

## DIAGRAMS

Pages 2-5 of the regular edition of the *March Bible Presbyterian Observer\** contain some elaborate diagrams, sharply presenting the contrast between the attractive simplicity of synod-directed agencies and the complexity of the present situation, in which independent agencies occupy many spheres of the interest of Bible Presbyterians.

It does look far simpler to imagine a situation in which everything is directed from one central head. "The men who make up the church-directed agencies serve on its boards for specific lengths of time and then return into the church so that others take their places." All the positions are fairly distributed, so that everyone has his proper place and no one has any greater voice than anyone else.

It is an entrancing picture. A close parallel can be found in the beautiful promises of Socialism, which offer to rearrange our economic and political life so that everything will be equally distributed and no one will have more than his fair share.

Yet experience shows that these are only dreams. In a system of free competitive enterprise, individuals who have ability step forward and eventually all profit by the results of their efforts. In religious things the same holds true. God gives a man a vision of a need. He steps forward and seeks to organize an agency to fill the need. If he has the requisite ability, he succeeds in gathering others around him, in stimulating them to work effectively, and in raising the necessary support. If he does not have the requisite ability his efforts fail, and someone else steps forward and performs the task. The whole process is far more complex and confusing than the simple promises and beautiful diagrams of Socialism or of an extensive system of synod-controlled agencies such as some are trying to persuade the Bible Presbyterian Church to adopt. But the system of free enterprise always accomplishes far more than the other system.

\*The *Bible Presbyterian Observer* is published by the First Bible Presbyterian Church of St. Louis, 2143 N. Ballas Road, St. Louis 22, Mo. The *Observer* takes up the cause of those who would change the B. P. Church into an organization different from what it was founded to be, and who would also seek to dislodge Dr. Carl McIntire from his position of leadership.

## Would the Road to Calvary Be Closed Within 25 Years If the American Council Were to Be Stopped?

Would the road to Calvary be closed within twenty-five years if the American Council were to be stopped? Nobody knows; the future is in God's hands. We cannot predict what He is going to do. We do know this, however, that the forces of modernism have been gaining more and more control of the religious life of America in the last forty years. Fifteen years ago they had already gained control of certain governmental agencies to the point where fundamentalists would have had practically no Bible-believing chaplains in the armed forces, if it had not been for the pressure exerted by the American Council of Christian Churches. There would have been practically no free radio time given to Christians, if it had not been for the American Council.

In many new housing areas it is proving increasingly difficult to secure lots for Bible-believing churches. Many radio stations are refusing to sell time for religious broadcasts. Many other examples

On the last day of the 18th General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, meeting in St. Louis, Mo., there was formed, independent of the Synod, a Committee for True Presbyterianism, by a number of brethren who were seriously concerned by the events of the Synod and the change which had taken place in the Bible Presbyterian Church. The purpose of this Committee is to bring information to the members of the Bible Presbyterian Church. This publication is issued in pursuance of plans to bring information to the Church.

Articles appearing in this issue have been prepared by Dr. Allan A. MacRae, president of the faculty of Faith Theological Seminary. The articles which appeared in the last issue of *The Free Press* (Vol. 1, No. 6, March 26, 1956) were prepared by the Rev. Carl McIntire, D.D.

All communications may be addressed to the secretary-treasurer of the Committee, the Rev. Arthur G. Slaght, 1630 S. Hanover St., Baltimore 30, Md.

might be given of ways in which the road to Calvary is gradually being closed.

Many will recall an event that occurred in the Philadelphia area a few years ago. Quite a number of radio preachers were purchasing time on a certain station. God was blessing their work, and His people were sending in sufficient money to pay all the expenses involved. Suddenly, the station announced its intention of cutting off all paid religious broadcasts. Many of these men had previously shown little interest in the issues upheld by Dr. Carl McIntire, pastor of the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood, N. J., yet now all of them flocked to him for help. He organized a protest rally. Soon the radio station offered special contracts to some of those who had been informed that they could no longer purchase time. Thus, in some cases, the efforts of Dr. McIntire and of the American Council have either slowed down or altogether stopped the progress of movements that would close "the road to Calvary," whose onward march would otherwise have met with little effective opposition.

In the face of such a situation, it is a bit discouraging to find the *Bible Presbyterian Observer* repeatedly minimizing the importance of the American Council. Thus we read on page 5 of its regular edition for March, 1956:

"A careless survey of this material might lead one to the conclusion that the destruction of the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches would be a so-called 'cure-all.' THIS IS NOT A TRUE NOR FAIR ANALYSIS!"

Yet two paragraphs earlier, the same article states:

"Here we have the importance of two agencies shown to be greatly out of proportion. . . . Therefore, the over-all picture seems to be that the church is not being served, but rather the church is the servant of these agencies.

(Continued on page 2)

## Preservation of Liberty

The editor of an influential weekly aviation business magazine has written, in a letter dated September 23, 1955, as follows:

"You are quite right in that we have been specially blessed in this country with a free spirit, and we are fighting any effort to curb the individual freedom of thought that has made this country unique in the world. Unfortunately we see, particularly in Washington, a growing attempt to curb our liberty. Rest assured we will continue to do all we can to fight against it."

That in the past twenty-five years this nation has seen in high places much concerted effort to bring more and more activities, properly belonging in the field of private enterprise, into the sphere of government control, is a fact which is undeniable. Tendency toward a socialistic form of government is equal to a tendency toward curbing liberty and freedom of thought. The price of freedom is eternal vigilance, and may involve controversy.

Tendency, in church government, toward monopoly by several synod-controlled agencies is similarly equal to a tendency toward curbing liberty and freedom of thought. In the church, as in the state, the price of freedom involves watchfulness and, possibly, controversy.

### Would the Road . . . ?

(Continued from page 1)

"The proof of this type of thinking is evident from the statement made several times at the 18th General Synod in St. Louis. During the discussion of the American Council situation our guest, Dr. Robert Ketcham, said quite often that if the American Council were stopped, '... the road to Calvary would be closed within twenty-five years.' Dr. J. Gordon Holdcroft reiterated Dr. Ketcham's statement, and all those present who were actively engaged in the work of these councils allowed this statement to stand.

"It should be pointed out if the work of the councils is kept in perfect line even if it is out of proportion, the situation is not intrinsically evil."

I must confess that such statements make me cringe. The situation really is intrinsically evil. A wicked tyranny is seeking to enslave us, and some of us sit by, picking dandelions. All the hosts of Satan are working vigorously to put an end to our hard-won freedom of preach-

## How Can an Independent Board Produce Bible Presbyterian Churches?

The above question has been repeatedly asked of me. A little reflection will make the situation clear. Any board can teach people to believe the Bible. Any board can teach people to believe in Presbyterian doctrine, and to organize a church along Presbyterian lines. What more is needed to produce a Bible Presbyterian Church?

However, we are told that this is not enough to make a Bible Presbyterian church in one important sense, since this alone does not make it a member of the Bible Presbyterian Synod.

It is true that in this sense the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions cannot produce a Bible Presbyterian Church. BUT NEITHER CAN THE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL MISSIONS produce such a church. All that either type of agency can do is to produce a church that holds to the Bible, and that believes in Presbyterian doctrine and government. No board or committee has the power to make it a member of the Bible Presbyterian denomination. This can be done only by a Presbytery. It is the duty of the Presbytery carefully to examine every church that applies for admission, *regardless of its origin*, and to make its decision on the basis of the facts involved. Friendly competition between two agencies to see which can produce churches of a higher standard, will prove beneficial in every way. But the actual acceptance of a church is the function of Presbytery. Presbytery's responsibility to investigate each particular situation and to make wise decisions can be shifted neither to a synod-controlled committee nor to an independent board.

ing the Gospel. The National Council of Churches reaches forth its tentacles into every sphere of life and into every branch of Government, seeking more and more to stop the means by which the Christian message is made known. The only agency that actually is doing anything to impede it is the American Council of Christian Churches!

Naturally the modernists hate the American Council, and particularly do they hate its founder, the Rev. Carl McIntire. How sad it is that even some unthinking evangelicals are to be found repeating slurs and abuses against him!

When Britain was threatened with invasion by air in 1940, it would have

## A Word From Dr. A.B. Dodd

"I have known Carl McIntire 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 U.S.A., 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."

Dr. Albert B. Dodd (IBPFM—Formosa), in a letter addressed to Members of the Bible Presbyterian Synod, January 14, 1956.

ill become an Englishman to spend his time criticizing the uniforms of the Royal Air Force. When Christendom is facing the greatest concentrated attack upon the Gospel that Satan has ever launched, it is distressing indeed to find evangelicals hunting for fly-specks on the American Council.

### STATEMENT LITERALLY TRUE

The American Council is not a super-church. It is not an instrument for the proclamation of the Gospel. But it is a protective force intended to drive back the onslaughts of those who would make it impossible for the church to fulfill the work for which God has raised it up. The statement of Dr. Ketcham and of Dr. Holdcroft is literally true. No one can tell what God may do, or whether He may choose to intervene in some way that we cannot foresee. However, aside from such an unforeseeable divine intervention, the American Council is the only force today that is attempting this necessary work of protecting God's servants from the increasing tyranny of modernistic repression. It behooves us to support it to the best of our ability rather than to do anything than can result in giving ammunition to the enemies of Christ,

## Separation, Positive and Negative

There are two aspects of the Scriptural doctrine of separation: the positive and the negative.

The positive aspect of separation is the building up of sound churches which are separate from unbelief. As one looks at the situation in most of our older denominations, he finds church after church in which there was formerly the sound preaching of the Gospel, but in which there is now a minister who tears the Bible to pieces. In many of these churches there are people who are accustomed to hearing the saving Gospel preached and who desire that their children hear it, but the children are growing up without any reality in their religious life. They are tending to drift away from the church. The parents realize that something is wrong. It is desirable that such people be won to a knowledge of what it is that is wrong, that they be induced to step out from any church that has fallen under the apostasy, and to give their influence to the forming of true churches in which their children can be trained in the knowledge of the actual teachings of the inerrant Word of God.

Separation is not an end in itself. The first purpose of separation from the National Council of Churches is the building up of churches in which the people can get the truth. This is positive separation. It is vital that positive separation be carried on in such a way as to accomplish this end. It is not simply an exaltation of separation *per se*, but it is a winning people, rescuing them out of denominations which have fallen under corrupt control.

In order to carry out this matter of the positive aspect of separation, it is necessary to do two things:

(1) It is necessary to wake people to the situation, to point out the wicked evil of apostasy, and to show how wrong it is for them to attend churches where the Word of God is denied and where people are pushed away from any knowledge of the Word of Life instead of being drawn toward it;

(2) It is also necessary to win these people and to convince them of the advantage that they can secure through stepping out and forming sound churches that are true to the Word of God.

All this is involved in the positive aspect of separation.

The American Council of Christian Churches is doing a work in this direction. The Bible Presbyterian Church is doing a work in this direction. It is vital

that all true Christians work in this direction. Specific accomplishment in this regard is far more important to the Lord than is the mere question of the building up of any particular agency, group, or denomination, whether it be the American Council or the Bible Presbyterian denomination.

### NEGATIVE SEPARATION

The negative aspect of separation may appear to some to be less important; yet it, too, is extremely vital. The negative aspect of separation is the foiling of the efforts of the leaders of organized apostasy who are trying their best to bring our nation under subjection. There has been developed an effort by a group of men, many of whom are near-Communist in their sympathies and most of whom are quite hostile to the true teachings of the Bible, to change completely the nature of our churches. Not only that, they are attempting to get such a hold over governmental institutions that it will be impossible for anyone to carry on religious activity who is not a member of the denominations they control. Effort has been exerted to gain control of the radio, of the chaplaincy, and of the entrance of missionaries into particular countries.

It is necessary that the Christian take an active stand in opposition to these trends. We see what the would-be tyrants have already tried to do in the United States and how the American Council has foiled them at point after point. We have seen what they have tried to do throughout the world and how the International Council has been mightily used of God to foil many of their activities, as in Australia last February. Is it not evident that Dr. Ket-cham's statement is a true statement — namely, that "the road to Calvary would be closed within twenty-five years if the American Council were removed"?

God, of course, if He so chooses, can keep the road open; but who knows but that this Council may be the means He chooses to use in doing it? This is the negative aspect of separation: to fight against all governmental efforts to advance the cause of tyranny, to fight against the efforts of Communists to gain control of the world in our generation, and to fight against the efforts of Communists to infiltrate our country with representatives of religious movements from behind the Iron Curtain, who would soften up our people for conquest. All this is part of the negative aspect of separation. It is a vital aspect, in which every true Christian should have a definite interest.

## Working Together or Picking Flaws

Dr. McIntire has shown remarkable ability in getting various Christian groups throughout the world to stand together against apostasy. Groups have often been involved that would not ordinarily work together at all, though both were composed of people who sincerely believe that the Bible is the inerrant Word of God and who are anxious to follow its teachings. Dr. McIntire has persuaded many of these groups which ordinarily stood absolutely aloof from one another to cooperate for the cause of our Lord Jesus Christ in opposition to modernism. He deserves much credit for getting such groups together in many parts of the world and thus increasing greatly their ability to stem the tide of apostasy.

In some cases it has been impossible to get groups to stand together. For one reason or another, sometimes for very petty reasons, groups refuse to work together. If one of them is in the movement, the other will not come in, and vice versa. In such cases it has been necessary for Dr. McIntire to investigate the situation and to decide with which group he should work. There may be good reasons in favor of each. The attempt to produce co-operation among the groups, and to decide between them, where such a decision is required, is often very difficult. To do this, it has been necessary for Dr. McIntire to deal with dozens of people and to write hundreds of letters. In the course of all this, naturally some mistakes are made. When we consider the amount of work that has been done, however, the number of mistakes that have been made is really amazingly small.

Let us praise God for the great things that this consecrated man has accomplished for the Lord, rather than to search through the many details of all of his work for flaws to criticize.

"I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith. . . . Let love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good. Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honour preferring one another. . . . Be not wise in your own conceits." — Romans 12:3, 9, 10, 16.

## Unprecedented Action

The *Bible Presbyterian Observer* of March, 1956 (regular edition), on page 7, middle column, speaks of the "unprecedented action" of the "Faith Seminary" board of directors relative to Dr. L. G. Gebb and the Rev. Hayes T. Henry.

What is meant by this statement? The event referred to is merely this: these men's term of office on the board expired and they were not re-elected.

Why does a board hold an election? Is it required automatically to re-elect all of its members? Or is it more proper that its members examine those who are up for re-election, to determine whether they should be re-elected? When a man has been on a board for many years, the board may perhaps be excused for continuing him without feeling it necessary to reinvestigate his fitness each time. When, however, a man has served only one term as a member of a self-perpetuating board, the other members would be remiss in their duty if they did not consider carefully whether it was best to re-elect him.

In this case, the two men mentioned had been members of the Seminary board only one term. During this term the board had met six times; one of the members had attended only one of these six meetings, the other had attended none at all.

In addition, the man who had attended no meetings of the board had recently published a statement in a letter broadcast throughout the Church in which he said, "I have no confidence in independent boards."\* Under the circumstances it would be rather strange if members of the board should vote to re-elect the two men.

\*The Rev. Mr. Henry's letter is published in Special Edition, No. 2, of *The Bible Press* (Sept. 9, 1955), put out by the First Bible Presbyterian Church of St. Louis. The paragraph from which the above sentence was quoted is as follows: "This is not a controversy over the Twentieth Century Reformation. It is over independency and the control of Synod's agencies. If there can yet be any question as to where I stand, we will clarify that by saying I am a Bible Presbyterian and loyal to my church because I believe her and her boards to be loyal to Christ and His cause. I have no confidence in independent boards—least of all one such as the new home board which springs out of spite and schism. We see reason, restraint, justice, and responsibility in a board controlled by Synod."

"These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, . . . Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one." — John 17:1, 11.

## Alleged Injury to Home Missionaries by the Founding of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions

It has been widely stated that home missionaries have suffered deprivation because they were unable conscientiously to receive money from the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions. Every one of these alleged instances refers to a case where a church which had been giving money to a missionary through the Committee on National Missions decided that it did not wish any longer to give its money through the Committee on National Missions, but to give it through the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions instead.

This new board has not cut off the support of anyone. To no one has it refused to give the support that he was previously getting. Churches which had been giving support through the Committee on National Missions and which now prefer to give through this new board have written to the missionaries and offered to continue the money, merely sending it through this channel instead of the other.

In a number of cases men have said that they could not conscientiously accept money through the Independent Board.

Why could they not accept money through this board? Was it because it is not a synod-controlled board? Was it because they do not believe in independent agencies? If so, then they are taking a solid stand on the idea of completely changing our church from what it was founded to be into something different.

### "VOLUNTARY" OR "MUST"

The March, 1956, regular edition of the *Bible Presbyterian Observer* carries the conclusion of the pastor of the St. Louis church in regard to his lengthy discussion favorable to an increase at this time of the number of synod-controlled agencies, as follows:

"Although this does not mean that we are forced to church-directed agencies in every case, it does mean that the centralization of power must be voluntarily changed in the immediate future and must not occur again."

Notice the contradiction between the two words, "voluntarily" and "must." Also notice that this statement clearly implies that in *most* cases the denomination will probably find itself "forced to church-directed agencies."

In our church, until recently, most of the activities were carried on by individuals working together as the Lord led them. Only in one field was the work under the direction of a synod-controlled agency. If a person cannot conscientiously work under an independent agency, he shows himself to be one who is anxious to change the church.

Perhaps this is not the reason that they could not conscientiously accept money from the board. Perhaps it is because they do not want to be connected with Dr. McIntire in any way. The fact of the matter is that Dr. McIntire is a member of the executive committee but is not an officer of the new home missions board. If they were receiving money from Dr. McIntire's church through a different agency before, there should be no reason why they could not with equal conscientiousness receive it from him now through the new independent home missions board.

All of the missionaries under the National Missions Committee whom I know are very, very fine men. Certainly there is no question of this. I am truly sorry, however, that some of them have been led to take what I believe to be an unjustified attitude of opposition to the missionary agency of which I am president; for the statement that the formation of this new missionary agency has brought deprivation to home missionaries seems to me to be without any real foundation.

"The tongue can no man tame; it is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison. Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God. Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not so to be. . . . Who is a wise man and endued with knowledge among you? let him shew out of a good conversation his works with meekness of wisdom. But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth. This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work." — James 3:8-10, 13-16.

## Not "A Spite Board"

The word is being spread near and far that the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions, of which I am president, is "a spite board." How can a person rightly judge whether or not this charge is true? To judge rightly he must have information from someone who is actually connected with it and who is therefore in a position to know the real facts.

I have known the complete facts about the founding of the IBPHM from the very beginning. I was present when the idea of its formation was first conceived. I was closely connected with the events which preceded its formation and I have taken part in every meeting it has held.

It is my testimony that I am thoroughly convinced that nothing in the origin or history of this mission board warrants such accusations against it. It grieved my soul when I heard that people were calling it "a spite board," and that some had even gone so far as to publish statements that they would be conscientiously unable to accept money through it. If I had the slightest reason to think that any of these charges were true, I would never have had anything to do with the formation of this board, nor would I have accepted its presidency—and I am in a position to know the facts about it at least as well as any man living.

In my opinion, monopoly is always bad. Any agency which feels that it should occupy such a privileged position that it need not face any competition is in danger of falling into eventual corruption. We need the stimulus of competition. Let us, however, keep the competition friendly.

It is our duty to use every possible means to spread the saving Gospel of Jesus Christ, to lead people out of apostate churches, and to form true churches of Christ. I pray God's blessing daily upon every agency for the spread of His Gospel. Some people may think one type of organization more effective, and some may prefer another. Why should not each of us support the one he thinks is most likely to be effective, and pray for all?

The Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions is not "a spite board." If people who gave to another board last year choose this year to give to this board, why would *we*, then, be accused of diverting funds, as if contributors were not free before the Lord to

(Continued on page 6)

## B.P.C.—End or Means?

Ichabod

There are many in our denomination who make the work of Christ throughout the world their ultimate objective, and who are interested in the Bible Presbyterian Church in so far as it is a useful means to support this objective.

But there are others who seem to take the development of the Bible Presbyterian denomination as the real objective, and to be interested in other matters only in so far as they contribute to the development or enlargement of the denomination.

I do not suppose that there are many who would put the matter quite as definitely as this, although the *Bible Presbyterian Observer* for March, 1956 (special edition), goes a long way in this direction. (See page 3 of that special edition, under the heading, "The Problem.") I am convinced that this is an underlying cause which divides our people today.

Personally, I have always felt that the making of a Christian is far more important than the making of a Presbyterian. I believe that if we are striving to win souls to the saving knowledge of Christ, He will honor us far more than if we are striving to change people who are already Christians into Presbyterians. God wants us to have a vision that reaches out to the great harvest fields of the world and to have a constant longing to win souls to Jesus Christ. He wishes us to bend every effort to lead people out of apostate churches and to bring them to a true, separated stand. This is the positive aspect of separation. He wishes us to extend as widely as possible the joy and comfort that comes from personal realization of the great blessings that we have because of the sovereignty of God, and of the other great doctrines of the Reformed Faith. If we are trying to extend these blessings as widely as possible, and are seeking to do all that we can to help all of God's true people, then I believe that God will bless the Bible Presbyterian denomination and cause it to flourish, far more than if we make it an end in itself.

I do not suppose there are many who have thought these matters through, but it is basic to much of the division within our church today. To my mind, the International Council of Christian Churches and the American Council of Christian Churches are instruments which God has raised up to do a great work in fighting apostasy. I believe we should stretch

(Continued on page 6)

## "Ideology of Domination"

People in our church talk about "the ideology of domination." Actually the situation is quite different. We have in Dr. Carl McIntire a man whom God has wonderfully blessed with remarkable abilities. He has a very quick mind and much greater ability to think things through clearly and see the results of certain courses of action than most have. He is unusually talented in winning people's support for a righteous cause. The activities that he is connected with prosper. The activities that do not have his support go much more slowly. Naturally, therefore, every agency that wants to move ahead is anxious to have his support and his help. A year ago the National Missions Committee held a big rally in Wilmington, and they asked him to come down from Collingswood to be its speaker. Up till a few months ago, his church was giving one-fourth of the money which came into the National Missions Committee.

Under these circumstances it is only natural and right that he should be interested to see that the money and support that is given as a result of his endeavors should be wisely used and should produce real accomplishment. For somebody to raise money, get support, arouse interest, and then simply pay no attention to what is done with it all would be positively idiotic.

It is true that under such circumstances as these a man might be moved with such a desire to dominate that it would be his purpose to make everything with which he was connected to work for his glory and not for the Lord's. However, that is not so in this case. Among men whom I have known through the years who possess comparable ability or standing, few if any have shown as little interest in their own prominence as he.

Dr. McIntire has never sought to manage the affairs of the National Missions Committee or of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions or of Faith Seminary. He has been very anxious that these organizations should stand for the great doctrines of the Faith and that they should give a proper emphasis to separation also. Occasionally he has felt a reason for being particularly interested in some particular detail of their administration. The great bulk, however, of the actions of all these organizations have been worked out by other people and he has never attempted to influence them in one way or the other, or to show any domination over them.

## SMEAR

Dr. Carl McIntire has been criticized on the ground that he has "smeared" people in the *Christian Beacon*, and then refused to give any redress. It is my observation that this is not true.

About fifteen years ago I remember hearing a Christian leader, in speaking of a certain man, say that he was always making great charges against people and not being able to substantiate them. "However," he said, "whenever you see something by Carl McIntire, you can just about depend on it that he's got the goods. He has always been able to defend every charge that I've ever seen him make against anybody."

In getting out a Christian newspaper the size of the *Beacon* every week and dealing with such controversial things, it is just about impossible to avoid occasionally making mistakes. My observation is that the number of these that have occurred in the *Beacon* during the past twenty years is very few indeed and that Dr. McIntire has been very ready to make amends. In fact, in some cases I have known him to go much further than I personally felt was at all necessary.

I know one case where some men were quite excited because they felt he had smeared them in the *Beacon*. What happened was that they had gone to a meeting of the American Council as representatives of the Bible Presbyterian Church. A constitutional amendment had been proposed and when it came to a vote, the representatives of all the other denominations voted against it unanimously, and only these Bible Presbyterians voted for it. The vote was 6 to 53. They had insisted on arguing at great length for it and made a great fuss about the fact that it did not pass.

The *Beacon* stated the simple fact that this measure had been proposed and that it had been defeated, giving the vote, and saying that the only votes in its favor were "cast by ministers of the Bible Presbyterian Church, five of them being delegates to the Synod." (See *Christian Beacon* for May 5, 1955, pages 1 and 8.)

The vote was a public vote. These men had all either stood up or raised their hands to vote. Personally, I do not see why anybody who votes publicly in favor of an action should object to having the fact of his public vote recorded in a news periodical. Why should this be considered as constituting a smear?

That the *Beacon* should relate the high lights of the meeting ought not be regarded as strange, since *Beacon* readers are accustomed to following American Council doings.

## The Proper Work of Synod

The make-up of the synod is such as to fit it for the carrying out of the work for which it is properly intended, that of ministerially interpreting the Word of God, guarding the church against the entrance of false doctrine, and overseeing the entrance to the sacred ministry. These matters are quite sufficient to keep the synod busy for the several days a year that it normally meets. In addition, it is also vital that there be time for Christian fellowship among the members, for encouraging one another to good works, and for telling one another what measures God has blessed, as each has endeavored to serve the Lord in his own particular area, and thus to learn from one another's successes and failures.

### Not "A Spite Board"

(Continued from page 5)

give their money where they think it can be most effectively used?

God has been pleased to bless the work of our Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions in several states of this nation. Pray with us, won't you, that He will continue richly to bless its work, and that through its efforts many fine new Bible Presbyterian churches may be established in the years to come.

### B.P.C.—End or Means?

(Continued from page 5)

every effort to help them, not to injure them.

No human organization is perfect. But I see many men spending great amounts of time propagandizing incessantly against what I call "fleyspecks" on the American Council, and doing practically nothing to promote it.

This comes, I feel, from a failure to stress the big things. It is an attitude of putting our little matters above the great concerns of the Kingdom of Christ in these days of peril. I really cannot see how we can expect God to bless such an attitude. If it becomes dominant in our little denomination, I believe that God will write "Ichabod" (the glory has departed) over its door.

Our little church stands at a fork in the road. Will it go off in a direction which leads to weakness, and eventual stagnation, or will it return to the direction which God has blessed in the past?

## Synod's Time

When a synod takes responsibility for the control of boards and agencies, there are always problems connected with them which have to be discussed at great length. This consumes a great part of the time of synod which should properly be devoted to other matters.

The meeting of the 18th General Synod last year in St. Louis had before it a large number of problems which the previous synod had committed to special committees for study, including such matters as the question of secret societies, the question of fasting, the study of the proof texts to be printed in connection with the Confession of Faith, the preparation of a Directory of Worship, and various other matters of this type. Each of these matters could well have consumed a few hours of the synod's time.

In addition, a committee brought in extensive reports from its examination of the various agencies endorsed by the synod. While it is true that this committee may have gone into matters of administration and procedure which are not properly the work of the synod at all, at least a part of its report was concerned with the question whether these agencies are standing true to Biblical doctrine, and this matter is one which synod ought regularly to face.

Yet all of these matters were pushed aside with merely the distribution of mimeographed statements to the synod. There was not even a minute given to the discussion of any of them. The synod failed to do its proper work because it undertook to consider, in detail, matters connected with the administration of the American Council of Christian Churches.

If the synod is to make even an attempt properly to administer a number of synod-controlled boards and agencies, it must expect to spend great amounts of time discussing their problems and making the vital decisions which will condition their work. To do it with several agencies is impossible. The mere attempt to do it means that the proper business of the synod suffers, as it did at St. Louis last year.

This was the sort of creeping paralysis which greatly injured the work of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in recent years, and which doubtless had much to do with its spiritual declension. Gradually, during the past century and a half, that body was turned away from its original purpose by the great development in it of synod-controlled boards and agencies. It will be sad indeed if the Bible Presbyterian Church fails to profit from that bad example.

## Machines

The increase of synod-controlled boards and agencies inevitably leads to the development of harmful ecclesiastical machines. Let us think for a moment about the meaning of this word "machine."

When a group of people holding a certain viewpoint get together to discuss ways and means of so presenting the viewpoint as to win others to it, this does not constitute a machine. Any group of members of a deliberative body may properly consider problems together in order to clarify their ideas, and to determine how they can most effectively present their viewpoint. There is nothing wrong or harmful in this procedure. A deliberative body is helped by anything which has the result of bringing all the facts before it, in order that it may give them proper consideration.

What we mean by a legislative or political machine is an organization which sets about to secure certain ends, not by presenting facts and enabling the body to understand all that is involved, but by deciding how advantage may be taken of parliamentary situations, or how measures may be presented, the full import of which the body may not immediately grasp, and then pushed through in some way in order to secure the ends which the machine desires without the body fully realizing what it is doing. Anything of this kind can readily be seen to be out of place in a proper religious body.

Yet the development of machines of this type is inevitable if there are to be synod-controlled boards and agencies. Let us see for a minute what happens if there is no such machine. An agency spends many months studying means of advancing its work. It comes up against all sorts of problems on which authoritative decision is necessary. If it is a voluntary organization, it has a board of control which can meet at frequent intervals, give full study to the problems involved, and make proper decisions. In a synod-controlled body, all these decisions have to wait until the next meeting of synod.

The very question of the election or continuance of its members is one which is decided not by the action of the other members who know how well these particular members do their work, and whether they are an asset or a liability to the organization, but by a larger body on the basis of personal liking, or some whim which has little to do with real efficiency. If no machine is developed, the utmost the synod can do is to examine two or three of the problems of one or two of

## Let's Turn Back

The establishment of three new synod-controlled agencies at the 1955 synod means that the days of free and untrammelled synods are over. Either chaos and inefficiency will come upon us, or various machines will be established, to some extent co-operating and to some extent conflicting with one another. These machines will confuse the ordinary member of the synod. He will not understand exactly what is happening, but he will leave the meetings with the feeling of having been trampled upon. When such machines are developed, they inevitably come in time to deal not only with matters which immediately affect their agencies, but they find it impossible to resist the urge to use their power in other areas as well. It was in this way that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. was gradually changed from a spiritual judicatory to a machine-run assembly.

It is to be hoped that the members of the Bible Presbyterian Church will seriously consider the great harm that has been done by this increase in the number of synod-controlled agencies, and will make a strong turn about in the near future.

the agencies. The rest of them have their membership, elected by the passing whim of the body, or the perhaps ill-considered ideas of a nominating committee. Time is lacking to present the most important problems to the body, or if presented they are often voted upon by snap judgment in quick time with no opportunity for decent consideration. The result is that if no machine is developed, the existence and efficiency of the agency are dependent upon accident, and chaos results.

No agency controlled by a large assembly could possibly continue, and do effective work, unless it developed a machine which could see to it that in some way or another the most necessary measures were pushed through the synod. It becomes necessary that means be found of reaching the members of the nominating committee, and getting them to nominate the ones whom it is desired to have on the particular committee. Great interests comes to be attached to the question of who is the presiding officer of the synod, because of his power in the selection of the nominating committee and of other committees. Thus, inevitably, a situation develops in which, in self-defense, a board or agency must develop what in the political world would be known as a machine.

Chapter XXXI, "Of Synods and Councils," paragraph III, *Westminster Confession of Faith*:

"All synods or councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both."

### Why INCREASE of Synod-controlled Boards and Agencies Is Undesirable

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A synod-controlled board or agency is properly defined as one having ministers and other employees working full time under its supervision.

## Blessings in Home Missions Churches

In his report to the president of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions, the Rev. John E. Janbaz of Pasadena, Calif., mentions (among others) the following items of praise:

"(2) Praise the Lord for a fine growth in our attendance now over that of our meetings in the V.F.W. Hall. This has been especially encouraging, for we find that visitors now return and worship with us again. The smell of the Saturday night party in the Hall was too much for many folk who visited with us. A number who came occasionally then are now among our most faithful attenders. There has been a tremendous growth percentage-wise, for our attendance had hit 'rock bottom' after the change in leadership at Highland College in March of last year. It meant practically starting all over again, but just at the time things were at such a low ebb, the Lord truly led us to this property. Families from the neighborhood are in a large way responsible for our good attendance. Souls have been saved recently. This has been the great encouragement.

"(4) Praise the Lord for the unity of the Holy Spirit in our midst, after the struggles of the last year centering around the difficulties at Highland College. We rejoice in the complete accord and fellowship we find with the College family. It is a privilege to raise a testimony which is in accord with the Twentieth Century Reformation Movement. It is our desire to be a greater help in years to come as the Lord blesses with growth and strength."

### OTHER AREAS

The Rev. Charles S. Jackson, pastor of the Bible Presbyterian Church in Morrisonville, Ill., has written as follows of the blessing of our God upon the new work there:

## Are Elders Really Wanted?

Although it is naturally to be expected that professionally trained ministers will have a special insight into theological and doctrinal matters, it is one of the cornerstones of Presbyterianism that ruling elders should participate actively in decisions on vital church matters. This active participation should give a practical tinge to assemblies and should be of real help in moderating the extremes that can easily result from the overheated feelings of theorists. If a Presbyterian body is to go forward effectively, it is necessary that elder-participation on all levels should be actively cultivated.

This will not occur spontaneously. Not many elders will object vocally if meetings are held under circumstances which do not suit their convenience. They are more apt to stay away.

At the 18th General Synod last year, actions were taken which may affect the whole future history of the denomination. Yet the voting membership of more than 130 included only 30 ruling elders. The

"The community is very needy; it is locked in a very dead modernism. Although there are many church members here, there are few who know the Lord Jesus Christ as their Saviour and Lord. . . .

"Our peak Sunday attendance in February was 48, and we constantly have visitors attending. As long as new people are coming, we have opportunity. We believe the Lord will bring the increase in His own time.

"God continues to meet our needs month by month. We do praise Him for the wonderful way in which He has accomplished what seemed impossible, and has blessed with such fullness."

Please pray, won't you, for these and other fields from which similar reports have come.

great mass of the laity of the church cannot be thought of as having participated in any real way.

One reason for this situation has been the planning of synods for the convenience of ministers, without trying to find a time that would be most suitable to the elders. If a meeting were held from Monday to Saturday, a layman could attend, without having to be absent from his employment for more than a week. For him to attend a meeting that runs from Thursday to Wednesday requires him to lose two weeks of employment. Only men who feel keenly that their personal attendance at synod is extremely important are apt to make this sacrifice. The great mass of the elders remain silent and forgotten.

Moving the synod to April this year, contrary to all previous precedent, is bound still further to increase the feeling of many elders that their participation is something politely suggested, but not really wanted. If the synod were held during the vacation season and arranged in such a way as to be convenient for elder-attendance, it would be possible to stimulate their interest from year to year. Otherwise the decisions of our synods will continue to lack that practical quality which is necessary if the church is to grow and prosper.

It is true that a special effort might bring a larger number of elders to one particular meeting (even an April meeting), but the sort of elder-participation that results in truly Presbyterian decisions requires stimulus of elder interest and attendance over a period of years.

"Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up. Speak not evil one of another, brethren. He that speaketh evil of his brother, speaketh evil of the law, and judgeth the law: but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge. There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy: who art thou that judgest another?" — James 4:10, 11.