

THE FREE PRESS

VOL. I - No. 4

1630 S. Hanover St., Baltimore 30, Md.

January 26, 1956

The Resolution About the "Gathering of Power"

Are We Grasping for Power?

The December issue of the *Bible Presbyterian Observer* features on its front page a resolution deploring "the recent series of actions indicating a gathering of power on the part of a certain group." It then lists seven specifications to show this alleged "gathering of power." Do the specifications actually prove what is alleged or do they fall short of proving it? Let us examine them briefly:

"1. *The removal of Dr. Robert G. Rayburn from the presidency of Highland College.*"

How does this specification join with the six following ones? Does it join at all? It is actually without any definite relation to them. As a matter of fact no individual whatsoever who is prominently connected with any two of the other six specifications can reasonably be said to have had an active part in the removal of Dr. Rayburn from the presidency of Highland College.

"2. *The attack on the Secretary of the Committee on National Missions and the attack on the Committee itself made at the 1955 Synod.*"

Personally, I must confess that I find it difficult to see how the fact that someone raises questions at a Synod meeting about the advisability of continuing a certain man as head of a Synod-controlled agency is evidence of a "gathering of power." We are frequently told that the only "democratic" way is to have all agencies controlled by Synod because then every question about them can be properly handled. It is rather strange when people who advance that sort of argument against independent agencies should become indignant at the raising of questions in Synod about the actions of a Synod-controlled agency. If Synod is really to control agencies, one would think that people would be en-

The next issue will carry the answer to the question of where and how this trouble began, with extensive quotations and excerpts from the files of Highland College and others. The proof of the "underground" will be presented and how it worked. The infiltration and intrigue reached even into Dr. McIntire's own office.

couraged to raise questions about them there, in order that these questions might be objectively and dispassionately examined, and thoroughly discussed. One would think that such questions would at least be referred to a special committee for careful and thorough investigation. The evening meeting at which these questions were raised was the only session of the 18th Synod at which I was not present in person. I was told, however, by various men who were there that the questions that were raised about the National Missions Committee were swept

aside without any detailed examination, and that a vote of confidence in the Secretary of the Committee was given by acclamation.

My personal knowledge is insufficient to make a full determination as to the rights and wrongs of the particular questions about the actions of the Committee on National Missions, or its Secretary, which were raised at Synod. It does impress me, however, that the way they were treated strongly reinforces my contention, that a system of "Synod-controlled agencies" is quite sure eventually to become an agency-controlled Synod. It would take at least a week for any Synod fairly to examine the questions that might legitimately be raised about any agency. Now that Synod has four such agencies, instead of one, as during most of our history, any such fair examination of questions about them at Synod would be clearly impossible. Either the agencies move on without any control at all, or Synod controls them through becoming an agency-controlled Synod. Yet it is truly amazing, isn't it, that the mere fact that questions were raised at Synod about one of its agencies should be listed as an evidence of "a gathering of power."

"3. *The formation of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions, with the methods tending to undermine the work of faithful pastors and bring division in many local churches.*"

How is it a sign of a "gathering of power" when a group of Bible Presbyterians decides to form an agency for the spread of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and for the winning of new supporters to Bible Presbyterian principles?

Some have even gone so far as to call the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions a "spite" board. If I had the slightest reason to believe that any such charge were true, I would have had nothing to do with the forming of

(Continued on page 2)

WHY INCREASE OF SYNOD-CONTROLLED BOARDS AND AGENCIES IS UNDESIRABLE

1. Such a development was one of the things that led to its becoming necessary for us to separate from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

2. This development is a definite step in the direction of prelacy, which is the type of church government to which Presbyterians have been most strongly and constantly opposed.

3. This development is contrary to original Presbyterianism, being practically unknown before 1790, and without any real warrant in the Westminster Confession or Form of Government, or in the original Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

4. The Bible nowhere commands such agencies, nor does it give evidence of the existence of similar procedures in apostolic times.

5. Synod-controlled agencies by their very nature tend to inefficiency.

6. This existence of Synod-controlled boards and agencies makes it difficult for the Synod to carry on the work which properly belongs to it.

7. Synod-controlled boards and agencies inevitably lead to the development of harmful ecclesiastical machines.

The articles on pages 1 to 6 were written by Dr. Allan A. MacRae, president of the Faculty of Faith Theological Seminary, and those on pages 11 to 24 are by Dr. Carl McIntire.

The Resolution . . .

(Continued from page 1)

this Board, nor would I have accepted its presidency. I believe that it is our duty to use every possible legitimate means to spread the Gospel, to lead people out of apostate churches, and to form truly Biblical churches of Christ. I thoroughly disbelieve in any sort of monopoly. I pray daily for God's blessing on every agency that is working for the accomplishment of these purposes.

Some people may think one type of organization is more effective; some may prefer another. Why should not each support the one which he thinks most likely to be effective, and pray for all? Let's quit talking about a non-existent "gathering of power," and spend our time advancing the Lord's work through such agencies as each of us may choose. If someone is to dictate to us which agencies we must support, that is nothing but monopoly. The very fact that the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions should have been subjected to such attacks as have been made against it is proof that a monopolistic thought-pattern was becoming established.

I find the second part of the specification rather confusing. As president of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions I am thoroughly familiar with all the methods it has used. I know of nothing it has done which could properly be described by the terms used in this resolution. If I had ANY reason to suspect that such methods were being employed, I would have quit the Board long ago.

A certain amount of division inevitably occurs, when two agencies compete for support. Yet each church and each individual has a right to hear the facts and to decide for himself how he wants to apportion his contributions. The alternative is totalitarian control, and eventually this always means stagnation. Let's not try to stop disagreement and competition, but let's keep the competition friendly.

"4. The displacement of the Rev. Linwood G. Gebb and the Rev. Hayes T. Henry from the Board of Faith Theological Seminary, and their replacement with three men all of whom are members of the new Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions."

Why does a board hold an election? Is it required automatically to re-elect all of its members? Or is it more proper that its members examine those who are up for re-election, to determine whether they should be re-elected? When a man has been on a board for many years, the board may perhaps be excused for con-

tinuing him without feeling it necessary to reinvestigate his fitness each time. When, however, a man has served only one term as a member of a self-perpetuating board, the other members would be remiss in their duty if they did not consider carefully whether it was best to re-elect him.

In this case, the two men mentioned had been members of the Seminary board only one term. During this term the Board had met six times; one of the members had attended only one of these six meetings, the other had attended none at all. In addition, the man who attended no meetings of the Board had recently published a statement in a letter broadcast throughout the Church in which he said, "I have no confidence in independent boards." Under the circumstances it would be rather strange if members of the Board should vote to re-elect the two men. Failure to do so is in no sense an evidence of a "gathering of power."

"5. The displacement of Dr. Flournoy Shepperson, Sr., and Dr. Robert G. Rayburn on the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, and the election to the board of nine persons, all nominated by adherents of this particular group in the Bible Presbyterian Church."

Again we ask the question, Are members of a board simply rubber stamps who are expected automatically to re-elect each other? Is it not rather the duty of a member of a board to consider each person up for election and to determine for himself whether the election or re-election of that person is for the best interests of the particular board? In this case, one of the men who was not re-elected had issued a statement in which it was repeatedly asserted that independent agencies are not Presbyterian, but Congregational. How can a man hold such a view and still expect to be re-elected to an independent board for Presbyterian foreign missions. The other man had sent a statement throughout the denomination as a sample for adoption by various churches in which it was maintained that failure to stand by every particular viewpoint that might be supported by a majority of those present at a Synod meeting, would be evidence that a man was unfaithful to his ordination vows. If this were true, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions should have been dissolved as soon as it was formed! Full details of these positions are contained in the excellent statement prepared by the three leading officers of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and reprinted elsewhere in this issue of *The Free Press*.

"6 The dismissal of Dr. J. Oliver Bus-

well, Jr., from the presidency of Shelton College."

How does this show a "gathering of power"? Shelton College is an interdenominational institution. Its bylaws require that no more than five of the members of its Board be from any one denomination. Aside from Dr. Buswell, only four of its members are Bible Presbyterians. The members of the Board declare before God that Bible Presbyterian problems had nothing to do with the dismissal of Dr. Buswell.

It might well be asked, what is the function of the Board of Trustees of a college? Are they supposed simply to meet and approve whatever the president requests? Or, are they superior to him? Is it not their function to survey his activities and to decide how long they feel his continuance in office to be for the best interests of the college?

A man may be God's man for the direction of a college at one time. Five years later, changes in his attitude or in the situation of the college may make it evident that his continuance is no longer for the best interests of the college. If trustees are to perform their normal and proper functions, it is their duty to face this question squarely and to make their decision upon it. When the Board of Trustees of an interdenominational college unanimously decides that it is time for a change in its presidency, it is ridiculous to consider this as evidence of a "gathering of power" on the part of a small group of Bible Presbyterians.

The *Bible Presbyterian Observer* for December, 1955, contains more than ten columns by Dr. Buswell answering the Resolution of the Trustees terminating his employment. Much of what he says relates to details of the business management of the college. No one could make a proper judgment as to the rights and wrongs of this discussion without spending many hours investigating the matter personally at first hand, and also cross-examining witnesses. It is the function of the Trustees to make these investigations and to decide regarding them. They have spent many hours prayerfully doing this, and have unanimously reached a conclusion. The Board contains consecrated Christian leaders from various denominations. When they reach a unanimous decision on such a matter, it is ridiculous to describe their action as a "gathering of power."

Those who desire to make all agencies in the Bible Presbyterian Church Synod-controlled hold that in a matter like this Synod itself should decide. Is it ever likely that Synod would take the days and weeks necessary to investigate all the details of such a matter, so

(Continued on page 4)

Who Is Raising Dissension in The Bible Presbyterian Church?

The three issues of the *Bible Presbyterian Observer* which have appeared to date all contain as a reason for their publication the statement that some brethren "now regularly publish articles attacking the activities of this Synod," adding that "the activities of these men will disrupt the peace and unity of our church." Let us examine the facts of the matter.

Those who desire the Bible Presbyterian Synod to return to the attitude which it followed during the first 16 years of its existence have thus far published three issues of *The Free Press* (June 30, 1955, July 28, 1955, and August 25, 1955). Those who seem to be endeavoring to bring everything under rigid control of Synod have published and widely circulated throughout the Church two special issues of *The Bible Press* (July 22 and September 9, 1955), a pamphlet entitled "The Ideological Division Within Our Church," by Messrs. Rayburn, Bunzel, and Lyons, and three issues of the *Bible Presbyterian Observer* (October, November, and December, 1955, with an issue already announced for January, 1956). Thus, one side has circulated six extensive publications and the other only three. Who is it who is disturbing the peace and unity of our Church by regularly publishing inflammatory material?

"CHRISTIAN LIFE" GIVEN FALSE INFORMATION ABOUT FIRST "FREE PRESS"

Someone gave the magazine, *Christian Life*, false information about the first issue of *The Free Press*. That magazine stated on p. 46 of its October, 1955, issue:

"McIntire countered by creating a 'Committee for True Presbyterianism.' It promptly published Issue No. 1 of a new paper, *The Free Press*. In it were six articles by Dr. Allan MacRae, head of Faith Theological Seminary, attacking church-controlled boards and agencies as wrong, unscriptural and unconstitutional."

Anyone who will take the trouble to read the first issue of *The Free Press* (which may be obtained from the Committee on True Presbyterianism), will find that I never said that Synod-controlled agencies are unconstitutional. I never mentioned this particular question. Our constitution clearly PERMITS them. It does not REQUIRE them.

I never said that Synod-controlled agencies are unscriptural. What I said

WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF THE ATTACKS UPON AGENCIES AND MEN WHOM GOD HAS GREATLY USED?

A woman in the East who last summer entertained a visitor from the West, recently received a letter, in the course of which this lay member of one of our churches said:

"When Dr. McIntire spoke here [San Francisco] in October, he awakened the people to such a degree that there has been a 'rumbling in the mulberry bushes' since. It was indeed a masterpiece, and was doing good to an appreciable extent; then lo and behold on the heels of that awakening comes a scathing pamphlet from a MacNair in St. Louis. Members of all B.P. congregations, regardless of their status as a Christian, received one and it was some of these babes in Christ that left the fold and returned to wallow in the mire of modernism again. . . ."

"When the Miller family from New Zealand visited our church, he said we had no idea of the extent and good will of Dr. McIntire's work internationally even."

Thus the result of these widely published attacks becomes apparent. Christ's little ones are suffering. People are being driven back into the apostasy instead of being led out of it. The effects of great addresses, mightily used of God for the advance of His cause, are being offset and injured.

was clearly stated, and reads as follows: "The Bible nowhere commands such agencies, nor does it give evidence of the existence of similar procedures in apostolic times."

I never said that Synod-controlled agencies are wrong. I said that they are unwise. Facts and logic pointing clearly to this conclusion were developed at length in the various articles included in *The Free Press*. They were summarized in a box on page 9, which is reproduced on page 1 of this issue.

"Lift not up your horn on high: speak not with a stiff neck. For promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south. But God is the judge: he putteth down one, and setteth up another" (Psa. 75:5-7).

But Did Not the First Issue of "The Free Press" Start It All?

It is true that the first *Free Press* was published before any of the other literature mentioned above. We would like to urge people, however, to reread the first *Free Press* and compare it with any one of the special issues of *The Bible Press* or of the *Bible Presbyterian Observers* which have appeared. These latter constantly deal with personalities. They incessantly imply that honored leaders of our Church are grasping for power. They quote with approval wholesale denunciation of the agency for the spread of the Gospel of which I am president, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions.

What a contrast there is between such publications and the first issue of *The Free Press*! It was a sober, quiet, almost academic examination of a matter of principle dealing from a viewpoint of careful reasoning with the question whether it is wise to proceed with the type of organization which has characterized our Synod during most of its history, or to veer sharply away in the direction of an entirely different type of organization. It attacked no personalities whatsoever. It did not criticize the activities of any individual or group of individuals. It did not accuse any individuals of "grasping for power." It pointed rather to certain developments which have come in other churches, which are sure to follow any sharp increase in the number of Synod-controlled agencies of our own Church. It neither said nor implied that these results had already appeared.

It would be difficult to imagine my surprise and dismay when this attempt to discuss a matter of principle on a basis of evidence and logic was answered by the issuance of a series of publications blasting me and my friends, and accusing us of "grasping for power." The first special issue of *The Bible Press* (July 22, 1955) accused me of misusing terms, being naive, indulging in "unconscionable distortion of fact"; the second special issue of *The Bible Press* declared that *The Free Press* was "free from responsibility to the Church," "free from facts," free "from balance," etc. "The Ideological Division Within Our Church" declared that independent agencies are not Presbyterian but Congregational. Thus such a program has gone on. Brethren, is this honoring to the Lord? If I could believe that the first *Free Press* contained anything which could reasonably be thought of as warranting such results, I would be filled

(Continued on page 5)

The Resolution . . .

(Continued from page 2)

as to reach a fair and objective decision on the basis of facts properly ascertained? An answer to this question may perhaps be gathered from the fact that when Dr. McIntire, at the 18th General Synod, raised a few questions about the fitness of the Secretary of the Committee on National Missions, his questions were pushed aside by acclamation. No time was taken to investigate them; they were not even so much as referred to a committee. Instead, the second item of this Resolution describes his raising of these questions in Synod as an action indicating a "gathering of power."

"7. The fact that faculty members of Shelton College have been ordered to refrain from expressing criticisms of the Board in the Buswell matter."

How does this alleged action show a "gathering of power"? It seems rather strange for an administrative agency to be criticized for expecting its employees to refrain from agitating against it. After the New York Central Railroad made a change in its presidency, no member of its administrative staff would have considered himself at liberty to agitate among the employees and among the customers of the railroad against this decision of its directors. Some of the railroad officials chose to resign rather than to work for the new president. This was their right. It surely would not have been considered to be their right to remain in its employ while at the same time agitating against decisions which its governing board had already made. The same is true of all administrative organizations of any type whatsoever:

Consistency is rare. Here is a magazine which promotes a resolution criticizing an administrative agency for expecting its employees to refrain from agitating against it while still remaining in its employ. Yet the same magazine prints with approval, as a pattern for widespread adoption, a resolution which declares that every Bible Presbyterian minister and elder is duty-bound to stand by and support every particular viewpoint espoused by a majority of any Synod. In any administrative agency, the members are expected loyally to support the controlling center of authority. A Synod is an organization of quite a different type. No Synod has any power to bind a succeeding Synod or to issue commands binding upon its members, except, of course, for such members as are directly employed by it, or are working in agencies under its control.

A simple illustration might be helpful. A member of the Congress of the United States has a right to agitate for

JAMES E. BENNET AND SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, CHARLES E. WILSON— BOTH SUBJECTED TO SAME SORT OF MISREPRESENTATION

Most Americans will remember the clever political method that was used to attack Secretary of Defense Wilson, which even led some Republicans to think that he would have to be dropped from the Cabinet. In connection with some remarks about local unemployment, Wilson expressed his wish that workers in areas of labor surplus might look for employment in areas of labor shortage, saying that he had always admired a hunting dog that would go out and scratch for its food more than a lap dog that would simply sit in the corner and howl. Immediately certain clever and not over-scrupulous politicians headlined his remarks with the statement that he had called workers dogs, and the headline led many people, who did not read far enough to see how false the allegation was, to gain an utterly false view of Wilson's attitude.

It might not be expected that such an unscrupulous trick would be repeated in a religious controversy, so we shall take the charitable attitude of assuming that someone simply made a mistake.

change in any decision that the Congress made, short of doing something that will injure the security of the United States itself. But an officer in the Department of Defense has no right to agitate against the action of Congress in approving the appointment of a new Secretary of Defense, unless he first severs his connection with the Department.

CONCLUSION: No one of the seven specifications in the Resolution really proves a "gathering of power." Nor do they all prove it together. Therefore it remains unproven.

The matters listed remain so diverse from one another that they cannot reasonably be said to constitute a "pattern" of any sort. It is unfortunate that so many fine people, desirous of serving the Lord, should have been led by insistent propaganda, or by unreasoning emotional appeals, to subscribe their names to such a resolution. Let us pray that God will open their eyes to the illogical nature of the Resolution they have signed, and that He will lead them now to turn aside from this attempt to raise dissension and disagreement within our Church. May He cause them instead to rally their support around all agencies that are serving the cause of Christ, and to seek in every possible way to promote the work of the American Council and of the International Council of Christian Churches in their great stand against the terrible apostasy of our day.

(I wish that we might all take this attitude more frequently. I am sure that in our Bible Presbyterian circles honest mistakes are far more frequent than intentional misrepresentation.) It is an interesting, though sad fact, that last summer and fall it was widely stated that Mr. James E. Bennet had compared the younger B.P. ministers to "the fleas on the tail of the dog." This allegation was even repeated in *Christian Life* (issue of October, 1955); though stated in such a way as to imply that it was Dr. McIntire who had made the alleged comparison. All who love truth should feel indebted to the *Bible Presbyterian Observer* of October, 1955, for printing in full the letter by Mr. Bennet on which the allegation was based. When we see what Mr. Bennet actually said, it becomes obvious that he made no derogatory statement about "all the younger men," but only about certain frustrated individuals, such as may be found anywhere—in fact any of us may easily assume these characteristics if we neglect to keep looking to Christ. Mr. Bennet did not say that these men were fleas, or dogs. With more, though insufficient reason, he might be alleged to have called them toads and to have called their churches "puddles"!! He simply used a popular fable or proverb, much as Secretary of Defense Wilson had done, and was similarly, even if unintentionally, misrepresented. What Mr. Bennet actually said (as printed in the *Bible Presbyterian Observer*, October, 1955, p. 6, col. 2) reads as follows:

"These pastors in this second group are big toads in small puddles. What they should do is to try to make the puddle bigger and forget themselves, forget church politics—but it is easier to be super-critical of the bigger and more successful men, who work ten hours a day, in order to accomplish the purposes which the Lord has set out for them. It is always dangerous for the tail to try to wag the dog—and the situation is worse when the flea on the hair of the tail of the dog tries to assume a position of importance."

If a person will lay aside his prejudice and read the above paragraph objectively, he will see that it really contains good, sensible advice. If we would all work "to make the puddle bigger," instead of trying to make ourselves bigger, we would be amazed at the way God would bless. He wants us to forget our own dignity and importance, and, instead, to stretch out our cords, extend our witness, and reach more people with His Gospel. If more of us would adopt the attitude that Mr. Bennet recommended, most of our troubles would disappear.

Synod-controlled Boards---the Channel Through Which Modernism Usually Gains Its Entrance

In the third issue of *The Free Press* I pointed out that agencies begun as Synod-controlled boards usually develop into Synod-controlling boards. It was the boards of the church that led the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. into modernism. It is a well-known fact that the boards and the educational institutions of the Southern Presbyterian Church are today, and have been for a long time, much more liberal than the Church as a whole. It is not the Church that is ruining the boards, but the boards that are leading the Church into apostasy.

Interesting light on this situation is contained in an editorial written by Dr. William Childs Robinson, professor of Church History in Columbia Theological Seminary. This editorial appeared in the July 27, 1955, issue of *The Southern Presbyterian Journal*. Dr. Robinson writes as follows:

ALL SYNODS AND COUNCILS

"may err" . . . "have erred"
"Not to be made the rule of faith or practice."

Yes, that is what our Westminster Confession has to say about our governing courts. We ought to have them. They ought to decide matters of faith and conscience, lay down rules for the worship and government of the church. But these decrees are to be received "if consonant with the Word of God." These courts are not to intermeddle with civil affairs but to handle ecclesiastical concerns. Moreover, they are not to make their own decisions the rule of faith or of practice, but are to be a help in maintaining the Word of God as the rule of faith and practice. The Roman Catholic Church made its canon law to be equal to and in practice superior to the Word of God; but Luther hurled that canon law into the flames at Eyster Gate, Dec. 10, 1520. The true Protestant position is that the Church is not to place her word on a par with the Word of her Lord; she is His servant not His confidential adviser; she is beneath Him,

But Did Not . . .

(Continued from page 3)

with penitence and shame for ever having written it.

FOOTNOTE: Extra copies of the first issue of *The Free Press* are still available while the supply lasts from the Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee for True Presbyterianism.

not equal with Him. He is the only King and the sole Lawgiver in Zion. Accordingly it is neither Presbyterian nor Protestant to insist that a minister pledge himself to everything the church courts may send down for the support of his congregation, nor to ask him, as a condition of entrance into a presbytery, to pledge his support to every individual or cause a presbytery may approve. We respectfully request our esteemed brethren who are pushing such pledges and asking such questions for admission to their respective presbyteries to re-read the Westminster Confession, "Of Synods and Councils," and to re-read the chapter in the Book of Church Order, "Of Christ the King and Head of the Church."

"Remove from me reproach and contempt; for I have kept thy testimonies. Princes also did sit and speak against me; but thy servant did meditate in thy statutes" (Psa. 119:22, 23).

On the last day of the 18th General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, meeting in St. Louis, Mo., there was formed, independent of the Synod, a Committee for True Presbyterianism, by a number of brethren who were seriously concerned by the events of the Synod and the change which had taken place in the Bible Presbyterian Church.

These men included the following: California—R. V. Dickerson, L. G. Gordon, J. E. Janbaz, C. L. Kennedy, J. W. Ludlow, C. M. Worley; Kentucky—F. B. Toms; Maryland—A. G. Slaght; Michigan—C. W. Brogan; Missouri—E. E. Ganz, R. I. Hatch; New Jersey—P. du B. Arcularius, R. E. Baker, C. A. Bancroft, B. J. Bashaw, R. L. Boertzel, J. F. Misicka, A. W. Oldham, E. A. Peters, C. E. Richter, R. S. Wigfield; New Mexico—W. M. Irving, Jr.; North Dakota—E. E. Matteson; Ohio—A. F. Faucette; Pennsylvania—W. H. Clinton, J. G. Holdcroft, A. A. MacRae, J. M. Norris; Tennessee—J. U. S. Toms; Washington—A. B. Hunter.

The purpose of this Committee is to bring information to the members of the Bible Presbyterian Church.

A subcommittee was appointed composed of Allan A. MacRae, Carl McIntire, Albert W. Oldham, Adam B. Hunter, and Arthur G. Slaght.

This publication is issued in pursuance of plans to bring information to the church.

STATEMENT OF "BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN OBSERVER" IN REGARD TO SUPPORT OF SYNOD ACTIONS:

COMMENT BY DR. GRESHAM MACHEN

The November, 1955, issue of the *Bible Presbyterian Observer* quotes with approval a so-called "Greenville Resolution" (reproduced in full in this issue on page 8) in the Statement by Messrs. Holdcroft, Bennet, and Lane). This resolution declares that "obligations taken by every minister and elder at their ordination . . . commit them in solemn obligation . . . if they are to remain true Bible Presbyterians," to "support and abide by the actions of the 18th General Synod," including "(1) a church-controlled paper, (2) formation of a church-controlled college, and (3) endorsement of the present National Missions Committee with its secretary, the Rev. Thomas Cross, as the official home missions agency of the Synod."

It would be interesting to know what the late Dr. J. Gresham Machen would have said about such a resolution as this. Our curiosity on this point, as it happens, can be easily satisfied. Dr. Machen, writing on page 2 of *The Presbyterian Guardian* for May 4, 1936, said with regard to a similar statement:

"The Mandate, by making the support of whatever program of boards and agencies is set up by shifting majority votes in the General Assembly a condition of ordination and of membership in the church, is placing the word of man above the Word of God and is de-throning Jesus Christ."

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write: for these words are true and faithful. And he said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely" (Rev. 21:1-6).

"Agencies Before the Change"

On pages 4 and 5 of the December issue of the *Bible Presbyterian Observer* the membership of several agencies is listed under the above heading. Certain names including my own are placed in bold face type, in order to show how a little group is grasping power.

On examining all the names listed as showing the membership of "Agencies Before the Change," we see that about 85 different names are thus listed. Of these, 14 occur in two different lists and three in three lists. Thirteen of those occurring in two different lists are in ordinary type, and only one name—my own—is printed in bold face. Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., occurs in three lists, but his name is in ordinary type, while mine, which occurs in two lists, is in bold face. Evidently whoever arranged the article considered it to be undesirable for me to be on the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign

Missions as well as on the Board of the institution of which I am president, but perfectly all right for the 13 others to be on two boards and for Dr. Buswell's name to appear on three. Is this sound reasoning?

Dr. Holdcroft's name occurs on three different lists in this spread, to show how a little group is seeking power. Anyone who knows this consecrated man of God knows how absurd it is to levy such a charge against him.

The name of Mr. James E. Bennet appears on four of these lists. There are perhaps a score of other Christian agencies to which Mr. Bennet has given unstintingly of his time and effort. His sound legal advice has meant much to all of them. Many have honored him with the title of vice-president. So far as I know, this is the first time that anyone has ever rewarded his interest in

advancing Christian causes by levying against him the absurd charge that he is seeking power.

The other two names that are printed in bold face are those of Dr. Carl McIntire and the Rev. John W. Murray. God has blessed these two consecrated servants of His with unusual energy and ability. Both of them have accomplished much for the cause of Christ. Any Christian agencies that can persuade either of them to take time from his busy life to help in its work is fortunate indeed. The fact that so many agencies desire their help is a tribute to their ability and consecration.

I have been privileged to know both of these men of God very well. I can say from personal knowledge that the greatest desire of each of them is the progress of the Gospel of Christ, and that nothing is further from their minds than a "gathering of power."

Statement of Officers of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions

Statement by the president, vice-president, and recording secretary of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, 246 W. Walnut Lane, Philadelphia, Pa.

November 11, 1955

Beloved in the Lord:

The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions maintains a distinctive and unique position in the Christian world because of the controversy which brought it into existence and the ecclesiastical fire through which its members went when they were placed on trial by the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. At the annual meeting of the Board, November 8, 1955, certain actions were taken by the Board relative to its historic stand. Because of these, we give a word of testimony.

When it came time to elect members to the Board (the term of approximately one-third of the members expires each fall), Dr. J. Gordon Holdcroft made a statement. He called attention to two documents which had come into existence in recent months, in which he said there were serious questions raised concerning the position of the Board itself by men on the Board. He asked that this whole matter be considered before the Lord. A lengthy discussion followed.

The first document was one entitled, "The Ideological Division Within Our Church," and Dr. Robert G. Rayburn, who was in the class whose terms expired, was one of three men who compiled this document.

The second document was a letter in the *Bible Presbyterian Observer* for November, 1955, involving the Rev. Flournoy Shepperson, whose term also expired.

The Hon. James E. Bennet, vice-president of the Board, took the two documents, read from them to the Board, and said that, had the position maintained in these documents been the position of the brethren at the time they were elected to the Board, the Board would not have elected them.

As a result, the Board declined to reelect these two men to its membership.

This was not an arbitrary or capricious decision. It was based upon considerations which reach down into the very principles upon which the Board was founded. We want to explain this decision to our friends, and, though we deeply regret its necessity, we believe the testimony of the Board's action ought

to strengthen in the minds of the Lord's people their confidence in the Board in its witness to our Presbyterian and Protestant faith.

I.

Dr. Rayburn was present when Mr. Bennet read from the document. He admitted, when questioned, that he had written some of it and agreed to all of it.

The document says: "Therefore, we will have to point out that the conflict is between Synod-controlled agencies and independently-controlled agencies. Someone always has to control everything! This applies to 'independent agencies' as well as to 'Synod agencies.' With that fact in mind, which is Presbyterian—an independent agency controlled by independent men who are responsible to no one but themselves, or an agency which is subject to 'review and control' by the body of which it is a part? And we repeat: we are not objecting to independent agencies as such. *But we are objecting to the attempt to picture independently-controlled agencies as Presbyterian, rather than as Congregational.* (Underlining ours.) When we berate the Modernists for injecting new meanings into old terms, let us not fall into the same error!" (p. 4.)

To this we object. The meaning of the word "Presbyterian" has not been changed. From the very beginning the Independent Board has maintained that it was a Presbyterian Board and that the fact that it was not under the control of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. did not make it un-Presbyterian. However, the Mandate of 1934, directed against the Independent Board, maintained the position that the Board was un-Presbyterian! The charge of "Congregational," "Congregationalism," was constantly made against the men of the Board when the Board was founded and during the time of their ecclesiastical trials.

Again the document (The Ideological Division Within Our Church) says: "However, we point out that Dr. McIntire himself apparently did not argue against the proposition that 'Assembly-controlled boards are Presbyterian' when he was 'still in.' It was only after he and the others had lost control of those 'boards' that they turned from Presbyterianism to independency for a solution." Here then is a reference to the Independent Board itself on the part of Dr. Rayburn. Actually, however, Dr. Mc-

Intire, in his ecclesiastical trial, insisted that members of the Board *remained* Presbyterian, had not turned from it, had not turned to independency or Congregationalism, and that it was in order to help preserve Presbyterianism itself, in its world-wide missionary testimony, that the Board had been established.

The document under discussion, however, still further emphasizes its position in regard to the Independent Board when, in referring to the founding of the Bible Presbyterian Church, it says, "We have said (page 1 of this paper) that the Bible Presbyterian Church is a 'hybrid mixture of Congregationalism and Presbyterianism'" (p. 7).

Surely this is going over to the camp of our opponents. There is, however, more of this, for on page 1 we read: "However, 1938 may have been the year that a hybrid mixture of Congregationalism and Presbyterianism was effected. In fact, our present ideological division became apparent only after men began to recognize the hybrid structure of the Bible Presbyterian Church."

It should be borne in mind that in 1938 there were only two independent agencies in existence which the Bible Presbyterian Church endorsed. First, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions; second, Faith Theological Seminary. The Articles of Association (1937) had mentioned specifically the support of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Thus these "Congregational" agencies became a mixture with Presbyterianism when the Bible Presbyterian Church was founded! This is a reflection upon the Independent Board and all the conflict which it had with the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Now, after eighteen years, the Board is confronted with a new document raising the same question, and of this document one of its members was a joint author and aided not only in its writing but in its wide dissemination throughout the whole church.

The document refers to "Congregationally minded men." It speaks of Dr. McIntire's "Congregationalist point of view" (p. 8). If the Independent Board is not a Presbyterian Board and if it is Congregational, then the U.S.A. Presbyterian Church was right in this particular charge which was made against its members. But, when the Orthodox Presbyterian Church started its own official denominational agency, the minority report maintained that men themselves could be members of the Independent

Board, truly Presbyterian, and yet not actually connected with any particular Synod.

Mr. Bennet read the following from the document: "Let us come to grips with reality, gentlemen! It is these self-perpetuating boards of these independently-controlled agencies, and these one-slate nominations for church council offices, that have already consolidated the 'vested interests' of the Twentieth Century Reformation movement" (p. 4).

Dr. Rayburn said that he believes in "both types" of agencies. Whereupon, reply was made that to produce a document which made the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions a Congregationalist agency rather than a Presbyterian agency represented a position which was not true. To undermine one position while professing to believe in both was an inconsistency which could not be accepted, and which could do and has done the Board much harm, for to urge such views is to advocate the dissolution of the Independent Board; to admit the validity of the argument is to acquiesce in its proposed destruction and agree that from the first it had no right to existence within the framework of a Presbyterian Church and should have been abandoned at its very inception as its U.S.A. Presbyterian foes demanded.

II.

In the case of Dr. Flournoy Shepperson of Greenville, S. C., the situation involved similar questions. A letter to which he was a party took the position of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. regarding the obligation of men under ordination vows to support actions of the General Assembly.

The entire statement as printed with underlining added follows:

"GREENVILLE RESOLUTION"

"Rev. Donald McNair
2143 N. Ballas Road
St. Louis 22, Mo.

"Dear Don:

"The enclosed resolution was passed by the session and by the board of deacons and read to the congregation.

"This may be a pattern that could be used by various churches. The people of the congregation do not have a chance to study all of these things and read all of these documents and so I believe that the official boards should make such a statement to the congregation which elected them.

"I am reading this document to the

congregation tomorrow with some explanations of it.

"With every good wish, I am

"Yours in His faithfulness,
"Flournoy Shepperson

"FS/elr"

"WHEREAS, there has been much confusion concerning the actions of the 18th General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church which met in St. Louis in June, 1955, and many varied and divergent opinions, and much misinformation, therefore it was voted at the meeting of the session of this church, Sept. 5, 1955, that it would stand by the actions of the Synod as required by the form of government of the Bible Presbyterian Church, and that a committee consisting of three elders, namely: C. N. Wallace, Sr., C. D. Couch, and W. J. Patterson, Jr., to work with the pastor in making a statement to the congregation after referring said statement back to the session.

"This Committee, after studying the actions of the 18th General Synod, endorses its stand on (1) a church-controlled paper, (2) formation of a church-controlled college, and (3) endorsement of the present National Missions Committee with its secretary, the Rev. Thomas Cross, as the official home missions agency of the Synod.

"The Committee's decisions about these matters were based on obligations taken by every minister and elder at their ordination. Every elder and minister took vows that commit them in solemn obligation to actions and the government of the church courts, as given in:

"(1) Chapter 12, BOOK OF CHURCH ORDER, paragraph 3, subparagraph (3): 'Do you approve of the government and discipline of the Bible Presbyterian Church?'

"(2) Chapter 13, paragraph 8, subparagraph (4): 'Do you promise to submit yourself 'in the Lord' to the government of this Presbytery, or any other Presbytery in the bounds of which you may be called?'

"It is our sober judgment that this session and church, if they are to remain true Bible Presbyterians, can do no other than support and abide by the actions of the 18th General Synod.

"As our church is sound in the basic doctrines of the Bible, and altogether free of modernism, and will continue to be, and was founded for 'the Word of God and for the testimony of Jesus Christ,' we believe all this dissension over the method of operation is relatively secondary and we should be about the Father's business in propagating the faith and the salvation of souls."

The above letter states the following things: (1) "It [the session] would stand by the actions of the Synod as required by the form of government"; (2) "The Committee's decisions about these matters were based on obligations taken by every minister and elder at their ordination. Every elder and minister took vows that commit them in solemn obligation to actions and the government of the church courts. . . ." (3) "It is our sober judgment that this session and church, if they are to remain true Bible Presbyterians, can do no other than support and abide by the actions of the 18th General Synod."

It must be said that the position maintained in the quotations from this letter is the position of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. against the members of the Independent Board when they stood trial. Mr. Bennet, who was the attorney in Dr. McIntire's trial, pointed out to the Board that, had it been known that Dr. Shepperson possessed such views, he would never have been placed on the Board.

In Dr. McIntire's ecclesiastical trial by West Jersey Presbytery, one of the charges against him was that he violated his ordination vows; that by refusing to accept the actions of the General Assembly of 1934, he did not approve of the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.! On page 255 of the record of his case, it is said by the prosecutor for the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.: "Mr. Moderator, we contend that these charges have grown out of conditions which were exclusively administrative in character. The conditions lying behind this trial are set forth in the 1934 Minutes of the General Assembly, pp. 69-116, which we shall offer at the proper time as evidence."

Because Dr. McIntire would not accept the actions of the General Assembly of 1934, he was convicted of not approving of the government of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.! Now the Session of the Greenville church maintains, in print, that "every elder and minister took vows that commit them in solemn obligation to actions . . . of the church courts," and that the *Form of Government* requires that they "stand by the actions of the Synod," and that they can do no other than support and abide by the actions of the 18th General Synod if they are to remain true Bible Presbyterians! It is the same line the original members of the Board suffered trial to repudiate!

In defense of his Presbyterianism in his trial, Dr. McIntire pleaded the *Form of Government* and the *Confession of Faith of the Church*, but primarily the Bible. In the *Form of Government of the Bible Presbyterian Church*, the very first preliminary principle, Chapter I,

says "that God alone is Lord of the conscience. . . . Therefore we consider the rights of private judgment, in all matters that respect religion, as universal and unalienable." In the Confession of Faith, Chapter XXXI, "Of Synods and Councils," reads, Section III, "All synods or councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both."

Men may be true Bible Presbyterians and refuse to accept the actions of the 18th General Synod because they believe they were wrong, and they may work for their being changed or rescinded. They do not have to approve of them because of their vows. We submit, therefore, that the position taken by the Greenville session in its letter binds men in ways which the Word of God and the Constitution of the Church have not bound them. Yet, Dr. Shepperson offers this resolution as "a pattern" to be used by various churches! May God forbid! Are we now to accept the very thing men suffered to reject?

The famous U.S.A. Presbyterian "Mandate" of 1934 reads, "The General Council would present for adoption the following action with reference to 'The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions'" (p. 111). Then we are told: "Finally, almost one hundred years ago, when many years of actual experience had clearly demonstrated the inefficacy of such agencies (independent agencies) under a Presbyterian form of government, the General Assembly reached the decision, the constitutionality of which has never been questioned, that all the missionary work of the Presbyterian Church should be conducted by the Boards or Agencies of the General Assembly, except for certain interdenominational work which in its judgment the Presbyterian Church could not undertake alone, and which the General Assembly itself would, therefore, agree to approve in specific deliverances."

"Upon reaching this decision, the General Assembly immediately declared that the Presbyterian Church could best contribute to the great task of evangelizing the world through Boards created by the General Assembly, which are responsible to it alone, which are under its advice, review and absolute control, and which are required to exercise their sound discretion and judgment in deciding upon and in conducting the business entrusted to them."

"From the day when that decision was made until the present hour, the General Assembly has endeavored scrupulously and faithfully to discharge the great responsibility thus laid upon it, in the unwavering and unvarying conviction

that nothing further is needed to impart unity and vigor of effort to the missionary work of the whole Presbyterian Church, than the honest adherence to, and the loyal support of, those specific provisions governing the work which are set forth in the Constitution to which all persons consent when they become members of the Church, and which all officers profess sincerely to receive, adopt and approve when they assume their office."

"In emphasizing this responsibility of all church members and church officers under the Constitution, to engage actively in the spread of the Gospel through the officially designated Boards and Agencies of the Church, the General Assembly would most emphatically state that there is no arbitrary abridgment of personal liberty in the requirement of this duty of all who have affiliated themselves with the Presbyterian Church" (pp. 112, 113).

But we have always maintained that it would have been an "arbitrary abridgment of personal liberty."

The fourth and final point of the 1934 directive said: "That each Presbytery be and hereby is instructed to inform the ministers and sessions of the particular churches under its jurisdiction that it is the primary responsibility and privilege of all those affiliated with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America to sustain to the full measure of their ability those Boards and Agencies which the General Assembly under its Constitutional authority has established and approved for the extension of the Kingdom of Christ at home and abroad" (p. 116).

The liberty which we have in Christ did not require any such commitment to the actions of the 146th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., nor to the actions of the 18th General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, as is recognized and submitted to by the Greenville session or as its pastor offers as a pattern to be used throughout the churches.

Furthermore, it was the experience of the members of the Independent Board with the "Mandate" and the Boards and Agencies of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. that led the First General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church to write the following paragraph under the section dealing with the powers of the General Synod, Chapter 10, Section 5, "Although the deliverances, resolutions, overtures, and other actions of the General Synod are to be accorded the weight which is proper in view of the character of the body, yet whenever such deliverances, resolutions, overtures, and other actions are additional to the specific

provisions of the Constitution, they shall not be regarded as *binding unless they become amendments to the Constitution.*" (Underscoring added.) Thus, the Form of Government provides no such basis of commitment to the actions of the 18th General Synod as presented by the session of the Greenville church.

The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and its members endured a fiery trial to maintain their liberty in Christ. It was when the Mandate fell upon the Board and its members, with this totalitarian concept of the church as binding men's consciences to the actions of a General Assembly, that the struggle was broadened, not only involving opposition to modernism, but involving also the Lordship of Christ over the heart of the believer. This, too, was doctrinal, and not administrative as was alleged—the liberty which we have in Christ and the repudiation of the totalitarian concept.

These matters were presented to the Independent Board in its meeting. They were thoroughly discussed along the lines that we have outlined. But the position of this Board historically and in its witness to Christ needs to be maintained. To this we believe God's people will agree. If, after these years, the concept of a Presbyterian Church, as maintained and enforced by the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., which concept we have resisted from its first enunciation in the Mandate, finds expression in *our* midst, how can we accept it?

We believe it will be seen that this is a real question of conscience before the Lord, rooting deep in the past and going to the very foundation of the Independent Board.

When the ballot was taken the decision was made by the majority. The Rev. Willard Armes, son of the late Roland K. Armes, former Board treasurer, and the Rev. James Pond of Greenville, S. C., were elected to the places formerly filled by Dr. Shepperson and Dr. Rayburn. Also, the membership of the Board was increased from 27 to 33. The charter allows 36.

III.

It is our earnest prayer that those who love the Board will understand exactly what is involved and that they will appreciate the Board even more, for it has stood once again for its principles. We trust also that those who have been led to believe that some other concept was in accord with the Presbyterian testimony of the Independent Board itself may realize the error into which they have fallen, turn from it, and openly confess that they were in grievous error by telling us that ordination vows bind

men and commit them to shifting majorities in a Synod.

If the Greenville pastor had secured a resolution merely saying they approved of the action of the 18th General Synod, that would have been well and good—some approved, some disapproved. But to find in ordination vows and in the Form of Government of the Bible Presbyterian Church ordinances binding all of us to decisions of Synods which may and do often err is to do what the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. attempted to do with the members of the Independent Board. Men at that time stood in obedience to Christ and in loyalty to His Word above all earthly powers. They paid a price for a true freedom in the Lord and that not for themselves alone. Who now, who really understands that which they won, would ask that it be surrendered?

Many things were said in the lengthy discussion in the Board meeting concerning consequences. Truly the Board is solicitous for its testimony and for its missionaries over all the world. But the Board, in the written ballot which was finally taken, we believe, did the right thing. May it be for the

glory of Christ. In the closing moments of its session the Board passed the following resolution:

"The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions has always held that there is nothing un-Presbyterian in the existence and support of independent agencies. It repudiates any statement that it itself is not thoroughly Presbyterian, or that a Presbyterian minister is in any way obligated by his ordination vow to give his support to particular agencies because they are set up by a particular denominational body."

Beloved, let us commit these things to the Lord in prayer and may we all have grace and strength and the necessary courage to stand for these mighty principles on which the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions has been built—the truthfulness and the authority of the Word of God with all the liberty which this gives to the sons of God.

Standing on these principles we rejoice in the way God has wonderfully blessed our Board and is using it throughout the whole world in behalf of the

Gospel and of the Twentieth Century Reformation testimony. Its influence has reached far beyond just the ten Missions which are now being maintained. It is known, and prayed for, and honored by many who have never seen an Independent Board missionary. And God is undergirding it financially. We were happy to see that, while in the first nine months of 1954 the Board had received about \$154,000, in the same period this year its income from living donors has increased to over \$184,000. These sums do not include legacies. They are free-will offerings of God's people. As the Board moves on, all of us together, we believe God will give us even greater tokens of His favor and goodness, "For the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to shew himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward him."

Sincerely yours in Christ,
J. Gordon Holdcroft,
President

James E. Bennet,
Vice-president

John W. Lane, Jr.
Recording Secretary

The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions A Standard, 1936-1956

Standing in the forefront of the Twentieth Century Reformation, so far as we Presbyterians are concerned, is the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. - It has been valiant for the faith. God has used it as a glorious witness in behalf both of the truth of the Scriptures, and of the authority of the Scriptures. These issues were clarified and tested in the fiery crucible of the ecclesiastical trials of 1935, which ended in the decision of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in 1936, convicting the members of the Independent Board of sin because of their membership in that Board and their refusal to obey the General Assembly.

In God's gracious providence, this Board has felt the heart throb of consecrated men with a missionary vision. It has received the devoted support of faithful stewards in their missionary giving. It has commanded the consecration and service of the finest missionaries of our day. Its record of achievement is indeed glorious and its place of leadership in the various mission fields of the world is excelled by none in our day.

It must be said that it was this Board more than any other one development that determined the nature of the separatist movement as it developed outside the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., and it determined the nature of the constitution and structure of the Bible Presbyterian Church itself.

It is more, therefore, than merely significant that in the present conflict within the Bible Presbyterian Church the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions has again become a source of conflict. We regret exceedingly that this Board has been brought into the present conflict in the Bible Presbyterian Church, but the very fact that it has may help to clarify in many people's minds the issue which now confronts the Bible Presbyterians.

I

THE POSITION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A. VERSUS THE POSITION OF THE INDEPENDENT BOARD FOR PRESBYTERIAN FOREIGN MISSIONS

According to the "Mandate," the 1934 General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions was *not* Presbyterian, while the official boards of the church established by the General Assembly *were* Presbyterian. The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

carried on its "great task of evangelizing the world through boards created by the General Assembly, which are responsible to it alone, which are under its advice, review, and absolute control, and which are required to exercise their sound discretion and judgment in deciding upon and in conducting the business entrusted to them" ("The Mandate," Minutes of the General Assembly, 1934, p. 112). Dr. Machen, according to the Mandate, had departed from Presbyterianism when he established the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

Dr. Robert G. Rayburn, Claude Bunzel, and Walter E. Lyons jointly compiled a document entitled, "The Ideological Division Within Our Church," which was presented as comments upon my article in *The Free Press*, Vol. I, No. 2, entitled, "The Formation and Testimony of the Bible Presbyterian Church."

The Rayburn-Bunzel-Lyons document specifically refers to the formation of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions as a turning away from Presbyterianism. They claim that, while we were still in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., we did not argue against the proposition that "Assembly-controlled boards are Presbyterian." "It was only *after* he and the others had lost control of those 'boards' that they turned from Presbyterianism to independency for a solution."

Aside from the fact that Dr. Machen and I never did have control of those boards, the point here is that independency became the "solution." Again we read: "When the 'Fundamentalists' lost control . . ., they set up an independent board which they felt they could control from then on. History repeats itself (to use Dr. McIntire's phrase). Thus when Congregational-minded men lost control of our National Missions Committee, they set up their own 'Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions.'" Again we are specifically asked, "Which is Presbyterian—an independent agency controlled by independent men who are responsible to no one but themselves, or an agency which is subject to 'review and control' by the body of which it is a part? And we repeat; we are not objecting to independent agencies as such. But we are objecting to the attempt to picture independently controlled agencies as Presbyterian, rather than as Congregational" (p. 4).

So here we have directly the answer to the question which I asked in my former article, Shall they say in the Bible Presbyterian Church that the Inde-

pendent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions was a mistake and that Dr. Machen was un-Presbyterian in forming it? According to these three men he turned from Presbyterianism to independency. Again I ask, Shall the U.S.A. Presbyterian Church be vindicated at Bible Presbyterian hands in its position that Assembly-controlled boards are Presbyterian? The paragraph from the Mandate quoted above answers the Rayburn-Bunzel-Lyons question. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. maintained that boards established by it, subject to its review and control, were Presbyterian.

Christian Life, in its astounding article, "BPC's 'Young Men' Revolt," has said concerning Dr. Rayburn and the 'young men,' "They said it was high time for some changes in the ACCC and the Bible Presbyterian Church." And here is a basic change and endeavor to take the Bible Presbyterian Church back to the position of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in its attack upon the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. The members of the Independent Board and Dr. Machen maintained that the Independent Board was not un-Presbyterian and that a Presbyterian could serve the Lord on it in freedom before Christ. For this position, members of the Independent Board staked their ecclesiastical lives. Now that this position is again being attacked within the Bible Presbyterian Church, shall not those of us who went through the fire and saw the issues so clearly warn the church and endeavor to deliver the church?

II

CONGREGATIONALISM AND A "HYBRID" MIXTURE IN THE BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

The Rayburn-Bunzel-Lyons document from beginning to end argues and maintains the position that the independent agencies are Congregational and un-Presbyterian. If this position were to be established in the Bible Presbyterian Church, it would mean the casting off of the independent agencies which have been developed through the years as a result of the position honored in the denomination and maintained by the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. These men said, "We repeat: we are not objecting to independent agencies as such. But we are objecting to the attempt to picture independently controlled agencies as Presbyterian, rather than as Congregational" (p. 4). Again,

"Not only does Dr. McIntire confound Congregationalism and Presbyterianism in many places, but here he distorts Presbyterianism itself" (p. 4). And again, "It is these self-perpetuating boards of these independently controlled agencies . . . that have *already* consolidated the 'vested interests' of the Twentieth Century Reformation movement."

But what are these independent agencies that have been "Congregational" all these years and that have committed this crime against Presbyterianism? First, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions; second, Faith Theological Seminary; third, Highland College; fourth, Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference; fifth, the Delanco Home for the Aged. There are independent agencies which Synod has been endorsing through the years.

But these brethren go further. They condemn the ministers of the Bible Presbyterian Church, their brethren, for being a part of these "Congregational" agencies. They call these men "independent-minded men within the Church," as opposed to being Presbyterian-minded. They declare, "Thus when Congregational-minded men lost control of our National Missions Committee, they set up their own 'Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions.'" Who are these "Congregational-minded men" within the Bible Presbyterian Church who are members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions? They include the president of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, the president of the Faculty of Faith Theological Seminary, the director of Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference, and others. Are these men not Presbyterian? Are they "Congregational-minded men"?

We come face to face with this revolutionary attack upon the position of the Bible Presbyterian Church through the years and we are actually told: "1938 [the year of the founding of the Bible Presbyterian Church] may have been the year that a hybrid mixture of Congregationalism and Presbyterianism was effected. In fact, our present ideological division became apparent only after men began to recognize the hybrid structure of the Bible Presbyterian Church." Did not these men, the three of them, and those who feel as they do, take an ordination vow to approve of the government and the discipline of the Bible Presbyterian Church? If they think that the Bible Presbyterian Church is a "hybrid structure" combining Congregationalism and Presbyterianism, how then as true Presbyterians could they possibly have approved of it? This is a vital and serious question!

These men recognize that "the Bible

Presbyterian Church as a body wants to continue this dual policy"—apparently this "hybrid structure"—but it is perfectly clear that these men do not want to continue it. Their arguments are that the policy should be discontinued. If the arguments of this document are followed, the Bible Presbyterian Church will have *only* Synod-controlled agencies and the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions will ultimately be discarded with high praise but as being Congregational, and it will be made "Presbyterian" by its coming under Synod's control. This is what some men have said—that it should be under Synod.

This same view is held by others. Dr. G. Douglas Young has written, "I feel the time has come that I must protest against the evils inherent in this congregational system of agencies." And he added, "If you personally were trying to build a congregational denomination, I could see no problem with what you are doing except the ethical one. When you carry the name Presbyterian, however, and act in the manner in which you are doing, I can only say the Lord will have to deliver us." Who then has changed?

II

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AND SYNOD-CONTROLLED AGENCIES

In my first article, I discussed the one paragraph in the constitution that relates to agencies and said, "The Bible Presbyterian Church at its formation did not maintain the position that true Presbyterianism called for officially controlled denominational boards and agencies." The constitution reads, "The General Synod may, at its own discretion, set up committees to act as its agents in conducting benevolent, missionary and educational enterprises or it may commend to the churches for their support such other Christian enterprises." I pointed this out and it has not been challenged, and it is interesting to note that these brethren, though they quote a section of what I said, do not deny it, and no one else has come forward to challenge it. This section leaves the matter of whether the Synod will have Synod-controlled agencies or independent agencies or both purely up to the discretion of the General Synod. The Synod, in its discretion, could have all independent agencies and still be a Presbyterian Church. Or, in its discretion, it could have all Synod-controlled agencies and still be a Presbyterian Church. Or, it could have both and still be a Presbyterian Church. This section, as I said, cannot be used to support the view that Presbyterianism involves Synod-controlled agencies, or in fact, anything in regard to agencies! This is the position of the constitution.

The position of these three men is that, unless we have Synod-controlled agencies, we are not Presbyterian, and Synod-controlled agencies are themselves Presbyterian. This goes beyond the position of the Bible Presbyterian constitution. And it is such a view that compels these men to believe that the recognition of independent agencies makes the Bible Presbyterian Church a "hybrid" affair.

In the document (p. 8) the three brethren say, "That there has been serious dissatisfaction over the relation of Synod to certain independently controlled agencies, which purport to be in fellowship with Synod, is not denied." And again we are told, "He [McIntire] himself has forced us to drop our former (we mean past months) tact and effort to be kind." I have known, of course, for a long time that the position these brethren have here openly taken was the position these brethren actually maintained, and I got into this conflict in an effort to defend the independent agencies from this charge of being Congregational, and to dispute the claim that Synod-controlled agencies are true Presbyterianism.

With such plain speaking there ought to be no doubt on anybody's part as to just what is involved in the heart of the present conflict. An effort is being made to change the Bible Presbyterian Church and make it over into a different type of church from that which came out of the great conflict in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and which stood by the position of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

Perhaps the most significant section of the Rayburn-Bunzel-Lyons document is their quotation from my article of our reference to Chapter 1, paragraph 8, of the constitution, "All powers not in this Constitution specifically granted to the courts of the Church are reserved to the congregations respectively, or to the people." And I added, "Before power can be exercised for an official voice of the denomination, it should specifically be granted in the constitution."

I was the one who suggested that this section be taken out of the Constitution of the United States and put in the constitution of the Bible Presbyterian Church to make it clear that power belonged to the people. Jesus Christ is the Head of the Church and His people are to do His will in the Church. In this present controversy, I belong with those who maintain that power belongs with the people, while there are others, including these brethren, who maintain that power belongs with the elders. This addition to our constitution made it clear that only limited and designated powers were given to the higher courts consisting of elders, and that all residuary powers belonged to the people. It is the people who elect

the elders. It is the people who call the pastor. It is the people who vote to affiliate with the Bible Presbyterian Synod. It is the people who vote to withdraw from the Bible Presbyterian Synod. These three brethren, however, write, "It will be easy to determine with which type of church government the above argument is in accord by a comparison of the statements quoted below from two prominent theologians."

Thus it is a *type of church government* that they are thinking about. The first quotation is from Charles Hodge, in which it is argued in a statement concerning Christ's kingdom, "It denies that Church power vests ultimately in the people. . . ." The second is from the Baptist, Augustus Strong, who presents "proof that the government of the church is democratic or congregational." Thus effort is made to prove that this section of the Bible Presbyterian constitution is in accord with Baptist or Congregational concepts of church government and not the Presbyterian. These brethren are taking issue with one of the most fundamental elements of the Bible Presbyterian Constitution. Regardless of how they may consider it, it is there, it involves a *type of church government*, and they, in their ordination vows, approved of the government and discipline of the Bible Presbyterian Church. I wonder if we are not face to face with the fact that a most basic and fundamental attack is being made upon the very system of the Bible Presbyterian Church itself, an attack which has no right to come from those who have taken vows within the church but which must be reserved for those who are outside of the church.

Our three brethren have a concept of church power, so far as the Synod is concerned, which we turned away from at the time of the Mandate of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. It is a concept of church power which the U.S.A. Presbyterian Church maintained concerning its General Assembly. I had said in my first article, "At Synod I argued that if we are going to have a Synod-controlled paper, 'the voice of the denomination,' it did not properly come under this paragraph and that we needed a constitutional amendment, but Synod went ahead on its own authority." Now these men comment, "Here we have a genuine paradox: Men within the Church arbitrarily establish *The Free Press*, then use its pages to agitate the whole Church to the effect that the Church must not be permitted equal freedom! To what other 'authority' is Synod to bow, if not to its own? We doubt very much that people in general will be swayed by such sophistry."

The church does not have equal freedom with the individual. Synod has only designated and limited, specific powers.

The constitution says so. It is the people who are free. They can publish as many papers as they wish to give out the Gospel and to present their view. If the church is going to have an official organ, a voice of the whole church, then power for such an organ must be granted by the people through our constitution. The men who may differ with *The Free Press* are perfectly at liberty to start a *Bible Press* or to issue a mimeographed document, as these three men have done. But Synod must bow to the authority of the constitution and recognize that its powers are limited. It is this church power, implied powers, developing powers, which we feared—and properly so. Now we are confronted with an effort to give some of this power back to the Synod without amending the constitution.

V

REFERENCES TO THE INDEPENDENTLY CONTROLLED AGENCIES

Running through the document of Rayburn-Bunzel-Lyons, is the contention that independently controlled agencies are wrong. And, in fact, the whole question is resolved on who controls what. It was even said that, when "Congregational-minded men lost control of our National Missions Committee," they started another independent board. This whole line of thought is utterly foreign to the spirit and practice of both the Synod and the independent agencies through the years of the Bible Presbyterian Church. The independent agencies of which it has been my privilege to be a member, have sat down, discussed their problems, faced difficulties, prayed about them, and then have come to a decision—usually, a unanimous decision—as to what is the best thing to do. The business has been conducted in an atmosphere of mutual trust. No one has been a pope or dictator. The Bible Presbyterian Church has operated in an atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence. There have been prayer meetings; there has been faith; committees have been elected; and men have gone home to do their work and to support both agencies with real assurance. This is the way it was until just recently. I myself have not been on the National Missions Committee for a number of years, so I could not be accused of controlling it. Many of the men on the new Independent Board have been on the National Missions Committee. So far as I know there has not been a question in people's minds as to just who was controlling that National Missions Committee, until this Rayburn party developed within the church, and the secretary of the National Missions Committee joined that party and his activity was in behalf of a Synod-controlled type of denomination with serious reflection on independent agencies! We have said so many

times that it is the Holy Spirit who leads us and directs the affairs of the church. And there has been no occasion or need for caucusing, either with an opposing party or to gain control of some agency or advantage in the Synod. All of this is new and it has made a change in the Synod. And so we hear that those who have been connected with the independent agencies are the "unofficial machine" and they have "been waxing more autocratic with each passing year." Please, pray tell, what evidence is there to support such an assertion? It is unsupported assertions of this kind, running through the present conflict, which are doing so much harm. Thus we are told, "Dr. McIntire may as well realize that the time is past when *all* of us are going to accept in blind faith his own appraisals and interpretations."

I never knew that that was being done and certainly we have never asked it or demanded it. Why do men even think that they accepted in blind faith? They assert, "We are part of the majority who want a truly *Presbyterian* church." So they explain, "The church is reverting back to its heritage of 'historic' Presbyterianism which men like Warfield and the Hodges gave time and strength to build long decades ago." They are thus changing the Bible Presbyterian Church to something which is different! Is it right, or honorable for men to come in and "revert" the church to something different from the way it was founded? Let it be clear that it is one thing to argue, as Dr. Allan A. MacRae and I have maintained, that it is wiser and better in the discretion of the church to work through independent agencies, in view of our experience in the history of the church, than to maintain, as Dr. Rayburn and his associates are doing, that Synod-controlled agencies are Presbyterian and the others are Congregational. Our position is in the realm of discretion! Their position is in the realm of a rigid Presbyterianism versus Congregationalism. It is our resistance to this position which they have introduced into the church which leads them to accuse us of being the disturbers of the peace, when, as a matter of fact, those who maintain that true Presbyterianism has to include Synod-controlled agencies are the disturbers of the peace in the Bible Presbyterian Church, for it is not in the constitution of the Bible Presbyterian Church, while the appeal to the matter of discretion is clearly within the constitution.

I am indeed sorry that these brethren feel that our position has led them to lay aside their tact and their kindness, but let me assure them that what I have here written is in the kindest spirit and man-

(Continued on page 14)

"The Ideology of Domination"

A number of Bible Presbyterians signed a statement called "Resolution." Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr.'s name heads the list of signers and seven points are given which represent "recent series of actions indicating a gathering of power," and then follows the statement: "The above actions certainly seem to be part of a consistent pattern leading to control by a small group. We do not object to independent agencies as such, but we must point out that the above repressive actions were taken by individuals or by boards controlled by these individuals who form a small interlocking group within the executive committees of these boards."

I regret exceedingly that these beloved brethren have put their names to such a document. In the same paper the members of the boards of Faith Theological Seminary, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, Shelton College, Highland College, and the executive committee of the American Council of Christian Churches are listed with the names of Carl McIntire, J. Gordon Holdcroft, James E. Bennet, John W. Murray, and Allan A. MacRae in bold face type. The article is headed "Agencies Before the Change." These five Bible Presbyterians are thus singled out by the editor of the *Bible Presbyterian Observer*, one of the signers of "Resolution."

An effort is here made, therefore, to put blame upon certain individuals in the Bible Presbyterian Church, and the seven points constitute an association of events with individuals to reflect against them. This is what is properly called "guilt by association" or "conviction by implication." May we examine briefly the seven points and see that there is no basis in fact for even a supposedly consistent pattern.

The Independent . . .

(Continued from page 13)

ner. By the grace of God, we shall never cease to be kind one to another, for the Scriptures enjoin us, "Be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you."

The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions is again a standard after 20 years of freedom from ecclesiastical tyranny and domination. It represents the kind of true Presbyterianism which the founders of the Bible Presbyterian Church believed in in 1938 when the Constitution was adopted—it was not hybrid!

"1. The removal of Dr. Robert G. Rayburn from the presidency of Highland College." Dr. Rayburn resigned as president of Highland College on March 1, 1955 after he had fired a student from the college. Dr. Rayburn's resignation was accepted. Rayburn's resignation was voluntary. Only two members of the above five—Bennet and McIntire—are on the Highland Board. Neither are on its executive committee. Neither were present. And I can say that neither had anything to do with the decision of the Board to accept Rayburn's resignation. So whatever may be said about the Highland College situation, that cannot be offered as evidence of "a consistent pattern taken by individuals or by boards controlled by these individuals."

I, for one, deeply regretted what happened, went out to Pasadena, and got both sides together, secured an agreement with the restoration of fellowship and confidence. Dr. Rayburn himself was most gracious in his appreciation of it and wrote others in the church that the Lord had worked and answered prayer.

Our beloved brethren, therefore, who have signed this statement and tried to use this particular incident to support a case involving J. Gordon Holdcroft, Allan A. MacRae, and Jack Murray are entirely beside their point. As to Bennet and McIntire, they were not involved, for they did not participate in the decision and gave no instructions or words concerning such a decision. They did not know that Rayburn was going to offer his resignation. They certainly knew of no plan to fire Dr. Rayburn. Jack Murray, by the way, it should be pointed out, formerly was a member of the Board of Highland College. He was not re-elected on the recommendation of Dr. Rayburn, but Mr. Murray was never informed of this action of the Board. No charge has been made, however, that this failure to re-elect Jack Murray was a part of any pattern. It has happened before with other brethren.

Paragraph 7, the last point, reads, "The fact that faculty members of Shelton College have been ordered to refrain from expressing criticisms of the board in the Buswell matter." This is not true. The action of the Board, November 15, the day Dr. Buswell was removed by unanimous action, reads, "It was voted that no literature which the Board considers detrimental to the operation of the College may be distributed in any manner on the property of the College. No literature dealing with the operation of the College or with any of its Trustees, Officers, Faculty, or Staff may

be distributed on the College property without written permission from the President." This is a proper action for any institution desiring to preserve itself and the unity of its student body. It was unanimously passed by the Board. Just how, therefore, this fits into a "consistent pattern" of "control" is difficult to see. It is not what is alleged.

The sixth point, closely related, refers to "The dismissal of Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., from the presidency of Shelton College." Here again the four Bible Presbyterians, aside from Dr. Buswell, constitute a minority of the Board. Other denominations in the American Council are represented by members on the Board and have the controlling votes in the Board. It has been repeatedly pointed out that Dr. Buswell's dismissal was on the basis of lack of administrative co-operation and loss of confidence on the part of the Board in his ability to lead the College. His effort to introduce the difficulties in the Bible Presbyterian Church into the situation was constantly resisted and repudiated by the Board itself. Here is an attempt to blame the Board for the very thing that the Board itself was doing its best to keep out of the administrative affairs and life of the institution. The problem which the Board had with Dr. Buswell existed before the difficulties arose within the Bible Presbyterian Church. Actually, it was the Bible Presbyterian members of the Board that were the restraining influences in the Board and it was Dr. Holdcroft and Carl McIntire in particular who pled with the Board not to dismiss Dr. Buswell at an earlier meeting. Now in this resolution these men are being singled out by Dr. Buswell, one of the signers, in an entirely unjustified manner so far as the facts are concerned.

This deals with three of the seven points which are supposed to indicate "a gathering of power." So far as the Shelton Board is concerned, the Bible Presbyterians on it have no more power than they ever had, and in every agency the majority of that agency maintains the power or testimony of the Board. It should be said that in past years, as the different independent agencies have worked, that, with rare exceptions, there has been such a gracious spirit of brotherly co-operation and love that after there has been a full discussion of any issue or question involved, there has always been unanimity of opinion, and there was unanimity of opinion in the final action in the removal of Dr. Buswell. It had to be done in order to save the college from disaster and to preserve it as a separatist school.

The second point deals with "The At-

tack on the Secretary of the Committee on National Missions and the attack on the Committee itself made at the 1955 Synod."

It was Carl McIntire who raised on the floor of Synod questions concerning the conduct of the secretary of National Missions. There was no attack made on the Committee itself by Dr. McIntire and he did not ask that the Committee be dissolved or anything of the kind. He did present a motion, a proper one made at the proper time and in the proper place, at the close of the report of the general secretary and while the questions of National Missions were before the Synod in its plenary session. If honest, sincere questions and evidence cannot be presented at such a point in the affairs of the Synod without being called "an attack" and without being interpreted as a pattern for "a gathering of power on the part of a certain group," then something serious has happened to the Bible Presbyterian Church. A Committee and secretary which are responsible to the General Synod are most certainly subject to question and reform, if necessary, at the hands of the Synod.

The third item refers to "The formation of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions, . . ." The plans for such a committee were made before the 18th General Synod. Men had even accepted places on this committee before the Synod itself met. There is a wide field of activity and interest open to this Board which the National Missions Committee cannot engage in. If there are those in the church, as is the case with a considerable number of people, including the Collingswood Church, who have come to the point where they cannot support the general secretary and the methods which he has pursued—with interference in the internal affairs of local churches and interference in the internal affairs of certain presbyteries, and, with carrying on propaganda against the independent agencies and in behalf of Synod-controlled agencies—it is their privilege and liberty under the constitution of the church to decline to give or support the Synod's agency and to support and contribute to an independent board or any other agency that they feel led of the Lord to support.

It is this inviolable right, guaranteed in the constitution of the church, and most of all given to us as free servants of Jesus Christ, which is at stake. There is not the slightest possibility of maintaining at this point that there is an evidence of "a gathering of power." There is unquestionably evidence that there are those in the church who desire to support an independent Board for home missions. This is their privilege and it should be duly respected. Conflict has developed

within the church, not over the rights of people to support an independent agency, but over the way in which the National Missions Committee has been represented by its secretary, the Rev. Thomas G. Cross.

When men take events and pile them together and say they show a pattern, there must be some substance and facts underneath such an association to justify such a conclusion.

This leaves only two points, four and five, and in both of these cases there is a most vital and basic question which does concern the Bible Presbyterian Church and everyone who delights in the movement which is represented by the agencies of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, Faith Theological Seminary, and the Bible Presbyterian Church, which have been a part of the same testimony from the day of the establishment of each.

Point 4 speaks of "The displacement of the Reverend Linwood G. Gebb and the Reverend Hayes T. Henry from the Board of Faith Theological Seminary. . . ." There was due and just cause for this.

Hayes Henry is a younger leader in the Bible Presbyterian Church. He was elected to the Board of the Seminary. He never attended a single meeting of the Board during his term. On September 9, 1955, *The Bible Press* published a letter which was circulated generally throughout the Bible Presbyterian Church signed by Hayes Henry in which there appears the following statement: "This is not a controversy over the Twentieth Century Reformation. It is over independency and the control of Synod's agencies. If there can yet be any question as to where I stand, we will clarify that by saying I am a Bible Presbyterian and loyal to my church because I believe her and her boards to be loyal to Christ and His cause. I have no confidence in independent boards—least of all one such as the new home board which springs out of spite and schism. We see reason, restraint, justice, and responsibility in a board controlled by Synod. This is true Presbyterianism in being subject to our brethren in the Lord, and under this subjection we are most willing to labor."

When a man is serving on an independent board which has in its charter that it shall never be subject to the dictates of any ecclesiastical body and then writes to make clear his position as, "I have no confidence in independent boards," should he be re-elected to a most vital and crucial independent board dealing with theological education? Answer that question, please!

What confidence would men have in

Faith Theological Seminary, an independent agency, if it elected to its Board a man who was in open public conflict with the position of independency and said that he had no confidence in independent boards? Surely there was ample justification for the majority of the Board of Faith Theological Seminary to elect someone else in the place which became vacant by the expiration of the term of Hayes Henry. Could such an action possibly be interpreted as "a gathering of power," domination, and the ideology of domination? No! It was the sober responsibility of Christian men seeking to maintain the integrity of the charter of Faith Theological Seminary to see that men directed the Seminary who did believe and had confidence in independent boards. How then, does this prove that there is a pattern "indicating a gathering of power on the part of a certain group representing the minority of our Bible Presbyterian Synod"?

In the matter of Linwood G. Gebb, the case is somewhat similar. Gebb attended only one meeting of the Seminary Board. It is essential that the Board have members who will attend its meetings and actively participate in the direction of the institution and share in the responsibilities of board membership. In August, 1955, Mr. Gebb circularized the church with a mimeographed letter addressed to Dr. MacRae, in which he took definite issue with the position of Faith Theological Seminary. In a letter dated October 7, 1955, Mr. Gebb addressed Dr. McIntire as follows: "Carl, every member of Synod is at liberty to express his displeasure at any action Synod takes, but if we are going to be a church with peace, purity and unity we will have to abide by the majority action of Synod. If the day should arise when I am no longer willing to abide by the decisions of Synod, even if only 51 per cent carry, I am at liberty to withdraw and will be in a hurry to do so."

This, of course, is in direct conflict with the true Presbyterian position. One is not bound to abide by the decision of the majority if he feels in conscience that he cannot do so, and he does not have to leave. It is in direct conflict with the provisions of the Form of Government of the Bible Presbyterian Church. Chapter 10, Section 5, of the Form of Government declares, "Whenever such deliverances, resolutions, overtures, and other actions are additional to the specific provisions of the Constitution, they shall not be regarded as binding unless they become amendments to the Constitution."

Unfortunately, two men involved in the conflict within the Synod had for some reason known to themselves taken positions which were in conflict with the position the Seminary maintains under

its charter and under the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms to which it is committed.

Instead of being condemned as a small interlocking group of five men running things, the Board of the Seminary should be congratulated for taking such a clear, forthright stand in the light of the confusion that has come in the Bible Presbyterian conflict relative to these basic, fundamental principles.

The answer which has been given when these things have been pointed out is that these men did not mean that, they really did not mean what they said. It should be observed that if these men do not mean what they say, when they speak upon such vital matters that concern liberty, Christian life, and testimony, or if they do not know exactly how to express what they do mean, there can be a real question as to whether they should be serving on a board of a theological seminary which 'is dealing with the grave responsibility of maintaining in these crucial days a faithful, uncompromising testimony. Why then, have these five men been singled out? Is it necessary in order to strengthen the case against these men to put all these seven things together in one basket? When each one is considered separately and on its merits it certainly does not support a consistent pattern of the "ideology of domination."

Carl McIntire is on all of these agencies—Faith Seminary, Independent Board, Shelton College, Highland College, American Council. In fact, he is the only one of the five that is on all of these agencies, and he was privileged in the gracious providence of God, to help to start them all. Has that now become an offense and is that a crime against the cause of Christ and the Bible Presbyterian Church? His position and attitude in these agencies is the same today as it has been through all these years. He has co-operated graciously with his brethren. He has tried to secure all the support possible for these agencies that they might grow and prosper and be used for the glory of God. Is there anything wrong in that? Furthermore, it can be said that Mr. McIntire is of the opinion that his name—because in the providence of God it has become known throughout the land for the distinctive testimony of the Twentieth Century Reformation—should be used to help in every possible way the movement at large. He gave his name to the Shelton College Board and from the very beginning stood loyally and solidly alongside of Dr. Buswell and sought to help him and to hold up his hands in every way. It was only when he came to see that Dr. Buswell had changed, that Bus-

well had lost confidence in the Board and said so to the Board's face, that it was apparent that it was impossible to go on, and anybody would recognize that to have been the case.

The last point (point 5) has to do with "The displacement of Dr. Flournoy Shepperson, Sr., and Dr. Robert G. Rayburn on the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. . . ."

Of all the agencies, God used the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions as the bellwether. Its members endured ecclesiastical trial. The Board stood for great and glorious Reformation truths—the truth of the Bible, the authority of the Bible, and that God alone is Lord of the conscience and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men.

The two men were not re-elected for cause. This has been stated at length in the letter by the president, vice-president, and secretary of the Board. It is printed in this issue of *The Free Press*. Here again, the church should rejoice in the fact that the Independent Board is going to maintain its historic stand without equivocation, compromise, or appeasement. The documentation in behalf of both of these men show that they had changed and that they had embraced positions and were circularizing the church with these positions, contrary to the stand of the Independent Board. Rayburn was a party to the document on "The Ideological Division Within Our Church," calling the Bible Presbyterian a "hybrid" church with a combination of Presbyterianism and Congregationalism.

The nine-page document says, "When we speak of the ideological division in our church we mean that equally sincere men hold concepts, ideas, and philosophies that cannot be harmonized." Then Robert G. Rayburn, Claude Bunzel, and Walter E. Lyons, the joint authors, say, "This means that the Bible Presbyterian Church must decide whether to continue its outward organizational form, within which this irreconcilable division is certain to be perpetuated, or to go our separate ways. . . ." They claim: "We are part of the majority who want a truly Presbyterian church. . . ." and, "1938 may have been the year that a hybrid mixture of Congregationalism and Presbyterianism was effected. In fact, our present ideological division became apparent only after men began to recognize the hybrid structure of the Bible Presbyterian Church." To call the present Bible Presbyterian Church a "hybrid structure" and appeal for a true Presbyterian church means, without doubt, that these men are seeking to change the Bible Presbyterian Church historically!

But what is this Congregationalism?

It is the independent agencies which God has used and made a part of the whole Presbyterian separatist cause. We are specifically asked, "Which is Presbyterian—an independent agency controlled by independent men who are responsible to no one but themselves, or an agency which is subject to 'review and control' by the body of which it is a part? And we repeat: we are not objecting to independent agencies as such. But we are objecting to the attempt to picture independently controlled agencies as Presbyterian, rather than as Congregational. When we berate the Modernists for injecting new meanings into old terms, let us not fall into the same error!" English language could not be used in any more specific or plainer way. The Rayburn who agreed to this ideological division and appeal for separation among the brethren is not the Bob Rayburn who, in 1952, wrote to the Rev. W. H. F. Moore, on the stationery of Highland College, as follows:

"You inquired about Highland College. Yes, it is a Bible Presbyterian College, but of course we do not have the control of any of our institutions or agencies in the hands of the church as such. We felt this was an evil in the old church and have tried to avoid it, so that in the future years pressures could not be built up to force men to support institutions which they did not want to support. But our charter makes this a definitely Bible Presbyterian institution. Of course, we are really in the beginning stages, but hope to be larger before long. We are offering liberal arts courses, but most of our young people are training for definite full-time Christian work."

Dr. Rayburn at that time held the position we still hold!

In the case of Flournoy Shepperson, the situation was even more acute as it concerned the testimony of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. We quote below in full the resolution in its original form as presented by him and a committee of three elders to the Greenville Session for adoption. The actual form in which the resolution was adopted is contained in the letter of Dr. Holdcroft, et al. This original form shows unmistakably the position of Dr. Shepperson and it was precisely the position of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. against the members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, when they were accused of sin against Christ by being members of an un-Presbyterian, schismatic, independent agency, and their ordination vows had been violated because they did not support the action of the 1934 General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. The posi-

(Continued on page 17)

Our Experience With a Synod-controlled Agency

The freedom which the Scriptures give to the individual before Christ and the liberty which the churches have in their financial giving is a precious heritage from the Lord. Christian giving is not a matter of denominational pressure. The Scripture says, "Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver" (2 Cor. 9:7). Giving must be free!

The Bible Presbyterian Church has had one major Synod-controlled agency, the National Missions Committee, and it has been only in recent years that difficulty has arisen on this matter of Christian giving and pressures have come from the denominational secretary and spokesman. I write this report not on the basis of speculation but on the basis of factual evidence, and I do so with the hope of in-

forming, particularly, the Lord's people in our denomination so that they may see the difficulty which has confronted us as we have sought before the Lord to handle an increasingly un-Presbyterian development.

The Collingswood Church has been the largest supporter of National Missions. At one time virtually all the money National Missions received came from Collingswood, and at the time the Collingswood congregation decided to discontinue their support of National Missions approximately one-fourth of the income came from Collingswood. Collingswood has been a loyal, faithful supporter and it has been my privilege as pastor of the church to endeavor to persuade our people to support National Missions and the whole movement in its every aspect so that there could be a balanced picture of

all that was being done to build the Bible Presbyterian Church and the separatist movement. May I report our experience since the Collingswood Church withdrew its support from the National Missions Committee.

At the congregational meeting, July 14, 1955, the congregation voted not to support the Synod-controlled agency any longer, and this information was immediately communicated to the National Missions Committee. The congregation had been sending the National Missions *Reporter* to all of its members as a part of its benevolent program and had supplied the National Missions Committee with addressograph plates made in the Collingswood office and kept up-to-date. The members of the congregation were

(Continued on page 18)

"The Ideology . . .

(Continued from page 16)

tion of the U.S.A. Presbyterian Church against the members of the Independent Board is the same as the position taken by Dr. Shepperson.

"WHEREAS, there has been much confusion concerning the actions of the 18th General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church which met in St. Louis in June, 1955, and many varied and divergent opinions, and much misinformation, therefore it was voted at the meeting of the session of this church, Sept. 5, 1955, that it would stand by the actions of the Synod as required by the form of government of the Bible Presbyterian Church, and that a Committee consisting of three elders, namely: C. N. Wallace, Sr., C. D. Couch, and W. J. Patterson, Jr., to work with the pastor in making a statement to the congregation after referring said statement back to the session.

"This Committee, after studying the actions of the 18th General Synod, endorses its stand on (1) a church-controlled paper, (2) formation of a church-controlled college, and (3) endorsement of the present National Missions committee with its secretary, the Rev. Thomas Cross, as the official home missions agency of the Synod.

"The Committee's decisions about these matters were based on obligations taken by every minister and elder at their ordination. Every elder and minister took vows that commit them in solemn obligation to actions and the government of the church courts, as given:

"(1) Chapter 12, of the *Book of Church Order*, paragraph 3, subparagraph (3): "Do you approve of the government and discipline of the Bible Presbyterian Church?"

"(2) Chapter 13, paragraph 8, subparagraph (4): "Do you promise to submit yourself 'in the Lord' to the government of this Presbytery, or any other Presbytery in the bounds of which you may be called?"

"To violate these promises and obligations is a sin against the fellowship of the brethren and against Christ.

"Therefore, we consider the formation of the so-called Independent Board for Home Missions as un-Presbyterian, un-Democratic, schismatic, and represents the tyranny of the minority against the vote of the majority of the Synod.

"It is our firm conviction that the Synod, after much prayer and sober judgment, was led of the Lord to face these issues which have threatened for a long period of time the peace, harmony and progress of the Bible Presbyterian Church movement.

"It is our sober judgment that this session and church, if they are to remain true Bible Presbyterians, can do no other than support and abide by the actions of the 18th General Synod.

"Moreover, this session views with alarm the manifestation of over-lordship in regard to the work of the Synod by a few who would rule or ruin our Bible Presbyterian Movement.

"As our church is sound in the basic doctrines of the Bible, and altogether free of modernism, and will continue to be,

and was founded for 'the Word of God and for the testimony of Jesus Christ,' we believe all this dissension over the method of operation is relatively secondary and that we should be about the Father's business in propagating the faith and salvation of souls."

Here, without any question, is indisputable evidence that both the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and Faith Theological Seminary took action, by the majority, to maintain the historic position of these agencies regarding their Presbyterian testimony.

It is sad indeed this was necessary, but becoming necessary in the light of the facts, God's people should thank God that the majority of the Board were determined to maintain the integrity of the charter of these two agencies.

There has not been a pattern of gathering of power, but there certainly has been a change on the part of some of the men in the Bible Presbyterian movement in regard to what true Presbyterianism is. The members of the Bible Presbyterian Church who believe the Bible and rejoice in the history of the movement must see that the present attack upon these five members of the various independent agencies is basically an attack upon them and other members who stand with them on the Faith Seminary and the Independent Board's uncompromising stand in behalf of the Board's testimony. If the Lord's people can see these facts and realize what happened, they can better judge the attacks which are now being made upon Dr. J. Gordon Holdcroft, Dr. Alan A. MacRae, Mr. Jack W. Murray, the Hon. James E. Bennet, and Dr. Carl McIntire.

Our Experience . . .

(Continued from page 17)

informed that if they desired to continue to receive the *National Missions Reporter* they could subscribe directly to it.

Now, in the Bible Presbyterian Church, a congregation is supposed to be perfectly free to take action for reasons which are sufficient unto itself. The constitution provides that a church may withdraw from the Synod for reasons sufficient unto itself, and, when this is done, the denomination, through its official Synod-controlled agencies, ought not to harass or seek to disrupt the work of the local church. But this has not been our experience with the National Missions Committee.

1.

Shortly after the congregation took its action and the National Missions Committee was informed of it, the secretary of National Missions used the addressograph plates, which had been previously given to the Committee for the sending of the *National Missions Reporter* to the Collingswood members, and addressed a letter to the members of the congregation appealing for their individual personal support of the Committee in view of the fact that the church had discontinued its support. We question most seriously the ethics of using a mailing list with last minute corrections given to the Committee to send out the *National Missions Reporter*, for such a purpose. The letter also proceeded to argue with the congregation concerning its decision, "Are the reasons for support of the new Board as valid as the reasons for supporting the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions when it was formed?"

When a local church decides to take an action, should the denominational agency use the facilities which that church provided to the agency in its mailing list to endeavor to argue about and to disrupt that action? We do not believe that this is the responsibility of a denominational agency in dealing with a local congregation! It is time now that the elders and members of our beloved Bible Presbyterian Church find out how one of its churches is treated!

2.

On August 24, 1955, the National Missions Committee again used the mailing list of the Collingswood Church given to it to send the *Reporter*, which had been discontinued, to address a six-page, single-spaced, mimeographed typewritten letter written by an elder of the congregation who had withdrawn

from the Session of the church, who was agitating in the church against the decision of the congregation. This letter attacked the Session particularly; it attacked the pastor of the church at length; and concluded with an appeal to the members of the Collingswood Church to break their pledges which they had made to the budget of the church and support the National Missions Committee directly.

Is it the task of a Synod-controlled agency to make league with a minority in a particular congregation for the purpose of having financial pledges of that congregation withdrawn? Shall a Synod-controlled agency make available to particular individuals the use of a mailing list which the congregation gave to it for a definite and specific purpose? We do not think it should, but it did.

There was no doubt that this was done. When people received the letters they found they were addressed with the same addressograph stamp that had been previously used on their *Reporter*, and they were the plates made on the Collingswood graphotype. Furthermore, when the Rev. Tom Cross, secretary of the Committee in charge of the office in Wilmington, was asked directly concerning the use of those plates to address the elder's letter, he admitted that it had been done. A local church may tell a denominational agency that it no longer desires to support it, but our experience is that even then one is not through with that Synod-controlled agency. The agency then joins in efforts to disrupt and even cause division in the particular church—which has resulted. This has indeed been a sad experience and one which we never dreamed we would be called upon to go through at the hands of the Committee to which we had given so much money through the years.

3.

But this is not all! On July 18, 1955, the Collingswood Session made a statement as to the position of the church in these matters. Almost three months later, October 11—and we do not know just why it took the general secretary three months to decide to write the letter—he wrote to all the men under the National Missions Committee declaring that there was a statement in the Collingswood letter which "constitutes a slur of the lowest kind against the character of the men under support of the Committee." He declared the statement "calls into question the moral character of every man financially supported in any way by the National Missions Committee." He wants to know if they are guilty of such a charge and promises "to do everything in my power to correct this misinforma-

tion to the people of our Bible Presbyterian Church."

This is indeed a serious charge! But Mr. Cross completely misconstrued and misinterpreted the paragraph which he quotes. The paragraph reads: "Then questions were raised concerning the National Missions Committee. Those who had vested interests financially and were under its support rushed vigorously to the defense of the conduct of the National Missions Committee's secretary. Yet men who stood with the secretary later explained that they knew the condition revealed was true." Mr. Cross concluded that "men" in the second sentence were the same men who were under the National Missions Committee. The paragraph dealt with the general discussion that took place at Synod and it did not refer in that instance to any of the men who were under the Committee. Mr. Cross, making an erroneous conclusion, then proceeds to base a charge upon his deductions and impute that to the Collingswood Church! Just how far can the denominational secretary go astray? But the impact of his letter to all the men under his Committee is to stir up additional feelings against the Collingswood Session. Of all times this is a time when we need restraint, facts, and peace.

Mr. Cross's letter does say, "I do not believe that I can be convicted of interfering with the work of local churches or presbyteries." The above evidence—the using of the mailing list, given to the Committee for one purpose, for another purpose, assisting in the efforts to disrupt the Collingswood Church—certainly in our opinion involves interference! The office of National Missions, when the Collingswood Church informed it that it was not going to support it any more, should have simply withdrawn and let the Collingswood Church do as the Lord led. Instead, the Committee turned over its facilities to a member who desired to continue his attacks upon the church in this way. We do not question the liberty of this member in doing what he did, but we do object to the National Missions Committee's aiding and abetting him in the task! Does National Missions make league with a minority in a church to attack the majority of a local congregation in order to get more support for the Committee?

The material which we have used in the discussion thus far is not based upon hearsay or conversation, but upon actual documentation in each instance. If this experience of ours with a Synod-controlled agency is a pattern, we do not want to have any more such Synod-controlled agencies! The churches should be absolutely free before God to handle their own affairs without external opposition or pressure from above in the

name of the denomination or a denominational secretary. This is the liberty which the Bible Presbyterian churches enjoy, but with this present serious crisis we have had a test which speaks for itself. If a large church is treated thus, how then is a smaller church to be treated by the representatives of the denomination as a whole, such as the Rev. Tom Cross?

4.

When the Collingswood congregation voted to discontinue its support of the National Missions Committee, it directed that the funds be sent directly to the individuals whom the church had been supporting, pending adjustments which would be made. In other words, the church did not cut off all at once all the support of the individuals.

A check was then sent to the Rev. Harold Mare of the Denver Church. Mr. Mare, as has been reported, endorsed this check and sent it back to National Missions with the indication that the Committee could do with the check as it saw fit, return it to Collingswood or keep it. National Missions kept the check and deposited it in its own treasury. This was after the Committee had received notification from Collingswood that no further funds from the Collingswood Church would be directed to it. It seemed to us that the most ordinary ethics required that the National Missions Committee return the check to Collingswood, in full recognition of the action of the Collingswood congregation in withdrawing support from the National Missions Committee.

5.

The Collingswood Church increased its 1955 contributions to the Committee on National Missions over 1954. Though there were questions, there was always the feeling that it would work out and with a common love for the cause and the church things would never go as far as they have. Dr. McIntire even arranged in 1955, after the Greenville Synod, to have a School of Missions dedicated to the National Missions Committee, and he was the first speaker at the Harvest Home for National Missions, in which he dealt with the issues before the Church. With these facts, the letters which are going to be published in the next issue of *The Free Press*, showing how the secretary and the office in Wilmington were working against the Collingswood Church and against its pastor, will be most revealing indeed.

Word came to us that Mr. Cross was reported to have said that there would be a split in the Collingswood Church and that some 250 members would leave and go to Haddonfield to start a congregation.

This was after the congregation had voted to support the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions. Stories to this effect were spread among the brethren. It was not surprising, therefore, that on one Saturday night an elder of the church went to the home of the clerk to inform him that he was leaving and that on the next Lord's Day a group would assemble in Haddonfield for the purpose of establishing the Covenant Bible Presbyterian Church and that the Rev. Tom Cross, secretary of National Missions, would preach at their service and would assist them in the formation of the new church. As it turned out, it was the group that was supporting Mr. Cross and that had been in contact with him in one way or another that left the Collingswood Church. Approximately 44 have asked for their letters or asked to have their names dropped.

Here was a tear or a schism and it was accompanied by very serious charges against the Session of the church and particularly the pastor of the church. There are a number of Bible Presbyterian Churches in the neighborhood to which these individuals could go and, in several instances in the past, members have received letters from the Collingswood Church to these other B. P. congregations.

Why must the secretary of the National Missions Committee be the one who comes on the first two Lord's Days to minister to this group and aid them in their purpose? Is the price of not supporting the National Missions Committee—a Synod-controlled agency—activity on the part of that Synod-controlled agency leading to a schism in a church? Is that what we have come to? And does not interference on the part of the National Missions' secretary in the internal affairs of the local congregation, following its decision to discontinue support, inevitably lead up to that sort of conclusion? There certainly is no Scriptural basis for a tear or schism in the Collingswood Church, and for this great church, which has stood and helped the movement as it has, of all churches, to be subjected to this sort of treatment by the secretary of National Missions indeed raises some very basic and fundamental questions for every church in the denomination. The Collingswood congregation, in order to support the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, saw their pastor placed on trial, and, before they were through, they lost their \$250,000 church property. They stood for their freedom in Christ and for the Lordship of Christ. Now when they stand for this same freedom and the privilege of supporting an Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions, they suffer at the hands of a denominational agency actually aiding and abetting

a minority group which led into a schism. Have we reached a point where, in order to support National Missions, we will split churches? Has National Missions become so desperate that, in order to receive financial backing, it must interfere with the internal affairs of a congregation?

Following Mr. Cross's two Sundays in Haddonfield, the moderator of the 18th General Synod came down to shepherd the group and has since been called as its pastor from month to month. The Collingswood Session declined to give letters of dismissal to the group going to the schismatic church on the ground that, because of their ordination vows, elders could not be a party to a schism and commend people to a church which was built on schism or contribute to the tearing down of the Collingswood witness for Christ.

The moderator of the Synod, a member of the Philadelphia Presbytery, came into the New Jersey Presbytery; the Haddonfield Church itself was organized without any reference to the New Jersey Presbytery within whose bounds it exists; and at the meeting of the Presbytery, January 14, a majority in the Presbytery took firm action when Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., appeared at the Presbytery instead of attending his own Presbytery on that day, and declined to seat him as a corresponding member. When application was made for the new church to be received, it was declined by laying the matter on the table. When former members of the Collingswood Church petitioned the Presbytery, asking them to order the Collingswood Church to give them letters, this, too, was laid upon the table. When an effort was made to make one of the former Collingswood elders (now an elder in the schismatic church) a corresponding member, this, too, was declined.

The Presbytery conducts a Bible Institute in the Collingswood Church. When Mr. McGregor Scott, a member of Presbytery's Bible Institute Committee, resigned his eldership and left the Collingswood Church and became an elder in the Covenant Church, he ceased to be a member of the Presbytery, the denomination, and the American and International Councils of Christian Churches. But at a meeting of the Institute Committee, the Thursday before Presbytery met, Mr. Scott was present and on a tie vote he participated in issuing a call to Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., to teach in the Institute for a full semester beginning the following Monday night in the Collingswood Church. Presbytery reversed the action of the Bible Institute Committee in this particular.

For the moderator of the last General Synod and the general secretary of the

(Continued on page 23)

name of the denomination or a denominational secretary. This is the liberty which the Bible Presbyterian churches enjoy, but with this present serious crisis we have had a test which speaks for itself. If a large church is treated thus, how then is a smaller church to be treated by the representatives of the denomination as a whole, such as the Rev. Tom Cross?

4.

When the Collingswood congregation voted to discontinue its support of the National Missions Committee, it directed that the funds be sent directly to the individuals whom the church had been supporting, pending adjustments which would be made. In other words, the church did not cut off all at once all the support of the individuals.

A check was then sent to the Rev. Harold Mare of the Denver Church. Mr. Mare, as has been reported, endorsed this check and sent it back to National Missions with the indication that the Committee could do with the check as it saw fit, return it to Collingswood or keep it. National Missions kept the check and deposited it in its own treasury. This was after the Committee had received notification from Collingswood that no further funds from the Collingswood Church would be directed to it. It seemed to us that the most ordinary ethics required that the National Missions Committee return the check to Collingswood, in full recognition of the action of the Collingswood congregation in withdrawing support from the National Missions Committee.

5.

The Collingswood Church increased its 1955 contributions to the Committee on National Missions over 1954. Though there were questions, there was always the feeling that it would work out and with a common love for the cause and the church things would never go as far as they have. Dr. McIntire even arranged in 1955, after the Greenville Synod, to have a School of Missions dedicated to the National Missions Committee, and he was the first speaker at the Harvest Home for National Missions, in which he dealt with the issues before the Church. With these facts, the letters which are going to be published in the next issue of *The Free Press*, showing how the secretary and the office in Wilmington were working against the Collingswood Church and against its pastor, will be most revealing indeed.

Word came to us that Mr. Cross was reported to have said that there would be a split in the Collingswood Church and that some 250 members would leave and go to Haddonfield to start a congregation.

This was after the congregation had voted to support the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions. Stories to this effect were spread among the brethren. It was not surprising, therefore, that on one Saturday night an elder of the church went to the home of the clerk to inform him that he was leaving and that on the next Lord's Day a group would assemble in Haddonfield for the purpose of establishing the Covenant Bible Presbyterian Church and that the Rev. Tom Cross, secretary of National Missions, would preach at their service and would assist them in the formation of the new church. As it turned out, it was the group that was supporting Mr. Cross and that had been in contact with him in one way or another that left the Collingswood Church. Approximately 44 have asked for their letters or asked to have their names dropped.

Here was a tear or a schism and it was accompanied by very serious charges against the Session of the church and particularly the pastor of the church. There are a number of Bible Presbyterian Churches in the neighborhood to which these individuals could go and, in several instances in the past, members have received letters from the Collingswood Church to these other B. P. congregations.

Why must the secretary of the National Missions Committee be the one who comes on the first two Lord's Days to minister to this group and aid them in their purpose? Is the price of not supporting the National Missions Committee—a Synod-controlled agency—activity on the part of that Synod-controlled agency leading to a schism in a church? Is that what we have come to? And does not interference on the part of the National Missions' secretary in the internal affairs of the local congregation, following its decision to discontinue support, inevitably lead up to that sort of conclusion? There certainly is no Scriptural basis for a tear or schism in the Collingswood Church, and for this great church, which has stood and helped the movement as it has, of all churches, to be subjected to this sort of treatment by the secretary of National Missions indeed raises some very basic and fundamental questions for every church in the denomination. The Collingswood congregation, in order to support the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, saw their pastor placed on trial, and, before they were through, they lost their \$250,000 church property. They stood for their freedom in Christ and for the Lordship of Christ. Now when they stand for this same freedom and the privilege of supporting an Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions, they suffer at the hands of a denominational agency actually aiding and abetting

a minority group which led into a schism. Have we reached a point where, in order to support National Missions, we will split churches? Has National Missions become so desperate that, in order to receive financial backing, it must interfere with the internal affairs of a congregation?

Following Mr. Cross's two Sundays in Haddonfield, the moderator of the 18th General Synod came down to shepherd the group and has since been called as its pastor from month to month. The Collingswood Session declined to give letters of dismissal to the group going to the schismatic church on the ground that, because of their ordination vows, elders could not be a party to a schism and commend people to a church which was built on schism or contribute to the tearing down of the Collingswood witness for Christ.

The moderator of the Synod, a member of the Philadelphia Presbytery, came into the New Jersey Presbytery; the Haddonfield Church itself was organized without any reference to the New Jersey Presbytery within whose bounds it exists; and at the meeting of the Presbytery, January 14, a majority in the Presbytery took firm action when Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., appeared at the Presbytery instead of attending his own Presbytery on that day, and declined to seat him as a corresponding member. When application was made for the new church to be received, it was declined by laying the matter on the table. When former members of the Collingswood Church petitioned the Presbytery, asking them to order the Collingswood Church to give them letters, this, too, was laid upon the table. When an effort was made to make one of the former Collingswood elders (now an elder in the schismatic church) a corresponding member, this, too, was declined.

The Presbytery conducts a Bible Institute in the Collingswood Church. When Mr. McGregor Scott, a member of Presbytery's Bible Institute Committee, resigned his eldership and left the Collingswood Church and became an elder in the Covenant Church, he ceased to be a member of the Presbytery, the denomination, and the American and International Councils of Christian Churches. But at a meeting of the Institute Committee, the Thursday before Presbytery met, Mr. Scott was present and on a tie vote he participated in issuing a call to Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., to teach in the Institute for a full semester beginning the following Monday night in the Collingswood Church. Presbytery reversed the action of the Bible Institute Committee in this particular.

For the moderator of the last General Synod and the general secretary of the

(Continued on page 23)

Orthodox Presbyterian Church and Bible Presbyterian Church Compared

A study of what has happened to the Orthodox Presbyterian Church is of significance in the present controversy in the Bible Presbyterian Church. Lionel L. Brown, a Bible Presbyterian minister, and his congregation in San Francisco, Calif., have recently left the B.P. Church for the purpose of joining the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, and it is commonly reported that there are several others in the B.P. fellowship that are considering this step. Brown has written that he considers the Orthodox Presbyterian Church more Presbyterian than the B.P.

In 1937, when the break came in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, a small group of ministers and a few elders signed the Articles of Association for the Bible Presbyterian Synod. One of the factors which led to this break was the repudiation by the Third General Assembly of the then Presbyterian Church of America of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, and the Assembly set up its own "Synod-controlled" foreign board.

According to the Minutes of the Second General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America, meeting in Philadelphia, November 12-14, 1936, there were 106 ministers enrolled in the Church.

According to the Minutes of the latest General Assembly, the 22nd, meeting at Westminster Theological Seminary, May 25-30, 1955, there were only 115 ministers enrolled in the Church; or, in 19 years, there has been a net gain of 9 ministers in the denomination. Of the present ministers, only 35 were among the original 106.

Concerning the official Committee on Foreign Missions, in 1955, we read, page 15, "The following missionaries were on the missionary roll of the committee at the end of the fiscal year." There are only 17 missionaries, including husbands and wives. The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions has 86 missionaries and serves 12 fields, and had an income last year of \$325,289.89. The O.P.C. official board has a budget (1955) of \$62,630. This Synod-controlled Board of Foreign Missions has made very little progress through the years.

The statistics of the denomination and its growth, as indicated by them, is also very significant. According to the 1955 report, there are only 5,979 communicant members in the denomination, an increase of 29 over 1954. According to the Minutes of 1951, the total communicant membership was 5,831. In 1953, it was 5,830. In four years, there was

a net gain of 148 communicant members in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. In a breakdown of the churches, there is one church with 390 members in Cedar Grove, Wis.; the second is Vineland, N. J., with 297; the third, Wilmington, Del., with 262; and the fourth, Oostburg, Wis., with 247. Of 72 churches, 55 of them have less than 100 members.

At the time of the break, in 1937, the leaders of the Orthodox Church took the Church and they had Westminster Theological Seminary, an independent institution.

According to the latest available Minutes of the General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, 1954, the total communicant membership was 8,428, or 25 per cent larger than the Orthodox Church. There were 198 ministers and 86 churches. The leaders of Westminster Seminary successfully resisted a move in the Orthodox Church to put the Seminary under the control of the General Assembly. And the *Guardian*, which generally serves the church, is an independent non-Assembly-controlled journal. The Orthodox Presbyterian Church has a Synod-controlled foreign board, home board, and Christian education board, and no Synod-controlled college, seminary, or publication.

The Bible Presbyterian Church, in its 18th General Synod, has in one Synod gone beyond the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in the question of Synod-control. It made provision for a Synod-controlled college, established a Synod-controlled official publication, and erected a powerful Synod-controlled Committee on Christian Education. The B.P. Synod does not yet have a Synod-controlled Board of Foreign Missions or a Synod-controlled seminary.

Dr. Buswell, moderator of the 18th General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, in the *Bible Presbyterian Observer*, December, 1955, has appealed for the setting up of agencies, "Where some agencies may have fallen completely under the ideology of domination, others must be raised up." And, according to the *Bible Presbyterian Observer*, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and Faith Theological Seminary have fallen under "the ideology of domination." There is talk among a number of the ministers in the Bible Presbyterian Church for the establishment of a Synod-controlled board of foreign missions and a Synod-controlled theological seminary, thus breaking with the Independent Board, its history, and turning away from Faith Theological Seminary.

The revolution in the Bible Presbyterian Church, which developed in the 18th General Synod, has swung the pendulum out even farther than it occurred in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. To establish a Presbyterian Church with Synod-controlled Home, Foreign, Christian Education agencies, official paper, college, and seminary is the pattern exactly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

The Orthodox Presbyterian Church has given an illustration of how an ingrown denomination, with its emphasis upon the Church and its "Reformed Faith" government, has progressed. The Orthodox Presbyterian Church also turned aside from the great struggle against the apostasy, which Dr. Machen was so valiantly leading. It declined to go along in the movement represented by the American Council of Christian Churches and it is not a member of the International Council of Christian Churches.

A movement which is going to challenge the apostasy must be free, militant, loyal to the faith, and aggressive in its evangelistic testimony. Is the Bible Presbyterian Church going to turn now and become like the O.P.C.; in fact, even go beyond the O.P.C. in this very emphasis upon the Church? The glorious emphasis of the Church should be upon Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

"Oh that thou wouldest rend the heavens, that thou wouldest come down, that the mountains might flow down at thy presence. . . . For since the beginning of the world men have not heard, nor perceived by the ear, neither hath the eye seen, O God, beside thee, what he hath prepared for him that waiteth for him. Thou meetest him that rejoiceth and worketh righteousness, those that remember thee in thy ways: behold, thou art wroth; for we have sinned: in those is continuance, and we shall be saved. But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away. And there is none that calleth upon thy name, that stirreth up himself to take hold of thee: for thou hast hid thy face from us, and hast consumed us, because of our iniquities. But now, O Lord, thou art our father; we are the clay, and thou our potter; and we all are the work of thy hand.

"Be not wroth very sore, O Lord, neither remember iniquity for ever: behold, see, we beseech thee, we are all thy people" (Isa. 64:1, 4-9).

Anti-McIntire Crusade

The struggle in the Bible Presbyterian Church, on the part of some, has become an anti-McIntire crusade with an effort to drive Dr. McIntire from the Church. Dr. McIntire has received letters from Bible Presbyterian ministers, some of whom have recently come into the denomination, telling him that he should leave the Church. Others have said that the Bible Presbyterian Church will not advance as long as he is in it, and that he is the big hindrance in the Church. He is also accused of not being a loyal Bible Presbyterian. Letters have come to the *Christian Beacon* from Bible Presbyterians cancelling their subscriptions and saying that they will have nothing to do with anything with which Dr. McIntire is connected. There are many wonderful Bible Presbyterians who do not know or realize how bad conditions have become in the attack on Dr. McIntire.

The first public attacks made on Dr. McIntire's character were made by Dr. Robert G. Rayburn when he questioned the integrity of the members of the executive committee of the American Council of Christian Churches in his Greenville report, charging them with "deliberate deception." Dr. Rayburn insisted that this was not a personal attack and that he did not call into question anybody's honor or integrity.

Later, however, he repeated the charge against Dr. McIntire in the presence of witnesses when, referring to a question of American Council statistics, he declared, "That is deliberate deception." This he repeated.

Later he insisted again that he was making no charges against anyone's integrity. Speaking before some of the Collingswood people, he insisted that no such charge was involved.

On the Synod floor in St. Louis, however, he declared that the basic problem was one of loss of confidence based on integrity. Later, in the *Bible Presbyterian Observer*, No. 2, he insisted that, since no name was mentioned in his Greenville charge of "deliberate deception," it was not an attack on any individual's honor or integrity.

Recently Dr. McIntire wrote Dr. Rayburn questioning this type of abuse and asking for specifications concerning the allegation that he was making that Dr. McIntire was violating the Ninth Commandment.

Dr. Rayburn wrote on December 28, 1955, on the official stationery of Covenant College, as follows:

"You challenge me for speaking evil

of you. That is really amazing! You knew as well as I did that your mimeographed report to the last Bible Presbyterian Synod contained false witness against me as well as against Max Belz in violation of the 9th Commandment, which false witness was circulated to hundreds of people. That is only one of a whole list of such offenses. You are not the one to get righteously indignant over such a statement as mine!

"You want an example of irresponsible authority. The Highland College situation is quite sufficient, although I could give you many. You had the authority to come out here and tell Kennedy and Gordon et al to apologize to me, which they did immediately, although others had appealed to them in every way possible to do so and had completely failed. You proved your authority."

The "mimeographed report" to Synod was Dr. McIntire's American Council report, and, according to his knowledge and belief, all of the statements which he made in it were true. The reference concerning "irresponsible authority" in going to Highland College is to his effort as a brother with brethren to bring peace, and he did secure a signed statement by both sides on the basis of which fellowship was restored at that time. This could hardly be "irresponsible authority." Rather, it was brotherly concern and love.

The anti-McIntire campaign has been used to discredit him in the broader field of his world-wide activity and witness, particularly in the International Council of Christian Churches. Some opposing Dr. McIntire have passed on information to the enemies of the movement.

Presbyterian Life, official organ of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., has carried a story the import of which is to discredit Dr. McIntire. *United Evangelical Action*, the official organ of the National Association of Evangelicals, carried an editorial entitled, "An Object Lesson." This, too, attempted to discredit Dr. McIntire. *Christian Life* headed its lengthy article, "BP's 'Young Men' Revolt," and observed that the conflict "could send McIntire spinning from his pinnacle in the ACCC." Again, it was McIntire who was fighting Buswell and it was "McIntire's habit of regarding his opinions as the opinions of the one million persons claimed as members of the ACCC."

The Alliance Weekly, January 4, 1956, organ of the Christian and Missionary Alliance, in an article by Carl F. H. Henry, professor in Fuller Theological Seminary and leader in the National Association of Evangelicals, had the fol-

lowing to say about the American Council:

"The American Council of Churches faced inner tensions, with a revolt against its titular leader, Dr. Carl McIntire, spearheaded by Bible Presbyterians."

The only conflict within the American Council has been by a Bible Presbyterian element led by Dr. Robert G. Rayburn, and the inner tensions of 1955 have been those that have been agitated by the Bible Presbyterian group represented by Dr. Rayburn. This, however, in the way in which it has been handled, has now given the enemies of the separatist position occasion to rejoice and blaspheme.

The *Presbyterian Guardian*, a voice within the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, features an entire article on the opposition to the "McIntire leadership."

Those who objected—the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., the National Association of Evangelicals, the Orthodox Presbyterian Church—to the uncompromising stand which Dr. McIntire has taken through the years in behalf of the separatist cause, its related issues, and also for the freedom which the Bible Presbyterian Church gave to its local churches and pastors in the beginning, have been furnished information and have not hesitated to use it in their publications.

The fact is that the executive committee of the ICCC is standing squarely and solidly with Dr. McIntire in his uncompromising position. The American Council of Christian Churches also is standing with him in the position on separation which he has maintained through the years.

The activity of Dr. Rayburn and others associated with him has served to do great harm to the ACCC, the ICCC, and particularly the testimony of the Bible Presbyterian Church itself.

These attacks made upon Dr. McIntire are being used to discredit him, his ministry, the *Christian Beacon*, the Collingswood Church, the ACCC, and the ICCC, with which he has been so intimately associated. The responsibility for handling these attacks in such a way as to reflect upon the whole separatist cause is a matter that should be of concern to the Christians in the Bible Presbyterian Church and to the Lord's people everywhere.

The truth is that, at the 18th General Synod on a secret ballot, Dr. McIntire received the highest number of votes as

(Continued on page 23)

Shelton College

The Board of Directors of Shelton College, after a number of lengthy meetings and after exhausting every effort to resolve the situation which had developed in the college under Dr. J. Oliver Buswell's leadership, unanimously removed Dr. Buswell from the presidency. The reasons for this were stated in a resolution adopted by the Board. In the December issue of the *Bible Presbyterian Observer*, Dr. Buswell has replied to this resolution, making numerous serious misrepresentations. The Board of Shelton College is preparing a lengthy statement and explanation for those who may desire it. Also, there are references to Dr. Carl McIntire on the part of Dr. Buswell that are in serious error.

Writing of Dr. Elmer Smick, professor of Semitics in Shelton, Dr. Buswell says: "Dr. McIntire asked, 'What right has Dr. Smick to teach on the faculty of Shelton College?' Dr. McIntire further questioned Dr. Smick's loyalty to the ACCC and ICCC organizations." Dr. Buswell continues:

"Mr. Bennet knew of members (only one or two as it subsequently develops) in Dr. Smick's church who are opposing him, and, Mr. Bennet said, 'I think Dr. Smick's people will take care of him.' I referred to the letters about Mr. Anderson and the remarks about Dr. Smick as 'cracking down' on free men. Dr. McIntire objected to my phrase, 'cracking down.' Rev. Jack Murray said, 'It is just the consistent application of a principle.'

"At the same Shelton board meeting Dr. McIntire moved to adopt the following statement of policy: 'Since the position of Shelton College is committed to the position and testimony of the American Council of Christian Churches, it shall be the policy of the College from this date not to employ on the Teaching Staff anyone who advocates withdrawal from, or in the opinion of the Board is hostile to the American Council of Christian Churches.'

"The motion was passed, and I confess that I acquiesced, failing to see the organizational implications."

Dr. Buswell gives an entirely erroneous impression and report. He places in quotation marks words which he puts in the mouth of Dr. McIntire. What Dr. McIntire did say at the meeting on June 20 was, that if Dr. Smick departed from the position of the college regarding the American Council of Christian Churches, then Dr. Smick or anyone else who would make such a departure could not properly teach on the faculty at the college.

Every member present agreed with the statement that Dr. McIntire made, and a committee was appointed by Dr. Buswell, after unanimous action, to contact Dr. Smick and ascertain his position. The Board has a right to ascertain the position of every member of the faculty whom it employs and Dr. Smick's attitude in the Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, in his vote, could not be taken as evidence. The Board must deal directly and not by hearsay or second-hand information with its teachers if it is to be a truly responsible Board. Dr. Buswell has repeatedly been told that he misrepresented Dr. McIntire and the other members of the Board in this matter. This has been told to him in the Board meeting itself. But here he has published far and wide a representation of Dr. McIntire which simply is not in accordance with the fact, and the members of the Board will testify to this. Dr. Buswell, in making it appear that Jack Murray was saying that it was just a consistent application of principle that he was objecting to the "cracking down" that Buswell refers to, is again seriously in error. Mr. Murray, in his remarks, was pointing out that, regardless of who the teacher was, if a professor was not going to take the stand of the school in regard to its commitment to the position and testimony of the American Council, he ought not to be employed.

The school is entitled to have standards and to maintain those standards, and when the school does maintain those standards it is not "cracking down" or engaging in reprisals but simply maintaining the integrity of its own testimony and position.

The resolution which was passed emphasizes the position and testimony of the American Council of Christian Churches. There was no thought on the part of anyone that blind allegiance was required to everything that the American Council did in every resolution or particular.

Dr. Buswell indicates that he failed to see, at the time, the "organizational implications." There are and were no organizational implications. Effort is here made to make it appear that the Board was requiring some sort of blind allegiance—allegiance to men rather than allegiance to Jesus Christ.

This twisting and perverting of the Board meeting and what was done, even after Dr. Buswell himself had been told that it was not a proper report or evaluation, is characteristic of what the Board members themselves have had to endure at the hands of Dr. Buswell through this conflict. Repeatedly he insists that

certain things have happened, when they did not happen. There has appeared to be a certain fixation about Dr. Buswell on some of these things, and pleading with him and the presenting of the facts and the testimony of others (more than two or three witnesses) just simply does not seem in any way to affect his attitude.

Shelton College is "an American Council school." It stands for the principle, position, and testimony of the American Council of Christian Churches.

In order to build a case against the Board, it is necessary for Dr. Buswell to engage in this sort of representation.

On the other hand, this should be contrasted with the action of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, where, in the case of declining to reelect two members to its Board, there was lengthy, publicly circulated documentation, which men had seen and all could study and review. In a meeting of the Shelton Board, Dr. Buswell threatened, if he were removed, to take part in the formation of another council of churches. And now he states in print that since the ideology of domination has come into being in independent agencies something must be done. "Where some agencies may have fallen completely under the ideology of domination, others must be raised up." Does this mean that, as some are now claiming, there is to be established a Synod-controlled board of foreign missions and a Synod-controlled theological seminary? As the Independent Board now exists, there has been no change of policy of any kind. Dr. Buswell and others associated with him are still members of the executive committee. When responsible leaders and members of independent agencies have done what they thought was right before the Lord in order to maintain the institutions in their testimony, shall God's people sit idly by while attacks are centered upon them, designed to cripple and destroy them in order that official Synod-controlled agencies may be established in their places?

Dr. Buswell refers to a memorandum dated July 23 "sent out by Dr. McIntire to a list the size of which he refuses to state." I told the Board that approximately fifty copies of this memorandum had been made and that it had been sent to all the members of the Shelton College Board. The meeting of July 21 was so disturbing that before I left for Europe I dictated a memorandum. This is something which I have done on other occasions, in order that we might have a record of what took place. It might

be well if this whole memorandum were read by God's people today. Here are two paragraphs:

"The gap between Dr. Buswell and the Board seemed to widen as the evening meeting proceeded. I moved that the actual vote on the motion be postponed until a meeting when every member of the Board could be notified and urged to be present. This was agreed upon for September 5, when Dr. Holdcroft and I will be back from the ICCS meetings in Europe and the Middle East. Men on the Board told Dr. Buswell that he had been responsible for many of the difficulties which the college had gotten into. Even during the meeting, while talking to one real estate man, he had made statements about our own financial condition which made it difficult to deal with that man so far as any offers were concerned. Buswell informed the Board that he thought that for the last three years, the college could not go on! He was then told that if he had felt that the college was going to fail, he should have resigned long ago so that someone could have been put in his place who believed that it could succeed and would have provided such leadership for the college. The following motion was placed on the minutes and unanimously approved by the Board: 'It was moved that this Board intends to maintain the independent nature of this institution. The Board regrets and deplors the question which has been raised by the committee of the Bible Presbyterian Church for a Synod-controlled college, inviting the surrender of control of the College and the resignation of the present Board of Trustees. The Board of Shelton College rejoices in God's goodness to it and does not wish to become embroiled in any particular denominational struggle. We assure our constituency that it can depend upon our steadfastness.'

"Dr. Buswell indicated that Dr. MacRae's arguments appearing in *The Free Press* were "silly" and that there was not going to be any split in the Bible

Our Experience . . .

(Continued from page 19)

National Missions Committee to co-operate in promoting a cause of schism in one of the faithful and loyal Bible Presbyterian congregations, a church which has done more than any other in the whole denomination to build it and support it, indicates just what happens when a Synod-controlled agency is rejected by a people. Instead of letting the group in Haddonfield establish themselves, restore mutual love and confidence, and then come to Presbytery with a desire to co-operate with the brethren, the whole matter was pressed immediately upon the Presbytery, causing considerable dissension and disturbing the peace of the Presbytery. Is it proper for a Presbyterian minister to go without the bounds of his own Presbytery, aid a schismatic

Presbyterian Church but that McIntire might lead off a small splinter. Toward the end of the meeting the situation deteriorated considerably, but all matters were postponed, and it was clear that Dr. Buswell was at real differences with his Board. The Board members indicated that they did not want to be forced to take an action of firing Dr. Buswell. It is trusted that prayer, and the grace of God, and the Holy Spirit will lead, that there may be some resolution of this situation which has been precipitated."

When a man has lost confidence in the future of a school and thinks it is going to fail, he is not the man to be president, and it is then time for the Board to make a change, especially if the Board believes that the school can succeed and that it ought to succeed.

When the general Christian public finds out these facts, they will appreciate the unanimous action of the Board. Buswell simply had to be removed if the college was going to be saved and preserved.

group, and then appear before the Presbytery within whose bounds the schismatic church exists, and expect to be received as a corresponding member to press the cause of the schismatic group? Is that the spirit of brotherly love? It was repeatedly said in the Presbytery that if the group that has gone to Haddonfield would establish themselves and if reconciliation with the Collingswood Church could be effected, there would be no objection to their being received into the fellowship of the Presbytery; but that until such mutual love and confidence can be maintained, which was the basis of the formation of the Bible Presbyterian Church, this issue could not be forced upon the Presbytery.

The two leaders in the Bible Presbyterian Church who have participated in this schismatic action have been Tom Cross, the secretary of National Missions, and J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., the moderator of the 18th General Synod. What they have expected to gain by this procedure is a real question! This does not commend Synod-controlled agencies to a people who want their freedom, especially when they have come out of a denomination like the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., where they do have Synod-controlled agencies with ecclesiastical powers using them for their own ends.

This report is not based upon speculation but upon actual experience.

Anti-McIntire . . .

(Continued from page 21)

a delegate to the ACCC and has been made the chairman of the delegation. He also was elected a delegate to the ICCS and has been made chairman of the delegation. So far as the votes of the Bible Presbyterian Synod are concerned, those that have aided in the attempts to discredit him in the movement at large represent a minority.

Requests for copies of *The Free Press* and all communications may be addressed to the secretary-treasurer of the Committee, the Rev. Arthur G. Slaght, 1630 S. Hanover St., Baltimore 30, Md.

