

THE FREE PRESS

VOL. I—No. 6

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

March 26, 1956

A One-Man Denomination

(Editorial photographed from the *Christian Advocate* of March 15, 1956, official organ of The Methodist Church, a denomination of nine million members.)

DR. CARL McINTIRE has a number of shortcomings (as any careful reader of the *Christian Beacon* must be wise enough to discover), but the worst is not theological obtuseness or obscurantism. In fact, some of the McIntire positions on theology are well taken.

His chief sin is that he has tried to build a denomination single-handed. He has tried to put McIntireism alongside Lutheranism and Calvinism and Wesleyanism; and Carl McIntire is simply not of that stature. (Besides, the followers of Wesley, Luther and Calvin exalted their leaders; the leaders did not attempt to build up themselves.)

Nobody can accuse Carl McIntire of laziness—he is a tireless worker. And nobody can charge him with cowardice—he has been an uncompromising fighter since he decided that Presbyterianism was becoming dangerously liberal and quit (or was put out) two decades ago. Nobody can say that he lacks resourcefulness—he was recently in Australia trying to badger the executive committee of the World Council of Churches. And he failed to damage the Council among informed observers down under, just as he failed to hurt the Council by his antics at the time of the second assembly in Evanston.

It is now becoming plain that McIntire is primarily

(Continued on page 2)

Scandalizing the Movement

The immediate occasion for the editorial in the *Christian Advocate* is the recent journey of leaders of the International Council of Christian Churches to Australia. There Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam was openly challenged, along with Prof. Josef L. Hromadka, the communist from Czechoslovakia sitting on the central committee of the World Council of Churches. Things were challenged and great good was accomplished in Australia. In this country, Fulton Lewis, Jr., referred to the journey and mentioned Dr. McIntire and the International Council by name on his coast-to-coast broadcast. This attack upon Dr. McIntire is essential to the modernists' cause, if they are to do anything in response. They cannot meet the facts, but if they can discredit the individual who has been responsible for presenting many facts, they can be successful in turning people away from them so that they will not give them proper consideration. Thus the intensified attack upon Dr. McIntire.

Naturally, therefore, these modernist leaders are very happy and their glee is manifest when they are able to exploit the conflict which has developed in the Bible Presbyterian Church. The Bible Presbyterian Church, in the history of the separatist movement, has provided leadership for that movement on the world level and also on the national level. The president of the Associated Missions of the ICCC, representing 21 different missionary agencies, is Dr. J. Gordon Holdercroft, also president of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. And the president of the International Council of Chris-

(Continued on page 2)

Who Is Hurt?

The article in the *Christian Advocate* hurts everybody. Even those in the Bible Presbyterian Church, represented by Dr. Rayburn's position, are hurt. They, too, must face the Christians of other groups. And what do people think about individuals who upset things so in their denomination that the whole separatist cause can be blamed when such is not necessary at all among Christian brethren who have love, confidence, and mutual concern for the cause?

All the denominations associated with the Bible Presbyterian Church in the International Council and the American Council are also affected. They have done nothing but become a part of a co-operating movement to which the Bible Presbyterians belong, and yet their co-operation with the Bible Presbyterians reflects on them—affects their missionaries, their churches, their people, everybody in the whole separatist movement. This would be true if the same thing happened in some other denomination which is connected with the Councils, but it is particularly true in the Bible Presbyterian Church because the two top leaders in the missions field and in the Council field are both Bible Presbyterian ministers—Dr. Holdercroft and Dr. McIntire.

Then, of course, the people in the grass roots in the churches are hurt. Those who see the great issues rejoice that a stand is being made, that a militant witness has been raised to challenge the apostasy, and there are men who are not ashamed to fight

(Continued on page 3)

ACCC Democratic

The *Christian Advocate*, in referring to the American Council of Christian Churches, says, "The next year the council changed its constitution to increase the size of its powerful executive committee elected not by the constituent churches but by the committee itself." This is directly the impression that Dr. Rayburn's position has given throughout the church; in fact, it has even been said that the American Council's executive was a self-perpetuating committee. Now this is simply not the case. The executive committee of the American Council of Christian Churches has always been elected, not by the committee itself, but by the officially elected delegates from the constituent churches! It must be remembered that the American Council started with only two denominations, and it was small, but this democratic principle was observed in the very beginning and has always been honored in the Council. The executive committee has never elected a member to the executive committee. Only the Council itself, which is composed of the official voting delegates of the denominations, has done this. The executive committee therefore represents the Council. It is the arm of the Council, and is the executive committee of the American Council of Christian Churches.

It has been pointed out elsewhere that the new Synod-controlled college, which had a committee of seven set up to run it for the first year, did proceed as a committee to elect 15 additional members to the committee, with a Board now operating with 21 members.

(Continued on page 3)

A One-Man Denomination

(Continued from page 1)

interested in promoting McIntire. And the revelation comes through the younger men in his movement who are challenging his leadership. They are saying that the Bible Presbyterian church and the American Council of Churches ought to cut loose from the McIntire dictatorship, while there is still time.

In 1953, the Independent Fundamental Churches of America pulled out from the McIntire-dominated American Council of Churches. The whispered reason was the plain fact that McIntire regards his own opinions as those of the few millions claimed as members of the ACC. The next year, the Council changed its constitution to increase the size of its powerful executive committee, elected not by the constituent churches but by the committee itself.

When President Robert G. Rayburn of Highland college, an independent Bible Presbyterian school,

wanted member denominations to choose their committee members, he was rebuked. Soon he was ousted as a college president, despite protests of most of his students. This "second generation" leader did not give up, and narrowly failed leading the Bible Presbyterian church in a temporary withdrawal from the American Council of Churches. McIntire, always the fighter, countered by creating a "Committee for True Presbyterianism," condemning church-controlled boards as unscriptural and unconstitutional.

There are other evidences of high-handed tactics. And from those who are in full agreement with McIntire's theological slant comes the news that his days of leadership are numbered. Isn't it always so when a man tries, from whatever motives, to set up a one-man denomination?

"A One-Man Denomination"

The charge made by the Methodist *Christian Advocate* that McIntire is "a one-man denomination" raises many questions and helps people to reconsider exactly what has been taking place.

Dr. McIntire was one of the very few leaders who helped start the Bible Presbyterian Church. His church in Collingswood has been the mother of the denomination. It is the largest church numerically and financially, and it has sought to help every aspect of the Church's activity and the movement at large. There was a time when all the money given to National Missions came from the Collingswood church. But as the years have passed, a different picture has developed. Other presbyteries have been formed, and one of the difficulties in the present conflict is that many of the brethren have declared that Dr. McIntire has forsaken the denomination, that his interests have been concentrated in other fields, and that he has not attended the meetings of Synod as he should; and that he has not helped the church financially as he should. On one hand, there are those who call Dr. McIntire a dictator in the church, and on the other hand, there are those who blame him because he is not asserting more emphatically his leadership in the church.

It makes no difference, so far as the editors of the *Christian Advocate* are concerned: all they want is something against McIntire because of the position which God, in His providence, has given him in the present world-wide struggle in behalf of the historic Christian religion.

The coming meeting in St. Louis, which Dr. Buswell has called, will be of great concern to the *Christian Advocate*, to *Christian Life*, and to *Christian Century*—What is the Synod going to do to McIntire? In fact, they are not concerned at

Scandalizing . . .

(Continued from page 1)

tian Churches, now representing 57 Bible-believing denominations, is Dr. Carl McIntire, pastor of the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood. Dr. McIntire is in his position by virtue of being an official delegate of the Bible Presbyterian Church to the ICCC and having been elected by the ICCC to serve as its Council president. Because of these facts of leadership, the modernists are quick to pounce upon any evidence of disharmony or trouble within the Bible Presbyterian Church itself, for this condition can be used to reflect against the leadership of the entire International Council and the Associated Missions. This is exactly what the Methodists are now endeavoring to do.

It is also apparent from the editorial that the Methodist leaders have a pretty good grasp of what is happening. Someone has briefed them rather accurately. Just who the individual or individuals may be, from Bible Presbyterian circles, we do not know. The charge that McIntire is a "dictator" has been made by some of the Bible Presbyterian men. The charge that the American Council of Christian Churches is McIntire-dominated has also been made, but this was not one of the reasons given for the withdrawal of the Independent Fundamental Churches of America. The charge that Dr. McIntire regards his own opinions as those of the members of the American Council is one of the specific allega-

all about whether the Synod has Synod-controlled agencies or not; that is not the issue with them. They must have something with which to help counteract the widespread development that is taking place throughout the Christian world under the leadership of the International Council of Christian Churches.

tions made by Dr. Robert G. Rayburn against Dr. McIntire. The attack in the church against Dr. McIntire came to light at the Greenville Synod in 1954, when Dr. Robert G. Rayburn, in a minority report on the American Council of Christian Churches, openly accused the members of the executive committee of the American Council of deliberate deception, and this included Dr. Carl McIntire, who was a member of the executive and a delegate from the Synod to the American Council. At that time it was freely said among brethren that such open public attack upon another brother in the position that Dr. McIntire was occupying in the Christian world would do untold harm to the cause, and thus it has. Dr. Rayburn should have (and was so exhorted by a number of the brethren) first gone to Dr. McIntire and other members in responsible positions and discussed the problems with them face to face before airing them in a public charge before the General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church. It was Dr. J. Gordon Holdcroft who immediately came to the defense of Dr. McIntire's integrity.

All of this we believe was unnecessary and could have been avoided, had there been a spirit of brotherly love, and had Dr. Rayburn and those who felt as he did, including Dr. Francis A. Schaeffer, sat down with Dr. McIntire and any of the other brethren and had a good heart-to-heart talk concerning the questions which were being raised. This was not done, and Dr. McIntire himself, as he testified, was totally unaware of Dr. Rayburn's intent or purpose to make such a public allegation, much less even a minority report, which report he was perfectly entitled to make.

The reference in the article, for instance, to "leading the Bible Presbyterian Church in a temporary withdrawal from the American Council of Churches" pre-

(Continued on page 4)

Mutual Love and Confidence

When the Bible Presbyterian Church was organized in Collingswood, N. J., the brethren had just come out of the fiery trial of ecclesiastical discipline, decisions on numerous complaints, and the like. It had been a stormy experience, and there was the tenderest feeling of love one for another as the brethren came together. It was decided that the new church which would be established would rest upon mutual love and confidence; that if the Holy Spirit could not hold the church together, it would not be held together. This meant also that, if there were going to be problems, brotherly love and gentleness and tenderness in dealing with one another would resolve them and not the hammer and tongs procedures with men issuing their ultimatums.

It was written into the constitution: "Particular churches need remain in association with the Bible Presbyterian Church only so long as they themselves desire. The relationship is voluntary, based only upon mutual love and confidence, and is in no sense to be maintained by the exercise of any kind of force or coercion whatsoever. A particular church may withdraw at any time for reasons which seem sufficient to itself." This guarantees that, if churches are not treated with grace and tenderness in their problems, they may leave; and some have left. If there had been this spirit of love and confidence in the past, very, very few would have left. When the Book of Discipline is used against people, the inevitable result, unless there is agreement, is a split. The Book of Discipline ought not to be used in the Church until it is absolutely the last possible resort.

Accompanying this statement was the provision introduced into 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." There are no implied powers. "Specifically" means, actually mentioned, named, delineated, or the like. And then in regard to the Synod, since there was such fear of creating a General Synod which might usurp powers or rest on implied powers, or ignore the rights of the people, it was said, "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."

The Synod itself must operate in an atmosphere of mutual love and confidence. Men support the actions of the Synod because they are led by the Spirit of God to see that they are actions which will help

Modernist Unbelief

Immediately following the editorial in the *Christian Advocate*, official organ of the Methodist Church with its nine million members, is an editorial, "Praying by Ourselves." The editor takes to task the Lutherans, stating that "Missouri Synod Lutherans have frowned on participating in prayers with believers of other faiths," and declaring that the objection of Missouri Synod is to "joining in prayers in students' meetings when Christian Scientists, Jews, Mormons, Unitarians and Roman Catholics are taking part."

This editorial, showing the utter breakdown of a true Christian testimony to the name of Jesus Christ, appears following the attack upon Dr. Carl McIntire. On one hand there is the blast against a leader in the battle against apostasy and for the faith, and on the other there is a blast against a group that would stand for the faith, insisting that it is impossible to come to God except through Jesus Christ and that prayer meetings with Unitarians and Jews, as they represent their faith, are out of line with the Christian faith.

ACCC . . .

(Continued from page 1)

When the American Council revised its constitution to increase the number of official delegates from the constituent denominations, it provided that on the executive committee there should be elected, by the Council, at least one member from each constituent body. And the bylaws of the Council also stipulate that this one member elected from each denomination must be from among the officially elected delegates of that denomination. So, even though the Council elects its own executive committee and all the delegates of all the churches do the electing, the bylaws stipulate that each denomination shall have a member on the executive who has been elected to the Council by his own denomination. The executive committee of the ACCC is not self-perpetuating, never has been; but this misrepresentation of the American Council by those in the Bible Presbyterian Church who have been saying that it is not democratic, and the like, is now being used by the Methodists in their glee to turn people against the American Council of Christian Churches and the separatist movement.

the cause of Christ. For this reason there can be progress and advance, but nothing is binding; and this includes deliverances, resolutions, overtures, and other actions. The sweep is comprehensive. So, how does Dr. Buswell and those associated with him feel they are going to solve the problems? No matter what actions they take, they are not going to be binding on the Church. The hearts, the confidence, the understand-

Disposing of McIntire

When men are in an army together doing duty for the Lord in defense of the faith, and the battle lines are drawn, men who wear the same uniform do not in any way give aid and comfort to the enemy. To do so is a serious matter. Men love each other, forbear one another, help one another; and love covers a multitude of sins. It always has among brethren as they have sought to understand and to bear with each other. This does not mean that there is not criticism, that there is not suggestion of change of activity or differing approaches to problems. Of course not! But it does mean that such activity does not reach such proportions that the enemy is able to use it in an effort to destroy the movement itself, or that men give information to the enemy!

In the present great world-wide conflict, the unbelief and apostasy that are prominent and prevalent in these circles, headed up in the World Council of Churches, are a terrible offense to God. Differences between brethren in the battle line, all of whom affirm their adherence to the position and principles of the International Council of Christian Churches, do not even enter into the same level of offense as that of unbelief and apostasy; and all that has happened in the developing conflict in the Bible Presbyterian Church seems so useless, so unnecessary. And now the modernists have it and their glee is apparent. In fact, the editorial actually concludes with the desired end that McIntire is already removed and that his days of leadership are over.

Who . . . ?

(Continued from page 1)

for the faith and bear the burden and heat of battle for the name of Jesus Christ. Many Bible Presbyterians, separated Baptists, and independent groups rejoice in this stand and thank God for it, and they are all deeply grieved.

Here, what appears to be an open attack, simply to discredit Dr. McIntire before the church and before the world, is being made by those who ought to love him, to stand by him, to encourage him, to exhort him, and to help him as a beloved brother.

Tremendous harm has already been done. God's people everywhere must join in repairing the damage and pressing the issue even more boldly with the enemies of the Cross.

ing, the love, the respect of the people in the Church must be won if the Church is to proceed.

These provisions fortunately stand in the way of those who want a tighter Synod with greater control and power! An at-

(Continued on page 4)

Text of St. Louis Resolution

A motion was approved that the Session ask the congregation for authority to withdraw from the Bible Presbyterian Synod provided 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.

Scandalizing . . .

(Continued from page 2)

supposes a lot of knowledge concerning what has happened. At the meeting of the Bible Presbyterian Synod in St. Louis in 1955 the motion which was made by Mr. Presley W. Edwards of the St. Louis church, and seconded by Dr. Rayburn was simply withdrawal from the ACCC. It was unconditional. Following this, in the discussion which developed after Synod passed, the brethren said that they intended only a temporary withdrawal and that has entered into much of the discussion, though the motion itself did not say so. The vote on withdrawal was 21 to 67.

But the main point of the Methodist editorial is simply to discredit Dr. McIntire himself. He is promoting himself, according to this story. The biggest point is that the younger men "in his movement" are the ones who are responsible for this attack, which has reached now to the very highest levels of the modernist arsenal and is being hurled against the separatist movement.

Mutual . . .

(Continued from page 3)

tempt was made at the Synod in New York in 1953 to amend the constitution, and in the provisions which were offered by the committee—which included such men as the stated clerk, Robert Hastings, and Dr. R. Laird Harris, an effort was made to modify the provision which says that a church may withdraw at any time for reasons sufficient to itself. The committee wanted to put in the statement that a church may withdraw for Scriptural reasons. But then the question was raised, Who would determine whether the reasons were Scriptural? The matter at that time was defeated. But the same element in the Church that has desired that some tie or hold upon the churches be obtained has continued to work and operate, and it is our opinion that this element is definitely involved in the present catastrophe which has come upon the B. P. Church.

Bennet Wants to Know

March 16, 1956

Rev. Donald C. MacNair,
2143 N. Ballas Road,
St. Louis, Mo.

Dear Don:-

I have read the March issue of the *Bible Presbyterian Observer* containing your two statements and conclusions. Apparently you seem to be surprised that we, who read the resolution adopted by your church, took it for granted that it means exactly what it says, which is:

1. The congregation issued a threat to withdraw from the B. P. Synod, provided that at the close of the 19th General Synod of the B. P. Church the present group "in control" of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, Shelton College, and Faith Seminary, have not relinquished control of these agencies.

2. That the same group must, at the same time, also disband the Presbyterian Board for Home Missions.

3. If this group does not do either of these two things, then they should resign from the Bible Presbyterian Church.

The penalty for the failure of these people to resign as demanded is that the sixty-one persons who voted for the resolution in the First Bible Presbyterian Church of St. Louis may withdraw from the B. P. Synod and they will be empowered also to invite any other churches of like mind to join together with them.

Inasmuch as I am one of the persons indirectly referred to, there are some things which I must know before I tender my resignation:

(a) Why should I resign?

(b) What have I done wrong or failed to do?

(c) If I resign, who will take my place?

(d) Of course, Shelton College cannot be included in the demand of the 61 persons of your congregation, because the five members of the B. P. Church who are trustees of Shelton College do not control the other sixteen. Your congregation probably included Shelton College through a complete misunderstanding of the facts.

(e) If all of those constituting a majority should resign, who will have the privilege of electing their successors? Will that devolve upon the 61 voting members of your church?

(f) What will be the platform or program of those who are elected to succeed me and those with whom I am associated?

(g) In what respect and to what extent will these independent agencies be improved in their work for the Lord by our resignations and the substitution in our place of persons chosen by the 61 voting members of your church?

(h) Did you really expect that we, who

joined in the organization of these independent agencies and have helped to maintain them during all these years, would resign because 61 members of your church voted that we should resign, without giving any reason therefor? And, if you did not expect that we would resign, why did you adopt the resolution containing the alternative that your church would withdraw from the B. P. Synod if we did not resign?

(i) Is it not plain that you had in mind that you would withdraw from the Synod, and you had the hope that others would join with you, and you could, therefore, split the B. P. Church, start another denomination, or, did you and the 61 persons voting with you think that you would frighten us so badly by your threat to withdraw, that we would actually resign?

(j) Did you think that the resolution adopted by the 61 members of your church, apparently at your suggestion, is a very conclusive affirmation of the quotation which you make from my letter of May 4, 1955, and did you not think, in view of the developments, I was justified in making the statements therein contained?

(k) Why do you think that Dr. McIntire's analysis is an attack on your resolution?

(l) Did you not expect that we would make some comment on your resolution?

(m) Do you think that your "movement," which may result in a split in the Church, is a better movement than we established by organizing and maintaining these various independent agencies?

(n) In another copy of the *Observer*, you accuse us of trying to gather power to ourselves notwithstanding we have always had the power in the independent agencies. Do you not think that this effort on the part of the 61 members of your church, as expressed in their resolution, is for the purpose of gaining power for themselves, with the threat that if the power is not given to them, they will resign from the denomination?

I remember that I was at the meeting of the Presbytery when you were taken under its care, but I never thought that things would develop into such a pass.

Yours very cordially
In His faithfulness,

JAMES E. BENNET

In the New Jersey Presbytery there are 2,231 church members in eleven churches. The Collingswood church represents 1,617 of the number, and the other ten churches represent 614. The 614 people are represented in Presbytery by ten elders. The 1,617 people are represented in Presbytery by six elders.

Letter to Individual Bible Presbyterians

To members of the Bible Presbyterian Churches Over the Country
Beloved in the Lord:

It is indeed with a very heavy heart that I feel constrained to write this note to you. The attack which has been made upon me by the modernists through these years has continued unabated, but, when they are able to take an attack made upon me by my own brethren in the Bible Presbyterian Church and use it to hurt the entire separatist movement, it is a calamity. The enemies rejoice, and untold harm is being done to the very things that all of us, through these years, have stood for and are trying to build up. The Lord must help us, and it is in His promises that we take refuge. God has blessed and led in the great battle for the faith, and now we come to this confusion and conflict which is being used by enemies of the Lord, to grieve God's people and to disillusion many.

Brethren, it ought not to be. Our little Bible Presbyterian Church has, according to the latest Minutes, only 8,600 members. We are small, struggling, and suffering. I have done and am doing my very best to prevent a schism in the Church and we are looking to God now, in this desperate hour, to deliver us and to keep the Church together and united in behalf of our testimony which God has so graciously given us in the beginning and through the years. Efforts are being made to "hound" us out of the church!

I have just recently been to Australia with a team of seven other leaders of the International Council of Christian Churches, and we have seen God work wonders in that land in arousing people and opening eyes to the apostasy. Souls were saved. Unquestionably, the editorial in the Methodist *Christian Advocate* is directed against this activity and similar developments that are taking place over the world by the groups that are standing with the ICCC. The article is obviously dependent upon a similar one which appeared in *Christian Life*, October, 1955, entitled, "BPC's 'Young Men' Revolt," which also quotes Dr. Rayburn and Dr. Buswell, with the main impact being, of course, against me. "Group charges McIntire with abandoning Presbyterian processes, urges upset of 'one-man denomination,'" is a subhead of the *Christian Life* article, and this article was obviously dependent upon a letter written by Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., July 25, 26, when I went to Scandinavia. In this letter Dr. Buswell, referring to us, had this to say, "There is now an issue, not of Modernism, not the wolves (Acts 20) but an issue of an irresponsible autocratic fundamentalism, the leaders who 'speak distorted things to draw away disciples after themselves.' Of course we should say with Paul, we are glad that 'Christ is preached,' but Paul does not gloss over the 'envy . . . strife . . . contention . . .

pretense.' (Phil. 1:15-18). . . . This sinister power reaches into colleges, missions, local churches, encouraging dissent against faithful pastors, and it is responsible to no one. It seeks to persuade God's people not to support a struggling committee for National Missions, directly responsible to the ministers and elders of a sound denomination, and it sets up a board, a close corporation, responsible to no one, dominated by one man who controls great power and influence." *Christian Life* took Dr. Buswell's phrase, "an irresponsible autocratic fundamentalism," and spread it over the world to the hurt of the ICCC, because I am president of the Council.

God knows, beloved, that we are not a sinister power! I get blamed for many things which are imputed to me, things which I have never done, and that is one of our difficulties. I have sought through the years to help build, in every way possible, the Bible Presbyterian movement, and this is not a sin. Zeal for the movement is not an evil either, as we have given ourselves! In this developing conflict, I have done my best to stand by what I believe to be the principles and position which we have taken in our freedom as churches, and I shall continue to do so with Christian grace and love. Our Church must not be changed into something different.

But why has all this attack come upon me? It looks now as though we are headed straight for a great disaster. It ought not to be, and so I come to you as a brother and one who had been singled out by these others in what I consider to be a most unfair manner. When God gives to a man a position of responsibility in a movement, does that make him a pope, or a dictator? Does that mean that he likes publicity for himself, or that he cannot receive criticism? God forbid such a thought. I have worked with my brethren through these years on various committees, and we have gone ahead, each criticizing one another and discussing what would be the best way to proceed.

Here in Collingswood, however, there is a church which is perhaps better informed than any in the whole denomination. For two years now we have been in the midst of something that we never dreamed would come upon Collingswood. It came into the open following the Greenville Synod and has resulted in a group going down to Hadonfield, breaking away from the Collingswood church. Our Session has now removed from the roll 46 of our former members out of our congregation of over 1600. Tom Cross came and started them, and Dr. Buswell has been serving as the interim pastor of this group! I never dreamed that anything like this would come to Collingswood. We saw Charlotte divide, Grove City, Tacoma, Wilmington, and then we saw an effort made, a determined effort, to cause a sizable schism in the Collingswood church. Thank God, He has delivered our people, but it took information, time, and

Christian love. In our recent Every Member Canvass, the Lord has blessed as never before, and with our budget of \$107,440 before us, God sent in pledges amounting to \$121,157. Our people know where they stand. We are not going to change. In our denomination the people are the ones who give, who make the major decisions, and, no matter what Synod does, it is the hearts of the people that must be won, for they must understand. We wrote into our constitution protections against the power of a powerful Synod. I am thankful we did, because it is a help to us now.

I have never in all my life endured such personal abuse. To be called a liar, "yellow," a "coward," and other things by the brethren whom you love, and to have stories of this nature circulated about you, and then to have them come into the hands of the enemies to be used against you, is hard to endure. I know how to be abased and I know how to abound, and I can say with Paul that I have counted all things loss. An effort has been made to make it appear that we are grasping for power and that there is a power sweep. Nothing like it has happened, I assure you, beloved.

In the case of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and all that God has given, the only desire of the majority of that Board was to be faithful to its charter. This was explained in *The Free Press*, No. 4. We want love among the brethren, humility, grace, strength to meet the enemy of the hour. We are a part of a great movement which has a tremendous potential. But this attack now upon me to discredit my ministry and testimony, when I have "walked in mine own integrity with my God," hurts, for also the brethren outside of our church are suffering.

We are human; we are frail; we make mistakes. We have made them, and we have always been ready to correct and apologize in a spirit of meekness before the Lord. That is my spirit now, and so I write to you, beloved. I do not know what is going to happen; only God knows. Let us look to Him in prayer and faith, for the enemy is using these attacks to scandalize a great and holy cause.

We are not a "one-man denomination." We are a denomination made up of godly people, and in it there has been the spirit to esteem the other better than himself.

I want to see our church preserved and be strong and free and go on with the tremendous challenge before us. The doors are open everywhere. There is more unrest in the apostate denominations than there has ever been any time in the history of the movement—and evangelism calls! Surely we must press on! By the grace of God, we shall press on, no matter what comes. I ask for your prayers. Let us stand by our original position, and not be a party to changing our beloved Church.

Yours faithfully,
CARL MCINTIRE

Changing the Church

The Rev. Robert Hastings, stated clerk of the General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, writing on official Bible Presbyterian stationery, June 1, 1953, to Dr. Robert G. Rayburn, then moderator of the General Synod, made the following report:

"When we visited the Seminary [Faith] a few weeks ago with the Committee on Visitation and Accreditation it came out in the discussion that my view of what we want to build is quite different from that of Mr. McIntire, and since that time he and MacRae have intimated that I am taking too much power to myself."

This statement by the clerk, when he was performing an official function on behalf of the Synod as a member of the Committee on Visitation and Accreditation, indicates how he and some others in the Synod were thinking. It is highly significant, in view of the present developments to change the Bible Presbyterian Church into a different kind of denomination from that which was originally established. A powerful stated clerk with vested interests in his office, a powerful General Synod with centralization of power, the denomination controlling the boards and agencies, and an official publication were all contrary to the concept which is inherent in the restraints and the specific provisions of the constitution of the Bible Presbyterian Church. It was never, never intended that the Bible Presbyterian Church should become another Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in organizational structure and power, but at the present time it seems clear, and it is the opinion of many, that there are those in the denomination now determined that, in order to be Presbyterian, the denomination should control the boards and agencies.

When a denomination sets up substantial agencies, it is necessary for those who are running the agencies, or in control of them, to have the support of the majority in the denomination in order to obtain the desired purposes for them. It is absolutely inevitable, therefore, that the agencies seek the support of the majority of a Synod for their own purposes. It has always happened this way. Moreover, those who are directing the agencies desire men of their choice to work with them on their boards.

Already we now see this in the case of the developing Synod-controlled college. First, the committee of seven feels free to go ahead and do certain things which it was not authorized to do—for instance, increase its number to 21. As long as the committee feels that it has the backing of the majority of the Synod, it does not hesitate to exceed the boundaries of authority given it by Synod. Second, the committee has elected men of its choosing—the choice of the seven original—to fill out the additional places which they have created. Here a committee in charge of a college is picking the men it desires to serve on such a committee.

Dr. Allan A. MacRae has pointed out

that Synod-controlled agencies inevitably lead to an agency-controlled Synod. With it develops the ecclesiastical machine, with the agencies' leaders operating in high places in the machine. This is a far cry and a long, long way from a denomination which is built by preaching the Gospel and consciously working for the building of churches free from the political maneuvering inherent in operating Synod-controlled agencies.

It is also interesting to observe that on the Synod-controlled paper which has been established the denominational secretaries are both to be found—the secretary of the National Missions Committee and the secretary of Christian Education Committee.

As the denomination gets larger, with this concept of Synod control, it will be utterly impossible for the denomination to handle in any adequate way the questions relative to so many agencies and institutions as they expand and grow. It is not the function of a denomination to run agencies. It is the function of a denomination to see that the Gospel is preached and that the Word of God is ministered and declared through the churches for the glory of God!

The proposed Synod-controlled college should not be put under Synod. Then, if those who desire to operate it with a board congenial to those who have certain purposes in operating it, they should be perfectly free to do so and to direct it as an independent agency. The churches can support it and the people in the church can be a part of its ministry as they are led by the Holy Spirit in their giving. But for a group in the church, even a majority, to operate and monopolize a Synod-controlled agency, as is now being done, in the name of the whole Church, including a minority who vigorously object to such procedures, can only cause continuing tensions and constant difficulties, troubling the peace of the Church. Those who desire a paper such as is now being published should be perfectly free to publish it on their own responsibility, but not in the name of all the Synod. We are of the firm opinion that the establishment of a Synod-controlled paper, to be the voice of the denomination, is absolutely contrary to the constitution. No specific provision in the constitution allows such a development. But again we are face to face with the reality that, when a machine begins to manifest itself in a church and a majority are lined up with its particular program, the constitution can be either ignored or broadly interpreted and their desired ends are accomplished.

When men set out to build a different type of denomination by changing a denomination which has been built along one line, there are difficulties, and one is that they must deal with those who are standing firmly for the original position of the church. It is in this light that Dr. Carl McIntire, Dr. Allan A. MacRae, Dr. J. Gordon Holdcroft, and others have been attacked. These men must be discredited in some way or other in the minds of the

people of the church. The attacks which Dr. McIntire has suffered and is suffering at the hands of his brethren actually are a part of the general program to establish the denomination along a different view of things, with the accent upon Synod control and ultimate realization of the Synod-controlled board of foreign missions, Synod-controlled seminary, Synod-controlled college, Synod-controlled National Missions, Synod-controlled paper. Synod-controlled Christian education—a Synod which controls the agencies, the nature of the agencies, and the purpose of the agencies which its people, in loyalty to the Synod, are called upon to support as loyal Bible Presbyterians. Both the unfolding history of the movement from its beginning and the principles upon which it was founded are diametrically opposed to any such concept of a monolithic church with increasing centralized powers in the hands of a General Synod.

For two years now the Bible Presbyterian Church has been torn with this controversy, with its increasing conflicts. Pastors and churches have spent hours dealing with the questions involved. Division has come in some churches. Several churches have withdrawn from our fellowship and the loss to the Bible Presbyterian Church is incalculable. If the same energy, the same time, the same zeal had been spent in united effort in evangelizing, building the churches, calling people out of the apostasy, the Church would have been way ahead numerically and spiritually.

Had the Church continued without any question in the maintenance of its original historic position and in a spirit of mutual love and confidence, this would have been the case. A church which is free and not bound down by ecclesiasticism and ecclesiastical politics can move on out and develop a great Presbyterian movement in this country, but a church which tightens its controls from the top, which narrows its vision and limits its circle of activity within its own boundaries, will become ingrown and will grow, indeed, very slowly. It will take its place alongside of other small, struggling Presbyterian movements, like the Orthodox Presbyterian and several others which simply have not been able to cope with the present conditions in the country and to take advantage of the opportunities which are particularly before Presbyterians.

The Baptists are building an expanding movement in real liberty and blessing. The Presbyterians were in a position, through the Bible Presbyterians' original position, to do this, but it will indeed take some time for the Bible Presbyterian Church to recover from the blow which it has suffered as a result of the present internal strife. Mr. Hastings put it pretty clearly in 1953 when writing to Dr. Rayburn, speaking in terms of "we." They have a different type of church that they want to build from that which Dr. McIntire and others associated with him set out to establish and did establish in the beginning.

McIntire's Plea to Buswell

March 22, 1956

My dear Dr. Buswell:

I received your letter of March 15th announcing your decision to go ahead with the meeting in St. Louis. We are very, very sorry, and I come to you with one final appeal for reconsideration.

In the docket you have provided on Friday for the hearing of "administrative cases." A complaint has been taken up against the New Jersey Presbytery. The New Jersey Presbytery, at its last meeting, by a vote of 18-8, questioned whether the meeting in St. Louis, which you are arranging, was a proper meeting of the Synod and declined to recognize it as such. No representatives of the Presbytery will appear at this meeting to defend any alleged complaint that may be brought against the New Jersey Presbytery. Actually, what is being brought up should be cast aside, for the constitution says that only matters affecting the doctrine and the constitution can be taken by complaint to the General Synod. There is nothing in the complaint against the Presbytery which deals with actions affecting the doctrine or constitution of the Church. The actions of the Presbytery were within the sphere of the Presbytery's proper discretion and liberty.

There are no minutes from the Presbytery for this last meeting, for the New Jersey Presbytery does not approve its minutes at the close of a meeting but leaves this until the following meeting, and what has been prepared has been drafted by one of the complainants against the Presbytery, and there are a number of instances where important matters affecting what has transpired in the Presbytery's meeting will need to be corrected, I feel sure, when Presbytery meets.

I am confident that there would be no question and there is no question concerning the Presbytery's willingness to defend any complaint against it before a proper meeting of our General Synod.

There are so many complications in what is developing. The 110 signatures which were presented to you by ministers and elders questioning the proper nature of this Synod and asking that you arrange for a Synod where such a matter would not be involved were obtained, not by a general circularization of the Synod brethren; these were sent out to a number of men simply with a view that if at least 100 signed, surely that would be enough to cause you, as Moderator, in all propriety and fairness to seek a time when in the interests of both sides to the conflict in the Church we could amicably sit down together in a lawful Synod and face the problems confronting us, in the Spirit of our Lord.

You point out that the action of the 18th General Synod, giving you the authority to fix the time and place, was without dissent. I think that is right, and I was the one that made the motion. And since

unanimous action placed such authority in your hand, you have a grave responsibility to see that the same unanimity, if possible, prevails when we sit down together again as a Synod, so far as any questions regarding convening are concerned, and since some called the St. Louis meeting one for a "showdown," it is all the more important. But you have made no such attempt that I know of, Dr. Buswell, in this regard.

According to the figures you have given, 138 signed petitions requesting the meeting in April, or a total, including our 110, of 248. And of this total, the percentages are forty per cent and a fraction, versus fifty-nine per cent and a fraction. Surely the unity and the peace of our Church calls for some consideration on your part. The minutes as now received record a note as follows:

"The possibility of a meeting place for the next Synod was discussed, and the Rev. Linwod G. Gebb, D.D., tendered a qualified invitation to meet in Lakeland, Florida. Because of conflicts in time and housing and because the situation was complex no decision was reached."

There was never any suggestion by anyone that the next Synod be held in February or April. Moreover, the resolution forming the college committee adopted shortly before this stipulated that the committee was "to operate for a period of one year, at which time final organization would be set up." The next Synod a year hence was in view!

When I made the motion, the questions in mind were simply whether Mr. Gebb could arrange for proper housing, and the precise time was an uncertain factor. These details were left in your hands to work out. We never dreamed you would use such power for an emergency. For such a crucial matter as it involves the conflict in the church at the present time to be decided by one man and one man alone finds us in a situation which is hardly in keeping with the spirit of historic Presbyterianism.

Our constitution does provide that when urgent problems arise and it is necessary for the Synod to meet earlier, that there may be a pro re nata meeting which can be properly and constitutionally arranged. This you have not done. What we believe you have done is to use authority given to you in a spirit of unanimity by the brethren to call the Synod around the regular time, a year later, to deal with a situation which, under the Constitution, should be handled by means of a pro re nata meeting! The spirit, purpose, and provision of the constitution are against the thought that one man should have power to decide such a question in matters of serious controversy.

Please believe that the men who see this and feel it, in the light of the constitution, are earnest and sincere and do not feel that the Synod of our Church should have any questions whatsoever concerning such a vital matter as a proper meeting.

"Bully," "Coward," "Yellow"

The Rev. James Miller, who has been a minister under the National Missions Committee and is now pastor of the Lemmon, S. Dak., Bible Presbyterian Church, said in a letter to Dr. Carl McIntire, March 16, 1956:

"So that you will not misunderstand my feeling, I will not even try to veil my remarks in polite language. What I have to say should not be open to any misunderstanding.

"Quite frankly, Carl, you are exhibiting yourself as a bully. You have done all you could to badger our Synod since we met in St. Louis last year. Now you are afraid to have a real showdown. You felt free to thrash about and stir up dust when you thought you were winning; now you want to run for cover in Harvey Cedars. Apparently you can dish it out, but you can't take it. If you fail to show up at the April meeting of Synod, I, among others, will be sure that you are yellow. You will prove yourself a coward by sulking in Collingswood. Come on out to Synod and prove yourself to be a man, Carl. Perhaps you will be able to regain some of the respect you have lost in recent months."

The Board of Harvey Cedars, at its recent meeting, did officially extend an invitation to you for the use of the Bible Presbyterians if desired. It is not too late, even now, for you to notify the brethren that you are cancelling this proposed St. Louis meeting. There is nothing in the constitution that forbids you to do this.

Dr. Buswell, in ecclesiastical matters through the years in the providence of God we were the minority. We suffered as such at the hands of a majority that desired certain ends. Now the question of majority opinion and minority opinion is discussed in your letter, and every consideration should be given to the right of the minority in this particular matter, for now issues are at stake that may divide and destroy the unity of the Church and have far-reaching consequences in the lives of all of our brethren and in the welfare of all of our churches.

In this official communication to us, you again have used your responsibility to speak in the highest praise of the Synod-controlled college, by quoting a pastor's wife. Inofficially communicating to us a docket, you should not have contributed to a debate on the question of the Synod-controlled college. There are many whose hearts are heavy when they see our Synod divided over this question and realize what Synod control involves for the future of the church. Why not place alongside of your statement a statement from some other dear, consecrated Christian pastor's wife stating the other side of this picture, which is just as sincerely held?

Are you using your position, Dr. Bus-

(Continued on page 8)

Clique-Controlled College

The action of the 18th General Synod in voting to approve a Synod-controlled college is found on page 79 of the Minutes. The action came in response to an overture from the Presbytery of the Great Plains, asking the Synod "to consider the establishment of a Liberal Arts College under the supervision and administration of the Bible Presbyterian Synod." The Synod's action reads, "Recommend to answer in the affirmative, and that a committee of seven be appointed to explore possibilities, with power to act in securing property and proceed to set up a school and operate for a period of one year, at which time final organization would be set up. Action is to be taken with two-thirds vote of the Presbyteries." The committee appointed by Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., the moderator, is as follows: E. A. Dillard, L. G. Gebb, O. C. Juliusson, Max Belz, G. W. Williams, Presley Edwards, G. B. Storey.

The Bagpipe, February, 1956, Vol. 1, No. 3, reports, "With every member present, the board of directors of Covenant College met in St. Louis on January 4 and 5." The story continues:

"The board was expanded to include fifteen new members so that each presbytery of the Synod would be represented. Those elected are: Mr. Kenneth O. Anderson, Tacoma, Wash.; Mr. Otis Jackson, Lakeland, Fla.; Dr. Hugh N. Johnson, University City, Mo.; Mr. J. E. Krauss, Wilmington, Del.; Mr. W. Ralph Lewis, La Canada, Calif.; Rev. Nelson K. Malkus, Gainesville, Tex.; Rev. W. Harold Mare, Arvada, Colo.; Rev. Edward T. Noe, Indianapolis, Ind.; Rev. C. Howard Oakley, Seattle, Wash.; Mr. Clyde Rigdon, Greenville, S. C.; Mr. McGregor Scott, Collingswood, N. J.; Dr. Flournoy Shepperson, Greenville, S. C.; Dr. T. Stanley Soltau, Memphis, Tenn.; Rev. Kyle Thurman, Bowling Green, Ky.; Mr. Ralph A. Veon, Enon Valley, Pa."

According to the action of Synod, a committee of seven men—not 21 men—was to "proceed to set up a school and operate

for a period of one year," and at the St. Louis meeting, January 4 and 5, this seven-man committee, calling itself the board of directors of Covenant College, expanded itself by adding to its number 15 new members, which it proceeded to elect and now announces that they are members of the board, thus maintaining a 21-member board.

The action of Synod did not give the committee of seven authority to expand their committee from seven to 21. The seven men were to operate for a period of one year, at which time final organization would be set up. Has not the committee, therefore, exceeded the instructions and authority given to it by the 18th General Synod? Has not a committee supposed to be working under the "supervision and administration of the Bible Presbyterian Synod" violated the provisions of the specific resolution of Synod saying that the committee of seven should operate for a period of one year? Did not the Synod reserve to itself the question of considering all such future matters when it said, "At which time final organization would be set up"?

But *The Bagpipe* reports that the 15 new members were added "so that each presbytery of the Synod would be represented." Is not this also a prerogative of the Synod to determine whether it wants each presbytery to be represented or whether it does not want each presbytery to be represented; or whether, if each presbytery is to be represented, who shall be the men who shall represent the particular presbytery? Here again, has not the committee exceeded the clearly defined responsibility given to it as a committee of seven?

Moreover, among the 15 added there is not a single representative of what is considered the minority element of the Synod in this particular question. Is not the whole Synod to have some voice in the running of a Synod-controlled college; or is it only the ones who "stand in" with the president of the college who are to be selected?

On page 78 of the Minutes is the report: "Statement on the rushed manner of the elections," made by the Rev. Nelson K. Malkus, one of the men elected to the board by the board itself. Malkus said:

"Inasmuch as the nominating committee did not report until one and one-half hours of Synod remained, it was explained by the chairman that, in the interest of time, the committee was submitting only a slate of names for each committee, instead of submitting a ballot, as has been the practice in the past two years." Is not this itself one of the objections to a college, under the control of Synod, with its members being elected in a rush period without due consideration?

But the most important feature of this expanding of the Synod's committee from seven to 21 is that after the committee says that each presbytery is to be represented, there is no representative at all from the New Jersey Presbytery. This Presbytery has been completely ignored and eliminated from any representation whatsoever. The name of

New Jersey Presbytery Statistics

In view of the attention which is being focused upon the New Jersey Presbytery, the statistics presented in the latest minutes, the Minutes of the 18th General Synod, present a picture of interest.

Financially, the total benevolences spent by all the presbyteries in 1955 was \$215,380. Of this amount, \$78,621 came from the New Jersey Presbytery, or 36 per cent of the benevolences of the whole Church. The next two highest presbyteries combined fall short of that amount by \$18,000, and six other presbyteries combined do not equal that amount. There are eleven presbyteries in the Synod. The Collingswood church alone gives approximately 31 per cent of the benevolences spent last year in the entire denomination.

Numerical statistics: total communicant membership of the denomination for 1955 was 8,670, while the New Jersey Presbytery alone, the largest, has 2,231, more than 25 per cent of the denomination's total membership. And these 25 per cent gave 36 per cent of the benevolences spent. The Collingswood church alone has more members in it than the combined membership of the Great Plains, Mid-South, Rocky Mountain, and Upper Mid-West Presbyteries. There are eleven presbyteries but more than one-fourth of the numerical strength of the denomination is in one presbytery. On the basis of representing the people, one can raise questions about how things are being run by the group in the Church that is driving toward a Synod-controlled denomination.

Mr. McGregor Scott of Collingswood is the only representative from the State of New Jersey, but Mr. Scott is not a member of the Synod. He withdrew from the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood and became a member of a church which is not in the Presbytery but is unaffiliated. This was the case with Mr. Scott on January 4 and 5, 1956, when he was elected. Mr. Scott, of course, has been a firm supporter of Dr. Rayburn and has been one of the leaders who has taken a group out of the Collingswood church to form another body.

Has the Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church authorized the appointment to committees which it sets up of men who are not members of the Synod, and who are members of churches which are not affiliated with the Synod? And does the committee of seven have the authority to settle such a question for the Synod? If the college is to be under the supervision and administration of the Synod, it would hardly seem proper to include on the board a man who is not a member of a church connected with the Synod.

Does not this set of facts indicate that the committee, in the name of Synod, is rather determined to use even the college itself for the promotion of their particular associates in the Synod?

McIntire's . . .

(Continued from page 7)

well, to the advantage of the side which you favor in this matter?

Well, this is all that I can do and in the name of the Lord we have come to you. The New Jersey Presbytery itself represents more than one-fourth of the numerical membership of our denomination, and I truly believe that more than a majority of the members in the churches of our denomination stand with us in the particular issues that have been raised.

Sincerely your brother in Christ,
CARL MCINTIRE

cm.p