

# The League of Evangelical Students

## HEADQUARTERS

Philadelphia - Pennsylvania

Address—Reformed Episcopal Seminary, 25 S. 43rd Street

---

The League of Evangelical Students of China—Affiliated.

---

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

*President*, JACOB DEVRIES, Westminster Theological Seminary  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

*Vice-President*, JAMES M. DEFRIEND, Evangelical Theological College  
Dallas, Texas

*Secretary*, E. LLOYD REES, Lafayette College  
Easton, Pennsylvania

*Secretary for Alumni*, JOSEPH R. WOODY, Hampden-Sydney College  
Hampden-Sydney, Virginia

C. HELEN MOOSHIAN, Eastern Nazarene College  
Wollaston, Massachusetts

---

*Field Secretary*, CALVIN KNOX CUMMINGS

---

### BOARD OF TRUSTEES

R. B. KUIPER, M.A., B.D., *President*,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

LEWIS S. CHAFER, D.D., *Vice-President*,  
Dallas, Texas.

CLARENCE BOUMA, Th.D., *Secretary*,  
Grand Rapids, Michigan.

R. K. RUDOLPH, A.B., B.D., *Treasurer*,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

P. B. FITZWATER, D.D.  
Chicago, Illinois.

LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.,  
Springfield, Ohio.

I. H. LINTON, B.A., LL.B.,  
Washington, D. C.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D.,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

HERBERT MACKENZIE, D.D.  
Cleveland, Ohio.

WILLIAM C. ROBINSON, Th.D., D.D.,  
Decatur, Georgia.

HAROLD PAUL SLOAN, D.D.  
Haddonfield, New Jersey.

MELVIN A. STUCKEY, Th.M.,  
Ashland, Ohio.

EGBERT W. ANDREWS, A.B.,  
Republic of China.

MARJORIE ERDMAN  
Wooster, Ohio.

HENRY STOB, A.B.,  
Grand Rapids, Michigan.

---

The League of Evangelical Students is an inter-denominational and international student movement for the defense and propagation of the Gospel in the modern student-world. The League welcomes correspondence with individuals or groups contemplating affiliation.

*The Evangelical Student* is published in October, January, and April of each academic year. Every member of the League is entitled to a copy of each issue. The subscription price to non-members and to institutions, in all countries in the Universal Postal Union, is \$1.00 a year.

Printed in the United States of America.

# The EVANGELICAL STUDENT

The Magazine of THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS  
CALVIN KNOX CUMMINGS, Editor

---

Volume X Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, October, 1935

No. 3

---

## EDITORIAL

### THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS AS A MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE

Within a few months the thirteenth Quadrennial Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement will convene at Indianapolis with such well known modernists as Toyohiko Kagawa, Henry P. Van Dusen, and Dr. Visser T'Hooft listed to speak. It is very evident that this convention will not differ in the slightest from the twelfth Quadrennial Convention about which one so favorable to the movement as the editor of *The Missionary Review of the World* remarked—"The watchword of the movement—"The Evangelization of the World in This Generation" was conspicuous by its absence."<sup>1</sup> Not only has the original purpose of the "Volunteer" movement been abandoned but by means of its literature and through extensive cooperation with The Student Christian Movement, the "Volunteer" movement has engaged in the propagation of the antithesis of Christianity; namely, Modernism. Certainly the time has come for the evangelical "Student Volunteer" to give serious consideration to the question of how the evangelical missionary enterprise which once characterized the "Volunteer" movement can be most effectively continued. In answer to this question we would submit the League of Evangelical Students—with its defense and study of the message of missions and with its purpose to evangelize the student-world and to recruit students for an evangelization of the world—as the most effective means available for continuing an evangelical missionary enterprise among students.

It has been strongly recommended that an entirely separate Student Volunteer Movement whose interests and purposes shall be confined to the subject of missions should be launched. A movement of this character appears to be unnecessary, inadequate, and impractical. It is believed that there already exists in the League of Evangelical Students a student missionary enterprise of the most wholesome kind. It is further believed that the League as a missionary enterprise is a more adequate and practical means of reaching and enlisting students for the Gospel ministry at home and abroad. In evidence of these claims certain facts are to be observed.

That the League of Evangelical Students is a missionary enterprise is evidenced both by the Constitution of the League and by the place missions has occupied in the program of the League. The Constitution definitely states that one of the four great purposes of the League is "to interest other students in the work of the Gospel ministry" whether at home or abroad. The programs of the Conventions and Regional Conferences of the League bespeak the League's fidelity in bringing messages of a missionary nature to its constituency. Seldom has *The Evangelical Student* appeared without an article on some missionary

---

<sup>1</sup> *Missionary Review of the World*, Vol. LV, No. 2, p. 67.

subject. Local Chapters have their missionary committees to stimulate greater interest in evangelizing the world. Grandest of all evidences pointing to the true missionary character of the League is the fact that the local League Chapters exist for the express purpose of witnessing in America's most sadly neglected field of missionary enterprise—the student world for the purpose of bringing lost students into saving relationship with Jesus Christ. It is this fact of the League's being a truly missionary enterprise that renders a new missionary movement unnecessary.

But does the League meet the student volunteer's needs as adequately as a movement whose sole purpose is to recruit students for the foreign field? It is believed that the League can more adequately meet the missionary student's needs because it affords the medium for both edifying the student and leading him forth to witness among his fellow students. By means of its program of study, Conferences, and Conventions, and *The Evangelical Student*, the student is strengthened and established in the truth. By raising a corporate and personal testimony in the midst of a hostile campus, the student is prepared for a more fruitful ministry in his future field of labor. To neglect the proper emphasis of these two essential aspects of any student missionary movement is to impoverish the source of missionary supply.

The League of Evangelical Students as a missionary enterprise, finally, is exceedingly more practical than a student missionary movement which would not include all that the League includes in its program. The average Christian student today is beset with serious questions and with sin. The unbelieving student is not even interested in Christianity let alone the propagation of it. It would seem to be exceedingly impractical to approach students in such a spiritual and mental state as this and engage them in conversation about volunteering for missionary service. As Christ in dealing with the woman of Samaria first answered the question that troubled her, so must the perturbing question of the student first be answered. Then the student will be more open to a consideration of the call to reach the unconverted and will be more likely to respond to that call when it is presented.

The need in the student world today is for a movement whose purpose is to edify the Christian student, to evangelize the student world, and to recruit young men and women who will give their lives to declare and defend the everlasting Gospel. To neglect the one or the other of these purposes is to seriously impair the Christian student's testimony. It is these purposes that the League of Evangelical Students endeavors to realize. May every evangelical "Student Volunteer" see the appropriateness of his affiliating with the League and be led to sever any affiliation whatsoever with the anti-evangelical "Student Volunteer Movement."



## FAITH AND KNOWLEDGE

It is frequently assumed and taught that faith is the antithesis of knowledge. As it is sometimes expressed—we *know* what we *see*; we *believe* what we *cannot see*. Knowledge, it is held, comes by a process of reasoning; faith comes by trusting. Knowledge is considered truth about which we are certain; faith is looked upon as truth about which we are uncertain. Immanuel Kant, probably the father of this false antithesis, gave the clearest expression to this view when he stated that in faith the objective facts are inadequate, but in knowledge the objective facts are adequate.

It is true, of course, that in knowledge the senses and the reason are more active and prominent while in faith the element of trust is more prominent. But this does not mean for one moment that knowledge is possible without faith or that faith is possible without reason. The difference between faith and knowledge is simply one of degree and not of kind. There is a quantitative distinction, not a qualitative distinction. The same qualities that are necessary to constitute knowledge are necessary to constitute faith. We cannot have true knowledge without exercising a degree of faith; we cannot have true faith apart from knowledge. The scientist making his observations and notations must have faith that his senses have reported the facts as they actually are; he exercises faith in the ability of his mind to arrive at truth; he accepts in faith the testimony of other scientists concerning the observations they have made. Without a trust in himself or in the testimony of others, knowledge is impossible. It is just as true that an individual cannot have faith apart from the use of his reasoning powers. Faith involves faith in something. This something we must be convinced in our minds is true, or it is psychologically impossible to have faith in it. It is utterly impossible to trust in someone unless we are first convinced upon the basis of sufficient evidence that this someone is trustworthy.

Immanuel Kant saw clearly that a person can have faith only in that which he is convinced is true. But Kant then held that a person can be subjectively convinced a thing is true when there is objectively insufficient evidence. When this occurs, we have what is known as faith, says Kant. That individuals adhere to beliefs for which there may be little or no evidence of its being true is evident. But that this is the essential characteristic of faith is quite false. This is to make faith and blind credulity interchangeable terms. It is to deny that a person can trust in certain objective facts which can be proved to be true. It is to assert that the faith we have in our friend is not based on adequate evidence for the trustworthy character of our friend. It makes faith in such a well established fact as the historicity of Jesus irrational. Faith becomes in its essence irrational. The faith in that friend we know to be trustworthy becomes unreasonable. Belief in the historicity of Jesus becomes irrational.

The Christian student can never be reminded too frequently that his faith is based upon knowledge, upon historic fact. His acceptance of and trust or faith in the facts and doctrines of the Christian faith do not render these facts and doctrines any less certain of being true. He can be just as certain of the validity of his faith as he can of the validity of his knowledge of the sciences. Knowledge is no more certain than faith. In knowledge we simply rest more directly and prominently on reason; in faith we rest more directly and prominently on the testimony of men who spake with authority. As Augustine has expressed it "We *know* what rests upon reason; we *believe* what rests upon authority." In knowledge we rely more upon our own testimony; in faith we

rely on the testimony of trustworthy men and the authority of God. This renders our faith in the Gospel not less certain but more certain. If we accept our own testimony the testimony of other trustworthy men is as valid. And "if we accept the testimony of men the testimony of God is greater."

---

## THE QUEST FOR AUTHORITY

In the history of the Christian Church we observe how men have repeatedly and insistently assailed the doctrine of the authority of the Scriptures. Each time this rejection of the authority of the Bible has marked the beginning of a quest for some other authoritative standard of truth. Without authority the soul has ever sensed its feeling of insecurity. In this quest for ultimate authority which has continued to the present time, men have arrived at various and widely divergent criterions for determining the ultimate standard for truth and authority. But however many and diverse have been the answers to this question concerning authority, for those who here rejected the divine authority of the Scriptures there is but one alternative; namely, the human authority of the individual. The one alternative to the *objective* authority of the Bible is the *subjective* authority of the individual. Either authority comes from without and is imposed on us or it comes from within the person who is in quest for authority.

Those who have rejected the Scriptures as the sole and final authority in matters of faith and conduct have always claimed for the authoritative standard which they have substituted that it is just as truly objective as the authority of the Bible. An examination of some of these claims to objective authority will reveal wherein these claims are not valid.

One of the first to espouse an authority other than the authority of the Scriptures was the Roman Catholic Church. They desired to retain the authority of the Bible but sought to place along side of the Bible the authority of the Church and her traditions. This was not only to deny the sole authority of the Scriptures; it was to make the deliverances of erring men an equal and even superior authority. Authority had come to be vested in themselves. In the early eighteenth century when destructive criticism had undermined faith in the inspiration of the Scripture, Friedrich Schleiermacher sought refuge in the feeling of dependence on God. Mystical experience became the authoritative criterion of religious truth. Here authority became more clearly subjective. Later on in the same century Albrecht Ritschl sought for a more objective source of authority and raised the criterion of "value judgments" as the final standard for religious truth. But who was to determine the value of certain doctrines or experiences but the individual? Again the person seeking for an objective authoritative standard of truth became himself the authority. In more recent times, Karl Barth has rejected the authority of the written Word of God and claimed for his authority the Word of God *behind* the written Word. That is the Word of God which is the Word of God *to you*. This is to make the mystical experience of the individual as he reads the Word of God the criterion of truth and authority. Buchmanism with its emphasis on first having an experience and then teaching doctrine has similarly made the mystical experience of the individual the final authority for faith and conduct. We are told that we are bound to obey only the leading of the Spirit. But without the objective Word of God the so-called leading of the Spirit becomes but the following of our own better

nature. The modernist with his appeal to the teachings or the spirit of Jesus has arrived at no better criterion of authority. It will be found that in every instance the modernist determines for himself what he thinks the real teachings of Jesus are or what the real spirit of Christ is.

Where then is that objective authority for which men have so long searched? The Christian replies—the revealed and inspired Word of God as found in the Old and New Testaments. Here we find the revelation of God. Here men declare not their own standards but God's standards. Here we find the claim and the evidence of God's authorship. And because God and not man is the author of the Scriptures, authority and finality reside therein.

---

## THE STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT AND COMMUNISM

In a previous issue of *The Evangelical Student* there appeared an editorial giving documentary evidence of modernism in the modern Student Christian Movement. It is observable now that The Student Christian Movement is not only modernistic; it is communistic as well. In a booklet setting forth the work of The Student Christian Movement of the Middle Atlantic Region it is urged upon local cabinets that they endeavor to secure certain speakers and counselors to assist them in their work. Among those recommended are seventeen individuals listed in Elizabeth Dillings book *The Red Network* as having "contributed in some measure to one or more phases of the Red movement in the United States."<sup>1</sup> Mrs. Dilling in each instance cites documentary evidence listing only those "who are or have been members of Communist, Anarchist, Socialist, I. W. W., or Pacifist controlled organizations."<sup>2</sup> Included in this suggested list of speakers are such prominent radical figures as Kirby Page, Sherwood Eddy, Edmund B. Chaffee, Norman Thomas, Francis J. McConnell, Rabbi Israel, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Henry P. Van Dusen. It becomes increasingly clear that the modern attack upon Christianity is not limited to an attack upon certain doctrines of the Christian Faith as the substitutionary atonement or the bodily resurrection. The whole Christian world and life view is the object of hostile attack. To reject the teaching of the Scriptures leads consistently to a rejection of any teaching of the Scriptures which contravenes human opinion.

It is evident that The Student Christian Movement views communism merely as a philosophy of economics. It is considered possible to advocate communism as a philosophy of economics without advocating the anti-Christian tenets of communism. This attitude comes from a failure to grasp the fact that even if it were possible to delete some of the offensive anti-Christian tenets of communism, communism even as a philosophy of economics is thoroughly anti-Christian. Christianity has principles for governing every sphere of life whether it be in the sphere of art or in the sphere of economics. And according to these principles as set forth in the Scriptures communism as a philosophy of economics is utterly anti-Christian. God's Word sets forth as one of the basic principles for society the right of the individual to hold property. The basic principle of communism is a repudiation of the right of the individual to hold property. All belongs to

---

<sup>1</sup> Compare—*The Student Christian Movement—Middle Atlantic Region*, pp. 12-15, and Elizabeth Dilling *The Red Network*, pp. 258-336.

<sup>2</sup> Elizabeth Dilling—*The Red Network*, p. 258.

the State. Man is a mere pawn of the State. The Word of God says—"Thou shalt not steal." In these words we are not only taught the right of the individual to own property but that right is solemnly safeguarded. To be able to steal presupposes that the individual has a right to own property. To violate that precious God-given right is to violate an essential and oft-repeated command of the living God. To repudiate the teaching of God in this matter is to impugn the veracity of God, to do despite to His holy law, and to make our fellowmen slaves of men rather than servants of the living God. The acceptance of communism in any form is a repudiation of unalterable Christian principle.

---

A NEW FEATURE FOR *THE EVANGELICAL STUDENT*. Attention is called to a new feature that begins with this issue of *The Evangelical Student*. We are happy to announce that beginning with this issue there will appear regularly a review of current evangelical books for students. The purpose of these reviews will be to bring the student in contact with the best modern evangelical books, to stimulate a desire in the student to read these books, and to give the student some of the most valuable thoughts presented in these books. It is believed that these reviews will supply a real need in the student's thought and life. The editor welcomes the receipt of any current evangelical books which are particularly adapted to the needs of students. The editor reserves the right, however, to determine whether the book received shall be reviewed in *The Evangelical Student*.

---

### WRITERS IN THIS ISSUE

MISS JOHANNA TIMMER, M.A. Miss Timmer is the highly respected and admired Dean of Women at Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

WILLIAM W. ADAMS, Th.D. Dr. Adams is Professor of New Testament Interpretation in Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary. His ability as a student and speaker of the World is well known in Baptist circles. Dr. Adams is a graduate of Louisville Southern Baptist Seminary.

JOHN J. BOGGS, D.D. Dr. Boggs has been for fifteen years Professor of Greek and Latin at Hastings College, Nebraska. Prior to that time he was a missionary in Canton, China. The League welcomes this first contribution from the pen of Dr. Boggs.

CHARLES J. WOODBRIDGE, M.A. Rev. Woodbridge is the General Secretary of the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Mr. Woodbridge has labored as a missionary in Africa where he was singularly blessed of God. Mr. Woodbridge has become a missionary speaker for whom there is much demand.

## GOD'S SECRETS\*

JOHANNA TIMMER, A.M.

Because a challenge can conquer hesitation and overrule fear, I consented, although not without misgivings, to share in this convention program. I look upon this occasion as one of the greatest single opportunities I have ever had. Concentrating most of my energies on working among the youth of my own denomination, whose youth I love, I welcome this opportunity of contacting a student group which represents a cross-section of American conservative Protestantism. Students, I subscribe to the purpose of the League of Evangelical Students, therefore I speak. I sense the need of the rising up of educated young men and women who have the courage of their Christian convictions, therefore I speak. I believe in the eternal truth and in the ultimate triumph of supernatural Biblical Christianity, therefore I speak.

It is a source of deep joy that this League makes possible the joining of hands in promoting a positive Christianity by means of which we can offset the host of adverse influences that impinge themselves upon our consciousness by virtue of our increasing contacts with the spirit of the world, especially that of pseudo-Christianity which is of the earth, earthly. That spirit of the world is doing everything to make itself attractive to the students of the land. It meets the student in the classroom not only, but it also meets him even in the church pew. To counteract these satanic influences the League must and does stimulate an interest in the truth of God. The League seeks to help the Christian students of America remain faithful to the true church of God until they reach the very city of God. If the League is to be an effective dynamic force for God, it must be properly charged. That it is, because it is charged with the very Word of God. Only by leaning on this Word of God and by walking in the light of it can the Christian students of America remain standing in this crooked world. To keep our hands lifted heavenward in our day, we need an Aaron and Hur to stay our hands. That to me is one of the services the League of Evangelical Students must render. Through it the Christian students of America are to be encouraged the one by the other to persevere in the battle, to keep their hands steady until the going down of the sun. Students, are you finding it hard to keep your head uplifted and your hands steady in a student world that is electric with anti-Christian influences? If so, accept the service of this League which will seek to sustain you as Aaron and Hur sustained Moses. (Ex. 17:12).

While doing graduate work at the University of Michigan in the year 1924-1925, I drew new meaning from the twenty-fifth Psalm. Much disturbed in spirit one time, I found surcease from my perplexities in the words of this Psalm. Among the several passages in that Psalm which met the needs of my soul were these two: "O keep my soul, and deliver me; let me not be ashamed; for I put my trust in thee," and "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him; and he will show them his covenant." The prayerful searching of that Psalm gave me new light and new peace. I recommend it to every perplexed Christian student. The farther time separates me from that soul experience the more meaning it gathers. Whenever I come into contact with anti-Christian thinking in the classroom or through my reading, I gain profound comfort from the knowledge that the secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him.

---

\* An address delivered at the Tenth Annual Convention of the League of Evangelical Students, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.



God has secrets. The secrets of friendship are not merely characteristic of intimate human relationships; they are characteristic of God's relation to His own. God's own know and hear and see and taste things foreign to the experience of all others. The reason why we cannot understand why John loves Mary and Mary loves John is that each sees in the other what we cannot see in either. John opens his soul to Mary and Mary opens her soul to John in such a way as they open their souls to no one else. The reason why John sees in Mary and Mary sees in John what no one else sees in either is that they open their hearts to each other as to none other. Browning immortalized that truth in his little poem entitled "My Star" which is supposed to have reference to his wife, Elizabeth Barrett Browning. Says Browning:

"All that I know  
Of a certain star  
Is, it can throw  
(Like the angled spar)  
Now a dart of red,  
Now a dart of blue  
Till my friends have said  
They would vain see, too,  
My star that dartles the red and the blue.

Then it stops like a bird; like a flower hangs furled:  
They must solace themselves with the Saturn above it.  
What matter to me if their star is a world  
Mine has opened its soul to me. Therefore I love it.

What Browning saw no one else saw. Others had to be satisfied with the Saturn above. The Saturn above could be discerned by the physical eye but Browning saw what only the eye of love can see. So too the Christian sees what no one else can see. Spurgeon said, "Saints have the key of heaven's hieroglyphics; they can unriddle celestial enigmas. They are initiated into the fellowship of the skies; they have heard words which it is not possible for them to repeat to their fellows." The secret of the Lord cannot be imputed by man to man. One enters into possession of it through faith which is a gift of God and itself a secret. A stranger to that secret calls the mysteries of faith folly. In I Cor. 2:14 we read: "For the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

What are some of the things which the natural man of the twentieth century regards as foolishness but which the Christian accepts as the very truth of God? I shall mention some of those the defence of which constitute the *raison d'etre* of this League.

I. First of all I would mention that regeneration by the Holy Spirit as the prime requisite to citizenship in the kingdom of heaven is one of God's secrets. The humanist is a stranger to the fact that regeneration by the Spirit of God is the only passport to man's highest possible existence. Says the humanist, "We, not the gods, are judges of what is worth while in life. Man is spiritually self-sufficient inasmuch as he is himself the highest judge of what is right and wrong, valuable or the reverse." Says Jesus, "Except a man be born again, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." The former statement is found in J. A.

C. F. Auer's book *Humanism States Its Case*; the latter in God's own Word. The occasion of the latter statement was that a certain religious leader needed to be disillusioned in order that he might be truly illuminated. May I aid you in recalling the picture? Nicodemus, a religious leader out of Judaism, stands face to face with the founder of Christianity. Nicodemus, an interpreter of the law, is face to face with Jesus who is the fulfillment of the law. Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, is face to face with Him who is the King of the Jews. Two noteworthy personalities stand face to face. One of them speaks with an authority and with a finality that is superhuman. His divine message to Nicodemus is—"Except a man (e'en though he be a religious leader out of Judaism, an interpreter of the law, a ruler of the Jews) except a man be born again he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." May I put it otherwise, to set it over against humanism? "Except a man be born again he remains a stranger to the highest values." Thus saith the Lord. "Man is spiritually self-sufficient inasmuch as he is himself the highest judge of what is . . . valuable . . ." Thus saith the humanist. The values set up by the humanist are as transient as man is transient; the values rooted in God are as durable as God is durable.

Humanism is void of real religious value. In the last chapter of his book, *The Next Step in Religion*, Professor Roy Sellers makes this statement: "The humanist's religion is the religion of one who says yea to life here and now and of one who is self-reliant and fearless, intelligent and creative . . . It is loyalty to human values." It is clear, is it not, that humanism rejects the influence upon man of an objective God. The object of worship must be sought within man. This is, however, hardly religion. Humanism impoverishes life; it shrinks the soul. I would say that humanism is not human enough. Humanity reaches out beyond humanity for satisfaction and completion. Man needs God. The humanist knows not the secret of God which opens the door to the salvation of man and to the mysteries of heaven. "Except a man be born again he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." The humanist must be drawn by a power higher than any power he recognizes if he is to enter that kingdom. "No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him." God shares the secret of regeneration with whomsoever He will.

II. It seems that the truth about the personality of God is also very much a secret in this twentieth century. Many who would fain call themselves Christians are cursed with ignorance concerning the personality of God. Some distort the nature of the personality of God; others limit the personality of God; still others reject the fact of the personality of God entirely. By the first group God is reduced to a jelly-fish being who is all love and no justice. Their God is a God who certainly will not have the heart to reject any soul which leads the kind of life which it chooses to think the best. They refuse to accept or are ignorant of the limitation contained in Acts 4:12 which leaves no road to heaven open save the one prepared by Jesus Himself. He is the only way; He is the only door, all the jelly-fish views to the contrary notwithstanding. "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."

The second group mentioned limit the personality of God by reducing Him to a finite being. Edgar Sheffield Brightman is a good representative of this group. He sets forth his conception of a finite God in his book *The Problem of God*. Ever since I have read his book I have been shocked to observe how general this view has become. I have come into personal contact with those who accept this as the only reasonable view of the personality of God. We do well to

acquaint ourselves with this point of view and with the ground adduced for the acceptance of this point of view.

In his book *The Doctrine of God* Knudson makes this statement: "The idea of a finite God was broached by David Hume, John Stuart Mills endorsed it, William James advocated it, H. G. Wells popularized it" (p. 255). This statement sheds light on the history of this concept. Knudson also throws lights on the implication of the term "finite God" when he asserts that a finite God is a "growing" God. Linked up, therefore, with the theory of a finite God is that of a growing God. Growth implies, does it not, a becoming; a process of becoming is a process of a passing through various stages; that, in turn, implies a *before* and *after*, a dependence on a temporal order. But God, if He be God, created the temporal order and can, therefore, not be dependent on it. He cannot be dependent on the thing He created because He was before its creation. We know growth only in relation to something external which stimulates it. James is right when he says that "a finite being grows by drawing upon its environment." If God, however, has an environment upon which He is dependent for growth, God is no longer God. He steps off the throne. God must be self-sufficient if He is to control all that is dependent, and changeless if He is to control all change.

Brightman adduces seven arguments which although they apparently support what he calls "the expansion of the idea of God" they in reality, he thinks, sustain what he calls the "contraction of the idea of God" or, if you will, the idea of a finite God. I shall seek to point out the vulnerability of his position with respect to several of these arguments in favor of a finite God.

In his first argument he takes the position that "the expansion of the idea of God into a being of all inclusive law" precludes the idea of God consenting to work miracles and to answer prayer (p. 92). He says, "A God of law will not violate law for any purpose nor in answer to any prayer." This strikes me as being a superficial argument. May we not say that we apply the term "law" to definite divine modes of operation? To say that the mode of operation which God ordinarily follows is the only mode of operation that He *can* follow as a God of law is gross presumption. God is, to be sure, not a fickle God. His mode of operation is so consistently the same that we are able to discover what we call natural laws, laws which are but expressions of or ways of divine operation. But to assume that the modes of operation that ordinarily function exhaust the divine possibilities of operation (according to law) is, in my estimation, unwarranted. If under special circumstances it pleases God to put into action a mode of operation ordinarily withheld, He can do so without forfeiting His title as a God of law. Likewise, if it pleases God to put into action a mode of operation only in response to prayer which He himself lays down as a condition, He thereby does not limit His power nor violate any law. He, rather, subjects the releasing of His power to certain conditions which He in His own power has laid down, namely, the condition of prayer. The concept of God as a worker of miracles and as a hearer of prayer does not, if properly understood, destroy the idea of God as a God of law. Law does not condition God; God conditions law. Brightman has no right to impose upon God the necessity of being limited to a few definite modes of operation. God is capable of as many modes of operation as are consistent with the essence of his own being. God is a God of law, but this does not mean that God is a God only of those laws which man has been given the insight to discover as a result of daily observation, or of scientific investigations.

Another factor in the expansion of the idea of God which Brightman sees as inevitably leading to a contraction of the idea of God is that of omnipotence (p. 96). A clinging to the theory of the omnipotence of God makes necessary, he thinks, a discharging of the idea of the absolute goodness of God. "Either God's power or goodness must suffer contraction" says he, in the matter of accounting for evil. If God is omnipotent then we must, says Brightman, make Him the cause of evil, but if God is absolute goodness with limitation of power, we can recognize the presence of evil without reference to God as the cause of it. To avoid positing an omnipotent God as the cause of evil, Brightman thinks it necessary to find refuge in a limited God. Is this necessary? Can we not retain the idea of divine omnipotence if we accept the theory that God made evil possible without being the cause of it? He made evil possible by creating man a moral being with free choice of action. God's omnipotence shows forth in His ability to create such a moral being. In making man moral God delegated to him responsibility. In the possibility either to use or to abuse this responsibility lies the possibility of evil. It is one thing to say that God caused evil; it is quite another thing to say, that God made room for the possibility of evil. "All power," says Harris in his *Philosophical Basis of Theism*, "is in God potentially." If so, then the power which makes the execution of sin possible is of God. To maintain that God made room for the possibility of evil without His being the cause of it makes God retain His omnipotence even in the face of evil, wherefore He also can use evil to carry out His purpose. If God were limited and by virtue of His limitation stood out of relation to evil, how could he direct it to suit His purpose? If the Lord cannot prevent evil how can He control it?

A third argument for the finiteness of God grows out of what Brightman calls the "Expansion of the idea of God into eternity" (p. 98). To posit a timeless God is really to limit Him, argues Brightman, because His very timelessness puts Him out of relation to the world of time. Says Brightman, "If His eternity be expanded to the point of eliminating all time from His nature, . . . His relations with the world of our actual time experience are not only contracted, but are rendered remote and unintelligible" (p. 99). Isn't Brightman stretching the argument here? To be vitally related to all that is in time, to control all temporal creation, God must not be subject to time but He must be independent of it. Time cannot belong to the nature of Him who created it, for He is independent of everything which He has brought forth. If, because of His eternity, His timelessness, He is "rendered remote and unintelligible," He must be so out of relation to time that whatever happens in time has, as far as man is concerned, no ultimate validity and then those who are in time cannot know Him who is eternal. God Himself has manifested clearly in the fact of the incarnation that that which appears in the spatio-temporal order can indeed have eternal validity. God does not have to act in time, but He *can* act in time. In his *Philosophical Basis of Theism* Harris makes the following valuable statement: "Any rigid idea of God's infinitude and unchangeableness, which involves the impossibility of His acting in time and space and expressing and realizing His eternal thought and purpose in finite beings, implies limitation of the infinite and is necessarily self-contradictory and false . . ." (p. 532).

Brightman furthermore argues that to ascribe infinite power to God is to necessitate disposing with human freedom. "Such a God must forego," says he, "a world of free beings, who are morally self-determined" (p. 102). This would be true, I think, if these free beings were self-existent beings; but if they

are beings that receive their moral freedom from their creator, their creator does not thereby forfeit His omnipotence but reveals it. In his omnipotence God freely bestows the gift of moral freedom on some of His creatures. Their using this freedom does not detract from the power of God, because it is a delegated power, a derived freedom, a freedom which a free God chose to bestow on a creature of His. God uses the very freedom of man in the carrying out of His purpose. The freedom of man is not absolute in the sense that it is independent of all relationship. It is relative. God has given it to him. God's freedom only is absolute. Brightman himself, interestingly enough, is forced to admit that this limitation of the power of God is more apparent than real.

The thing that really limits God is what Brightman calls "The Given" within God's own being. God is absolutely good, but because of the presence of a retarding force, "the Given," within Him, He is not able completely to realize His will in the world. Hence the presence of struggle and suffering. Brightman wonders how, if God be omnipotent, we can account for the "cosmic drag which retards and distorts the expression of value." Brightman forgets that because man's criteria of value are marred by limitation and evil, he may fail to see value where God does. We must guard against identifying appearance with reality. Suffering may appear to indicate limitation of divine power whereas in reality God has complete control over it. "Is there an evil in the city that I have not done?"

If there is in God a "retarding force" there must be a delay in God. Delay, as I see it, presupposes a temporal order. Delay is possible in an order where there is a relation of before and after. If so, how can it be postulated of one who exists independently of the temporal-spatial world? By asserting that God is dependent on time for the overcoming of the "retarding force" within Him, we destroy His right to divinity. To be God, God must be self-existent, dependent of all relations, yet related to everything. God must be absolute in order to be God. "The absolute is" as some one has said, "that which exists out of all necessary relations." If God is finite in power, His power must be conditioned. If conditioned, there must be a power behind His power which conditions it. If so, God forfeits His name as God.

Doctor Henry Nelson Wieman, a recognized authority on the philosophy of religion at the University of Chicago Divinity School, goes beyond Brightman by robbing God of personality on the grounds that "a personality is an impossible abstraction." In his book *The Issues of Life* (p. 218) he clearly states that "personality is not the greatest value, but, rather, that personality is a necessary component in the greatest value." "The greatest value," says Wieman, "is an association of personalities communicating with one another by way of physical conditions and symbols, and thus achieving truth, beauty, art, personal affection, moral goodness, and all the other great values." On page two hundred and twenty of that same book Wieman clearly states that because a personality cannot stand alone it is not the greatest value. "We deny personality to God because He must have greater value than any personality can ever have." Wieman defines God thus: "God is that order of existence and possibility by virtue of which the greatest possible good is truly a possibility and can be achieved by human effort. "He is an order," says Wieman, "which includes both a part of actuality and a part of possibility." God then is in part an order which is *becoming* actualized, God is in process of becoming. This hardly agrees with God's own testimony concerning Himself. In Exodus 3:14 God says, "I am that

I am." The implication of that text hardly leaves room, if I understand it correctly, for the possibility of God's *becoming*. In Malachi 3:6 God says, "I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." In Hebrews 13:18 we read, "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, today, and forever." Does sameness include otherness? God furthermore has never revealed Himself as "an order of existence." God is the eternal "I"—a divine personality possessing intellection, volition, and emotion. This "order of existence," is, besides being impersonal, natural. All orders of existence are orders of nature, this one included. The supernatural has no place in his philosophy of religion. God is reduced to one of the natural orders of existence, the highest of the natural orders, to be sure, but natural nevertheless. Wieman has truly taken away my Lord. Prayer is not communion with a personal God who governs all, but "prayer at its best is the deliberate establishment of those attitudes of personality through which the order of God can possess the world." In other words, prayer is an attitude of personality which promotes "progressive integration," or prayer is an attitude of personality which promotes "the growth of organic unity." By rejecting all that cannot be proved by observation and reason Wieman rejects all the mysteries (the secrets) intrinsic to Christianity. His rejection of these mysteries is an inevitable result of his denial of the supernatural. His God is a component part of nature whereas God Himself has revealed that He is the creator of nature. When I speak thus I realize that I am in the realm of revelation, but if God hath spoken we need that revelation for an adequate answer to the question, "Who is God?" Nature is only one of the ways in which God can reveal Himself. Therefore nature does not give a complete answer to the question, "Who is God?". Creation must give way to revelation. The fact of the infinite personality of God seems to be a secret to the modern non-Christian intellectualist, but to him to whom heaven's gates have been opened it is an indubitable truth.

Finally, God is cursing many of the twentieth century Christians so-called, and many of the twentieth century intellectualists with ignorance concerning the divinity of Jesus. Roy Sellars, professor of philosophy at the University of Michigan, in his book *Religion Coming of Age* rules out of court as unhistorical the historical facts of the sinless Jesus, of the superhumanly wise Jesus, of the Jesus who sacrificed Himself for sin. "Quite obviously," says he, "all this is pioussness, edification, and apologetics, but not history." I ask, if this is not history, what is? What grounds has he for stripping the Biblical account of its historicity? I realize that positing a naturalistic universe, Sellars cannot grant the validity in history of a figure who claimed supernatural significance. The most he can then say, however, is, granted my naturalistic universe, I cannot accept the validity of a vicarious sacrifice for sin. He discredits the Biblical account, mind you, because, says he, "it was not written until over a hundred years after the event and in an atmosphere of fantasy" (p. 96). *But note*, that the Gospel narratives were written before the end of the first century has been as conclusively proved as many things have been that Sellars no doubt would accept as true. They were written in a day when personal witnesses of Jesus were still living and therefore had occasion to reject this account had it been untrue. If Sellars places so little value on an account which he claims was not written "until over a hundred years after the event and in an atmosphere of fantasy," how can he place any value on that part of the evolutionistic process which dips into the eons of prehistorical existence? He perhaps would answer

that the one is scientifically discerned, the other religiously discerned. Fact is that the one is a big leap into the unknown; the other a matter of personal observation on the part of those who were Jesus' contemporaries. Deny the incarnation as Sellars does, and one has to deny the historicity of the Bible in order to disprove the incarnation. The divinity of Jesus, the incarnation of Jesus, is unknown to Sellars and to those who think likewise. It is one of those secrets which neither the wisdom of the wise nor the discernment of the discerning can grasp but which is revealed only by God's own Spirit.

Winifred Kirkland places a greater value on Jesus than Sellars does, although her evaluation of Jesus falls far short of acclaiming Him as divine. In *The Great Conjecture: Who Is This Jesus?* Winifred Kirkland gives a rather clear statement of what Jesus means within a large circle of the religious world today. She has built up a Jesus who appeals to the modern mind because her Jesus reassures contemporaries of man's possibility to attain to divinity. Jesus is divine only in the sense in which man will become divine if only he realizes his own creative capacities. If only man will run the risk of throwing himself into the maelstrom of adventure in order to test the validity of what Jesus has proved possible, he can prove God true and man divine.

Miss Kirkland's Jesus has burst the bounds of creeds, of the New Testament, and of death though "two thousand years dead." Two thousand years dead? Thus saith the Scriptures—"For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly: so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matthew 12:40). Pray, if Jesus is now "two thousand years dead" in what sense did He burst the bounds of death? All that Miss Kirkland evidently means by resurrection is that man through the imagination visualizes at his side "the Presence of the Man of Galilee." If Jesus, however, did not actually and bodily arise from the dead, what sort of imagination is man building on anyway?

Who is this Jesus, Miss Kirkland? Is He the Saviour who by His vicarious atonement can free the sinner? Indeed not! Salvation is rather secured by obeying "the same laws of self-creation that He (Jesus) Himself had employed." Salvation is not something secured by a vicarious substitutionary atonement wrought by Jesus, but by obedient emulation of Jesus' manipulation of the laws of self-creation.

Miss Kirkland, if this be so, then you have taken away my Lord, nay, you have never met my Lord. You are a stranger to the secret of the redemptive power of Jesus who is not merely the "Man of Galilee" but also the very Christ of God.

I must close. What is the matter? The Christian world is being turned upside down in an attempt to make Jesus, in the words of Dr. Vos, "fit the times." There is much ado about remodelling Jesus to fit the twentieth century. Says Dr. Vos in his book *The Self-Disclosure of Jesus*, "Let us beware of incurring the charge of making Jesus to fit the times, instead of fitting the times to His teaching" (p. 64). That sentence is, methinks, freighted with significance. The so-called Christian world in an attempt to make Jesus fit the times is doing much thinking and re-thinking which is creating an ever widening gap between Modernism and the Christianity of the Bible. Christians, so called, are not only re-thinking missionary motives; they are re-thinking, under the pressure of this scientific and humanistic age, their idea of God and of the relation of God to the world, to man, and to the problem of evil. This re-thinking

is leading many supposedly Christian thinkers into the lap of naturalism, of humanism, of social idealism, of finite personalism, and what not. J. A. C. F. Auer, in re-thinking religion, has found a humanistic order; Edgar Sheffield Brightman, in re-thinking religion, has found a finite God, a God who has to struggle constantly in order to overcome gradually the Given within His own personality; Henry Nelson Wieman, in re-thinking religion, has found a naturalistic order and is very much at ease in it.

Each one of these men commands attention in the world of thought. Professor Wieman, for example, has been classified among the purest theologians of the day. What, then, is the matter? The matter is not with their scholarship; the matter is not with their intelligence; the matter is that they have let go of the foundation of all truly Christian thinking—the Word of God infallible, and the matter is that they possess not that secret of faith that reaches out in confidence to God as He has revealed Himself.

This question remains: How are we as Christian students going to do our thinking and re-thinking as we face the problems of today? Have we the courage to base our thinking on the Word of God infallible? Have we the courage to reject the “wisdom of the wise” and the “discernment of the discerning” in favor of the wisdom of God and the discernment of God? By whom are we going to let ourselves be called fools last? By the “wise” and the “discerning” or by the God of wisdom who said, “I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the discernment of the discerning will I bring to nought.” The impact of anti-Christian philosophies of religion we cannot escape in our day, but God forbid that we should accept the spirit thereof.

May it be true of all of us that we have the mind of Christ. Let us help to make the impact of that mind felt on the social, the economic, the political, the educational, and the religious world of today. If we do not want to waste our time with the futilitarian theories of the day we must cast our roots in the Word of God eternal; we must cultivate the mind of Christ, and the life of faith, laboring forever, even against great and greater odds, unto the coming of God’s glorious Kingdom, and unto the glory of His blessed name.

“He read a chapter from the Book,  
And then a single verse he took  
And held it up where all could see  
The purpose of infinity.  
It had a hundred facets, yet  
In one magnificence they met,  
As may the spectrum first appear  
Within a jewel crystal clear.

“And in these times when much is taught,  
Without much reason or much thought,  
When you are wrong, and I am right,  
And little held up to the light,  
When we might look at all the sides  
Of any question that divides,  
I mind that preacher in my youth  
And how he sought and found the truth.



“He did not ask us to depend  
 Upon his thinking, nor pretend  
 That he alone could think at all;  
 God was too great, and he too small,  
 He held the gospel up to them  
 As does a jeweler a gem  
 Until its hues become one fire  
 Of some great truth that men require.”<sup>1</sup>

You and I know what that truth is which men require. Are we going to hold it up to them or are we willing to sit back while university professors rage and Modernists imagine a vain thing?

---

## WHY I BELIEVE THE GOSPEL

WILLIAM W. ADAMS, TH.D.

It is not necessary to speak at length of the Gospel that I believe. I am aware of the wide differences of opinion regarding some phases of the Gospel. Upon one point all of us are agreed! The Gospel is Good News—the Good News of salvation through Jesus Christ.

I believe firmly in the Gospel. It is not a blind, uncritical belief. In no sense is knowledge inimical to belief. The more I study the Gospel, the criticisms of and charges against it, and its practical issues in human life, the stronger grows my belief in the Gospel.

Not all the reasons for believing the Gospel can be set forth in one short paper. Certain primary truths can be discussed briefly.

I believe the Gospel because it is based upon indestructible historical facts. The Gospel is Jesus Christ; his person, mission, and actual achievement in human beings. Jesus is no mythical character. He stands out in the full blaze of history. He has created most significant history. He separates all previous history from that which followed upon his appearance in history.

We can localize and analyze Jesus' earthly environment. We know the antecedents to his appearance on earth. These are embedded deeply within the history, ideals, hopes, strivings, and prophetic utterances of the race to which he belonged. We know where he was born, the family into which he came, and the time of his stay on earth. We can follow him geographically, from city to city, as he makes his way over Palestine. We become acquainted with his associates, both individuals and groups. And these folk are natural. They fit perfectly into the total picture of the times.

Certain conditions, needs, and problems prevailed during the time of Christ. We discover Jesus addressing himself to these conditions and meeting the needs.

Jesus was a teacher. Among other things he disclosed his purpose and plans. He set forth promises and the human conditions upon which they rested. He moved towards the accomplishment of a definite and comprehensive program. He released forces that initiated the mightiest enterprise known to man.

---

<sup>1</sup> Douglas Malloch, *Held to the Light*.

This is all history. So that the Gospel concerns, not theory or speculation, but facts. It is this fact-basis and fact-content of the Gospel that repeatedly rises up and smites mens' destructive criticism of the Gospel.

One needs to pause only a minute to call attention to the contrast between Christianity and other religions regarding their historical foundations. The roots of many religions lie deep within the fog and shadows of myths, uncertainties and absurdities. Much known history of some religions invalidates their claims. While in the case of Christianity the history of its origin is known, and the more one knows of this history the more steadfastly one may cling to the Gospel that grows out of that history.

I believe the Gospel because of the unitary nature of the testimony of the original witnesses of the Gospel. The New Testament is made up of many separate parts. These parts differ as to author, place, time, and occasion of composition, and emphasis. This diversity and variety no one denies.

But is there unity in this variety? It is not long since criticism gave us what is known as The Back to Jesus Movement. This movement was consciously away from the Jesus of modern preaching. The assumption was that preaching had transformed the human Jesus into the theological, supernatural Christ. With one stroke of the pen we made our way back through the Christ of modern preaching and of the creeds of the church. We would find the human Jesus in the first century. But alas! John and Paul were as guilty of loose handling of facts as we moderns. So was Peter, the author of Hebrews. But the Synoptic Gospels would disclose the truth. Matthew and Luke likewise had to be passed by. It was not different with Mark. Finally "Q," the one sure pre-Synoptic source, was examined exhaustively.

In this oldest record, Jesus was the same in essentials—Divine Son of God, miracle-worker, redeemer of men. In these essentials all the New Testament writings were agreed. The picture is many-sided, but it is *one* picture. Criticism was compelled to conclude that the Gospel cannot be rejected on the ground that the narrators of the origins of Gospel history are contradictory in their testimony. Their presentation of the facts of the Gospel is consonant with the basic claims and essential nature and genius of the Gospel.

I believe the Gospel because it originated in Jesus Christ and not in human beings. Jesus appeared in history. He lived among men. He taught them, worked with them and changed their lives. It was the sum total impact of Jesus upon his disciples and contemporaries that gave birth to the idea that they had good news to tell. The Gospel originated with Jesus, not with his disciples. Jesus created the good news before men went forth to herald it.

One recalls that the charge is frequently made that the Gospel is not dependable because it has a human foundation. Its ideas are men's and so are fallible.

No one denies that our knowledge of the historical Jesus does depend upon the writings of human beings. But where did they get their ideas? Are they the product of legends, of an uncontrolled imagination, of overtaxed nerves, of misunderstanding, and of wilful perversion of facts? In short, does the Gospel message that presents Jesus as God's eternal Son and man's Saviour go back in its thought-content simply to a group of men?

These questions may be answered definitely and fully. Jesus did more than work in his disciples the *experience* of good news. Before he entrusted to them the responsibility of proclaiming the Gospel to the world, he made sure that their message was the true message. Throughout his entire public ministry

Jesus' teaching followed closely upon his program of mighty works. He increasingly sought to interpret the meaning of his deeds.

He made slow progress—until after the resurrection. It was the announcement of his coming death that had closed their ears to most of his teachings. But the resurrection changed the whole atmosphere. The stumbling block was removed. The disciples were teachable. Jesus knew it and took full advantage of the opportunity.

One does well to ponder these words of Scripture: "And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself," (Lk. 24:27). Was there ever such a course in Old Testament exegesis? Teacher and student knew the scriptures. Jesus is in the very midst of the process of fulfilling those scriptures. These disciples have witnessed the fulfillment. Jesus became the teacher *about himself*. He recalled and explained what Moses and all the prophets had said. Then he showed how he himself had been fulfilling these prophecies, especially in the recent baffling events in Jerusalem. He took plenty of time to disclose his message fully.

This ministry of self-interpretation was given to the larger group of Apostles and disciples. "And he said unto them, These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their mind, that they might understand the scriptures; and he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations beginning from Jerusalem. Ye are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high." (Lk. 24:44-49).

Moses, the prophets and psalmists wrote of Jesus—"concerning me." These things *must* be fulfilled. They have been and are being fulfilled. Jesus opened their minds so they could understand. He then summed up the threefold, primary truths set forth in the Old Testament that are now being fulfilled. These are his (the Christ's) sufferings, death, and resurrection, and the universal proclamation of redemption in his name. This is their message. Jesus can say, "Ye *are* (not will be) witnesses of these things."

These are samples of Jesus' comprehensive teaching ministry before his ascension. Luke says that throughout the forty day period Jesus was instructing his disciples in the things concerning the Kingdom of God. (Acts 1:3).

How does this help us believe the Gospel? By reminding us that the New Testament conception and teachings concerning Jesus as the Good News to the world rests upon Jesus himself and not upon his disciples. Jesus interpreted himself to his future interpreters before he sent them forth with the evangel. The truth of the Gospel rests upon the Christ of the Gospel. And he is abundantly able to bear this responsibility. He authenticates the claim of his first interpreters. They claim that their interpretation rests originally upon him and not upon themselves. I believe the Gospel because it is Christ's own exposition of himself.

But do we possess that exposition? Was it not lost or perverted in transmission? We are not left to our own opinions. The disciples were forbidden to witness for Christ until they were Spirit filled. Christ came to them in his other self, the Holy Spirit. This Spirit recalled all that Jesus had said to them,

and taught them all things, (Jno. 14:26). In the process of remembering and completing and proclaiming and recording the Gospel message, the disciples were as divinely guarded against error as when Jesus was with them in the flesh.

Jesus Christ and not man stands back of the good news.

I believe the Gospel because it authenticates itself in human experience. It thus becomes continuous history, linking you and me to the history already past. The Gospel began in human experience and it ever seeks to propagate itself and prove itself in human experience. Nowhere does the Gospel make its sole and primary appeal to the reason. Its ever living imperative is, "Come and see;" "Do and ye shall know." In meeting this test there is room for the mind, the will, and the emotion. But the test ever remains experimental.

Millions and multiplied millions bear witness to this truth. The greatest mind as well as the smallest finds satisfaction in Jesus, *in obedience* to his commands. Oftentimes what the reason and all other human powers cannot do, faith in Christ accomplishes.

I can by reason justify my faith in the Gospel. But if someone should succeed in casting doubt in my mind, I would still have as foundation for belief my transforming, heart-satisfying experience of the dynamic presence of Christ.

The history of my own salvation in Christ binds me to the Christ of all history and deepens my faith in the Gospel.

Lastly, I believe the Gospel because it is the world's only hope. Human beings are not made for the gutter. We are made for the light, the open sky. We are created for God—to think his thoughts, to do his will, to share his life and glory. Our desires and hopes ever turn in this direction. We are fashioned in the image of God.

It was God who so fashioned us. And it is he who wills to supply our need in the realization of his plan and purpose for us. God did not make us for himself without providing for our redemption unto himself. Jesus Christ is the Father's answer to man's basic desire and need. The Gospel is adequate in accomplishing God's purpose with man.

Apart from this Gospel there is no hope. This is the message of Christ himself in the New Testament. Because the Jews would not believe on him, Jesus said, "Ye shall die in your sins." It is true with all of us. The early disciples and preachers reechoed their Master's warning—"There is no other name."

All history gives emphasis to this truth. Human wreckage, individuals and groups, testifies that there is no hope except Christ.

The present hour declares it. Nations beat out their life against the effort to go forward without Christ. Plans, efforts, enterprises collapse in rapid succession, because Christ is absent.

The Gospel works, when tested. Nothing else does. I believe the Gospel. I have nothing else to believe. God help me never to lose my belief in the Gospel!



## TWO RELIGIONS

JOHN J. BOGGS, D.D.

Different religions, as contrasted, are different conceptions of man's relation to God. The Buddhist religion is one conception of that relation; the Mohammedan religion is a very different conception of that relation. We easily recognize the fact that these are different religions. The difference in name is a help in distinguishing two systems. But confusion arises when different things are called by the same name. Now the most fatal and seductive of all errors in the history of human thought arose when two different systems of religion came to be called by the same name, Christianity. If a man should bottle cottonseed oil and sell it as olive oil he would get into trouble for violating the law. With perfect religious freedom, one has the legal right to apply a false name to any system of thought. Witness the name "Christian Science," which is, as has often been said, "neither Christian nor scientific." So the principle of "caveat emptor" prevails: let the buyer exercise care as to the quality of the goods he purchases.

We must make a clear distinction between true Christianity and anything with that name that is false or incomplete, lacking its vital elements. There is the true, authentic Christianity that has come down from the founding of the church, reaffirmed at the Reformation, and is actively working today. Then there is opposed to this, disguised under the same name, a system or group of systems, non-Biblical. We read that there were departures from the truth even in the apostolic age, and there ever have been such, but this is the most insidious warfare on the truth ever waged. The opponents of Biblical Christianity would condemn it as "traditionalism," but let us rejoice in the designation, for it is a glorious tradition. "Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught." Neither should the opponents of historical Christianity take offense when their ideas are called non-Biblical. They do not derive their system from the Bible, so of course they should not object when it is called non-Biblical.

### *I. Whence our knowledge of God is derived.*

Here is the first distinguishing mark between the two religions; they differ on how we get a knowledge of God. Evangelical, New Testament Christianity teaches that we get our most important knowledge of God by God's revelation of Himself to us. "Natural religion" is recognized, but the saving truths of religion are made known to us supernaturally. "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." "The Spirit of truth will guide you into all truth." The text-book of our religion is the Bible, the Teacher is the Holy Spirit. If a student should wish to learn the principles of chemistry or astronomy he must apply himself to a proper text-book of his science. So our knowledge of God must be derived from the Book with the help of the Author Himself. This is entirely reasonable.

Now the teaching of the Bible is obnoxious to the adherents of the other religion and always has been. "We know that everywhere it is spoken against." Yet they show a wrong sense of values when they reject God's word on account of what they mistakenly think are inaccuracies or scientific errors, and so reject the way of eternal life. If a man should believe that the earth is flat, that belief need not endanger his soul's eternal welfare. It is not facts about the earth

that save a man, but being in the right relation with God. The first step in the apostasy of many a man has been his doubt of God's Word. The first destructive critic, as has been said, was Satan himself: "Yea, *hath* God said?" If a man will not believe that God has revealed Himself, he is an easy victim to all kinds of error.

When the Bible is rejected as the supreme authority, what authority do men follow? Leaving the "impregnable rock of Holy Scripture," there is no firm footing, only the slippery, steep incline that ends in ruin. One leader of the anti-Biblical forces on being asked what is the supreme authority said: "Tested thought." But whose thought, and how tested? Another says, "the best thought of leading men." But leaders of different ages and races and nations and groups of men differ widely in thought. And who is to say who are leaders and what is their best thought? Some may prefer the guidance of a fetish medicine man, others that of a Brahman priest, others a canon of an English cathedral. Is truth relative, and is that which is true for one false for another?

The Biblical Christian takes the Bible as the Word of God. His opponent calls it the "record of the religious experience of the race," and "studies the Bible just like Shakespeare." Let those who would follow the "Jesus way of living" regard the Bible and use the Bible as our Lord did the Old Testament when He was upon earth. So doing we can know God and our relation to Him. Rejecting the Bible as their supreme authority men depend on their reason or imagination. Following the one route they wander about in the wilderness of rationalism, from which is the well-trodden path to atheism, and following the other they fall into the morass of mysticism, from which the natural issue is into pantheism. We shall obtain an adequate knowledge of God from the Bible, or not at all. And men who disparage the Bible have had a long enough time to write a better book if they could.

## II. *Our ideas of God.*

God's revelation to us teaches the personality of God, theism and God's providence, the Trinity, and the deity of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. It exalts God infinitely above the thoughts of men by showing His boundless love. It exhibits God as infinitely more worthy of our worship, gratitude, love, and obedience than any other religion does, by whatever name it is called. The highest conceptions ever held by the mind of man were taught us by God Himself. Compared with what He teaches, all other conceptions are inadequate and incomplete, or unworthy.

The teachers of the other religion do not agree among themselves as to what God is. A common characteristic of their teaching is its vagueness, indefiniteness, ambiguity. They use familiar terms with meanings not allowed by established usage, with the result, whether intentional or not, of deceiving the unwary. Now it is an axiom of logic that "thought can be expressed," and it is inexcusable in these people that they so misuse language as to deceive. Others, however, are clear enough in the expression of their belief in a god that is not personal. They would avoid the ascription of the term "atheist" by patronizingly using the name "God" for a principle, or the sum of the forces working in the universe, and for various conceptions that deny the personality of God.

Then there is the large group of those who admit a personal God but who are practically deists. They recognize a Creator but not a Providence. Prayer, miracles, revelation, and prophecy are rejected, actually if not verbally. This is essentially the same as the deism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries

in England, but far more effective in its fatal work because it is inside the organized churches, and insidious in its action. The theory of prayer held by these people can by itself identify them as deists: that prayer is efficacious only in its beneficial effect on the mind of the one who prays.

Again, there are theists who do not hold adequate and Biblical conceptions of the Trinity and of the person and work of Jesus Christ. Are there as many Unitarians in the denomination of that name as in the other churches? They misuse terms and say that Jesus of Nazareth was "divine," but divine only in the sense that all of us may become divine; He was a religious leader because He "had more of a God-consciousness than other men." He was a teacher like other teachers, but surpassing them in the quality of His teaching. He was a "Saviour" only through the salutary effect of His teaching and example. The plain Biblical statements as to His birth, miracles, atoning work, and resurrection are rejected or explained away. He is classed with various ancient teachers or "Saviours" as of the same order. Deism and unitarianism are the prevalent phases of the non-Biblical religion we are discussing.

### III. *Man's relation to God.*

In the third place, this religion differs from that taught in the Bible in its conception of the relation of man to God. The divine revelation shows how man's sin has alienated him from God, but "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree." "By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." "We must be born again." We are taught that our sins have so separated us from God that we absolutely have no access to Him save through Jesus Christ alone. Thus is furnished the most powerful motive to lift man out of his innate selfishness and sin, and at the same time there is provided the divine power to lift him out. This plan has always worked successfully when it has been tried, in the apostolic age, in the missionary period of the early church, at the Reformation, in the great period of modern missions. It is successful now where it is being applied.

The opposing teaching of sin-deceived men is that sin is nothing, or a minor defect of little consequence, and that man has as a natural right all the approach to God that is desirable. They misunderstand entirely our relation to God, thinking that man's side of that relation is the important side, and that what man does or can do is all that we need consider. It is a man-centered system. The Bible system is God-centered; it is not what man does that is of supreme importance, but what God has done for him. It is not reasonable to think that the culprit has the right himself to fix the penalty for broken laws and to secure peace with the offended King and Judge. The Law-giver is the Judge and He fixes the penalty and the terms on which the penalty is remitted. But such is the infinite grace of God that He has provided a way of pardon and peace. So no sin can be greater than that against God's love in rejecting the one and only Way of reconciliation that He has prepared.

Many men reduce religion to ethics, and do not recognize that there are duties to God as well as to man. Their preaching is legalism, they seem never to have read the Good News. Their religion, so much as they have one, is a "boot-strap" religion, thinking that a man can by his own efforts lift himself into a right relation to God. By magnifying man's powers, and concentrating

attention on man, they tend to deify man at the same time that they depreciate God. Their thinking follows two lines: on the one hand we have humanism, the idea that man fulfils his destiny by evolution, depending on the education of the individual and the race; on the other, we have the comparative study of religions, teaching that all we need to know of God and our relation to Him may be attained by extracting the common element of all religions. No wonder that they would cut the nerve of foreign missions by their doctrine of "sharing." What motive have they for foreign missions except the desire to counteract the preaching of the Gospel, as in the case of the man who "could hardly wait to learn the language in order to tell the Chinese that what they had learned about the Bible was all wrong." They would still the voice of witnesses to the power of the Cross and the shed blood of Christ. It is the old story of the "offence of the cross." What Christ has done in the atonement and what the Holy Spirit does in the rebirth are the saving facts of our religion, and consequently they are the facts most obnoxious to opposers of the truth. Probably the deity of Christ and the other deep truths they reject would not be so offensive to them as the dependent fact, so humiliating to the pride of man, that he needs to be saved, that he is not all right of himself. Man will glorify himself instead of his Creator.

These two systems of thought differ so widely on the three vital points of religion that they constitute two religions. They are irreconcilable, conflicting, antagonistic, opposed as day to night. But the opponents of the Bible often try to cloud the issue, to keep the contest out of the open, to delude the unwary into thinking that darkness is light. If by an adroit and unwarranted use of language they can bring people over to the position of believing that God is not personal, or has not intervened in the affairs of men in a supernatural way, or does not exercise providence over us and secure salvation for us in a supernatural way, the thing is done. One way to enable us to distinguish clearly and prevent such obscuring of the issue is to judge by results. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

First, we may judge of the effects of true and false religion on the individual. There is a natural order of progressive degeneracy, like the progress of disease in the physical body, when we abandon God's revealed truth, throwing away one after another of the great saving facts of Christianity: "liberalism," rationalism, agnosticism, atheism,—these are the regular steps, and with the descent there is very often an accompanying abandonment of moral principles. With apostasy from revealed religion there is no longer a solid basis for morality. We older ones have known sad cases of such moral shipwrecks. If men reject as much of the Bible as they wish as standard of faith, why should they regard it as a standard of morals? So there are many who consistently reject it in the two spheres of faith and morals.

Again, as society is made up of individuals, it shows the fruits of apostasy; it cannot be better than the individuals that compose it. So we see the confusion, unrest, and chaotic condition of the present age. There are seemingly unsolvable problems in politics, economics, and morals, strife between social classes and economic forces, between nations and races of men. This is the age of confusion, hatred, conflict, and war. It has not only produced the most terrible war of history, but every day we hear rumors of wars. It is a period of colossal selfishness, of cruelty and brutality, of inhuman crimes almost passing belief, of suffering and want in a large part of the population of many countries



at a time when nature produces lavishly, and also of the piling up of great wealth in the hands of a few, often to be abused. It is a time when men seize great power illegally and tyrannize over men as dictators and despots. Law and order are ignored by many who hold power in church and state. Why all this moral decline? The chief cause is the apostasy in religion. We can trace it historically. There was the succession of philosophers, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, and later Nietzsche. There were the theologians, Schleiermacher and Ritschl. There were the many destructive critics of the Bible. They sowed the wind; we are reaping the whirlwind. What a world this is! Atheism the national cult in one country, paganism being established in another, and the gross materialism of our own! Against such it was written aforesaid: "The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man . . . who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator." Man exalting man and leaving God out of his thoughts has not made out very well! The same God reigns now who reigned when Rome exalted herself in all her grandeur and pride, and who reigned when she fell. It often seems that the race learns nothing from experience; some individuals do, but it is hard for the race to do so. It is the things of the spirit that really constitute civilization. Airplanes and motor cars and great cannon and poison gas and moving pictures and the radio, material things, are not civilization, and the handing down of knowledge in **dealing with material things** is not what we mean by learning from experience.

The devastating influence of anti-Christian teaching is seen not only in the break-down of religion, but also in the collapse of morals. Hence the appalling growth of crime, the shocking impurity of life, the vast increase of divorces and suicides. There is wide-spread unrest and discontent, a general lowering of moral standards. After the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, there comes a rapid liberalizing of the laws, permitting gambling and commercialized Sabbath amusements, and people are just now clamoring for state lotteries. Graft, bribery, and racketeering seem to be established customs in this our land. The opponents of the Bible plan of salvation have had for a slogan "the salvation of society," but how much has society improved under their influence? After fifty years of active propaganda on their part we can judge of their work by its results. Prominent men in church and state, in the schools and in the press, have declared themselves appalled at the situation, both in this country and in the world at large. A noted French writer has called this "the blackest hour in human history." There is degeneracy in art, literature, morals. A crisis seems approaching. What is the remedy? It is for the church to preach as our Lord did at the beginning: "Repent ye, and believe the gospel."

Those who do not believe in predictive prophecy are doing much themselves to fulfil prophecy. Who can conscientiously deny that there is now a great "falling away" from the faith of fifty years ago? Then what are we to expect in the future? There is threatened a lapse into dark ages, like the dismal centuries of the mediaeval church. But things move too fast in the present, changes are too rapid, to let that seem probable. Instead, there may come a tremendous

revival of true Christianity throughout the world. If a John the Baptist, a Luther, a Wesley, a Moody, shall arise, we may see the world transformed. But it will have to be by the power of the Spirit of God, not by organizations or machines or human wisdom and power. If the future should not lie in either of these directions, then there is to be expected a great world change, when "the Lord whom you seek, shall suddenly come to his temple." The false religion that calls itself Christian may largely prevail for a time, and it may use organized power to persecute true believers. But we know from the word of God that a remnant shall remain. There will always be true witnesses "until He shall come, whose right it is."

---

## THE MISSIONARY OBJECTIVE

CHARLES J. WOODBRIDGE, A.M.

Have you ever wondered why it is that you and I know the blessed gospel of the grace of God, while multiplied millions around the world are perishing without that knowledge?

It is because centuries ago missionaries of the cross, called by the Spirit of God, crossed the seas with the message of salvation.

What was the motivating power that drove these early missionary pioneers across the world?

It was the compelling sense that apart from the Christian gospel men and women everywhere were lost; that they were dead in trespasses and sins. But that eternal life had been made available through the death of Jesus Christ the Sin-bearer.

The proclamation of this good news was the major objective of the first Christian missionaries.

Throughout the years the Holy Spirit has continued to call young men and women into missionary service. And in our own day He is still kindling in the hearts of those whom He truly calls a passionate devotion to that primary objective.

\* \* \* \* \*

But the twentieth century is witnessing a strange and tragic phenomenon.

A new, anti-Biblical objective is coming into prominence in the conduct of the missionary enterprise. So much so that the young person of our day who would volunteer for missionary service must be even better equipped for the task than were our fathers.

As one reads the addresses delivered by missionary leaders of forty years ago at annual Student Volunteer Conventions, he is impressed by the emphasis placed upon such virtues as loyalty, devotion, unselfishness, courage, humility.

Today these virtues are just as necessary for the prospective missionary.

But another virtue is needed.

This virtue is spiritual discernment. By this we mean the ability to detect and combat any missionary policy or program which would dethrone from its central position the cardinal objective of foreign missions,—the salvation of lost souls.

How brightly burned the flame of loyalty to the gospel in the hearts of the missionary pioneers of a generation ago! Theirs was the sense of urgency. For they knew that souls were perishing without the good news which God had graciously vouchsafed to men.

But today?

In *Rethinking Missions* we read (page 19), "Whatever its present conception of the future life, there is little disposition to believe that sincere and aspiring seekers after God in other religions are to be damned: it has become less concerned in any land to save men from eternal punishment than from the danger of losing the supreme good."

In this quotation the shift of missionary objective is clearly seen. Compare such a statement with God's holy Word, "He that believeth not is condemned already" (John 3:18).

It is true that some missionary boards have repudiated *Rethinking Missions*. But it is likewise true that some agencies which have officially taken issue with that Report are advocating in their policies the very viewpoint they appear to condemn.

On the field today the missionary must continually be on the alert lest the Christian objective be replaced by a modern counterfeit.

\* \* \* \* \*

Let us be more specific.

We have before us a little pamphlet advertising a so-called Christian College on the mission field.

Should not the cardinal purpose of all Christian education be the rebirth of human souls? Did not our Lord say, "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." (John 3:7).

But this pamphlet reads: "Many a Hindu and Mohammedan student of the . . . . College goes out a nominal Hindu or Mohammedan, but his conscience has been made more sensitive . . . . In his years in the college something has happened to him—Christ has captured at least part of his life. He is unwilling to surrender wholly to Him as yet, as he feels that would be a violent break with his past, and the Indian is the most conservative of humans by nature."

Does the missionary movement have as its objective the sensitivising of conscience or the salvation of souls?

It is not surprising that in this particular college, according to 1931 statistics, 37 of the students were professing Christians, while 1,063 were unbelievers.

Spiritual discrimination is an essential for the true missionary of Christ.

\* \* \* \* \*

The change of objective is based ultimately upon a new conception of the gospel and the Word of God. Let us see how this conception appears on the mission field.

Hudson Taylor, John Paton, and missionaries of their type believed that the Bible was the Word of God, true from cover to cover. But what do we find today?

We quote from a booklet recently published for the National Christian Council of India, Burma, and Ceylon.

"The Evangelists (writers of the gospels) were not miraculously safeguarded from error as they wrote, any more than we are as we read. The Gospels in many points, some of them important, contradict one another . . . . It may even be said that the first three Gospels give contradictory stories side by side . . . .

It is the business of the historical student to disentangle the original story . . . . Each age has to find afresh its own idea of Jesus, and the idea for this age still eludes us."

The true missionary believes that Jesus Christ, God's only begotten Son, lived a miraculous life while on earth. But at a certain University in China a text-book is used in which such quotations as the following occur:

"It is quite unnecessary to suppose that Lazarus was really dead; that was only the belief of Palestinian peasants;"

Jairus' daughter "had become unconscious." They "believed that Jesus had raised her to life;"

"The account (concerning the widow of Nain's son) was written by one who had only the knowledge of that time, and who, in common with all about him, believed the young man to have been dead. There is nothing in the story, however, inconsistent with the idea that a state of coma had been mistaken for death, and that Jesus, with His unique psychic or magnetic power had aroused him from that state."

Think of it! That such blasphemy should be taught to students who have voluntarily entered a "Christian" institution in the Far East. Yet, according to the 1931 Catalog of this particular school, the President of its Board of Founders is actually one who forty years ago was challenging young people throughout the United States with the call of foreign missions.

The early missionary pioneers believed ardently in the deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. Upon that rock they based their message of redemption.

But today in China one of the best-known Chinese "Christian" leaders writes, "One of the most tragic blunders of Christianity has been the placing of such extreme emphasis upon the uniqueness of Jesus that a great difference has been created between him and the rest of mankind. If all human beings are created in the spiritual image of God and if there is only one kind of personality, then the only difference between Jesus and ourselves is one of maturity. Of course that difference is a tremendous one, for he climbed far higher than the rest of us have ever been able to reach. But his very purpose in living was to enable his followers to live as he lived and if need be to die as he died."

Our missionary forefathers believed that Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God, shed His precious blood to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God.

But in a pamphlet which the Christian Literature Society for India has printed we read these astounding words, "A God of love needs neither a propitiation nor a substitution . . . . Neither does God's righteousness demand the punishment of the sinner . . . . It is inconceivable that a God of love whom Jesus revealed should insist on the penalty being paid if not by all men at least corporately for all men by Jesus Christ."

The missionary volunteer of today needs, in the first place, a clear conception of the essential objective of the enterprise in which he hopes to enlist. He needs, in the second place, a burning conviction that the gospel of the grace of God is forever true and effectual unto salvation. Finally, he needs the Spirit-given ability to discern between truth and error, and the courage to stand unflinchingly and at any cost for the whole counsel of God.

## CURRENT EVANGELICAL BOOKS—REVIEWED

## NEW BIBLICAL EVIDENCE

*From the 1925-1933 Excavations. By Sir Charles Marston, F. S. A. Illustrated. Fourth Enlarged Edition, \$2.69. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York.*

There are certain books that have gone through many editions and revisions, in order to keep them up to the standards resulting from the latest research, such as Hall's *Ancient History of the Near East*, Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley's *Hebrew Grammar*, not to mention more.

Here is another work that really should similarly be kept up with the swift march of time. It is up-to-date now, its fourth edition, 1935, containing archaeological materials never published before, while its first edition appeared as recently as 1934. But archaeological knowledge moves forward swiftly, due to numerous excavations, several of which were promoted by Sir Charles himself,—as at Jerusalem and Jericho, in Egypt and Babylonia. Moreover, progressive Biblical, believing scholars have not been slow to see the enormous advantages that archaeological facts have given them, in the battle against the theories that were once “made in Germany,” to oppose the Scriptures. Some hold that when German theories die, they go to England or America.

However, the Word of God never dies, but is living, vital and searching, and its tonic is evident in the present work, which in its field is as outstanding as are the works of Karl Barth, Edwin Lewis, and John Gresham Machen, in their respective fields.

The author has prepared a broad survey of the new archaeological evidence vindicating the Scriptures, the kind of survey that should be brought up-to-date in a similar popular book form, or in later editions of this work, every few years, in order that others besides the specialists may have ready access to materials that serve so well to strengthen the faith. Foot notes to the literature would enhance the work.

Some of the most significant parts of the book concern Jericho, excavated through Sir Charles Marston's munificence, and interpreted by the author and by Dr. Garstang. The city walls were found to have fallen down flat, outward, except that a small portion had remained standing! This evidence is wonderfully impressive, the more so to those that, like the present reviewer, have viewed these excavations. The Egyptian royal scarabs, found at Jericho, no less than the thousands of specimens of pottery, found there, vindicate the early date for the Exodus.

The author's evidence on the Exodus involves a more accurate dating than was heretofore possible, is in line with the biblical data, and marks a most important contribution to human knowledge. On this subject, we regard Sir Charles Marston as the world's leading authority.

Another valuable original contribution published in this volume concerns the specimens of ancient Hebrew, alphabetic script, found at Lachish, from the thirteenth century, B. C., certainly another unlucky find for the Wellhausen school, which was so confident that Hebrew writing was not at the disposal of Moses. Specimens of the script found and interpretations are here published. The discussion includes the earlier evidence of the Sinaitic, alphabetic script of pre-Mosaic days, and the script from Ras Shamra, with which this latest evidence integrates wonderfully.

The author's broad survey of these and many other items of new biblical evidence justifies his conclusion: "There is no longer any doubt that the races who inhabited the Euphrates Valley, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, in ancient times, possessed a much higher culture than has been postulated for them by the Bible critics. For example we know that the art of writing in cuneiform on clay was in general use long before the days of Abraham, and discoveries referred to in this work carry even alphabetic script back to before the days of Moses. How different must have been the whole course of criticism of the Old Testament had this evidence been originally available, and its significance apprehended a century and a half ago."

Sir Charles Marston closes his book with a refutation of the view that Deuteronomy is "a pious forgery," to use his words. According to Duet. 31:2, Moses is God's prophet, saying, "I am a hundred and twenty years old this day." Says Sir Charles, "In His conflict with the devil in the wilderness, the Saviour quotes thrice from the Old Testament. It is significant that all three quotations are from the book of Deuteronomy."

Also Dr. G. Ch. Aalders points out that Deut. 31:9 tells us that "Moses wrote this law," (of Deuteronomy), while Deut. 31:22 relates that "Moses wrote this song,"—that follows in chapter 32. (Aalders, *Genesis*, pages 30, 31.)

The author takes exception to the view of the naturalistic evolution of religion, up to Monotheism, and points to early evidence of monotheism. He might have added the etymology of Babel, gate of God, as well as certain items of Assyriology.

He discusses and illustrates a clay tablet, "containing entire Sumerian lists of dynasties before and after the flood, down to 2076, B. C. The names of those before the flood correspond to the names of the ten patriarchs mentioned in Genesis."

Though there is an occasional statement with which we do not agree, in general this book represents an accurate account of the new biblical evidence, vindicating the Scriptures.

MARTIN J. WYNGAARDEN,  
Calvin Theological Seminary.

Reprinted by permission from *The Banner*.

\* \* \* \* \*

### WHO MOVED THE STONE?

By Frank Morrison. Published by The Century Company, New York.

*Who Moved the Stone?* is a clear, fascinating presentation of the evidences for the bodily resurrection of Christ. Writing in a perfectly delightful narrative style, the author makes the various lines of evidence converge to establish the historic fact of the empty tomb and the bodily resurrection of Christ as the only adequate explanation for the story of the empty tomb and the appearances of Jesus.

The original intention of the author of this book was to write a monograph on the life of Jesus and "strip it of its overgrowth of primitive beliefs and dogmatic suppositions to see this supremely great person as he really was." Higher (Destructive) Criticism had left him with grave doubt concerning the trustworthiness of the Gospel records. Modern science had convinced him that true Christianity was non-miraculous. But having a deep and reverent regard for the person of Christ and possessed of a desire to satisfy his own mind as to who

Jesus really was, the author began a study of the last seven days of the life of Jesus on earth. The last seven days of Christ's life were taken because this period seemed to him remarkably free from the miraculous, all the Gospel writers manifested striking agreement in what they narrated, and political consequences and a vast literature growing out of the trial and death of Jesus established these events as historical. Here if anywhere he felt he would find the real Jesus. After a prolonged study of the last seven days of the life of Christ, Mr. Morrison became fully convinced, as he testifies by way of conclusion to his treatise, that "there certainly is a profoundly historical basis for that much disputed sentence in the Apostles' Creed—the *third day* He rose again from the dead."

The chapter which answers most specifically the question of the treatise is the chapter "The Witness of the Great Stone." In this chapter the author exhausts all the possibilities for answers to the question of his treatise *Who Moved the Stone?* In answering the most plausible of the naturalistic answers to this question; namely, that Joseph of Arimathea and helpers removed the body the night of the crucifixion, the author replies why should Joseph conceal such a legal and natural proceeding and how is it that the men who helped Joseph did not declare what they knew when a few weeks later Jerusalem was ringing with the claim that Jesus had risen. A supernatural explanation alone remains adequate to account for the empty tomb.

Although not seriously detracting from the value of this splendid book—there is one point at least where evangelicals will be disappointed and grieved with the author. Mr. Morrison rejects the fact that it was an angel that met the women at the tomb and asserts it "was a young man in the original story" as found in Mark. His theory is that the angels of Matthew and Luke are simply later accretions. Knowing that the Scriptures clearly set forth the angels as men we can see no reason for supposing that the "young man" of the Marcan narrative was not an angel. But the book will edify the Christian student and prove most worthy of being highly recommended to students who are in doubt and unbelief.

C. K. CUMMINGS.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### THE TRIUMPH OF JOHN AND BETTY STAM

*Mrs. Howard Taylor. Published by The China Inland Mission, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Prices—fifty and seventy-five cents. Headquarters will be glad to handle orders of students.*

This splendid little book on the life of John and Betty Stam is in a large measure a compilation of the letters of John and Betty Stam and the numerous poems written by Betty Stam. Mrs. Taylor in writing this life of the recent martyrs has contributed a book which may well anticipate the same popularity and blessing which her *Borden of Yale '09* received.

The thing that leaves the deepest impression on the mind and heart of the reader is not the horrible blood thirsty death which John and Betty Stam experienced. It is the calm, triumphant, even joyous way in which they met this cruel death. Nor was this calm mustered on a moments notice. Rather it was the natural result of their humble and Godly walk with Jesus Christ since the time when each had accepted the Lord—throughout business and school—"that in all things Christ might be glorified, whether by life or by death." The reader

is impressed with the consistency of their Christian lives, which was so clearly evidenced in the manner of their death. And in answer to the question why God required their lives we find an intimation of an answer in the lines from Betty's *Song of Sending*:

"That man I need to move the world  
Who gives Me all, to Me his all."

For, as Mrs. Taylor writes, "Sacrifice in carrying out the divine purposes of redemption sets free the great reserves of divine power and love."

Every evangelical student will find this book most profitable and enjoyable reading and we cannot but wish for it the widest possible circulation.

M. H. CUMMINGS.

## NEWS OF THE LEAGUE

**TWO NEW CHAPTERS APPLY FOR LEAGUE MEMBERSHIP.** Since the April issue of *The Evangelical Student*, groups at the University of Georgia and at Converse College have applied for membership in the League of Evangelical Students. The group at the University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, will number about seven when they begin functioning this academic year. The group at Converse College, Spartanburg, S. C., is a trifle smaller than this, but gives promise of a wholesome growth. The Executive Committee of the League has voted these two groups into membership subject to the approval of the eleventh annual Convention of the League. The Southland is proving a very fertile territory for the Field Secretary to plant the League's testimony to the Gospel.

\* \* \* \* \*

**WESTMINSTER SEMINARY STUDENTS TOUR COLLEGES OF NEW ENGLAND STATES.** Between September eighteenth and October second, four students from Westminster Seminary made a tour of fifteen colleges in the New England States. All the League Chapters in the States of Maine, Massachusetts, and Connecticut were given a strong evangelical message. The visits to the colleges where there are no League Chapters were most profitable because the students had received the names of numerous evangelical students attending these institutions before departing for the trip. This made it possible to contact the strongest evangelical students on the campus. A fuller report of this splendid trip will appear in the next issue of *The Evangelical Student*. It is hoped that the coming academic year will be one in which every Chapter of the League will engage in carrying the League's testimony to the Gospel to adjacent colleges. Only thus can the League's testimony experience a steady growth.

\* \* \* \* \*

**WRITING OF THE PROGRAM OF STUDY BEGINS.** During the summer months the Committee on the Program of Study made considerable progress in formulating their plans for editing and publishing a four year course of study for League Chapters in America. It has been decided that, as God supplies the needs, the Committee, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees and the eleventh Annual Convention, will publish the program of study in the form of a Quarterly in combination with *The Evangelical Student*. It is felt that this



will be an attractive, popular, and very economical form of publication. The character of the studies will be a combination of solid Bible study and a presentation of a full system of Christian doctrine. Outstanding students from every seminary in the League will be engaged to write on the assigned subjects. The writers for the first year of the program of study have been selected and all have very graciously accepted. They are: Rev. Horace Wood—graduate of Eastern Baptist Seminary—Life of Christ—studies in the Gospel of Luke; Rev. Egbert Andrews—graduate of Westminster Seminary—the Gospel of John; Rev. Henry Stob—graduate of Calvin Seminary and studying under a fellowship at Hartford Seminary—The Nature and Works of God; Rev. Robert Strong, Th.M.—received his masters in Theology from the University of California and is a graduate of Westminster Seminary—Revelation; Rev. Joseph Young—at present studying abroad under a fellowship from Westminster Seminary will write on Inspiration; and the Field Secretary of the League will write the introductory chapters. It is hoped that the manuscripts may be ready for the approval of the Board of Trustees and the eleventh Annual Convention so that the program of study may be available for the academic year of 1936-37. Every student should be much in prayer for those who will be writing for the program of study. There is probably nothing more daily needed in the work of the League than a program of study. Any suggestions will be gratefully received.

\* \* \* \* \*

**AVAILABLE MATERIAL FOR PROGRAM OF STUDY.** For the academic year 1935-36 the following material is available for use as a program of study:

A prepared course of study of Bible Doctrine by Dr. Lawrence Gilmore.

*Christianity and Liberalism*—J. Gresham Machen.

*What Is Faith*—J. Gresham Machen.

All of these will afford most profitable and interesting material for use in meetings of the League. They may be obtained free of charge. The books by Dr. Machen may be secured by writing directly to him, 206 S. 13th St., Philadelphia, Pa. The course of study by Dr. Gilmore will be sent upon request of the local chapter to Headquarters.

\* \* \* \* \*

**FOUR LEAGUE MEMBERS GIVE RADIO BROADCAST.** On April 3, 1935, four members of the League of Evangelical Students at Princeton University broadcasted over Station WMCA their replies to the questions propounded by Erling C. Olsen. The broadcast has been published in pamphlet form under the title of *The Challenge of Christ on a Modern University Campus*. In addition to sending forth their definitely Christian testimony, a word of testimony to the League of Evangelical Students is also given. Copies of the broadcast are available from Headquarters.

\* \* \* \* \*

**STUDENTS FAVOR LEAGUE AT COLUMBIA SEMINARY—FACULTY OPPOSES.** A large majority of the students at Columbia Seminary, Decatur, Georgia, signed a petition requesting faculty sanction for the formation of the League on their campus. The faculty, with the exception of Dr. W. Childs Robinson, opposed this petition. The Board of Trustees to whom the matter

was then referred voted "no action." It is hoped that the students will understand that according to the Constitution of the League it is not necessary to have the official sanction of the faculty in order for them to be constituted as a Chapter of the League. All that is necessary is for three students who subscribe to the doctrinal position of the League to send in their application for membership in the League. It is entirely in the power of the League Executive Committee and Convention to determine whether this group shall be recognized as a League Chapter. May the Lord lead very definitely in the decisions these students must now make.

\* \* \* \* \*

**LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS IN CHINA SPONSORS TWO SUMMER CONFERENCES.** From the Field Secretary of the League of Evangelical Students in China comes the following report:

"Dear Readers:

"I am glad to tell all members of the League in the world that the League in China will have two Conferences this summer. One is to be held at Taian, Shantung. The other is to be held at Hangchow, Chekiang. The date for Hangchow is the first week of August, for Taian the last week of June. Those who have travelled in China will know that these two places are the best scenic grounds. Hangchow has the famous West Lake, Taian has the famous mountain Tai Shan. We wish all students who attend the Conferences may have the best spirit and receive blessings from God. Your prayers are much appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

JONATHAN HSU."

\* \* \* \* \*

**RECENT ACTIVITIES OF THE FIELD SECRETARY.** 1—Institutions visited: University of Washington (Maryland), West Chester State Normal, Vassar College, University of Delaware, Upsala College, Bloomfield College and Seminary, New York University, Columbia University, Biblical Seminary in New York, New Jersey College for Women, National Bible Institute, University of Cincinnati, and God's Bible School, Cincinnati.

2—Audiences to whom the testimony of the League was presented: Radio audience of WKRC, Cincinnati; First Christian Reformed Church, Cincinnati; Calvary Baptist Church, New York; Burlington Presbyterian Church, New Jersey; Hamilton Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian Union Service, Baltimore; Beacon Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia; Senior Class of Stony Brook School; Adult Bible Class of Covenant First Presbyterian Church, Cincinnati; People's Tabernacle, New York; and Eastlake Presbyterian Church, Wilmington.

3—Places visited for contacts with evangelical college students or prospective college students: Stony Brook School for Boys; Keswick College Student Conference; and Montrose Young People's Conference.

4—Executed duties as Chairman of the Committee for the Program of Study.

5—Conducted Summer Bible School of Forest Park Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, and engaged in summer preaching at the Burlington Presbyterian Church, New Jersey.

6—By consent of the Executive Committee the Field Secretary went into partnership with the League in purchasing a car for his travelling as Field

Secretary of the League. This will facilitate his traveling and will be more economical since he could not procure a "clergy" railroad ticket.

7—By permission of the Executive Committee the Field Secretary will use a portion of his apartment for his office at a rate less than the committee had voted to pay for an office for Headquarters. The Reformed Episcopal Seminary will continue to serve as Headquarters of the League.

\* \* \* \* \*

## EVANGELICAL STUDENT MOVEMENTS ABROAD

### THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS.

On September 3-9, there was held at Stockholm, Sweden, the second Conference of "The International Conference of Evangelical Students." The purposes of this movement as set forth in their Constitution are: "to unite and strengthen the National Evangelical Unions; to seek by all means amongst students in all the countries of the world to stimulate personal faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and to further evangelical work, but nothing in this clause or elsewhere in this Constitution contained shall be so construed as to give any power of the Conference or its Committees in any way to control the activities of the National Evangelical Unions, which shall remain autonomous." The movement appears to be sponsored largely by the Inter-Varsity Fellowship. Just how this group will function and whether the problems of distance and differences of approach can be overcome remains to be seen. According to one of the leaders of the movement the main function of this Conference will be to organize evangelical unions among students in other countries. We shall await with interest to learn what the affiliation of these new groups will be. Will they be called by the name of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship? If so, the movement is really nothing more than The Inter-Varsity Fellowship and could hardly be considered as a distinctly separate movement.

\* \* \* \* \*

### INTERNATIONAL CALVINISTIC STUDENT MOVEMENT—THE HAGUE.

From The Hague comes the following communication:

"For the last twenty years there has existed in Holland a Calvinistic Students movement comprising about 600 students of different Universities and Colleges.

For five years this movement possessed an international Committee, which had to prepare an international Organization of Calvinistic Students. The leading thought of this Committee is, that all Calvinistic Students in all countries must unite in one great World-Organization. Nowhere better than in the World of Students is there to be found an opportunity to prove in a practical way the international character of Calvinism.

Our Committee tried to make a beginning. We looked up addresses and we corresponded with different persons in foreign countries. So in the course of the years there grew up a most friendly correspondence between us and the various leaders of Calvinistic Students in other countries. At the same time we tried to get a more intimate contact with such like groups by issuing a cyclostyled correspondence paper: *The International Student Paper*. From the beginning this had to be a really international paper with columns for all countries connected. Just by issuing such a common paper we think we shall the sooner come to an international organization. This paper later on was printed, so as to

increase its value also externally. Liberally distributed in foreign countries as it was, this paper however did not lead to the results wished for. It was read with much interest as we hear, but the idea that it should be at the same time the own paper of the Calvinistic movement in each country, we have not been able to rouse. With sufficient co-operation from other countries, we can continue our work. We should like to have your opinion in this matter and we wish to put the following questions to you:

1. What is your opinion about an international organization of Calvinistic students?

2. As a beginning, what do you think of editing an international paper? And what should be its contents?

3. Do you consider it possible to get your country interested for this idea? If so, will you co-operate? Or can you give us the names of others, who eventually may co-operate?

4. Is there in your country an organization of Calvinistic students? At what address?

5. Are you willing to act as co-editor of such a new paper? Or can you give us the name of any other person, whom you should consider suitable?

6. Are you prepared to help us in any way? (e. g. by making propaganda for, or by sending in contributions to such new paper, etc.)"

Calvanistic members of the League will be interested in linking up with this movement.

---

*ERRATA—In the April issue of "The Evangelical Student" certain serious errors, some typographical and others not. The following corrections should be observed:*

*P. 31 reads "Sociology." Should read Soteriology.*

*Inside of Back Cover—Reads "Michigan University." Should read—"Michigan State College. The name of Harvard University is omitted.*

*These errors, whether by the printer or by the editor are deeply regretted. It is hoped this acknowledgment will prevent any serious misunderstandings.*

---

## OUR GRATITUDE

For the first time in five years *The Evangelical Student* has appeared three times in one year. We cannot but express our gratitude to God and the friends He has sent us for the gifts that have made this possible. It becomes more evident each year that the printed page is a most effective way of propagating Christianity among college students. It is our wish and prayer that this regularity of publication may in the Providence of God continue. Only as God's people become more faithful can *The Evangelical Student* continue to go forth regularly to America's most sadly neglected field of missionary enterprise—the student-world.

### BOOK LIST

Here is a list of references which the *Cambridge Inter-Collegiate Christian Union Review* published in its Summer Term Issue, 1928. The compilation is the work of the Rev. R. Wright Hay, Secretary of the Bible League. It is reprinted, without change, for the value it may have for students who seek just such works as those listed, in their own study and in their efforts to deal with their fellow-students:

- How to Study the English Bible*, by Girdlestone.
- The Superhuman Origin of the Bible*, by Henry Rogers.
- Theopneustia—the Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scripture*, by Gausson.
- The Bible and Modern Criticism*, by Sir Robert Anderson.
- The Bible or the Church?* by Sir Robert Anderson.
- The Epistle to the Romans*, by H. C. G. Moule.
- What is Faith?* by Gresham Machen.
- Christianity and Liberalism*, by Gresham Machen.
- The Origin of Paul's Religion*, by Gresham Machen.
- Studies in the Book of Daniel*, by Dr. Dick Wilson.
- The Visions and Prophecies of Zechariah*, by David Baron.
- Horæ Evangelicæ*, by Canon Birks.
- Modern Ideas of Evolution*, by Sir J. W. Dawson.
- Evolution at the Bar*, by Philip Mauro.
- The Bankruptcy of Evolution*, by Harold Morton.
- The Religion of a Man of Science*, by Howard A. Kelly.
- The Offerings Made Like Unto the Son of God*, by W. S. Moule.
- Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies*, by Sayce.
- Many Infallible Proofs*, by Pierson.
- The Gospel and Its Ministry*, by Sir Robert Anderson.
- Doctor Doctorum*, by Girdlestone.
- Outlines of Christian Doctrine*, by Moule.
- The Divine Unity of the Scriptures*, by Saphir.
- The New Biblical Guide*, by Urquhart.
- Inspiration and Revelation*, by Burgar.

# CHAPTER DIRECTORY of the LEAGUE of EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

---

- ALBANY COLLEGE,  
Albany, Oregon.
- ASHLAND COLLEGE,  
Ashland, Ohio.
- BEAVER COLLEGE,  
Jenkintown, Pennsylvania.
- BLOOMFIELD COLLEGE AND THEOLOGICAL  
SEMINARY,  
Bloomfield, New Jersey.
- BOSTON UNIVERSITY,  
Boston, Massachusetts.
- UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA,  
Vancouver, British Columbia.
- JOHN BROWN UNIVERSITY,  
Siloam Springs, Arkansas.
- CALVIN COLLEGE,  
Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- CALVIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,  
Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- COLUMBIA BIBLE COLLEGE,  
Columbia, South Carolina.
- CONVERSE COLLEGE,  
Spartanburg, S. C.
- CORNELL UNIVERSITY,  
Ithaca, New York.
- UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE,  
Newark, Delaware.
- EASTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMI-  
NARY,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEGE,  
Wollaston, Massachusetts.
- EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE,  
Dallas, Texas.
- GENEVA COLLEGE,  
Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania.
- UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA,  
Athens, Georgia.
- GORDON COLLEGE OF THEOLOGY AND  
MISSIONS,  
Boston, Massachusetts.
- HAMPDEN-SYDNEY COLLEGE,  
Hampden-Sydney, Va.
- HARVARD UNIVERSITY,  
Cambridge, Mass.
- HAVERFORD COLLEGE,  
Haverford, Pennsylvania.
- JOHNS HOPKINS TRAINING SCHOOL,  
Baltimore, Maryland.
- KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,  
Pittsburg, Kansas.
- KINGSTON BIBLE COLLEGE,  
Kingston, Nova Scotia.
- LAFAYETTE COLLEGE,  
Easton, Pennsylvania.
- LEHIGH UNIVERSITY,  
Bethlehem, Pa.
- UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE,  
Louisville, Kentucky.
- MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE,  
East Lansing, Michigan.
- UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,  
Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE,  
Chicago, Illinois.
- MUSKINGUM COLLEGE,  
New Concord, Ohio.
- NATIONAL BIBLE INSTITUTE,  
New York, New York.
- NORTHWESTERN BIBLE SCHOOL,  
Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA,  
Norman, Oklahoma.
- UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- PHILADELPHIA COLLEGE OF PHARMACY  
AND SCIENCE,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,  
Princeton, New Jersey.
- QUEENS-CHICORA COLLEGE,  
Charlotte, North Carolina.
- REFORMED EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL  
SEMINARY,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL  
SEMINARY,  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- SHIPPENSBURG STATE TEACHERS  
COLLEGE,  
Shippensburg, Pennsylvania.
- SIoux FALLS COLLEGE,  
Sioux Falls, South Dakota.
- TEMPLE UNIVERSITY,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON,  
Seattle, Washington.
- VASSAR COLLEGE,  
Poughkeepsie, New York.
- WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,  
Holland, Michigan.
- WESTMINSTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- WHEATON COLLEGE,  
Wheaton, Illinois.
- WILSON COLLEGE,  
Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.