

## St. Louis Ultimatum—Resign or Get Out

*The Bible Press*, published by the First Bible Presbyterian Church of St. Louis, Mo., the Rev. Donald MacNair, pastor, reports the action of the congregation as follows:

"A motion was approved that the Session ask the Congregation for authority to withdraw from the Bible Presbyterian Synod, provided that at the close of the 19th General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, the present group now in control of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, Shelton College, and Faith Seminary does not relinquish control of these agencies and disband the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions, or leave the Bible Presbyterian Church; and further, that, if the Session found it necessary to act, they be empowered to invite any other churches of like mind to join together with us.

"This resolution was moved and seconded and had lengthy discussion. It was most definitely pointed out that the resolution does not put us out of the Bible Presbyterian Church at this time. It was also pointed out that the intent of the resolution is that we do not want to leave or to cause ourselves to become independent. It was further pointed out that this is in no wise a schismatic act; rather it is an act which demonstrates the presence of schism already in the midst of the Synod. It was pointed out that this resolution is the only logical action that we as people responsible for our convictions before God could take if we believe that the over-all situation is tainted by the desire of a few to maintain bigness and importance, especially in the American Council and International Council realms, even at the expense of purity of fact in the presentation of the picture. Full discussion was held of the impact of this motion upon

us as a people and upon the Synod as a whole. After a very lengthy but orderly and God-pleasing discussion, the vote was called for. By this time there were 65 voting members still present (which is a large voting percentage of our roll). The voting was 61 in favor, three against, and one cast a blank ballot.

"The pastor would like to say that he is very happy that the Lord so evidently led in the decision before us. If it had been a very close vote, there would have been evidence of problems that might arise in the future because of the feeling expressed. However, the rather strong unanimity evidenced the fact that our people are together in this issue.

"These are difficult things to do and to write about. We must face the problems that are coming to a head at the Synod to be held in April in the Y.M.C.A. here in St. Louis. We feel that we have taken action that will be honoring to the Lord and that will allow us to know where our people stand. The members of Session, of course, are the spiritual leadership and the responsible agents of the Congregation. However, they do not have authority to act for the people in actions of this nature other than to lead and guide. Therefore as they did that, the people responded; the responsibility now is upon all our shoulders, and we look to the Lord to continue this work for His Glory."

---

THIS IS A SPECIAL ISSUE OF *The Free Press*, PUBLISHED AT THIS TIME BECAUSE OF THE RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE FIRST BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF ST. LOUIS. THE REV. CARL MCINTIRE, D.D., HAS PREPARED THE ARTICLES.

---

## A Parallel

The St. Louis ultimatum, and such is exactly what it is, for it tells men to do certain things or else they will do certain things, which means that the church is to be split, parallels in striking fashion the attitude of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. 22 years ago toward the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

In 1933, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions was formed, free from the direction, "review, and control" of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., and incorporated under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania. This Board was called schismatic, un-Presbyterian, Congregational, a spite board, and other things. The General Assembly of the denomination adopted what became known as "the Mandate," an ultimatum that the Board desist, dissolve, and its members resign within 90 days or else stand trial, the trial which suspended them from the ministry. Members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions declined to resign and appealed to the Scriptures and the constitution of the Church for their liberty in Christ. The resulting trials led in the break which came in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., and which is a part of the foundation and the history of the Bible Presbyterian movement.

In 1955, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions was formed, independent, free from direction, "review, and control" of the General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, and incorporated under the laws of the State of New Jersey. This Board has been called schismatic, un-Presbyterian, Congregational, a spite board, and many other things. The same things said about the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions in 1933-34 are now being said about the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions in

*(Continued on page 4)*

### LEADERS IN THE MOVEMENT WHO HAVE BEEN ASKED TO RESIGN OR LEAVE CHURCH



J. G. Holdcroft



J. E. Bennet



A. A. MacRae



A. G. Slaght



C. McIntire



J. W. Murray



## St. Louis Ultimatum

An amazing development in the conflict within the Bible Presbyterian Church has taken place in the action of the congregation of the First Bible Presbyterian Church of St. Louis calling for the dissolution of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions or that its members leave the church; and also calling upon the groups directing the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, Faith Theological Seminary, and Shelton College to relinquish their control.

This development is the natural sequence and outgrowth of the thinking of those who have been seeking to change the position and testimony of these agencies, and to establish a church in which there would be Synod-controlled agencies.

First, there was circulated the document, "Ideological Division Within Our Church," prepared by Robert G. Rayburn, Claude Bunzel, and Walter Lyons, calling the Bible Presbyterian Church a "hybrid" organization combining true Presbyterianism and Congregationalism, and attacking as "Congregational" independent agencies which God has used to establish the movement.

Along with this was the resolution passed by the Session of the Greenville Bible Presbyterian Church, under the leadership of Dr. Flournoy Shepperson, claiming that the Form of Government of the Bible Presbyterian Church requires the churches and members of the church to stand by the actions of the Synod and stating, "If they are to remain true Bible Presbyterians, they can do no other than support and abide by the actions of the 18th General Synod." This un-Protestant and un-Presbyterian position was offered as a pattern for the churches and led to statements from brethren that, if ministers in the church were not going to abide by the actions of the 18th General Synod, they should get out.

The second development was the signing of a resolution by a group of Bible Presbyterians, headed by Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, including Donald J. MacNair and an elder, Mr. Presley Edwards of St. Louis, accusing "a certain group representing the minority" as "gathering power." This resolution was discussed at length in No. 4 of *The Free Press*.

Now we have, in the third place, the action of the St. Louis congregation demanding that brethren whom they have identified, as Dr. Buswell has stated it, as "representing the ideology of domination," step out of their positions in the movement or leave the church, or else the St. Louis church will withdraw and gather others to it for another denomination.

A canvass made of various members of the agencies referred to, falling under the ban of the St. Louis church, indicates that these brethren intend to continue in their positions as God has led them in His providence, and that they do not intend to resign or to withdraw from the Bible Presbyterian Church!

## A Petition by 110 Elders And Ministers

A PETITION TO DR. J. OLIVER BUSWELL, JR., MODERATOR OF THE 18th GENERAL SYNOD OF THE BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

We, the undersigned ministers and ruling elders of the Bible Presbyterian Church, respectfully request that you call the 19th General Synod at the usual time, early in June, 1956, at Harvey Cedars, New Jersey, for the following reasons:

1. The discretionary power given to you to set the date and place of the 19th General Synod did not stipulate or envision a change in the usual season of the year, and we question whether a Synod called by you for either February or April can be a proper Synod.

2. Harvey Cedars will be private, without cost for rooms, with plenty of conference space, and the only expense will be meals, which can be offered at cost.

3. It has been customary to hold two out of three of our Synods on the eastern seaboard where our two largest presbyteries are and where the majority of our membership lives.

4. It is most essential that the elders of the churches, if we are to be a Presbyterian body, be able to attend, and it is more convenient because of vacations, as has been the case in the past, for them to come in the summer.

5. We call attention to the fact that in your fixing of the two present dates we have not heard of any brethren of the Synod who were consulted by you who represented a position different from yours on the vital questions before the Church.

6. We object to a call being sent out under your authority as moderator in which you refer to a possible separation in the Church. We are all under vows to work for the purity, peace, and unity of the Church.

7. Finally, we call attention to the provision in our Form of Government concerning the Synod, which reads as follows, 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."

Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

— Philippians 3:13, 14

## Letter to Moderator

Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr.  
408 Lippincott Avenue  
Riverton, N. J.

Dear Dr. Buswell:

I am enclosing a petition which has been signed by elders and ministers in the Bible Presbyterian Church. There are, we believe, 110 signatures. There may be a few others yet to come. This same petition was adopted by the Presbytery of New Jersey and I understand that California, Philadelphia, and Kentucky-Tennessee Presbyteries took actions asking that the Synod be held around the usual time or on the East Coast, or words to that effect.

The resolution of the Presbytery of Kentucky-Tennessee, attested to by the Stated Clerk, is typed on the bottom of one of the petitions. It requested that the date be set not earlier than June, 1956, and was passed by the Presbytery without a dissenting vote, nine ministers and two elders present and voting. The moderator did not vote.

I was the one at the 18th General Synod who made the motion that you be given the liberty of setting the time and the date of the 19th General Synod. There was no thought at that time of any other time than the usual season. We were pressed and there was some question as to whether Dr. Gebb could get some school or academy and he did not know just when in June its sessions would end.

We have now received the report of the St. Louis resolution calling upon the members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions to dissolve the Board or leave the Church. In view of this position of the St. Louis church and what it has demanded of members of our Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, Faith Seminary, and Shelton College, I think that you should consider definitely the propriety of calling Synod at a more neutral place, such as has been suggested in the petitions which are respectfully submitted.

Sincerely yours in Christ,  
cm.h CARL McINTIRE

Put not forth thyself in the presence of the king, and stand not in the place of great men: for better it is that it be said unto thee, Come up hither; than that thou shouldst be put lower in the presence of the prince whom thine eyes have seen. Go not forth hastily to strive, lest thou know not what to do in the end thereof, when thy neighbour hath put thee to shame. Debate thy cause with thy neighbour himself; and discover not a secret to another: lest he that heareth it put thee to shame, and thine infamy turn not away.

— Proverbs 25:6-10



## Schism

The St. Louis church, in its resolution, has informed the denomination that, unless the men whom it has singled out do what they say they should do, the church is prepared to leave the denomination. This becomes schism. The resolution, of course, disclaims such a thought when it says, "This is in no wise a schismatic act; rather it is an act which demonstrates the presence of schism already in the midst of the Synod." Yet, the Synod is still intact; it has not broken. It is perfectly possible, by the grace of God and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, that a spirit of brotherly love may prevail and that the differences and difficulties which have arisen may be reasonably discussed and resolved in full faithfulness to the Bible, the constitution, and the history of the church. The St. Louis church, however, has indicated its future course of action.

One of two things will happen; either honored and highly respected agencies will submit their control to the desires of those representing the position of the St. Louis church, and the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions will disband, or the St. Louis church leaves the denomination. According to this ultimatum, the St. Louis church is going to leave, on one hand; or else those who are spoken of as "now in control" must leave, on the other hand. There has to be a separation, according to the St. Louis resolution. This comes nearer to "ugly schism."

It is the firm belief of many that there is no Scriptural warrant for schism in the Bible Presbyterian Church, and that saner and sounder counsel should prevail, and that the whole church, in loyalty to its founding principles, find itself in the midst of the present confusion and go on unitedly together. This is the fervent prayer of many—we can say, of all of those who are, according to the St. Louis resolution, called upon to do certain things their way or else leave the church.

### FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE

The St. Louis ultimatum to the members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions is in direct conflict with specific provisions in the constitution of the Bible Presbyterian Church. The same provisions of the Confession of Faith, which were used in defense of the liberty and the conscience of the members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, must now be adduced in defense of the liberty and conscience of the members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions.

Chapter XX, "Of Christian Liberty, and Liberty of Conscience," paragraph II, of the Confession of Faith reads: "God alone is lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in any thing con-

## Synod Members Asked to Resign or Leave Church

Dr. J. Gordon Holdcroft, president of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions; Dr. Allan A. MacRae, president of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions; Dr. John W. Murray, president of Shelton College; Dr. Carl McIntire, president of the Board of Directors of Faith Theological Seminary; and the Hon. James E. Bennet, vice-president of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, are among those to whom the ultimatum of the St. Louis Bible Presbyterian Church is addressed, when it called upon "the present group now in control of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, Shelton College, and Faith Seminary" to "relinquish control of these agencies."

These men, among others, are members of various independent agencies which God has used in the establishment of the separatist movement and also of the Bible Presbyterian Church.

Members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions, ministers or laymen of the Bible Presbyterian Church, who are formally called upon by the congregation of the Bible Presbyterian Church in St. Louis to disband the Board or leave the denomination, are as follows:

Mr. B. J. Bashaw, Hon. James E. Bennet, Mr. John E. Carson, Rev. Charles Dana Chrisman, Rev. Emmet Cleveland, Rev. Robert V. Dickerson, Dr. Ralph W. Duncan, Rev. Robert DuVall, Mr. Robert H. Fox, Rev. Lynn Gray Gordon, Mrs. Louire B. Greeley, Rev. Robert I. Hatch, Dr. J. Gordon Holdcroft, Rev. Adam B. Hunter, Rev. John E. Janbaz, Rev. Clyde J. Kennedy, Mrs. Lawrence Rust Lee, Mr. J. Wyman Ludlow, Dr. Carl McIntire, Dr. Allan A. MacRae, Rev. E. E. Matteson, Dr. John W. Murray, Mrs. Helen E. Noon, Rev. Albert W. Oldham, Rev. Emanuel A. Peters, Mrs. George R. Putnam, Miss Elsie Richards, Rev. Charles E. Richter, Mrs. J. B. Roper, Rev. Arthur G. Slaght, Rev. Fred Stroud, Mrs. Huston Thompson, Mr. E. O. Todd, Rev. F. Burton Toms, Rev. Robert B. Vanderney, Rev. Clarence van der Veen, and Mr. Glenn O. Young.

trary to his Word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commandments out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience; and the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also."

A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver.

— Proverbs 25:11

## Time Limit

The St. Louis church states the time at which its ultimatum must be fulfilled, "The close of the 19th General Synod." This is the session to which Dr. Buswell has summoned the church in St. Louis, April 5-11, 1956. The resolution says, "We must face the problems that are coming to a head at the Synod to be held in April."

It is perfectly obvious that it is intended that at the end of the Synod there shall be a split in the church. If the brethren have not withdrawn by that time, or dissolved the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions, the St. Louis church will lead that split, inviting "any other churches of like mind to join together with us."

This situation calls now for the most serious attention of the Lord's people in the Bible Presbyterian movement. Allan A. MacRae, Carl McIntire, and others do not intend to be a party to any such schism. The Lord's people throughout the Bible Presbyterian Church are not prepared or ready for any such schism. The people of the church, who are the church and who must make the great decisions, as they are called upon to vote as congregations as to what they shall do, are not informed. Too many of the pastors have kept from their people the information as to what has actually been going on in the church. Dr. Buswell has called what has been termed "an improper Synod" and has exceeded the limits of the authority given to him by the 18th General Synod. If those of us with whom they are seeking to deal will simply stay away from this gathering we will not be there to "fight" with them or to argue with them and precipitate such a split. One Synod does not bind another Synod, and the constitution of the Bible Presbyterian Church has made it clear that the actions of the Synod are not binding unless they become amendments to the constitution.

For these reasons among others we intend to stay away from St. Louis, and we call upon the members of the churches to be in prayer. Dr. Buswell's call has come at a time that many, many of the elders are unable to be present, and it will be a small and limited "rump" meeting at the most, even if it were recognized as a "proper" Synod.

For the Bible Presbyterian Church to present to the Christian world a spectacle such as is demanded by the St. Louis resolution will do the cause of Christ great harm.

A man that beareth false witness against his neighbour is a maul, and a sword, and a sharp arrow. Confidence in an unfaithful man in time of trouble is like a broken tooth, and a foot out of joint.

— Proverbs 25:18, 19



## Covenant College

It should be observed by the Lord's people in the Bible Presbyterian Church that St. Louis is the location of the new "Synod-controlled" Covenant College. This college is not far from the First Bible Presbyterian Church, and the First Bible Presbyterian Church will be "the mother church" of the college. With the congregation feeling as it does toward the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, Faith Theological Seminary, and the other agencies which God has raised up as a part of the separatist movement, it will not be difficult to see that the influence and impact of this college will be against the independent agencies and those who have had a part in establishing them. The Synod-controlled college will indeed turn out students who will be in favor of only Synod-controlled activities and agencies and, as Dr. Allan A. MacRae has so adequately pointed out, it is the experience of history and the weakness of human nature, that, where there are Synod-controlled agencies, the Synod soon becomes an agency-controlled Synod!

It was all of this that the founders of the Bible Presbyterian Church turned away from, that the movement as a whole turned away from, when such institutions as Faith Theological Seminary had written into their charters that they would never be subject to the dictates of any ecclesiastical body.

The development taking place within the Bible Presbyterian Church under the leadership of the St. Louis centered program represents a revolution in the church and is a departure from that to which the church was originally committed and for which it was established. It has been pointed out by a number that other elements have come into the church, opinion has been led to change, and now the church itself is to be diverted and made into an entirely different kind of body from that it was established to be.

Serious and basic questions are raised by any such procedure.

## A Parallel

(Continued from page 1)

1955-56. The congregation of the St. Louis church has now, by official action, issued an ultimatum that the Board should be dissolved and its members should desist or else leave the denomination. The discipline of the church has not yet been invoked, but the next step is to put the members of this Board on trial. If they will not leave the church, then the St. Louis session is empowered to leave them.

Actually, the members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions

## A Full Meeting of Synod

As a "rump Synod," with a limited number of elders in attendance, the meeting which Dr. Buswell has called in St. Louis cannot possibly represent the mind of the church. If, instead, a full meeting of the Synod could be arranged, when all elders and pastors of all the churches could attend and in a spirit of prayer, brotherly love, humility, and meekness before the Lord the problems which are concerning many in the church could be discussed, then perhaps an understanding could really be reached for the glory of God and the peace and the unity of our beloved church.

It is believed that Dr. Buswell, in proceeding as he has (and as has been outlined in the petition presented to him), is actually using his position for the advantage of the particular side to which he belongs in the present issue. The meeting of a "rump Synod" will not settle the issues in the minds of people throughout the church, and the fact that the Synod itself has been challenged as an improper meeting, as Dr. Buswell used authority placed in his hands by the last General Synod, will of course keep a number away. There should be a meeting of Synod at which there will be and can be no question concerning its propriety under the constitution.

The constitution does provide that, if there are questions which arise which are so pressing that they must have immediate attention, a special meeting can be arranged at the requirement of the necessary signatures from ministers and elders. But Dr. Buswell has not employed this constitutional means for the calling of the St. Louis meeting. He has, instead, abused the power and exceeded the limits of the setting and context within which such power was granted to him by the 18th General Synod.

are entitled to the same rights and liberties that the members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions fought for under the constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and were not granted. It seems almost incredible that such a parallel situation could develop within the Bible Presbyterian Church, which was actually founded with the full recognition of the liberty which God grants to His servants and testimony to the fact that the constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., including its Confession of Faith, grants that very liberty of conscience. Instead of this type of attack as made by the St. Louis congregation, every church, minister, and individual in the Bible Presbyterian Church should defend the liberty and the right of the members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions to do what they did as Presbyterians as they felt led of the Lord.

## ACCC Statistics

The St. Louis manifesto says, "It was pointed out that this resolution is the only logical action that we as people responsible for our convictions before God could take if we believe that the over-all situation is tainted by the desire of a few to maintain bigness and importance, especially in the American Council and International Council realms even at the expense of purity of fact in the presentation of the picture."

Up to the present time, so far as we are aware, no questions have been raised concerning the International Council of Christian Churches as to its bigness.

The questions raised concerning the American Council's statistics have been thoroughly considered by the American Council and by the Bible Presbyterian Church. There is no question of purity and fact. The American Council, at its recent meeting in Grand Rapids, acceded to the request which had been made by the Bible Presbyterian Church concerning the term "auxiliary member," classing those who were formerly under that category as "auxiliaries." The statistics which the American Council has given concerning its denominations are those submitted to it by the denominations themselves. The Committee on Statistics of the American Council has been careful to see that all the figures which it uses have been trustworthy.

It was Presley Edwards of the St. Louis church who made the motion for the Bible Presbyterians to withdraw from the American Council, and it was seconded by Dr. Rayburn. This was defeated at the 18th General Synod. It would do great harm to the cause of Christ throughout the world for the Bible Presbyterians to repudiate the American Council of Christian Churches. The American Council has not sought to maintain bigness and importance. It has sought, as a Gideon's band, faithfully to defend the faith and to challenge the great colossus of the twentieth century apostasy. The Bible Presbyterians are the only individuals in the Council who have raised any question, and the Council has, to the present moment, met the request of the 18th Bible Presbyterian Synod.

And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people. But when he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted, and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd. Then saith he unto his disciples, The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest.

—Matthew 9:35;38



## Letter to Bible Presbyterians from Dr. A.B. Dodd

5 Hsin Sheng Road  
Tamsui, Taiwan (Formosa)  
January 14, 1956

Dear Members of the Bible Presbyterian Synod —

As a loyal presbyter of the Bible Presbyterian Church, I owe you an expression of my convictions on the important issue that is before us.

To begin with, I trust you will agree with me that by far the most urgent problem is a spiritual one — to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace, and that we take the greatest care to walk worthy of the high vocation wherewith we are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forgiving one another in love. This is far more vital to our testimony than is the choice as between the use of independent or church boards and agencies. Far better is it to continue to employ both kinds than to fall out among ourselves over the type we should use. There is much to be said for each type. Let us respect one another's opinions and be loyal to those agencies which stand true and are doing effective work under the blessing of God. It is not fair to call either type unpresbyterian and there is a real question as to the relative efficiency of Synod-controlled and individual Christian enterprises, corresponding to state and free enterprises in the world. There are advantages and dangers in both types of Christian work. We hold fresh in our minds the tragic results of the former type when the old church went amuck, though of course agencies of either kind may go amuck. It was undoubtedly true that the Assembly-controlled Boards, in the course of time, came largely to control the church and were a chief factor in hastening its apostasy.

It is not accurate to say that the church has no control over independent agencies. Church courts can and should exercise a large measure of control over all such agencies as it has a part in supporting. They can do this through thorough investigation of their work and faithfulness, followed by frank recommendations to their constituency who support or are connected with these agencies. Of course I do not mean mischievous interference with the policies and work of such boards or agencies, nor attempt to make rules, beside or in violation of the Word of God, to bind the conscience.

I think too that, while it is proper and often necessary for church courts to function in an executive capacity, there is truth in the contention that they may overload

themselves in this way, to the detriment of their spiritual government. So, being of one mind on essential matters, do let us "agree to differ" on comparatively less important issues, which involve procedure rather than principle, and "resolve to love"!

Now, as to the more serious matter of the adverse criticisms against Dr. Carl McIntire, it was a great pain to hear them on my recent return to America and to read them more recently. Though I tried to consider them objectively, I have failed to see their weight after considering both sides.

1. I have known Carl from his youth up and have greatly admired and respected him for his sterling integrity, his profound love, loyalty and consecration to Christ and tireless zeal for His cause, his outstanding ability, coupled with true humility. I regard him as a leader especially raised up for our Twentieth Century Reformation. On the whole, I believe he has shown great wisdom in the way he has exercised this leadership. Had I shown the same wisdom and consecrated persistence years ago in China and in the USA, I might have accomplished vastly more than I did in the good fight for the faith. Had Bible-believers in general and our group in particular given more united and unstinted support to such leaders as Machen and McIntire, the Great Apostasy throughout Protestantism might have been checked and millions of precious souls saved from its hellish clutches.

2. It seems to me that the criticism in regard to the statistics of the ACCC was uncalled for. I believe a genuine effort has been made to keep these statistics as correct as possible and up-to-date. Anyone who has had experience as Stated Clerk knows of the many problems involved in doing this. Then it is common practice for organizations to recognize various grades of membership, counting all grades in the total — such as constituent, consultative, advisory, associate, etc., with no intention whatever to mislead anyone as to the number of voting members. So it has been with the ACCC.

3. So too, I believe, it has been in regard to statistics as to the Balloon Project. In statistics of Scripture distribution the word Scripture or Bible is often innocently made to include substantial portions of Scripture.

4. So too it often becomes one's painful duty to defend our position against unfair attacks from other misguided Bible-believing leaders, or from their compromising practices which greatly endanger the sacred cause of separation. It is unfair to question the motive back of such

public defense or criticism, and false judgments may often be passed as to their necessity from lack of full knowledge as to the background in the way of private attempts to correct such errors. I believe Dr. McIntire has been greatly misjudged along these lines.

5. The attempts to discredit the leadership of this great man of God is working sad havoc to our cause all over the world where he has been so dearly loved and looked up to as a leader especially raised up by God to help the churches in this dire hour of need. This attitude toward him was plainly visible at Philadelphia in 1954 and I can testify to it in all the lands that I have visited in late years. I can also testify to the disastrous results of recent harsh criticisms against him. Groups that should be with us have been turned against us.

6. In so far as the opposition to him may arise from a desire to retreat from the fierceness of the life-and-death struggle to save the church throughout the world from apostasy, it would show a most deplorable tendency in our beloved church. We just *must* be true to the heavenly vision which called our Bible Presbyterian Church into being. It is unthinkable that the Bible Presbyterian Church should forget or prove false to its distinctive call and mission. We must, in the face of all opposition and every difficulty, continue to fight the good fight with all our might. This is not only our God-given task; it is, as well, our most effective strategy. As in both chess and war, the soundest defense lies in pushing offense. This all-out fight against the apostasy need in no way hinder a most aggressive campaign for winning souls and fighting all kinds of sin within our ranks.

7. The criticism of Dr. McIntire for his determined stand against Communism is unjust. He is not leading our movement into politics. He is rather leading it to take a truly Christian stand on a most vital issue which primarily is a spiritual and moral one. In view of the compromising position of the NCC and WCC, the truly Christian church would be shirking its grave responsibility if it did not clearly utter its voice in protest.

Assuring you again of our most earnest prayers for God's Spirit to prevail mightily in your meeting, putting out all that is evil and filling your hearts with love and sweet reasonableness and harmony which He alone can bestow, I am

Yours in the love of Christ,

ALBERT B. DODD

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.



