter enthusiasm.

## OHIO

Cincinnati Presbytery

At the April meeting of Presbytery Moderator Frank R. Elder announced the ap-

pointment of the new Vice-Moderator, Rev. Homer M. Campbell, pastor of the North Church. Ministerial Commissioners to the General Assembly elected at this time are: R. Dale LeCount, Gordon Lang, R. H. Clarke and F. R. Elder.

**Lancaster**—The First Church, the Rev. Benjamin F. Paist pastor, at its annual meeting announced that all bills were paid for the previous year, a small balance remained, and a large note had been wiped out. Nine new members by confession were received at the Easter Communion and two by letter.

Portsmouth Presbytery, meeting April 17-18 in the Second Church of Portsmouth, the Rev. Maurice P. Stoute pastor, voted to concur in the overture to be presented at General Assembly asking for complete severance of our denomination from the Federal Council of Churches. The Rev. H. G. Vorsheim was elected Moderator. The Rev. Mr. Stoute will be the ministerial commissioner to General Assembly.

St. Clairsville Presbytery, whose Moderator is the Rev. D. C. Marshall, elected the Rev. F. S. Williams as its ministerial commissioner to General Assembly. At the evening session of its April meeting the speakers, the Reverends J. C. Stamm, A. L. Varady and C. W. Pindar, workers in the mission fields of Presbytery presented the needs of their various fields.

The pastor of the First Church of Cambridge, of this Presbytery, the Rev. L. S. Evans, reports a series of unusually earnest and inspiring Sunday evening services. The Rev. E. W. Lodwick, pastor of the Buffalo Church, Cumberland, reports a banner Easter Day as the closing of an intensive Every Member Visitation Campaign. Of the eighteen who united with the church thirteen joined on confession.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

## News Notes from the Southeast

By the Rev. William Childs Robinson, D.D.

Meetings of Presbyteries

NORTH CAROLINA

**M**ECKLENBURG Presbytery met at Siler Church April 11th and 12th. Rev. L. P. Burney, pastor of the Sugar Creek Church, was elected moderator; Rev. E. H. Gammon and former moderator Mr. R. A. Dunn were elected commissioners to the General Assembly. The Presbytery accepted the suggestion of Moderator Crowe that only two commissioners be elected this year. A congratulatory telegram was sent to the Presbytery of Orange (N. C.) commending its action in refusing to receive a minister who had been called by the Chapel Hill Church on the ground that he did not accept the Westminster System of doctrine.

Davidson College reported the endowment of a school of Music by Mrs. Cameron Morrison.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Piedmont Presbytery met at Pendleton, April 10th and 11th, elected Rev. Eugene Wilson of Walhalla Moderator, and the Rev. S. J. L. Crouch of Clemson College and Dr. Parker its commissioners to General Assembly. Candidate J. K. Aiken was licensed to preach the Gospel. The presbytery voted against the amendment to require a three-fourths vote for any change of title to Church property.

Enoree Presbytery met at Reidville, April 10th and 11th, and elected Dr. C. H. Nabers of Greenville its Moderator. Candidate W. J. Hazelwood was licensed as a preacher of the Gospel. The meeting was permeated by a spirit of trust and confidence in God's care for His people and His Church.

Bethel Presbytery met at Ebenezer, a church that was founded in 1725. It adopted a modified form of resolutions proposed by Drs. Gregg and Joplin opposing repeal of the eighteenth amendment.

## ALABAMA

East Alabama Presbytery met at Lebanon Church, Rev. F. H. McElroy, pastor, April 11th and 12th. The opening sermon was preached by Rev. L. W. Carleton, retiring moderator. Rev. C. H. Rogers of Dothan was elected moderator. The tone of the meeting was intensely evangelistic with a sermon on that theme by Dr. J. E. Hobson of Eufaula and discussion by Dr. D. C. Macquire and others. Candidate J. Moody McNair was licensed to preach the Gospel, and arranged to conduct a number of evangelistic services in the Presbytery the approaching summer.

North Alabama Presbytery met at Goodwater Church, Rev. M. C. MacQueen, pastor, at the same time. Dr. W. C. Robinson was elected moderator; Dr. F. D. Wallace of Decatur, Alabama, and Elder Thigpen of Gadsden were elected commissioners to the Assembly. Dr. C. G. Partridge presented his resignation as Superintendent of Home Missions in order to accept a call as pastor in Florida. The presbytery ordered resolutions of affection and appreciation of Dr. Partridge's useful service sent to his new Presbytery. The amendment on the protection of the title to Church property was answered in the affirmative. Rev. I. H. Trusler of Gadsden First Church preached a stirring sermon on evangelism.

Each of the ministers of the Synod received a Message from the Moderator of the Synod, Dr. George Lang of the University of Alabama. In commending the evangelistic year Dr. Lang insisted that to-day is *A Presbyterian Day*, a time for the proclamation of the sovereignty of God, the realization that a plan does guide the creative will, that human destiny is in the hands of God. Another especially fine line in his thoughtful message is: "Our gospel is a gospel of salvation, not a social formula nor a 'success' philosophy"; we are 'to relate

men to Christ and Christ to them in the elemental reality of the gospel of the New Testament and of all time!"

DECATUR, GA.

## News Letter from Western Pennsylvania

By the Rev. Harold J. Ockenga

APRIL 19-21 marked the meeting of the tenth annual Evangelistic Conference of the Federal Council of Churches. It was held at the William Penn Hotel in Pittsburgh, and was attended by a nation-wide representation. The policies for the churches represented, including twenty-six denominations, were formulated for 1934.

The keynote seemed to be that the church must start a battle for social justice if it is to make an appeal to the youth of today. "The church must go to war to destroy corruption in government, to wipe out intolerance, to end war itself, and to establish social justice," said Dr. D. A. Poling. Representing youth, he claimed that a militant church would get the response of youth today.

Arthur Braden, president of Transylvania College, Lexington, Kentucky, likewise criticized the attitude of the church toward present day problems. "When suggestions are made that the church put the principles of Christ into politics and business, international relations and race problems, somebody howls—and the church subsides . . . the trouble with the church today is that it has gone flat."

Dr. Harry N. Holmes, field secretary for the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, New York, said, "The chief danger that youth face today is that of losing heart. . . . They need Christ for a hero."

In all this talk of evangelism by the group that is supposed to outline the program for the Presbyterian Church there was a conspicuous absence of the one source of evangelistic endeavor — the Redeeming Christ and the Power of the Holy Spirit. That a firm stand on social questions is needed is evident, but that evangelism cannot be carried on without the dynamic of a risen, saving Christ, a knowledge about Christ, and a renewal of prayer is our conviction. The secretary, Rev. Roy B. Guild, said, "People are losing interest in the theological questions . . . the churches are trying to save men for this life." A true evangelism can never be conducted without a theology. This is what lays the churches open to inroads of error and unscriptural practices such as contained in Buchmanism. It is a pitiable sight to see Protestantism stripped of its heritage of truth to satisfy the claims of an easy tolerance. We cannot look to the Federal Council for inspiration in evangelism.

The Elders' Association Annual Dinner and Meeting of Pittsburgh Presbytery was

held at the Point Breeze Presbyterian Church on April 24th. Dr. Louis H. Evans of the Third Presbyterian Church, delivered a powerful address on "The Message of Our Forefathers to the Men of Today." As one looks into the faces of these laymen who love God, he realizes that hope of evangelical Presbyterianism resides in them. A doctrinally conscious laity will save our church.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

## Eastern Pennsylvania News Letter

By the Rev. John Burton Thwing, Th.D.

AT the meeting of Lackawanna Presbytery at Troy on April 18th, the National Missions Committee took over the work among foreign-speaking people, conducted since 1886 by the Rev. F. Von Krug. The merger was arranged in the interests of economy, receipts having shrunk considerably in the last two years. Dr. Von Krug resigned and the Rev. Ebenezer Flack was retained.

Delegates to the General Assembly from Lackawanna Presbytery include the Revs. Richard A. Rinker, Plummer Harvey, D. H. Johnston and F. Von Krug, and Elders L. B. Wagner, Troy; L. P. Bierly, West Pittston; L. B. Tingley, Montrose; and W. R. James, Plymouth.

The Rev. William K. Newton has resigned from the Honesdale Church, effective June 4th. The Rev. S. T. Foster, of Carbondale, was appointed Moderator of the church. Harold G. Keen, a Princeton student, and Daniel Rinaldi were licensed by the Presbytery.

The Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D., spoke at Beacon Church, Philadelphia, May 3rd, baptizing the pastor's daughter, Lucy Blakeslee Thwing, at the same service.

At the meeting of Philadelphia Presbytery on May 1st, the "Machen" overture, presented by Prof. Allan A. MacRae, was adopted by a vote of 57 to 16.

Commissioners elected to Synod included the Revs. Hilko de Beer, William P. Fulton, Abram Long, Charles F. Ball, Walter T. Riemann and Walter B. Greenway; and Elders Harry A. Palmer, of Arch Street Church; Andrew A. Scott, Patterson Memorial; H. F. Dittmann, Temple; Peter B. MacLeod, Fourth; Charles F. Hardie, Trinity, and Mrs. Naomi Norton, Faith. Mrs. Norton's name was placed in nomination by Dr. William P. Fulton, and, coming from the Presbytery's newest church, she is also the first woman elder ever elected from Philadelphia to Synod.

Two brothers, Robert and William T. Strong, of Westminster Church, Philadelphia, and students in Westminster Seminary, were taken under the care of the Presbytery, and the Rev. James L. Rohrbaugh was received from the Presbytery of Yellow-

stone, Montana. No action was taken upon the request of the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly that a vacancy and supply committee be organized in the Presbytery.

Bethlehem Church, Philadelphia, on April 10th, celebrated its sixtieth anniversary. Dr. William L. McCormick, D.D., is the church's pastor.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

## New England and New York Synods

By the Rev. L. Craig Long

THE Presbytery of Connecticut Valley met in the First Presbyterian Church of Hartford on Monday and Tuesday, April 24th and 25th. Rev. A. J. Wm. Myers, Ph.D., of Hartford Seminary, was nominated for the Moderatorship by Rev. Alexander Alison, Jr., and was unanimously elected. It was moved by Mr. Long and seconded by Dr. Alison that the Presbytery concur with the Hudson Overture and ask General Assembly for the breaking of all relationship with the Federal Council of Churches, and this motion was carried after debate by a vote of twelve to seven. All other Overtures were voted "No action." An overture presented upon the matter of the Board of Foreign Missions and asking General Assembly to reorganize that Board and remove all Auburn Affirmationists and also asking that the Candidate Secretary be carefully chosen from among men of sound faith, was, by immediate suggestion of the Moderator and several others, branded as "radical," and was tabled. Rev. Valentine Alison of Springfield was elected Commissioner to General Assembly and Elder Wm. Wyncoop of the Westminster Church in Bridgeport was elected as Elder Commissioner. Both of these Commissioners voted in favor of the Hudson Overture.

The speakers at the Bible Conference being held in the Calvin Presbyterian Church of New Haven, May 14th to May 21st, will include Dr. James M. Gray, president of Moody Bible Institute; Dr. Henry Ostrum and Dr. Max Reich, who is a Hebrew Christian. The Conference is under the direction of the Moody Bible Institute. Everett Bean, a sixteen-year-old Junior in a New Haven High School, accurately answered the entire Westminster Shorter Catechism in twenty-five minutes during a broadcast from that Church Sunday evening, April 23rd. He is the third High School student to do this within a month. The result of this widespread interest in Catechism throughout the Church membership is evident in all phases of the work of the Church. Twenty-nine persons united with the First Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn at the Easter Communion service. Forty-one persons were received by the Presbyterian Church at Glens Falls, New York. The Central Presbyterian Church of Buffalo received one hundred and twenty-six new members. This

makes the total membership 2,232. Six hundred attended the midweek service in the Spencer Memorial Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn on Tuesday, April 18th, to hear Dr. Donald Gray Barnhouse give his weekly message. (When I read this in the Spencer Bulletin I was made to think of the great midweek service in the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, where I had the privilege to worship the Wednesday evening before Easter and hear Dr. Macartney preach to a similarly large audience. Such midweek services are witness to the power of the Gospel.) On Palm Sunday there were seventy-two new members received into the membership of the Central Presbyterian Church of Rochester. Dr. William E. Biedewolf, a Presbyterian Minister and a world famous evangelist, will conduct a two-week campaign in the Central Church under the auspices of the Gospel Tabernacle of Rochester. The dates are May 7th to May 21st. Dr. J. Gresham Machen preached both morning and evening of April 23rd in the First Presbyterian Church of Gouverneur, N. Y. The evening service was a Union service of all the Churches of Gouverneur. Twenty-one new members were received into the membership of the First Presbyterian Church of Poughkeepsie, at their Spring Communion. The Church, which was founded in 1749, observed the twenty-fifth anniversary of the dedication of its present Church edifice on Sunday, April 2nd. Rev. Harold Benner Kerschner and Rev. Leland Wieand Kuns are the Ministers.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

## Netherlands Letter

By the Rev. F. W. Grosheide, Th.D., Professor in the Free University, Amsterdam

EASTER time is in Holland a time of meetings. Especially ministers of the different churches have their assemblies in that period. But, before I tell something about the meetings of the theologians, I have to speak about others. I mean the commemorations of the three-hundredth birthday of William the Silent.

William the Silent was the founder of the Dutch nation in its present state. The Dutch themselves only seldom call him William the Silent. For he was not taciturn at all and he received that nickname because he was too wise to be silent at a certain time. This was when the King of France spoke to him about the destroying of the Protestant people in the Netherlands of Philip the Second, King of Spain and sovereign of the Low Countries. This was but an episode in the life of William the Silent. We Dutch speak of William of Orange, and orange is our national color.

It was not without good reasons, that different circles, including the universities, held their commemorations. For William of Orange was not only a man of moment

as statesman and general, but he had also great influence as a spiritual and religious leader. He was the first in Europe to proclaim liberty of religion and more particularly liberty of conscience. He defended that liberty not only against the Roman Catholics but also against the too severe Calvinists, who desired that the Church should rule over the State. And now the ideas of William of Orange have become the common good of all civilized nations. We in our time pluck the fruits of his struggle and his death by a murderous hand. William of Orange did not mean that all religions had the same worth, that it was a thing of no interest, what people did believe. But he proclaimed that no State, no Church had the right to interfere between God and one's conscience. And therefore the churches also have reason to be grateful to the Prince of Orange.

And now the meetings of the theologians. All the theologians have not yet met. But if I had waited until all the meetings were held, my letter would have reached the editors too late. So I can speak only of the Assemblies of the ministers of the Reformed Churches. It is a matter of course that a meeting of reformed ministers is filled up with the reading of papers and discussions. What could they do otherwise than speak and debate? Now, there were good subjects to speak about. There was a paper on the new Oxford movement (not that of Newman, but of Buchman); one on the secession of 1884, and on the Duplessis case; and one on I Cor. 7. The second has no direct interest for America. The Buchman movement has gained entrance into Holland. In our country, however, till now it has no great influence and in the Dutch East Indies even less. Now, generally speaking, the conclusion of the debate was, we must be grateful for the group movement, for there is some good in it, especially this, that it is an evangelization of the higher ranks of society, which thus far have been almost unapproachable for the preaching of the Word of God. But it is not good that Calvinistic people join the Oxford movement. They have all the movement they can handle, if they only live according to their confession.

The Duplessis case put also to Dutch Churches the question, what ought to be the rights and the duties of the civil judge in the affairs of the Church? Thus far Dutch judges have refused to interfere with Church questions, if a minister is true to the standards of the Church. The court only examined, if the Church had proceeded according to its own ecclesiastical order and if no faults were made. The meeting gave as its opinion that this was the right way. The paper on I Cor. 7 dealt with the question of divorce in the broadest sense of the word, a question of importance, as in all countries there are movements to augment the causes on which a marriage may be dissolved.

## Scottish Letter

By the Rev. Prof. Donald MacLean, D.D.

MAY is the month of Presbyterian Assemblies and Synods in Scotland. Edinburgh is the constant meeting-place of most of these. Thither the Presbyterian tribes go up once more to pray for peace and felicity, and for prosperity to Israel's testimony.

The reports to be submitted to the various supreme courts are now ready. Their contents, while they do not disclose any impressive impact on the churchless multitude, show that the Reformed or Presbyterian form of Faith is still, of vital interest to those who, perhaps, count for most in the life of our nation.

The smaller churches still adhering unreservedly to the Westminster standards are the Free Church of Scotland (the largest of the Group), Reformed Presbyterian Church, United Original Secession Church, and the Free Presbyterian Church. A few years ago the Free Church General Assembly issued a general invitation to all these churches to confer with the view of formulating a basis for incorporating union or co-operation. All the churches concerned, except the Free Presbyterian Church, appointed representatives to confer on the proposal. Several conferences of a very friendly and interesting kind took place. The issue of these conferences will be submitted to this coming Assembly of the Free Church. The report to be submitted is long and interesting and will be of permanent historical value whatever the issue may be. All these churches are already united in the Faith, but each has made its own distinctive contribution to the Christian life of our country, and of other countries also. The question that will determine the issue is whether these churches can better serve their Lord by continuing separately, but in mutually helpful relations, than by an organic union which might eliminate or submerge distinctive and historically interesting characteristics, which are worth conserving. Union is not probable but closer co-operation is.

The war-time and post-war-time enthusiasm for external ecclesiastical unity, which received such a strong impetus from the military analogy of unity of command, is decidedly ebbing out in this country. This was manifested in the Church of Scotland Assembly last year, when, in response to an appeal from Lambeth, representatives were appointed by a large majority, although not without vigorous opposition, to "unrestricted conference" with appointed representatives of the Anglican Church. The "opposition" have formed themselves into "the National Church Association for the Safeguarding of the Protestant and Presbyterian Witness of the Church of Scotland." Their view of the "unrestricted conference" is thus expressed by themselves. "We have had enough of ecclesiasticism in Scotland. . . .

The Kirk of Scotland has too much to do to waste any energy on futile negotiations. It can best do its work as Protestant, Presbyterian, Evangelical, and Free." Piquant interest therefore attaches to the first report from the conference which is to be submitted to the coming Assembly. The appeal of Lambeth to the Church of Scotland cannot be dissociated from the present perilous condition of the Church of England. That Church, says its venerable Bishop Knox, "is almost a collection of sects held together by endowments and by a precarious connection with the State." It is envious of the Church of Scotland which, by adroit Parliamentary movements, permanently secured for itself both Endowments and State connection. Can the Church of Scotland help it to secure similar almost unlimited doctrinal freedom and financial and State privileges? Or is the Church of Scotland sitting so loosely to Church organization as to require the recognition of the "historic Episcopate" to give validity to its orders, authority to its decisions and sanctity to its fellowship? Should the Church of England disrupt, could its "liberal" evangelicals find an honourable fellowship in the Church of Scotland? Can ecclesiastical unity be retained in spite of doctrinal differences that often amount to contradictions? Do not unions secured at the cost of minimizing doctrine react injuriously on the whole of religious life; and are not creedless unions futile as national teachers and spiritual guides? Such are some of the questions that are now agitating many minds, inside and outside conferences, and leading the more earnest away from comprehensive unions towards the old Calvinistic ideal of federal relations.

EDINBURGH.

## In France: Looking Toward Revival

By Pastor A. Cruvillier of the *Église réformée évangélique*

AFTER three centuries of conflict against enemies without (the Roman Church and State powers), Protestantism, free at last to proclaim and apply its principles, might have hoped to work in peace upon the task for which God had marvellously preserved it: the evangelization of France. Alas, upon external conflicts have followed internal conflicts. Under different names (*liberalism* and then *modernism*), and upon the fallacious pretext that in order to conquer the world for the gospel the world must be given a "reasonable" gospel, rationalism has not ceased to attack the fundamental principles of Christianity and of evangelical Protestantism: *The sovereign authority of the Bible and salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, who was delivered for our offenses and was raised again for our justification.*

For three decades and especially since the war of 1914-1918, through an aberration on

their part, which is truly inconceivable, the directing bodies (synods and committees) of the various unions of churches and of the majority of societies founded by evangelical Christians on an evangelical foundation have placed themselves little by little at the disposal of the *Protestant Federation* of France which, departing from its original object, approved by everyone (the defense of common interests), has attempted to realize Protestant unity by grouping together for religious action the most opposed tendencies. The Federation has become, therefore, a school of doctrinal skepticism. The danger is a mortal one.

But God watches over our churches. Since salvation cannot come to them except by the revival of souls through fidelity to the Christ of the Scriptures and to the Scriptures of the Christ, God has raised up for this work some men whose ministry was renewed through the Welsh revival. One of them, particularly qualified by his fidelity to biblical doctrines, Pastor Ruben Saillens, preaches the gospel of the cross with power and with the evident blessing of God.

While in the churches of Paris and of the north of France there is especial enthusiasm for the cause of centralization of the Protestant forces of all tendencies, in the churches of the south, which Pastor Saillens has visited, souls are being revived. A little church in the Cévennes, Lézan (Gard), became the center of a Christian Convention to which people have come from far and near, even from foreign lands. In 1920 the movement took shape in the foundation of *The Union of Evangelical Christians of France*. In the face of the growing abandonment of the foundations of the faith, evangelical Christians of all ecclesiastical denominations grouped themselves together to bring once more into the light, in a spirit of prayer, humility and love, the fundamental truths of Christianity, to the end of a revival of souls. The opposition which the Union meets is great but, by the grace of God, this work is developing. The Union has a periodical, *Le Chrétien Évangélique*,<sup>1</sup> which appears semi-monthly. The Union also publishes works of theology, pamphlets and treatises. Every year it holds a general conference which gives it opportunity to make its position known upon the questions of the day in the churches. It organizes Christian conventions. It has a circulating theological library, etc. Its influence is growing. To be sure, it has not secured all of the positive results in its conflict against modernism which might be desired, but it has certainly checked the progress of the latter and thus far prevented the Federation from bringing about the fusion of the churches on a basis of doctrinal indifference. The fight is going on.

<sup>1</sup> *Le Chrétien Évangélique*. Price of subscription: 10 frs. Subscriptions may be sent to Mademoiselle de Védrières, Francescas (Lot-et-Garonne), France.

In addition to The Union of Evangelical Christians other revival movements have begun: "The Cévenols," "The Missionary Brigade of la Drôme," "The Missionary Group of la Gardonnenque," all of which are working with zeal and success at God's work. Two Bible institutes have been founded to prepare workmen of the Lord: one at Nogent-sur-Marne (Seine) by M. Saillens, the other at Dieulefit (Drôme) by the Brigade of La Drôme. All these movements are autonomous but enjoy most cordial relations among themselves and with the *Union of Evangelical Christians*. They all have the same doctrinal foundation: fidelity to the Bible, divinely and plenarily inspired, and therefore of sovereign authority. They pursue the same object: the revival of souls. God blesses their activity, and this enables us to look to the future with confidence.

VAUVERT, GARD.

## China Letter

By the Rev. Albert B. Dodd, D.D.

THE widely heralded amalgamation in 1927 of Presbyterians with Congregationalists and others in the very inclusive Church of Christ in China, wherein evangelical and "modernist" ministers are attempting to work together on a doctrinal basis broad enough for all concerned, apparently has caused most of our constituency in the homelands to overlook the important fact that there is a strong united continuing Presbyterian Church in China with a membership of some twenty thousand and its own theological seminary which is the largest in all China and which draws its students from a dozen or more denominations and as many provinces. The name of this Church, adopted some years before the amalgamation mentioned above, is still The Presbyterian Church of Christ in China. When the thoroughly fundamentalist "League of Christian Churches," proposed by its largest Synod, was formed in 1929, that portion of this Church which for doctrinal reasons declined to enter the Church of Christ in China reorganized its General Assembly and unanimously voted to enter the League.

Since then the blessing of God upon both this Church and the entire League has been most marked. A widespread and gracious revival has come upon both these bodies in many sections. Though it must be admitted that in the earlier stages of this revival there were in some places excesses and certain features which could hardly be considered genuine, these are gradually being discarded while the real deepening of spiritual life and the winning of souls go on.

The Executive Committees of both these bodies have placed themselves on record in no uncertain terms as repudiating the doctrinal position, aims, and general methods proposed by the "Laymen's Report." The

supporters of Missions may rest assured that the League of Christian Churches, numbering probably between one-fifth and one-sixth of the entire body of believers in China, and including the Presbyterian Church with nearly one-twentieth of China's Christians and the out-and-out evangelical North China Theological Seminary at Tenghsien, Shantung, will pursue the way of Christ's Great Commission even more steadfastly and aggressively than before in reply to this deep-laid scheme of Satan to divert the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ into treasonable by-paths.

With two small but appreciated exceptions, the League of Christian Churches receives no financial support from the Boards of its constituency. Like the great China Inland Mission whose Churches now comprise about half of its membership, the League is on a faith basis, making no appeal to any man for funds and using money in its constantly expanding work only as the Lord provides in answer to believing prayer.

In this day, when the Gospel is being so bitterly undermined and attacked in print, sometimes even by those who misuse for this purpose funds which are so largely contributed by consecrated fundamentalists

at home, will American Christians not join in prayer for funds and wisdom for an advance movement in the production of literature having as its aim the more effective promulgation and defense of the pure Gospel which is the power of God unto salvation? And will they not join with the League in earnest watchfulness that their own Foreign Boards in particular put their contributions to work only in control of those who may be depended upon to use them in the right way? But whenever your several Boards can give you a satisfactory guarantee of such use, give to them now in the day of their need and the world's great white harvest as you never have given before and follow your gifts with earnest prevailing prayer and you will some day find that you have made the grandest and safest of all investments.

TENGHSIEN, SHANTUNG, CHINA.

## News Letters Omitted

Due to the unusual congestion in this issue late news letters from Germany, Brazil, Canada, Spain, Korea, and "Here and There" have been crowded out. They will appear in the June number.

# Philadelphia Presbytery Adopts "Machen Overture" 57-16

AFTER a stirring debate lasting for more than two hours, the Presbytery of Philadelphia on May 1st by an overwhelming vote adopted an overture to the General Assembly concerning Foreign Missions identical in wording with that offered to the Presbytery of New Brunswick by the Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., on April 11th. The overture was sponsored in Philadelphia by the Rev. Allan A. MacRae, assistant professor of Old Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary.

Consideration of the overture had been made the order of the day for 2.30 o'clock. At that hour Mr. MacRae read his overture, which was seconded, and made a brilliant speech in support of it. He began by stating that when he gave notice of the presentation of the overture a month ago he had felt strongly the advisability of its adoption, but that events during the month had so changed the situation as to make it not merely advisable but absolutely imperative that the overture be passed. He mentioned the right of the Church to criticize the Board of Foreign Missions or to question what it does. It seemed to him that since

the Board is an arm of the Church and has as its only reason for existence the carrying out of the purposes of the Church, it is the duty of the Church not merely to support its agency with money and with prayer, but also to survey its actions and to make sure that it is really carrying out its proper functions. Any failure to fulfill this duty made the Church itself responsible for failure.

After these preliminary remarks, Professor MacRae proceeded to present in detail four principal reasons why the passage of the overture was necessary. First, he held up before the Presbytery a copy of the book, "Re-Thinking Missions." This book contains an appraisal conducted under the auspices of a committee representing various denominations. Of the five Presbyterian members of the committee, two are members of the Board of Foreign Missions, and one is a Vice-President of that body. Before the appraisal appeared, various statements of the Board declared its anticipation of the good that would come from this appraisal. On the front cover of the latest edition of this book appears its enthusiastic endorse-

ment by a Presbyterian missionary: "I think this is the only book I have ever read that seems literally true in its every observation and right in its every conclusion." Thus the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions was to an extent committed to the findings of this Report. Now, what did the Report contain? Professor MacRae read a number of citations, giving in clear form its repudiation of historic Christianity. The Board was committed to the view expressed in the appraisal, unless it definitely and publicly repudiates that view. Though the appraisal had been before the public now for some time, it had never been expressly repudiated by the Board. Silence here would seem to express concurrence in at least the main conclusions of the Report.

The second reason presented by Professor MacRae was the case of one missionary who has become especially prominent recently. There was no reason to think that this case was unique or a new development. But it has become very evident in the last few months. He read quotations from magazine articles published by Mrs. Pearl S. Buck. In one statement she declared that the belief that the eternal destiny of a human being was determined by his acceptance or rejection of the salvation offered through Christ was an outworn superstition, from which the Chinese ought to be protected. These views had been expressed in magazine articles several months ago. The Board had every reason to know the viewpoint which Mrs. Buck was publicly proclaiming. She was speaking as a missionary under its jurisdiction. Did its silence mean that it also had laid aside the old view that there is no other name by which one can be saved except that of Christ alone? At the last meeting of the Presbytery of Philadelphia a resolution had been passed calling upon the Board to dissolve its relation with Mrs. Buck and to desist from publishing or distributing material for mission study which she had prepared under its authorization. This resolution had been transmitted to the Board. What steps had been taken? The only evidence that had been given of an effort to deal with the situation had been a number of newspaper reports of declarations by one of the secretaries of the Board that Mrs. Buck was a very excellent type of missionary and statements of similar import. Though we should not forget the possibility of inexact newspaper quotations, yet it was noticeable that the import of every such quotation had been in support of Mrs. Buck, and that no one of them had expressed any repudiation of her widely published utterances. One of these statements had declared that every difference between Mrs. Buck and the Board could be cleared up by an informal conversation. If the view of the purpose of missions under which the Board was acting is so similar to that clearly expressed by Mrs. Buck that the difference could be ironed out by an

## The Philadelphia Overture

The Presbytery of Philadelphia respectfully overtures the General Assembly of 1933.

1. To take care to elect to positions on the Board of Foreign Missions only persons who are fully aware of the danger in which the Church stands and who are determined to insist upon such verities as the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth of our Lord, His substitutionary death as a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice, His bodily resurrection and His miracles, as being essential to the Word of God and our Standards and as being necessary to the message which every missionary under our Church shall proclaim.
2. To instruct the Board of Foreign Missions that no one who denies the absolute necessity of acceptance of such verities by every candidate for the ministry can possibly be regarded as competent to occupy the position of Candidate Secretary.
3. To instruct the Board of Foreign Missions to take care lest, by the wording of the application blanks for information from candidates and from those who are asked to express opinions about them, or in any other way, the impression be produced that tolerance of opposing views or ability to progress in spiritual truth or the like, is more important than an unswerving faithfulness in the proclamation of the Gospel as it is contained in the Word of God and an utter unwillingness to make common cause with any other gospel whether it goes under the name of Christ or not.
4. To warn the Board of the great danger that lurks in union enterprises at home as well as abroad, in view of the widespread error in our day.

informal conversation, then surely the view of the Board must be very far away from that of historic Christianity. Nor had Mrs. Buck given any sign of changing her views. In fact, the May issue of *The Cosmopolitan Magazine* contained an article by her in which she declared it to be a matter of no importance whether Christ ever actually lived on earth! In remaining silent and

failing to repudiate the views expressed by Mrs. Buck, the Board had in effect committed itself to these views. If the Presbytery of Philadelphia also remained silent and failed to condemn the failure of the Board to repudiate these views, then it also was in effect placing itself on record in support of them.

The third reason presented by Mr. MacRae was the statement made by a secretary of the Board in a recent communication to a committee of the Presbytery of Philadelphia. This communication was made part of the Presbytery's records at the April meeting. In it the secretary spoke of the "virile, student evangelism" of Sherwood Eddy and declared that Eddy "is making God and His Christ real and divinely redemptive and vitally reformatory to many. . . ." Whatever Sherwood Eddy may have believed or preached twenty years ago, his recent attitude is very evident. In a number of his recent books, which have been widely distributed, it has been made obvious that he is not presenting Christ as the only means of eternal salvation, but rather is urging a development along purely social and humanitarian lines, with special emphasis on various features found in Russian Communism. His books make his attitude very clear. It is patently contradictory to the historic purpose of Presbyterian missions. Professor MacRae did not maintain that the secretary of the Board who praised Eddy's work in this way himself was committed to the views held by Eddy, but he did say that a secretary who could not see the difference between Eddy's work and a true Christian evangelism was not a man who should be one of the directing members of such an agency of the Church, and that a Board which employed such a secretary was certainly unworthy of confidence.

The fourth reason presented by Professor MacRae dealt particularly with the second paragraph of the overture, that relating to the Candidate Secretary. Certainly no man was fitted to perform the difficult task of interviewing the various applicants for Christian missions and encouraging or discouraging them in their aims who himself did not consider belief in essential facts of Christianity to be necessary for the Christian ministry. Yet the Board of Foreign Missions employed for this important task a man whose name is signed to a document repudiating this necessity. Furthermore, the Candidate Secretary was carrying on exactly the type of destructive propaganda which might be expected of one who had signed his name to such a document. Professor MacRae produced an authenticated copy of a letter which the Candidate Secretary had sent (according to own statement), to over a thousand students preparing for Christian Missionary work. This letter recommended certain books for devotional reading and spiritual benefit. These books included books by such men



as Fosdick, D. J. Fleming and Oldham. The book by Oldham, "The Devotional Diary," included in its very first section a reference to Christ as one who had Himself experienced rebirth! Was a Board which employed a secretary who sends out recommendations of books containing such blasphemous statements and such un-Christian views as this worthy of confidence?

In conclusion, Professor MacRae pointed out that the passage of the overture was not a question of fact but a question of principle. The facts were abundantly clear. If time permitted he would proceed to give other evidences, but those already mentioned were fully sufficient. Any one of the four happenings adduced would be ample to show that the Board of Foreign Missions is throwing its influence on the side of the view that Christianity is only one of many religions each of which contains some truth and some error. Any one of these evidences made it painfully apparent that the Board was not hearing an unqualified witness to the facts of Christianity as true and necessary to the salvation of all men everywhere. In view of the four reasons presented there could no longer be any question as to the position of the present Board. The question before the Presbytery of Philadelphia was not one of fact but one of attitude. If they were silent it meant that they also adopted the view presented in the book, "Re-Thinking Missions," in the various public utterances of Mrs. Buck, in the Board's secretary's approval of the "virile, student evangelism" of Sherwood Eddy, and in the propaganda issuing from the office of the Board's Candidate Secretary. Let anyone who holds this view of Missions vote against the overture. But anyone who holds that Christianity is the only true and final religion, and that the purpose of Christian missions is to lead men to accept this religion and thus to turn them from darkness to light could not possibly avoid the duty of voting for the overture. It was not a question now of what the facts were (they were clear enough), but of what we desire the purpose of the Board of Foreign Missions to be.

After Mr. MacRae had concluded, debate was continued by the Rev. Howard M. Morgan, of Tabernacle Church, who argued that he would not vote for anything that expressed doubts concerning the Board of Foreign Missions. (The Moderator, the Rev. Hilko de Beer, had ruled that speeches must alternate between those supporting and those opposing the overture.) The Rev. Weaver K. Eubank, of the Ninth Church, then spoke in support of the overture. He was particularly concerned with the case of Mrs. Buck. He was followed by the Rev. Matthew J. Hyndman, of the Olivet-Covenant Church, a consistent and forceful defender of the Board at all times. He expressed his confidence in the Board and sug-

## Speer-Machen Debate Provokes Wide Comment

THE historic debate on Foreign Missions between Robert E. Speer and J. Gresham Machen, held in Trenton, N. J., on April 11th, before the Presbytery of New Brunswick, has provoked wide comment and reaction in the Church. (The debate was reported in full in CHRISTIANITY TODAY for April, of which a limited number of copies are still available.) Competent observers declared that the debate marked a definite turning point in the history of the Church, due especially to the failure of Dr. Speer to attempt a reply to Dr. Machen's specified charges. While Dr. Machen lost in the Presbytery in the vote that immediately followed yet he gained the ear of the nation and the Church in his campaign. The resulting rising tide of indignation against the Board was undoubtedly responsible for the acceptance of the resignation of Mrs. Buck, and for steady rumblings in other parts of the country, particularly in Philadelphia.

gested that Mrs. Buck had said good things as well as bad things. If the Presbytery could read an article concerning her in an issue of the *Christian Herald*, they would see that she expressed herself in a definitely Christian manner. Dr. Hyndman's heart had always been in the work of foreign missions, he said, and he exhorted them not to embarrass the Board at this critical time when funds were so slow in coming in. Further, he expressed himself as wondering about the motives that led those who were pushing the overture to do so. (The implication that seemed inescapable was that Dr. Hyndman regarded the good faith of the overture's sponsors as at least doubtful.) He concluded by saying that he could not conscientiously vote for the overture. He seemed almost to take it for granted, however, that the motion was sure to carry.

Debate was resumed for the proponents of the overture by the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths. Mr. Griffiths began by recalling the reference made by Dr. Hyndman to the motives of those presenting the overture. The debate so far, he said, had been carried on upon a high level, unmarred by personalities. That was as it should be. Dr. Hyndman had raised the question *why* the overture was being presented. It was being presented, not because of any desire to injure the work of foreign missions, but out of a deep desire to help it, and to rescue it from its drifting. But *why* was the work of Foreign Missions in such difficulties now? Why all these deficits of which Dr. Hyndman had spoken? The economic explanation was only partial. Another reason was, that confidence in the Board had been impaired to such an extent that evangelical people hesitated to give as in former years.

The fountain of support was being dried up at its source. It was to *help* the work of Foreign Missions that a thorough purging was desired, a purging toward which this overture was a step.

Further, the overture did not propose anything that should startle the Presbytery of Philadelphia. It simply carried on the great tradition begun in 1923 when the Assembly approved the "Philadelphia Overture." The overture did not propose to set up unconstitutional or extra-constitutional tests. It simply dealt with the qualifications of appointees as Board members and as missionaries—a matter with which the appointing bodies had rightly to do.

Mr. Griffiths then brought out four specific facts. (1) The commendation of Dr. Sherwood Eddy by a paper filed with the presbytery's committee on Foreign Missions by representatives of the Board earlier in the Spring. Mr. MacRae had mentioned this, but had not read it. It was as follows: ". . . many worse things could be done than aid Eddy in his virile, student evangelism . . . Eddy and Kagawa are making God and His Christ real and divinely redemptive and vitally reformatory to many individuals who become stalwart, fearless and effective followers of their new-found Lord and Saviour." This hardly needed comment. Informed people could draw their own conclusions when representatives of the Board could call Sherwood Eddy's work "virile, student evangelism." The question was then asked from the floor: Who wrote this paper? Mr. Griffiths asked the stated clerk to read what was written on the top of the paper. The clerk found the paper and did so. The heading was: "Prepared by Dr. Geo. T. Scott, at solicitation of Drs. Speer & McAfee." (2) Dr. Hyndman had spoken in high praise of the article interviewing Mrs. Buck in the *Christian Herald*, for January, 1933, had said he wished we all could read it. Fortunately the speaker had a copy of that article with him. The quotation which pleased Dr. Hyndman was probably this, or one like it: "Christianity, and by that I mean the person and principles of Christ—ought to be at the center of this revolution and it isn't." But this must be understood in the light of her final statement in the article—a statement which showed her Modernism clearly. It was: ". . . the more I see of China and the Chinese the more I believe in what Christianity can do for them. But the Christianity that will reach and change China is one that has neither ecclesiasticism nor theology at its center, but Christ." This statement of Mrs. Buck's was applauded by a small coterie of Modernists who occupied some of the rear seats. (3) The speaker then turned to the book, "Living Issues in China," officially recommended as a study book by our Board of Foreign Missions. He assured the Presbytery that what he was about to read did not

come from a copy of "Re-Thinking Missions" hidden behind the covers of the other book, but from our own official textbook. The quotation he read, from page 175 of the book, almost made the Presbytery gasp. It was time, he said, that some notice were given to our Board when it could recommend such a book. ("Living Issues in China" is given extensive treatment in this issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY in the trenchant article by Mr. Schofield, which appears on page 4.) (4) He could only say what he was about to say with deep regret. But truth compelled him to tell the Presbytery what it ought to know. He did not want to engage in personalities. Yet when individuals take public positions on questions of the day, they must not object and try to claim exemption from having that public stand publicly discussed by others. And to do that, names *must* be mentioned. Furthermore, we Presbyterians had indulged too much in man-worship. Man worship is never safe. To idealize individuals until we are blind to their mistakes may be to destroy the Church. We should never follow any leader unless he is *right*. And that applied to any man in the Church, even if that man should be a secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions! He held in his hand a copy of the report of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America for 1932. In the report of the committee on Latin America, it was stated that one of the notable achievements of the year was the translation and publication in Spanish of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick. Two signatures were appended to the report, those of the chairman and the secretary. The name of the chairman who signed this report glorying in the translation of Dr. Fosdick's books into Spanish was, he was grieved but compelled to say: Robert E. Speer.

The speaker ended by appealing to the Presbytery by its action to let it be known in the whole Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., in the whole world, that the Presbytery of Philadelphia still stood four square for the gospel, and that it was determined to insist upon its proclamation at home and abroad.

Mr. Griffiths was followed by Dr. Geo. Oakley, Professor in Beaver College, Jenkintown, Pa. He made a long and learned argument against extra-constitutional tests for ministers, which was, of course, based upon a misapprehension of what the overture asked. Had this not been so clear to the Presbytery his argument would have had great weight.

Dr. Oakley was followed by the Rev. Merrill T. MacPherson, who made a vigorous and eloquent plea for the overture. Auburn Affirmationist Edward B. Shaw attempted unsuccessfully to heckle Mr. MacPherson, who would not yield the floor. Mr. MacPherson spoke of the great faith missions, *their* work was not showing deficits. Why?

## Needed

More readers for what its Editors modestly believe is one of the best Church papers in the world. It makes its appeal on the basis of the quality it offers. It is strikingly "different" from ordinary Church papers. Each month it gathers the news of the Christian World. A great many people who have absolutely no sympathy with its doctrinal position are enthusiastic subscribers who would not be without it. Book reviews, questions and answers, letters are some of the usual features that are crowded out this month. Get these and other distinctive offerings. There is no room in CHRISTIANITY TODAY for the stereotyped, banal dullness that is sometimes associated with a Church paper. We know a dollar has grown bigger, but look at what a dollar will buy! A whole year of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, beginning with the General Assembly report in the June issue! Tear off, fill out and mail the enclosed prepaid card today. Send no money now. We will bill you later, —and paying will be a pleasure.

Because they were faithful to the Word of God, and people knew they could give safely to work where no Modernism was tolerated. Let the Modernism in the work of our

## Mrs. Buck Resigns; Board

### Accepts "With Deep Regret"

PEARL S. BUCK, famous missionary-novelist on May 1st resigned as a missionary of the Presbyterian Church. Her resignation was accepted by the Board "with deep regret." Her resignation was followed by that of Mrs. Henry V. K. Gillmore, a member of the Board, who quit in protest of the acceptance of Mrs. Buck's resignation.

The action of the Board was minuted as follows:

"A letter was presented from Mrs. J. Lossing Buck, of the Kiangnan Mission, requesting to be released from responsible relationship to the Board. The Board had hoped that this step might be avoided, but in view of all the considerations involved and with deep regret it voted to acquiesce in her request. The Board expressed to Mrs. Buck its sincere appreciation of the service which she has rendered during the past sixteen years and its earnest prayer that her unusual abilities may continue to be richly used in behalf of the people in China."

Board be eliminated, and confidence would return. The speaker also denounced the idea that because the Presbyterian Church contained both Modernists and evangelicals, it ought to send out missionaries to represent both groups. "Missionaries aren't sent out to represent Modernists or even fundamentalists," he thundered, "but to represent the Lord Jesus Christ,—the Christ of the Bible." Speaking of Mrs. Buck's "putting Christ in the center," he said that *he* wanted to put Christ in the center, too. But before he did so, he wanted to know *which* Christ he was going to put in the center. "The Christ of the Modernist, the Christ who wasn't virgin born, who did not die as our substitute and rise again, isn't worth putting at the center of *anything*," he cried.

Mr. MacPherson's telling speech was followed by that of Auburn Affirmationist Alvin B. Gurley, who was very indignant at those who did not favor Modernism. "If any man has a bigger Christ than I have," he said, "then his Christ is *my* Christ." Mr. Gurley was followed by Ruling Elder Roland K. Armes, of the Tenth Church, the only elder to *speak*, although the aroused elders' vote was practically unanimous for the overture. Next came Dr. N. B. Stonehouse who showed clearly in a last-moment-before-voting statement that the overture proposed nothing unconstitutional.

Then came the vote. Its proportions, 57 to 16, showed how aroused the Presbytery of Philadelphia has become concerning the whole situation, and was everywhere conceded as making Foreign Missions a major issue at the Columbus Assembly.

The following sentence, however, was used in publicity:

"After various friendly conversations and without appearing before the Board, Mrs. J. Lossing Buck has requested that she be permitted to retire from active connection with the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, and at its meeting on Monday the Board accepted her resignation with regret."

Following the meeting comment became widespread. Mrs. Gillmore made a statement in which she said as quoted in the *New York Sun*:

"My resignation is merely an open and public declaration of my liberal principles. It does not mean that I am at war with the Presbyterian Church, and I am happy to say there is a very large, liberal element in the Presbyterian Church today. There is also a very conservative element. Each side has a right to its opinions, but if there is to be progress and tolerance, those of us who hold so dearly to such ideals must make our stand public. That is all."

"I certainly wish to correct the impression that the Board meeting was a stormy or unfriendly one. There was nothing but the most friendly discussion, even when Mrs. Buck's resignation came up for a vote. Mrs. Buck had written a very tactful letter, giving largely as her reasons for resigning that her literary work was requiring most of her time. Mrs. Buck has been financing her own work, and has not been accepting money from the Board for a number of years now, and her work has been highly praised.

"I felt that the Board, therefore, should have refused to accept her resignation, to show appreciation to Mrs. Buck for this generous contribution, and to indicate clearly and openly that the Presbyterian Church is a liberal and tolerant body, according its members freedom of opinion. I made a brief speech to this effect, but other members expressed the opinion that it would be better to accept the resignation for various reasons. . . ."

Mrs. Buck was quoted in news dispatches as saying that she harbored no resentment.

"I feel just as I did before," said Mrs. Buck. "Of course I didn't know I was such a nuisance to the Board before all this came up, and certainly I shouldn't want to continue a nuisance. One wouldn't like to stay with any organization that one was a nuisance to, would one?"

"You see, I never did do the evangelical sort of thing anyway. I was a teacher, and I haven't even been teaching for three years or so.

"So I expect to go back to China, and to continue my life just where I left off, only without the formal title of missionary. By my life I mean my writing, which takes up a great deal of my time indeed, and my job of being a wife and a mother.

"I'm still devoted to China, and I imagine I always shall be. China is my home, and I am happy there. I'm sure all this will make no difference to me, or to my friends.

"Nor do I harbor any resentment at all about the tangle or its results. You see I'm still a Christian. I'm a Christian by conviction and shall continue one. My status as a missionary or as a lay member has nothing to do with that.

"Am I still a Presbyterian? Surely—oh well, I don't think that's very important. I don't go in for creeds and that sort of thing so very much. I'm just a Christian."

The Board of Foreign Missions, had, of course, refrained from saying *why* it accepted Mrs. Buck's resignation. But Mrs. Buck herself seemed to have hit the nail on the head when she called herself a "nuisance" to the Board. Indeed, it was obvious that the Board never would have dismissed her on doctrinal grounds, only wished to be rid of an embarrassment. This view was confirmed in a statement made in Youngstown, Ohio, by Dr. W. H. Hudnut, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church there, out-

## Resignation Accepted



PEARL S. BUCK

*She wanted to be no "nuisance."*

standing Modernist and member of the Board of Foreign Missions:

"I cannot blame her for resigning," said Dr. Hudnut. "That was the best way out of it. It was the fair thing for her to do, not only for herself but also for the Church, if she was going to be a bone of contention."

"She is a magnificent woman," said Dr. Hudnut. ". . . In her private life, she is an unusually fine woman and has a right to her own opinions on the mission."

He declared that he believed Mrs. Buck never would have been tried by the Mission Board on a heresy charge if she had not resigned.

A bland denial that Mrs. Buck quit because of the doctrinal issue was, however, made in Atlantic City on May 4th, by Dr. C. Franklin Ward, secretary of the General Council of the General Assembly. According to news dispatches he said:

"Mrs. Buck has withdrawn solely because her literary interests take so much of her time that she cannot serve along the lines laid down by the Foreign Missions Board.

"She has to come back to the United States on business connected with her writing, and the Board cannot treat one missionary differently, in the matter of granting leaves, from others. Doctrinal discussion had nothing to do with her dropping out."

Observers were quick to point out that this was in amusing contradiction to Mrs. Buck's own idea of why she resigned, although it was conceded that she had tactfully mentioned her literary work in her letter.

## Probable Results

What would be the result of Mrs. Buck's resignation? Would it slow up the movement for Board reform? At first it seemed that it would. Moderator Kerr, speaking from Tulsa, said that he believed the resignation would "end the whole controversy." When, however, the fact came out that the Board had only accepted the resignation "with deep regret" and when it was made clear that the Board had put no pressure on Mrs. Buck, opinion veered sharply the other way. The case against Mrs. Buck was only a part of the case against the Board. But the Board, trying to keep on good terms with everyone, evidently displeased both Modernists who thought it should have stood by Mrs. Buck and evangelicals who saw in the action final proof that the Board had refused to stand up for the faith of the Church. Speaking before the Elders' Association of the Presbytery of Jersey City, the Rev. Clarence E. Macartney, D.D., Minister of the First Church of Pittsburgh, said:

"The Church which alters its voice with the changing age, and speaks not to eternities, but to the times and does not know or care whether Christ lived and died and rose again from the dead or not is a Church whose voice will be lost on the screaming hurricane of time."

Dr. Macartney quoted Mrs. Buck's article as follows:

"What Christ is materially I do not know, and what if He never lived, what of that? Whether Christ had a body or not, whether He had a time to be born in His life and a time to die as other men have is of no matter now. Perhaps it never was of any matter."

Then he declared:

"Sad as is this denial of Christ's living, there is something sadder, that is to have leaders of the missionary work of the Presbyterian Church tell us, as some who protested have been told, that this missionary served without any honorarium.

"The implication would seem to be that unbelief is not a serious thing as long as it does not cost the Church anything financially."

The Board was excoriated for its action by Dr. Machen in a statement issued after the resignation had been made public. It said, in part:

"In attempting to evade a perfectly plain issue by accepting 'with regret' the resignation of Mrs. Pearl S. Buck the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America has added still further to the contempt into which it has brought the Presbyterian Church in many ways. . . ."

"What every supporter of the Board has a right to know is whether the Board tolerates the radically anti-Christian views of Mrs. Buck or whether it is true to the Bible and to the Confession of Faith of the

Church. Mrs. Buck raised that issue with admirable clearness. The Board has sought to evade it, as it has sought to evade the same issue when it is raised in many other ways. But Bible-believing Christians are no longer going to be deceived."

## Westminster Seminary Commencement

**WESTMINSTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY** held its fourth annual commencement exercises on the evening of Tuesday, May 9th, in Witherspoon Hall, Philadelphia. Presiding was Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney, Minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., a Trustee of the Seminary. The service was opened with the processional hymn.

O Word of God Incarnate,  
O Wisdom from on high,  
O Truth unchanged, unchanging,  
O Light of our dark sky,  
We praise Thee for the radiance  
That from the hallowed page,  
A lantern to our footsteps,  
Shines on from age to age.

Following the doxology, the Invocation was offered by the Rev. Hilko de Beer, D.D., Moderator of the Presbytery of Philadelphia. Then all sang the hymn:

When I survey the wondrous cross  
On which the Prince of glory died,  
My richest gain I count but loss,  
And pour contempt on all my pride.

The Scripture lesson was read by the Rev. J. A. Schofield, Jr., Minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Gouverneur, N. Y. Prayer was offered by the Rev. John T. Reeve, D.D., Minister of the South Presbyterian Church of Syracuse, N. Y.

The address of the evening, which will be reported fully in the June issue of **CHRISTIANITY TODAY**, was delivered by the Rev. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., D.D., President of Wheaton College. He spoke on "Our Task As Ministers."

Certificates were then awarded to the graduating class of ten seniors. Graduate certificates were also awarded to five graduate students.

It was announced that the Wm. Brenton Greene, Jr. prize in Systematic Theology was awarded to James Erskine Moore, of Salisbury, N. C. The Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield prize in Old Testament was awarded to John Hamilton Skilton, of Philadelphia, Pa. The Wm. Brenton Greene, Jr. prize in Apologetics was awarded to William Theodore Strong, of Long Beach, California.

The address to the graduating class was given as usual, by the Rev. Professor J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D. It will be summarized in the next issue.

After the address to the graduates, Dr. Macartney read a greeting from the President of the Board of Trustees, Dr. Frank H. Stevenson, who was unable to be present. His statement, which will be published in full in the next issue, contained this significant sentence: "Here on the Pacific Coast,

Westminster is looked upon as an institution so strong, so serene and so permanent that our enemies themselves give it their reluctant respect."

Announcement was made that the Board of Trustees, upon the unanimous recommendation of the Faculty, had unanimously elected the Rev. R. B. Kuiper, D.D., President of Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan, to be Professor of Practical Theology. Dr. Macartney expressed the sincere desire of the Board that Dr. Kuiper would accept.

Then Dr. Macartney loosed a veritable bombshell—a sudden and ringing declaration concerning the state of the church, in which he aligned himself squarely against the present policies of the Board of Foreign Missions.

"We are here for our Fourth Commencement," said Dr. Macartney. "Five years ago we did not even exist. Now in four years we have grown in wisdom and stature, and I trust in favor with God and man. The line of the seminary has gone out into all the world, and wherever its graduates have gone they have been proclaiming the gospel in its purity and power.

"The signs of the times indicate the Protestant churches are rapidly approaching a critical change and a possible division. Within even the creedal and doctrinal churches of Protestantism, such as the Presbyterian body, there are groups holding interpretations of Christianity and the Scriptures which are absolutely hostile and irreconcilable. This preposterous union and fellowship cannot continue forever.

"In the days of the persecution of the church by the Roman Empire, the Christians who, under threat of violence, surrendered to the authorities the sacred writings were called 'Traditores.' There are a multitude of 'Traditores' within the Protestant church today. At every threat from the world's philosophy, science or ridicule, they are ready to hand over and surrender great truths and portions of the Bible.

"A church of power must be a church of witness. It has been the policy of the rationalists in the Protestant body to hold on and fight determinedly for a place within the churches whose bread they eat, but whose doctrines they derogate.

"At present, however, the conservatives and evangelicals show a noble unwillingness to be driven out into the wilderness and to be separated from the inheritance which belongs to them by every consideration of confessional statements, history and common honesty.

"This institution has a notable faculty. Much might be said concerning each member of it. But I want to say a word particularly about the honored senior member of the faculty [Dr. Machen]. In him you see a rare combination of intellectual ability and great courage. Men like him are the hope of the evangelical churches in their present struggle with Laodiceanism and apostasy in our churches. Only once in a half century, or even a century, is the Church of Christ granted such a man.

"Recently, as an act of noble Christian courage, he has called the attention of the whole Presbyterian Church to present conditions and policies in its Board of Foreign Missions, by his 110 page brief, presented in Trenton to the Presbytery of New Brunswick,—a brief that has yet to be answered by the Board of Foreign Missions!"

In conclusion, Dr. Macartney quoted two stirring stanzas, seldom printed in America, from "Stand up, stand up for Jesus," and exhorted the graduating class to stand true to the Gospel without compromise or shame against the embattled forces of unbelief.

There were those who felt while listening to Dr. Macartney's address, suddenly delivered with passionate earnestness, that this moment would in years to come be remembered as a turning point in the history of the Presbyterian Church,—marking the opening gun of battle fired by the great leader of the campaigns of 1923-24, now again aroused by the audacity of unbelief in the church.

Then followed the hymn:

Soldiers of Christ, arise,  
And put your armor on,  
Strong in the strength which God supplies  
Through His Eternal Son.

and the benediction. The exercises were attended by the customary large audience of people from Philadelphia and various parts of the eastern seaboard.

## Presbytery of Aberdeen Adopts "Machen Overture"

**J**UST before going to press on May 5th, the news has come that the Presbytery of Aberdeen, S. D., has overtured the General Assembly in the same terms as the Presbytery of Philadelphia, that is, the "Machen overture." A significant straw to show how the wind is blowing.

## IN THIS ISSUE:

Why Does Our Board of Foreign Missions Approve and Commend Modernist "Mission Study Books"?	4
J. A. SCHOFIELD, Jr.	
Samuel G. Craig, Editor of Christianity Today.	5
FRANK H. STEVENSON	
Dr. Robert E. Speer and His Latest Book	15
J. GRESHAM MACHEN	
This Changing World	17
"CALVINIST"	
The Comfort of the Scriptures	17
DAVID FREEMAN	
Unto All the World	18
ELIZABETH WILLET THOMPSON	
Sunday School Lessons for June	19
The Evidence in the Case: A Review	20
The Laymen's Report, the Foreign Board and the New Hymnal	21
OSWALD T. ALLIS	
News of the Church	26