

THE FREE PRESS

VOL I—No. 8

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

May 4, 1956

The Meeting in St. Louis

The meeting which was held in St. Louis will go down in the history of the Bible Presbyterian movement as a tragedy and a disgrace to the name of Presbyterianism.

1.

First, the Synod should be called a "lawless" Synod. This lawlessness was manifest particularly in the adoption of the resolution against the Committee for True Presbyterianism. The constitution gives no such authority, and this mandate, as it is properly called, parallels in the strangest fashion the mandate of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. against the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions of 1934. Synod, under the constitution, cannot instruct any committee to initiate judicial processes. In fact, Synod has become, through its committee, the prosecuting committee against brethren in the Synod; and, if such cases should be initiated, then the Synod itself becomes the final judge, for it is the final court of appeal.

Actually, as Dr. Machen pointed out in the case of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., it has prejudged the case before it has heard it, declared men guilty before tried! The General Synod of 1956 has prejudged the case in issuing instructions against the officers of the Committee for True Presbyterianism. How could such a Synod ever as a judge hear cases it authorizes as the prosecutor? This is lawlessness of the same order, type, and tyranny that the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. manifested in 1934. Dr. Machen refused to obey the deliverance of the 1934 General Assembly and every member of the Committee for True Presbyterianism should defy, refuse to obey, and refuse in any way to recognize or to meet with this committee which has been set up unlawfully by the Synod meeting in St. Louis.

If there were no questions in the minds of people about the propriety of such a Synod, and the Synod were a duly called, properly recognized Synod by everyone, these actions would still remain unlawful and in violation of the constitution of the church. Ecclesiastical pressure in the name of judicial cases is here

used as pressure against brethren. The meeting in St. Louis has illustrated just how men, when they are stirred with deep emotion, can go beyond the protective bounds of constitutions. History is full of such transgressions.

Another act of lawlessness had to do with the Presbytery of New Jersey. A call for a *pro re nata* meeting to be held in St. Louis was issued by the stated clerk and sent by him to all the members of the Presbytery. According to the constitution of the denomination, a request for a *pro re nata* meeting must be submitted first to the moderator who is to handle the same, and, in case he is dead, absent, or

(Continued on page 2)

ACTION OF SYNOD RELATIVE TO ACCC AND ICCC

OVERTURE ON THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES

Action: Reaffirming its position on the purity of the visible Church and its position on separation from Modernism and inclusivism, the Nineteenth General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, finding sufficient cause for dissatisfaction in its representation by the American Council of Christian Churches, hereby terminates the power of that agency to represent said denomination, and directs the Stated Clerk of this Synod to give immediate notification of this action to the American Council of Christian Churches.

OVERTURE ON THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES

Action: Reaffirming its position on the purity of the visible Church and its position on separation from Modernism and inclusivism, the Nineteenth General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church, finding sufficient cause for dissatisfaction in its representation by the International Council of Christian Churches, hereby terminates the power of that agency to represent said denomination, and directs the Stated Clerk of this Synod to give immediate notification of this action to the International Council of Christian Churches.

"Catholic, Visible Church"

The Form of Government of the Bible Presbyterian Church, Chapter 2, "Of the Church," says, in paragraph 1, "Jesus Christ, who is now exalted far above all principality and power, has erected, in this world, a visible body which is His Church."

Paragraph 4 reads, "The Bible Presbyterian Church declares itself to be a branch of the catholic visible Church of Christ and further declares its willingness to hold Christian fellowship with all other such branches of the Church."

One way, the important way, in which the Bible Presbyterian Church expressed this willingness for such fellowship was through the American Council of Christian Churches in the United States, and through the International Council of Christian Churches throughout the world. In the ICCC the Bible Presbyterian Church was in fellowship with 56 other branches of the "catholic visible Church of Christ." This tie has now been broken, and the Bible Presbyterian Church stands alone.

Did it have Scriptural reasons for its action? If so, it did not so state them. The action in withdrawing from the ACCC and ICCC does not specify any reasons. In view of this provision of the constitution, it surely was incumbent upon the Synod to make clear its reasons in giving a testimony of withdrawing from such an organization as the International Council of Christian Churches.

Serious harm and injury has been done to the whole cause of Christ and to the "catholic visible Church." The action of the Bible Presbyterian Synod has injured the groups with which the church was previously in fellowship.

Individual churches are still free to give the expression of fellowship and faith with other churches in the ACCC and ICCC. Thank God, this spirit of brotherly love, Christian co-operation, does still exist in the church and can be expressed for Christ's glory.

The Meeting in St. Louis

(Continued from page 1)

unable to act, the stated clerk is authorized to proceed. The call which was sent out to the Presbytery was never submitted to the moderator. He did not even know it existed until he was notified along with the other members of the Presbytery.

An earlier proposed call was submitted to the moderator, but, before he acted on it, it was abandoned and another call signed by the same individuals was requested to be made and this is the one the stated clerk, usurping the authority of the moderator, proceeded to handle.

The moderator informed the Presbytery that when it meets he will rule such a *pro re nata* meeting illegal and unconstitutional.

The moderator has not yet ruled in the Presbytery meeting so that the Presbytery of New Jersey could decide on the legality of the moderator's ruling. But, because the stated clerk was present at the Synod, he brought the whole question before the Synod on his own responsibility. The Presbytery was not notified, the moderator of the Presbytery was not notified, was not there, and the Synod proceeded to rule that the meeting was perfectly legal and proper even though the constitutional provision that the notice be handled by the moderator was not fulfilled. Synod decided on a matter which has not yet come before the Presbytery and which is a matter for the Presbytery itself to decide before Synod could consider it.

This is lawlessness on the part of the Synod—completely by-passing a Presbytery, its responsibility and privilege under the constitution. Now if the Presbytery sustained the ruling of the moderator that the *pro re nata* meeting was not legal and its minutes could not be honored in the Presbytery, then a complaint could properly be taken to the General Synod for orderly decision. But operating as the Synod did in St. Louis, it is not necessary to have complaints, or for parties to be given notice of hearings, or anything of the kind. Synod can automatically, at its own discretion, reach into any Presbytery, if someone raises some question, and give a decision without the opposite parties even knowing that such a matter is being considered. This is lawlessness in the church.

2.

Second, the meeting in St. Louis will go down in history as a "willful" Synod. This willfulness perhaps is best illustrated in the paragraph in the Mandate of 1956 which says, "Some on this Committee are committed, by the publication of *The Free*

Press (Vol. I, No. 4), to a false concept of Presbyterianism by advocating non-attendance at a properly called General Synod of the Church." There was a sincere question concerning the propriety of the "call." Synod arbitrarily insists that its "call" was proper and then uses this as a basis for instructions to a committee to initiate judicial cases against the men if the committee thinks necessary. This is real willfulness.

The Synod, meeting in St. Louis, was called by one man, the moderator. An effort was made to get the moderator to call the meeting when all parties could sit down without any questions of propriety. This failed. The unity and the peace of the church involves the whole church, not just the activity of a majority. It involves the welfare of the majority and the minority together. And the concern for the peace and the unity of the church by the group in St. Louis should have involved a desire to have a meeting when all the brethren could sit down together, discuss questions, problems, and seek to find, if possible, come agreeable solution under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The St. Louis Synod represented a "majority," with very few from the minority side represented, and it proceeded to go ahead in great strength to accomplish the purpose of the majority present without due respect to the "minority" in the church. This is definitely in the realm of willfulness.

3.

Third, the meeting in St. Louis will go down in history as a "tragic" Synod. It was said that the meeting there would solve the problems. It has solved virtually nothing. In fact, it has made things considerably worse and complicated the situation of many of the men who attended. The action in withdrawing from the International Council of Christian Churches and the American Council of Christian Churches was precipitous and was a tragedy, and the consequences of it will plague the Bible Presbyterian ministers as long as they live, regardless of what may become of them. Also, churches are weary of fighting, desire peace, and a number are considering withdrawing, that they might have peace to preach the Gospel and to be free from such conflict. Someone somewhere should call a halt to this and brethren should be ready and willing to sit down as brethren, in a spirit of prayer, patience, tenderness, grace, and deal with one another and not demand, in the authority and the name of the church, that men shall meet with a committee,

A Minister Writes

The Rev. W. B. Goebel, Kannapolis, N. C., wrote a letter to Dr. Carl McIntire after the meeting of the Synod as follows:

"Dear Brother McIntire:

"After serving many years service in the ministry of the Southern Presbyterian Church I came out of it not only because of modernism but also because of the dictatorial powers of the men who had control of the agencies of the denomination.

"Now our Synod has brought about the same conditions that existed in the old church, and the whole thing is of the 'flesh,' and I am against their every action. I shall continue to stand for our independent agencies, and under a separate cover I am applying for membership in the Councils.

"You have done a great work for our blessed Lord, and you have my sympathy and prayers. May the blessings of God rest upon you and your labors and in some manner overcome the injustice that has been done to you and our cause."

which, if its terms are not satisfied for what they consider to be peace, then judicial processes shall be initiated as they think necessary.

The Bible Presbyterian Church is going down to great disaster and if the brethren who are responsible for these deeds are not willing to turn around, to back up, they are going to find, we are afraid, that the common man in the pew who loves the Lord is going to forsake them and find fellowship in some other fold.

Are all these extreme actions, unlawful actions, willful actions, tragic actions designed simply to force the minority out of the church? If that is what they have been designed to do, they have failed. The constitution of the church protects the minority. The minority has not transgressed the constitution of the church. At least, what is now considered the minority appears to be rapidly becoming a majority, in church after church, throughout the denomination. The positions taken by Dr. Holdcroft, Dr. McIntire, Dr. MacRae, and others are clearly being vindicated by the extremes to which the brethren opposing them have gone. The church must be saved, it must be preserved and brought back in genuine sorrow and repentance for what has been done in the name of our Lord, the Head of the Church.

Bible Presbyterian Church Association

"The Bible Presbyterian Church Association shall consist of presbyteries, churches, ministers, and individual members of local churches in the Bible Presbyterian Synod and Bible Presbyterian Churches, Unaffiliated.

"The purpose of this Association shall be to maintain constituent membership in both the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches. This Association accepts and approves the Preamble and Doctrinal Statement of the constitutions of the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches, and all members of the Association shall approve of the same in writing.

"The Association shall seek to promote and support in every way possible the position, principles, and testimony of the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches.

"This Association shall select delegates to these Councils in the manner to be determined by the Association and the Association shall meet upon its own adjournment. Dr. J. Gordon Holdcroft, the Rev. Robert DuVall, the Rev. George W. Fincke, and Dr. Carl McIntire constitute the original committee to act in the furtherance of this Association."

The above statement was read publicly in a Bible Presbyterian rally held in the Collingswood Church on Friday night, April 13, 1955. It is the full statement concerning the formation of the Association to be the means by which Bible Presbyterian churches and ministers will continue in the ACCC and ICCC.

Application Form

For Individual Membership in Bible Presbyterian Church Association

Forms have been prepared for affiliation with the Bible Presbyterian Church Association. These concern local churches to be filled out by Sessions, individual pastors, and individual church members. The form for individual church members who are in churches which have not affiliated with the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches is as follows:

Rejection of ICCC

The withdrawal of the St. Louis group from the International Council of Christian Churches is, perhaps, its most disastrous act, for, since 1948, groups, standing for the purity of the church and the testimony of separation from modernism and apostasy, have been gathered together in every section of the world. Bible Presbyterian leadership has contributed to the organization of this worldwide fellowship. Regional and local groups have been formed in countries and continents. There is the Latin American Alliance of Christian Churches, the Far Eastern Council of Christian Churches, the Scandinavian Evangelical Alliance, the Canadian Evangelical Protestant Council, the Middle East Bible Council, and recently the Australian Council of the ICCC. Much hard work, travel, and patience in dealing with brethren have brought together these fellowships throughout the world, and the two leaders who are presidents in this movement, one in the field of the Council and the other in the field of missions, are Dr. Carl McIntire and Dr. J. Gordon Holdcroft. The action of the Bible Presbyterian Church is already being used as indicated by the *Evening Bulletin's* article to hurt the cause and to bring aid and comfort to the World Council and National Council of Churches.

Man after man in the Bible Presbyterian Church has repeatedly affirmed that he was 100 per cent for the ICCC and also the ACCC. It has been under the leadership of Francis Schaeffer that much dissatisfaction over the ICCC has been spread among the ministers, particularly in the Bible Presbyterian Church. His

Repudiation of ACCC

The American Council of Christian Churches, which the Bible Presbyterian Church helped found and in which it has had a leading place of responsibility through the years, was repudiated by the Synod in St. Louis. The Synod formally withdrew from the ACCC. This is the fulfillment of a threat made by Donald McNair in Memphis in 1954.

The 1955 Synod in St. Louis asked the American Council to do certain things and at the latest meeting of the American Council in Grand Rapids every request made by the Bible Presbyterians was either granted or implemented as far as possible under the constitution.

activity has been carried on without the knowledge of Dr. McIntire or others in the ICCC. At Synod, it was learned that he had written a very lengthy letter, a report, back in August of 1955. This had been mimeographed and had been in the hands of a number of brethren, but Dr. McIntire and others connected with the International Council had not seen it and did not know that it was in circulation.

Dr. McIntire was with a team of eight ICCC leaders who recently toured Australia for 16 days and in all the ICCC's history nothing received quite the attention that this trip did. A continent was reached with the issues of the apostasy, the purity of the church, and the presence of communists who have infiltrated the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches. Now all of this is to have cast over it the shadow of the St. Louis action.

FOR INDIVIDUAL BIBLE PRESBYTERIANS WHOSE CHURCH DOES NOT UNITE WITH THE BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH ASSOCIATION:

I desire to be a member of the Bible Presbyterian Church Association for the purpose of affiliation with the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches. I approve of the Doctrinal Statement and the Preamble of both of the Councils.

NAME
ADDRESS
LOCAL CHURCH

Any Bible Presbyterian who is in such a church may, by the signing of this and the mailing of it to Box 218, Collingswood 7, N. J., be enrolled as a part of the

American Council and International Council of Christian Churches in the Bible Presbyterian Church Association. There are no fees. It is purely a voluntary association for this specific purpose. The Association is primarily for those who are in the Bible Presbyterian denomination, though it does include Independent Presbyterian and Bible Presbyterian Churches, Unaffiliated.

Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever.—1 John 2:15-17.

McIntire Receives Official Communication From Synod

In an envelope marked "Personal," postmarked Boone, N. C., April 13, 1956, 11.30 a.m., the Rev. Carl McIntire, D.D., pastor of the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood, N. J., received the following communication from Dr. Edgar Archer Dillard, chairman of a newly created Synod committee to deal with the officers of the Committee for True Presbyterianism:

Dear Dr. McIntire

I am sorry you were not at the nineteenth General Synod meeting in St. Louis. The Synod passed the following action.

OVERTURE REGARDING THE COMMITTEE FOR TRUE PRESBYTERIANISM

"Action. WHEREAS, the Committee for True Presbyterianism was organized on the closing day of the 18th General Synod, and apparently as a result of certain faction's finding themselves in the minority in that Synod; and

"WHEREAS, this is a deliberate affront to the Church; and

"WHEREAS, this Committee has falsely charged, publicly, that the 18th General Synod took actions which by their nature constitute 'a big step in the direction of Prelacy, and away from True Presbyterianism' (*Free Press*, Vol. I, No. 1, page 6) and

"WHEREAS, some of this Committee are committed by the publication of the *Free Press* (Vol. I, No. 4) to a false concept of Presbyterianism by advocating non-attendance at a properly called General Synod of the Church;

"Therefore be it resolved, that Synod take due note of the serious implications of the actions of the Committee on True Presbyterianism with regard to the constitution and the official actions of the Church, and formally register its disapproval of this Committee and its divisive activities, and

"Be it further resolved, that a special committee be formed by the moderator to study the whole problem and to confer with the officers on the Committee of True Presbyterianism with an effort to resolve any problems and to restore peace, and that such a Committee be instructed to bring any administrative or judicial

Special Committee to Deal With Officers of Committee for True Presbyterianism

The action of the St. Louis Synod relative to the Committee for True Presbyterianism needs to be carefully understood by every Bible Presbyterian.

A paragraph which actually appears in the resolution as adopted by the Synod was omitted in the quotation in the official letter to Dr. McIntire. This was probably an oversight. The omitted paragraph, paragraph 2, reads:

"WHEREAS, the name of this Committee clearly implies that the majority of the 18th General Synod have espoused a false concept of Presbyterianism; and"

In this action Synod established a special committee, gave it instructions "to bring any administrative or judicial cases as it thinks necessary to such a court of the church as it finds proper."

The overture is frank enough to say that it is dealing with "the serious implications of the actions of the Committee," and in its second section it says what the name "implies." All of this indicates how sensitive the group in St. Louis was, and it further indicates that they are presuming to use the power of the church to deal with this particular group in the church. To say that the name, "Committee for True Presbyterianism," implies that "the majority of the 18th General Synod have espoused a false concept of Presbyterianism" clearly indicates that the implications are those which are understood or created by the majority and not the minority, though they have not been specific as to what these implications are. This, they claim, is "a deliberate affront to our Church," a totally unwarranted, unjustified, and extreme conclusion drawn simply from the name of a committee. A committee can be formed to deal with trends

cases as it thinks necessary to such a court of the church as it finds proper."

Pursuant to this action the moderator appointed Messrs. Gebb, Horner, Rayburn, and myself as a committee to meet with you and the officers of the Committee for True Presbyterianism.

Would it be possible for you and the said officers to meet with us at the Robert Morris Hotel in Philadelphia, Pa., on May the fifteenth at two p.m.?

I would appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience as I wish to notify the other members of Synod's Committee.

Yours in Christ,

E. A. DILLARD, *Chairman*

or individual acts in a church without "deliberate affront" to our church.

This type of language partakes of the well-known language of the Synod of 1954 when Dr. Rayburn brought in his report charging the executive committee of the American Council with "deliberate deception." As to the third paragraph, "this Committee has falsely charged," there obviously can be a difference of opinion in the Synod concerning a majority or minority and such difference of opinion does not have to be penalized by threats of judicial cases. Actually, the resolution itself is the greatest indication that prelacy has come to the Bible Presbyterian Church that has thus far been evidenced.

This is prelacy in its worst form in Presbyterian polity, when a minority opinion must be dealt with on the basis of serious implication and instructions to a committee created by the majority to proceed with judicial cases if it thinks necessary.

But what is there in the constitution concerning the official actions of the church that the members of the Committee for True Presbyterianism are bound by? As to the official actions of the church, the constitution supports the Committee for True Presbyterianism when it says, concerning all actions, "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" (Form of Government, Chapter 10, Section 9). So, both the official actions and also the constitution have certainly not been transgressed so far as the rights of individuals within the church are concerned. The Synod in St. Louis apparently forgot that the constitution of the church has such provisions in it when it passed this resolution.

Synod's action definitely takes the position that the present majority is true Presbyterian and that those who objected are not true Presbyterian, and for this reason the peace has been disturbed, particularly through the publication of *The Free Press*, and that something must be done to restore peace. Therefore, a committee with authority and power has been created and given instructions.

We have here a clear case of "the usurped claim of making laws." The Form of Government, Chapter 1, "Preliminary

(Continued on page 5)

Charges Against McIntire

If the committee set up by Synod and named by Dr. R. Laird Harris, consisting of Dr. Dillard, Dr. Gebb, Dr. Rayburn, and Mr. Horner—should wish to proceed to initiate judicial cases against men in the courts of the church, it is necessary for them first to write charges against these men. The three charges, which Dr. McIntire was convicted of in disobeying the Mandate of 1934 now come to be most appropriate for this committee's use in case they go this far.

The first charge on which Dr. McIntire was convicted by the Presbytery for disobeying the Mandate of 1934 reads:

"Disapproval, defiance, and acts in contravention of the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A."

This fits very well the Mandate of 1956. The minority is declared to be in defiance of the constitution and the official acts of the 18th General Synod. It is an "affront" to the church, and in contravention of the government. A very interesting parallel!

Second:

"Not being zealous and faithful in maintaining the peace of the Church."

This charge also fits very well the Mandate of 1956, which is designed to restore peace or have judicial cases, and it is the members of the Committee for True Presbyterianism who are alleged to be responsible for the disturbance of the peace.

Third:

"Violation of his ordination vows."

These violations of his ordination vows, of course, were that he was not subject to his brethren and that he had disturbed the peace. All of this fits perfectly the Mandate of 1956. In Mr. McIntire's trial in 1935, he admitted that he was a member of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, that he did not intend to resign, that he felt it was the Lord's will. We are confident that the officers and members of the Committee for True Presbyterianism do not intend to resign, dissolve the Committee, stop publishing *The Free Press*, or anything else, in reply to demands of a General Synod acting through a committee with threats of judicial cases hanging over the men.

But one step further needs to be taken. If the purpose of these judicial cases is to drive men out of the church since they will not voluntarily leave, and this is the only way they can be gotten out of the

The proper title for the action dealing with the overture regarding the Committee for True Presbyterianism must be and will be historically the Mandate of 1956.

It was an action similar to this which the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. took in 1934. Simply an administrative deliverance, nothing more, nothing less, which the members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, under the leadership of Dr. J. Gresham Machen, called the Mandate of 1934. Now we have another administrative deliverance, in answer to an overture, and

church, then any trials which may be initiated will have to end in a censure, not in admonition or rebuke, but in the censure of suspension from the ministry and deposition. If, after they have all their trials, they just admonish or rebuke the members of the Committee for True Presbyterianism, they have not restored the peace of the church.

Should men be forbidden to preach the Gospel and be suspended from the ministry simply because they are members of this Committee for True Presbyterianism? One can easily see the path down which these men who are now running the Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church have proceeded. The road they are now walking, the same identical road that the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. walked, can only mean suspension of men from the ministry — thus their removal.

It surely looks as though history is repeating itself; but the people in the pews who love the Lord and rejoice in the stand of the men who suffered on the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions are not going to tolerate any such proceedings, and it is obvious that there has already been a very sizable reaction in the church toward the attack of the 19th General Synod upon the Committee for True Presbyterianism.

Special Committee ...

(Continued from page 4)

Principles," says: "Now though it will easily be admitted, that all synods and councils may err, through the frailty inseparable from humanity; yet there is much greater danger from the usurped claim of making laws, than from the right of judging upon laws already made. . . ." Here is a usurpation, on the part of a majority, of power which they do not possess.

Mandate of 1956

its parallel and similarity to the Mandate of 1934 and the circumstances which produced it are astounding.

I.

The Mandate of 1934 was addressed to the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, an independent committee, not under the jurisdiction of the Assembly, but which was organized and announced on the closing day of the General Assembly. The Committee on True Presbyterianism, independent, not under the jurisdiction of the General Synod, was organized and announced on the closing day of the 18th General Synod.

II.

The Mandate of 1934 was designed to deal specifically with the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, which was considered to be not Presbyterian and also a disturber of the peace. One who reads the Mandate of 1956 sees that it is directed toward a committee which is not considered to be truly Presbyterian and which is disturbing the peace of the church. As to this parallel, there is a similarity that could hardly be disputed.

III.

The Mandate of 1934 considered the Independent Board an affront to the church, and the Mandate of 1956 considers the Committee for True Presbyterianism to be an affront to the church.

IV.

The Mandate of 1934 attacked the Independent Board as a false concept of Presbyterianism. The Mandate of 1956 attacks members of the Committee for True Presbyterianism as advocating "a false concept of Presbyterianism by advocating non-attendance at a properly called General Synod of the Church."

The Mandate of 1934 took due note of the serious conditions which had developed in the church because of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. The Mandate of 1956 takes due note of the "serious implications of the actions of the Committee for True Presbyterianism."

The Mandate of 1934 did not create a special committee, but it gave instructions to the presbyteries. The Mandate of 1956 gives specific instructions to a specific Synod committee. The Mandate of 1934 was more specific in its detailed provisions, while the Mandate of 1956 leaves the specific desires of the Synod to be decided upon by the committee of four, and they are to make known their desires to

(Continued on page 6)

Christian Reports

Get-Rid-of-McIntire Spirit

The Rev. George S. Christian, Fawn Grove, Pa., released a paper during the meeting of the Synod entitled, "David, Not Rehoboam," with the subtitle, "Mid-Synod Reflections of a Presbyterian to the Nineteenth General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church." Excerpts from this paper are here reported as an indication of things which were being said around the Synod about Dr. Carl McIntire.

... First of all, let us turn our attention to the shouts of exaltation which some of us are emitting as the muddy waters of Jordan are wetting our feet.

"We've got to bust. McIntire's got to go! For twenty years he has been a bully. I'm fed up! This thing can't drag on any longer. We've got to settle it now. I can't take it another year. It's breaking up my church and hindering the Lord's work. It's even affecting my nerves and my home life. If I have to live under McIntire's thumb another year, I'll quit the ministry. We've lost the Seminary. There is sin in the American Council and the International Council, and God just isn't going to bless us so long as we are a part of anything that has sin in it. If we don't stick together and act decisively now we won't have a Synod next year. The men just won't stay and take it. It is impossible to change McIntire! He's got it coming to him!"

Do we hear the spirit of wild Rehoboam in these shouts, or is it all the moderate spirit of David, the man after God's own heart? . . .

"But McIntire is a villain!" we hear someone scream.

Is he?

That may be, but if he is, we B. P. C.ers are not well balanced and have not yet matured sufficiently to have a great movement of God entrusted to our hands. Six years ago when this same Bible Presbyterian Synod met in this same city, the writer remembers that the Synod rose to its feet and applauded when Dr. McIntire simply entered the room. A guest—an outsider to the B. P. C. Synod who was with the writer—later remarked, "George, that was not good; it is a bad sign."

The writer's guest was right. We were not then and are not now balanced. Six years ago we venerated Dr. McIntire; now we are goading him to get out.

Has Dr. McIntire changed these last six years?

My fellow presbyters say he has always been just about the same. Why then

this radical extremism on our part? Something is unbalanced somewhere with us.

Well, which is worse: goading to schism, or actual schism?

Who committed the greater sin twenty years ago, the O. P. C. for goading the B. P. C., or the B. P. C. for the actual schism?

Who will have been the greater sinners if the B. P. C. is now split: the goaders or the schismatics? . . .

To press human nature beyond the breaking point is neither realistic nor in harmony with the Scriptural teaching of instant justification by faith and gradual sanctification over a period of time. The Shorter Catechism asks, "Are all transgressions of the law equally heinous?" The answer is, "Some sins are in themselves, and by reason of several aggravations, more heinous in the sight of God than others."

(Continued on page 8)

Mandate of 1956

(Continued from page 5)

the members of the Committee for True Presbyterianism.

In this aspect the Mandate of 1956 is nebulous, uncertain, and far worse and more dangerous. Four men have the power of Synod to make demands upon brethren in Synod in the interests of the peace of the church, and if such are not met to their satisfaction, then they are instructed to proceed with judicial cases, as they think necessary.

V.

The Mandate of 1934 when carried out, placed the General Assembly in the position of initiating judicial processes against ministers. The Mandate of 1956, if carried out, places the General Synod in the position of initiating judicial processes against ministers. In the case of the Mandate of 1934, this was seriously protested and objected to by Dr. Machen and his counsel, for the General Assembly was not a court to initiate judicial cases. Nevertheless, it was done, under the phrase, "superintending the concerns of the whole church." In the formation of the Bible Presbyterian Church, that phrase was eliminated from any powers of Synod and there is no power anywhere in the constitution of the Bible Presbyterian Church which gives the Synod authority to initiate judicial cases by instructing a committee.

VI.

The Mandate of 1934 instructed the stated clerk of the Assembly to notify the Independent Board members. The

"Goading" McIntire

A new term has become current in the vernacular of some of the Bible Presbyterian preachers. It is the word "goading." It is set as opposite to the word "schism," and it is freely being admitted that an effort is being made to "goad" Dr. McIntire out of the Bible Presbyterian Church. Dr. McIntire has announced on several occasions that he does not intend to leave the church but he intends to stay in it and to work for the return of the church to its original position. It was also said among brethren that if the Bible Presbyterian Church left the International Council of Christian Churches, of which Dr. McIntire is president, then Dr. McIntire would have to leave the Bible Presbyterian Church. But, it is possible in the International Council and the American Council of Christian Churches for church associations to be received as constituent members and the churches in the Bible Presbyterian Synod which desire to be represented in the ICCC and ACCC may continue to do so. It is believed that a large number of the churches will be represented in the Council through the newly formed Bible Presbyterian Church Association.

Mandate of 1956 instructed a committee of four to proceed with their own program for peace as Synod's program. The Mandate of 1934 held the threat of judicial discipline over the heads of the members of the Independent Board. The Mandate of 1956 holds the threat of judicial discipline over the heads of the officers on the Committee for True Presbyterianism. The instructions to the committee of the Bible Presbyterian Church are general and broad. They provide for either peace or judicial cases as the committee decides. The committee is therefore instructed, under the authority of Synod. The General Assembly of 1934 also wanted peace or judicial cases. The Bible Presbyterian Church's instructions are more nebulous, and cover the specific demands to be made by a committee of four.

There is a real question as to whether ministers in the Bible Presbyterian Church should even consent to serve on such a committee. It seems incredible and almost unbelievable that after twenty years, for it was in 1936 that the judicial cases were finally decided for the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., that a mandate so similar should be adopted by the highest court in the Bible Presbyterian Church and be directed specifically to the Committee for True Presbyterianism, an independent committee, operating within the liberty which belongs to all Presbyterians.

Independent Agencies Not Approved

The 19th General Synod, meeting in St. Louis, turned its back upon the agencies which have been used, in the providence of God, to help build the Synod.

I.

The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, the pioneer agency of the whole movement in Presbyterian circles, did not receive the endorsement or approval of the Synod. The Board has been endorsed faithfully through the years and commended to the churches for its support. This commendation was withheld this year. In a resolution, reference was made to missionaries, but the Board itself is no longer one of the approved agencies of the Bible Presbyterian Church. The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, according to one of the leaders of the Synod, has "one more year of grace." No opposing Synod-controlled board of foreign missions has yet been established.

The Articles of Association, the first document of any kind dealing with the Bible Presbyterian movement, signed June 4, 1937, has the following reference: "We heartily affirm our faith in and support of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, and join in the vigorous testimony of that Board against modernism and unbelief of all kinds."

The 19th General Synod declined to affirm its faith in and support of this Board. Let it not be said that there is no change in the Bible Presbyterian Church from the position of its founding fathers!

II.

Faith Theological Seminary has been the institution which has supplied the ministerial leadership for the Bible Presbyterian Church. It is independent and its charter says that it shall never be subject to the dictates of any ecclesiastical body. Faith Theological Seminary did not re-

ceive the endorsement or approval of the Synod in St. Louis, and it is no longer on the approved list of agencies of the Bible Presbyterian Church. In a resolution, reference was made to the teaching of the institution, but the institution itself has now been replaced by a Synod-controlled seminary which is to function as a graduate department of theology in connection with the Synod-controlled college.

III.

The *Christian Beacon* has been a faithful minister, assisting the Bible Presbyterian Church in many ways since the

Action of Synod Relative to Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions

DEPLORE ACTION OF INDEPENDENT BOARD FOR PRESBYTERIAN FOREIGN MISSIONS IN DROPPING DRs. RAYBURN AND SHEPPERSON

Action: Commend all the missionaries of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions to the loyal support of the churches but to deplore the actions of the Independent Board in dropping of Drs. Rayburn and Shepperson without due cause.

Action of Synod Relative to Faith Theological Seminary

INVESTIGATE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SEMINARY IN MIDDLE WEST UNDER THIS SYNOD

Action: Synod authorize Covenant College Board, if, as, and when accepted by Synod to initiate theological training on graduate level at their discretion.

formation of the church in 1938. The Synod in St. Louis withheld its endorsement and approval of the *Christian Beacon* and it is no longer a Synod-approved agency. It has been an independent agency, incorporated separately, and has been edited by Dr. Carl McIntire. The Synod now has its Synod-controlled paper, edited and published under the authority of Synod.

The three major independent agencies which have contributed to the building and promotion of the Bible Presbyterian Church through the years have been the *Christian Beacon*, Faith Theological Seminary, and the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. All three have now been officially removed by the Synod from its approved list of institutions.

Though leaders in the Synod affirmed their belief in independent agencies as well as Synod-controlled agencies, in actual fact and practice they have committed the Synod to a Synod-controlled seminary as opposed to Faith Seminary, to a Synod-controlled paper as opposed to the *Christian Beacon*, to a Synod-controlled college as opposed to Shelton and Highland Colleges.

IV.

Shelton College, which has had the approval of the Synod regularly, was not endorsed as an approved agency of the Bible Presbyterian Church. There are no independent colleges approved by the Bible Presbyterian Church any longer.

The action of the Synod in regard to these independent agencies indicates in reality the fulfillment of what Dr. Allan A. MacRae and Dr. Carl McIntire have previously written in *The Free Press*. The philosophy of Synod control, though men may give lip service to independent agencies, eliminates the independent agencies and develops a tightly controlled denomination.

ST. LOUIS PASTOR'S REPORT

The St. Louis Church does not fulfill the provisions of the resolution it adopted recently. None of the men have left the Synod; none of the men have resigned from the agencies.

Following is the first part of the report given to the St. Louis Church by its pastor, the Rev. Donald J. MacNair:

"The 19th General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church has met here in St. Louis and has evidenced the blessing of the Lord throughout its business

sessions. As you all know, we faced a time of decision that made this probably the most important Synod in our history.

"The work that the body accomplished was done slowly and deliberately. The sessions lasted from 8:30 a.m. until 1 p.m., 2 to 6 p.m., and 7 to 10:30 or 11 p.m. each day except Sunday. However, the extent of the work covered was complete so that the voice of the Synod and its feelings about the problems before us has been lifted on almost every important subject on hand. The greatest fruit of the Synod seems to be the realization of unity and determination among our ranks."

"And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers;

"For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ:

"Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

Ephesians 4:11-13

Organization of the Church

When the Bible Presbyterian Church was organized, it was to be a fellowship of churches held together by the bonds of love in the Holy Spirit, on the basis of mutual love and confidence. The founders determined that no General Synod would ever again be able, by means of a mandate, to initiate judicial processes against men and that men would never be able to say that deliverances and actions of the General Synod had to be obeyed on the plea of being subject to their brethren. Therefore, the following provision was written into the constitution:

"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."

This stands for freedom of conscience, protects the individual and the churches, and it also means that the Synod is not arbitrarily to impose its will upon the churches or upon ministers. If there are problems arising, they are to be discussed and handled on the basis of mutual love and confidence. On that basis, matters could be settled. The concept which is now reigning in the Bible Presbyterian Church, under the leadership of Dr. Buswell and Dr. Rayburn, is that the constitution becomes a weapon, a threat of discipline by the General Synod on a basis of technicality, to force men and churches. This does not work.

Christian Reports . . .

(Continued from page 6)

Of course, we must not condone Cignoni affairs, Bible balloons, statistics, wholesale board replacements, and the like. And of course, we must press for reformation.

But if we use these twigs for the foundation of our excuse for schism, or goading to schism, our house is sure to fall in on us, and ourselves be crushed in the wreck.

"Twigs!" someone screams. "Why, if your job were jeopardized, you wouldn't talk that way! And remember, truth is truth, and McIntire has twisted it a little from time to time! Away with this man. Away with anything he has a part in. We can't participate in sin. Indi-

Radical Change in the Church

The Rev. Donald J. MacNair, editor of the *Bible Presbyterian Observer*, has an article entitled, "Young Men's Revolt?" in the April, 1956, issue. I quote: "This is certainly Food for Thought, and does not indicate that any great change is coming into our Bible Presbyterian Church."

The change has already come. The church has been a part of an organized movement against the apostasy of our day, but that has been changed. Of what "movement" is the Bible Presbyterian Church a part since the St. Louis Synod? About all the Bible Presbyterian Church has at the present time is the church and its own official agencies. As is pointed out elsewhere, it no longer endorses agencies and recommends them to its people—Faith Seminary, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, the *Christian Beacon*, Shelton College, Highland College, etc. The movement which the Bible Presbyterian Church officially supports now is itself and its agencies! It is no longer connected with the American or International Councils of Christian Churches. It has cut itself off from this part of what was previously known as "the movement." And the movement previously included all these other activities and interests as a part of the Bible Presbyterian testimony. Previously, one outlook was possessed by the church. Now an entirely different outlook has taken hold of those who were in control of the St. Louis meeting.

We just do not see how Mr. MacNair could say that the situation "does not indicate that any great change is coming." It has already come! Now a restricted, ingrown view of the church—its minis-

viduals have talked with him for years. Never mind the cold war of official, gentle, Scriptural censorship which God's Word and the Book of Discipline teaches. It will never work anyway. McIntire is hopeless. Let's belch him out! You say we have never tried this other way. It isn't worth a try."

But remember, O screamer, you yourself can't divest yourself of human nature, either; and with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged!

Remember, it is an unbalanced movement which one minute has a god as its leader and the next turns him into a devil!

Remember, it is an unbalanced movement which uses a sledge hammer to drive a tack!

Remember, tack hammers not sledge hammers are for tacks.

Remember, not even the tack will be

try and testimony—has replaced the fuller, broader concept which founded the church and blessed the church for many years.

This radical change has taken place speedily. The first open attack came in 1954 in Greenville, by Dr. Rayburn, when he lifted his voice against the American Council of Christian Churches. The Synod, the following year, took steps to initiate a Synod-controlled college, established a powerful Board of Christian Education, and set up an official organ. Then the next year, 1956, it cut itself clear from the independent agencies relating to these fields and has confined its approved activity to its Synod-controlled agencies. The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions is going on without the approval of the Synod, even though Synod has not yet established its own official foreign board. But, with the position now championed by these brethren, it will only be a short time before a Synod-controlled foreign board is formed.

Also, the doctrine of the new concept of the church is seen in the set-up of the Synod-controlled college. Only members of the majority in the Synod are permitted to serve on its board of control. Though the college speaks and operates in the name of the whole Synod and represents the whole Synod, only the majority are permitted to be on its board. This too, is a new concept, for previously, in both the American Council and the National Missions Committee representatives of all aspects of the church were included. The official delegates to the ACCC last year included both majority and minority elements in the Synod. This confining of the representation to the majority alone represents a part of the change which has come into the church.

driven if you use a sledge hammer, for the wall which was to hold it will be destroyed!

"But McIntire's 'twigs' and 'tacks' have rocked the world like the horse shoe nail which lost the shoe, which lost the horse, which lost the rider, which lost the battle!"

Right, but still it was a horse shoe nail, and can't be fixed in any other way than by a horse-shoe-nail hammer.

"But how would you like to live under the fear of reprisal and the stigma of twisted truth while you are trying this lovey-dovey gentle, official church discipline with love and mercy for the offending brother, which you say has never been tried before with Dr. McIntire?" I just can't take it another year. Christian or no Christian, I just can't turn the cheek this time. I just want to belch McIntire

(Continued on page 10)

(Photographically reproduced from *The Evening Bulletin*, Philadelphia, April 16, 1956 — Night Extra, New Jersey Edition, page 3)

Bible Presbyterian Church Splits, Rejects Dr. McIntire

The national assembly of the Bible Presbyterian Church has rejected the leadership of its principal founder, the Rev. Dr. Carl McIntire, of Collingswood, N. J., it was learned today.

The action was taken at the 19th General Synod meeting of the denomination in St. Louis last week.

The group, composed of some 8,800 members, also disassociated itself from the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches.

Two Charges

The synod charged "undemocratic leadership" of the two parent groups and "exaggeration" of membership statistics.

Dr. McIntire, pastor of the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood, is the founder and a past president of the American Council and founder and president of the International Council.

He was not present at the week-long meeting of the synod.

It also was reported that a number of faculty members of the Faith Theological Seminary, Elkins Park, and Shelton College, N. J., will resign at the end of the school year for similar reasons.

McIntire is founder of both schools.

'Dissatisfaction' Stressed

The Rev. Dr. R. Laird Harris, faculty member of the Faith Theological Seminary and moderator of the synod, emphasized that the break reflected no disagreement over church doctrine but a "dissatisfaction with certain administrative actions and policies."

The formal resolution, passed 76 to 16, stated:

"Reaffirming its position on the purity of the visible church and its position on separation from modernism and inclusivism, the 19th General Synod . . . find-

ing sufficient cause for dissatisfaction in its representation by the American Council of Christian Churches hereby terminates the power of that agency to represent said denomination."

The schism was effective immediately.

Up to Individual Churches

Dr. Harris pointed out, however, that individual churches in the synod had the power to re-affiliate with both the national and international bodies.

It was learned that a new group, called Bible Presbyterian Association, will be organized by church leaders who want to re-affiliate.

Dr. Harris said Dr. McIntire is not an officer of the American Council but is "its moving spirit" and is mainly responsible for its policies. The group will meet in Fort Worth, Tex., April 25.

Ousted in 1936

The Bible Presbyterian Church Synod, one of the 14 denominations affiliated with the American Council, will not be represented, Dr. Harris said.

Dr. McIntire, Oklahoma-born fundamentalist, was ousted as pastor of the Collingswood Pres-

byterian Church in June, 1936, by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the U. S. A. for declining to resign from an independent group that challenged the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions.

The ouster from the \$250,000 church was backed by the New Jersey Courts and in March, 1938, Dr. McIntire with 1,200 members of the congregation marched out of the church and founded the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood, Haddon av. and Cuthbert blvd., Collingswood.

The church became the nucleus of the Bible Presbyterian Church Synod, which now has 88 affiliated churches.

Dr. McIntire in 1941 founded the American Council of Christian Churches, which in organization parallels the National Council of Churches in Christ of the U.S.A.

It claims some 220,000 members.

The International Council of Christian Churches was organized by McIntire in Amsterdam in 1948. It boasts world-wide representation through 54 affiliated denominations with a total membership of 1,100,000.

REPORTS IN "EVENING BULLETIN" AND "COURIER-POST"

The *Evening Bulletin* story was rewritten and carried on the front page of the Camden, N. J., *Courier Post*, with a two-column head, "Bible Presbytery Split: Synod Hits Rule of Rev. McIntire." The story opened: "A split in the 18-year-old Bible Presbyterian Church has resulted in rejection of the leadership of the Rev. Dr. Carl McIntire, of Collingswood, its principal founder."

Station WKDN, Camden County's radio station, reported the "rejection" of Dr. McIntire by the Bible Presbyterians.

This publicity in the Philadelphia area, immediately preceding the May 4th meeting which Dr. McIntire is leading against the coming of the communist clergy, has greatly embarrassed all the Bible Presbyterians and other groups connected with the International Council of Christian Churches. It is a matter of wonder as to how the other Bible Presbyterian ministers would feel if their local papers were to carry similar stories about the "split" in their church.

The "Bulletin" Story

The Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin* gave more space to the report concerning Dr. McIntire than it has to anything related to the separatist movement for years. During the sessions of the ICCS in Philadelphia, the *Bulletin* virtually skipped them. As to Dr. McIntire's recent trip to Australia, when all information was sent to the *Bulletin*, no notice was given of it.

Dr. R. Laird Harris's statement given to the *Bulletin* was used to discredit Dr. McIntire. How Dr. Harris could justify his references to Dr. McIntire and his contribution to such an attack upon him before the ungodly world is indeed a question! The news that members of Faith Theological Seminary faculty are planning to resign was made known to the Seminary Board members and others for the first time by means of the *Bulletin* story.

Who gave the *Bulletin* "statistics" about the International Council of Christian Churches is also a question, for to the present time the International Council has never released nor have any of its officials discussed total membership statistics. All that has ever been released has been the 57 denominational figure. With the denominations scattered over the world, with circumstances varying in each country, and with difficulties in connection

with the same, these statistics have not been reported.

When the Synod, meeting in St. Louis, adopted the reference to the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches without giving any reason whatsoever for such action to the ICCS or to anyone else, it is only natural that the newspaper report would gather up the charges and report them as "the Synod charge."

Dr. Carl McIntire, when these attacks were made, declined to make any reply. He felt that he should not enter into a public controversy before the world on this matter, and that it would be better to take the wrong and bear the reproach than to have headlines—"McIntire Strikes Back," or "McIntire Blasts Harris," or the like.

The use which the *Bulletin* has made of the difficulty in the Bible Presbyterian Church indicates how serious the whole affair is and has been from the beginning as it relates to the separatist cause. It further indicates as true what some are now saying—that there is a determined effort on the part of brethren to destroy the ministry of Dr. McIntire, if possible.

The question of statistics in the
(Continued on page 11)

Appeals From Boards and Agencies

A clear example of how Dr. Buswell and those associated with him are turning and twisting things and also rationalizing some of the acts is seen in his discussion of the Collingswood Church's experience with the Rev. Thomas G. Cross of the National Missions Committee in the *Bible Presbyterian Observer*, April, 1956, page 3. Dr. Buswell endeavors to justify Mr. Cross's use of the addressograph plates of the Collingswood Church for an appeal to the Collingswood people to break their pledges to the congregation and support instead the National Missions Committee's program. Dr. Buswell writes, "Presumably these addressograph plates had been given to the Committee on National Missions for the purpose of soliciting funds and promoting the interests of National Missions." The article to which Dr. Buswell is referring, written by Dr. McIntire, "Our Experience With a Synod-controlled Agency," had specifically explained that the plates were given simply for the purpose of sending the *National Missions Reporter* and nothing else! Why does Dr. Buswell presume when the record was before him? Mr. Cross used these plates to address letters to the members, which were not even National Missions letters. The article by Dr. McIntire asked, "Is it the task of a Synod-controlled agency to make league with a minority in a particular congregation for the purpose of having financial pledges of that congregation withdrawn? Shall a Synod-controlled agency make available to particular individuals the use of a mailing list which the congregation gave to it for a definite, specific purpose? We do not think that it should, but it did." Dr. Buswell then wrote, "By what right then does the Collingswood Church session withdraw its own people from the privileges which all other Bible Presbyterian people have in hearing appeals from various agencies?"

It was not the Session; it was the congregation, in a duly called meeting, which said that it no longer desired to support the National Missions Committee. Letters sent out by the Session informed the churches throughout the denomination of the stand of the Collingswood Church. But Dr. Buswell writes, "It is assumed that the people of the Collingswood Church are not to be appealed to by the regularly established Committee on National Missions which had long been serving the Church." Have we here a new doctrine in the church concerning boards and agencies in relationship to the churches? It appears to be the case. When a local congregation withdraws its support of an agency, it does not have

the right to object to the use of the addressograph plates which the congregation gave for one purpose, "to be used for the privileges which all Bible Presbyterian people have in hearing appeals from various agencies." Does the Synod, through its agencies, have the right to go into local congregations, regardless of how the local congregations may feel toward these agencies? A more powerful Synod has more powerful Synod agencies. And it is in this light that Dr. Buswell says, "The argument on the use of addressograph plates is quite peculiar."

What, then, is the liberty of the local congregation under the new setup in the Bible Presbyterian Synod, where there are only Synod-controlled agencies which have been approved by the General Synod? Is it only Synod-controlled agencies which now have the privilege of coming to the people in the Bible Presbyterian churches? Since the Synod has withheld its endorsement from Faith Seminary and the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, are pastors now to tell their people and are sessions to inform the congregations that they must support to the full measure of their ability those boards and agencies approved and endorsed by the denomination's highest court — the Synod? Since Synod has not endorsed the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and Faith Theological Seminary, are appeals which are to be sent from these institutions to individuals in Bible Presbyterian churches to be considered in contravention of the will and purpose of the 19th General Synod? It certainly appears that Dr. Buswell has pointed up a new doctrine concerning boards and agencies and their rights in the local churches in his defense of Mr. Cross's interference in the internal affairs of the Collingswood Church after that church, by official action, had voted to withhold its support from the Synod-controlled National Missions Committee.

This whole circumstance raises serious questions concerning the liberty which Bible Presbyterians won for themselves when they left the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Are ministers coming into the church also to be checked by the "powers that be" for a favorable recommendation on the basis of their willingness to support the "denominational program" through its officially approved agencies as opposed to the interests of the independent agencies which still exist but are no longer endorsed? How similar are all these questions to those which surrounded the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions at the hands of the denominationally approved Assem-

A Church Acts

The Bible Presbyterian Church of Sapulpa, Okla., established as the direct result of the *Christian Beacon* and Dr. Carl McIntire's contact with Mr. Glenn O. Young, at a recent congregational meeting withdrew from the Bible Presbyterian Church and changed its name to Community Bible Church of Sapulpa. Mr. Young, leading elder, objected to undemocratic pressures put upon his church by representatives of the Presbytery of the Mid-South.

A major factor in the withdrawal of the congregation was internal interference by the Rev. Tom Cross, secretary of the National Missions Committee. The church had been a National Missions church and was pastored for some time by the Rev. Hayes Henry.

Christian Reports ...

(Continued from page 8)

out. You speak of the example of Christ and David, well, it doesn't apply when I am the one under pressure. It was all right for David and for Christ and for Paul when they were under pressure. They were out to win people for Christ by their suffering, but I am a Bible Presbyterian and I win people by attacking them!

"What do you mean there has been few tears for Dr. McIntire in this Synod, and not even so little as one word of prayer on the floor? . . ."

Are the good brethren of the Synod who hold to "get rid of McIntire" rather than "get rid of all unscriptural McIntire policy" fully conscious of the enormity of their sins or the gravity of its consequences? Not so much its immediate consequences (and that is bad enough) in the ACCC and ICCC, but its consequences to themselves a generation hence? Has it occurred to them that this is a far greater sin than twisted statistics, hyperbolic advertising, board replacements, and the like?

bly agencies of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and the General Assembly of that body, which insisted that the institutions established and approved by the General Assembly were Presbyterian, and it was the right and the privilege of the members of the church to support them. Dr. Buswell now, it seems, argues that it is the right and privilege, which cannot be deprived a congregation, even when it votes to the contrary, to have the approved agency appeal to it through its membership list!

Collingswood Church's Resolution

The Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood in its annual congregational meeting unanimously adopted the following resolution and unanimously voted to affiliate with the Bible Presbyterian Church Association.

Mrs. William A. Chamberlin, widow of Dr. Chamberlin, the senior elder for years in the Collingswood Church, in the discussion at the meeting rose and said that we (our congregation) were in the denomination before these others and that we still hold the views which the denomination had when it was started.

The resolution as adopted follows:

"RESOLUTION REAFFIRMING OUR CONFIDENCE IN OUR PASTOR, CARL McINTIRE

"On the occasion of this 19th Congregational Meeting, April 17, 1956, we, the officers of all the official boards and members of the Collingswood Bible Presbyterian Church, regret the action of the 19th General Synod in withdrawing their support from all agencies which we and our pastor have had a major part in organizing and supporting.

"And we do hereby resolve that we continue to approve and support all independent agencies as have been set forth in our previous statements, and also as set up in our budgets.

"And be it further resolved, that we, the officers and members of the Collingswood Bible Presbyterian Church, continue our faith in and support of our pastor and God-given leader in our Bible Presbyterian denomination, our independent agencies, and world-wide Twentieth Century Reformation movement."

The "Bulletin Story"

(Continued from page 9)

ACCC (there never has been any question in the ICCC) was dealt with and settled at the Boston meeting, and there had been no exaggeration. When false charges are made by brethren and then used in public news reports to discredit the ACCC and ICCC, and particularly Dr. McIntire, serious questions are raised.

The Committee for True Presbyterianism

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

These men included the following:

Rev. Philip duB. Arcularius, Lakewood, N. J.
 Mr. Robert E. Baker, Camden, N. J.
 Mr. Clayton A. Bancroft, Haddonfield, N. J.
 Mr. Burchelle J. Bashaw, Haddonfield, N. J.
 Mr. Robert L. Boertzel, Collingswood, N. J.
 Mr. C. W. Brogan, Lincoln Park, Mich.
 Mr. William H. Clinton, Bakerstown, Pa.
 Rev. Robert V. Dickerson, Long Beach, Calif.
 Rev. A. Franklin Faucette, Lakewood, Ohio.
 Mr. Eugene E. Ganz, Manchester, Mo.

Rev. Lynn Gray Gordon, Pasadena, Calif.

Rev. Robert I. Hatch, Kansas City, Mo.

Rev. J. Gordon Holdcroft, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.

Rev. Adam B. Hunter, Tacoma, Wash.

Rev. William M. Irving, Mentmore, N. Mex.

Rev. John E. Janbaz, Pasadena, Calif.

Rev. Clyde J. Kennedy, Glendale, Calif.

Mr. J. Wyman Ludlow, Pasadena, Calif.

Rev. Allan A. MacRae, Ph.D., Elkins Park, Pa.

Rev. E. E. Matteson, Wilton, N. Dak.

Rev. Carl McIntire, D.D., Collingswood, N. J.

Rev. Joseph F. Misicka, Collingswood, N. J.

Rev. John M. Norris, Red Lion, Pa.

Rev. Albert W. Oldham, Harvey Cedars, N. J.

Rev. Emanuel A. Peters, Merchantville, N. J.

Rev. Charles E. Richter, Collingswood, N. J.

Rev. F. Burton Toms, Bristol, Tenn.

Rev. Arthur G. Slaght, Baltimore, Md.

Rev. J. U. Selwyn Toms, Chattanooga, Tenn.

Mr. R. S. Wigfield, Collingswood, N. J.

Mr. Clyde M. Worley, Pasadena, Calif.

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

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

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

This issue of *The Free Press* was produced by Dr. Carl McIntire and he is responsible for it.

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

Statement on Dr. Buswell

Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., former president of Shelton College, in an article in the *Bible Presbyterian Observer*, April, 1956, makes certain statements concerning which we are in a position to give testimony.

1. Referring to a statement which Dr. McIntire is alleged to have made before the Presbytery of New Jersey, January 14, 1956, Dr. Buswell wrote, "Dr. McIntire said, 'Dr. Buswell was removed [from Shelton]. Nobody wanted to save him more than me [sic]. I opposed the removal of Dr. Buswell, and many people turned to me and said, 'Why have you gone soft?' Buswell is my brother . . ." This statement of Dr. McIntire's is contrary to fact."

We are witnesses to the fact that Dr. McIntire's statement is true. Furthermore, Dr. Buswell was not present in the Board when the discussion to which Dr. McIntire referred took place. He had temporarily stepped out of the Board's presence while the Board was discussing the problems. For him, therefore, to categorically say that this statement of Dr. McIntire's is contrary to fact is beyond his knowledge or power to say as a personal witness.

2. "Dr. McIntire voted in favor of the motion to ask me to resign on account of my suggestion that Shelton College might be consolidated with the new Bible Presbyterian College."

Dr. Buswell did not make any such suggestion to the Board. The information concerning his suggestion came from a letter which Max Belz had written and Dr. Buswell denied, in the presence of the Board, that it was his suggestion. So far as we know, this is the first time that Dr. Buswell had admitted that it was his suggestion, for he repeatedly denied, in the presence of the Board, that it was and he never even brought such a suggestion to the Board. The matter was not discussed

ACCC Issues Statement on Dr. Carl McIntire and Leaders Of the Council

The American Council of Christian Churches in session at Fort Worth, Texas, April 27, 1956, goes on record as being most mindful and appreciative of the leadership God has given the Council, and with the way in which He has endowed these leaders with the necessary gifts, vision, guidance, wisdom, and strength to serve the Lord acceptably in these perilous times of apostasy, compromise, and constant attack.

The American Council is particularly appreciative of the service and fidelity of Dr. Carl McIntire—his courageous stand, his faithful presentation of the Gospel, his editing of the *Christian Beacon*, his initiative in carrying the fight into the citadels of the foe throughout the world, including his recent leading of a "Truth Squad" to Australia, and the sponsoring of the Faith and Freedom Rallies soon to be held in the cities of Philadelphia, New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago.

We therefore resolve, that we commit our brother, Carl McIntire, to the grace, love, and protecting care of God; that we assure him of our constant prayers; that we give him every possible support and call upon the Lord's people everywhere to do the same; and zealously press the battle which the Lord has committed to the American Council of Christian Churches.

by the Board until the members of the Board brought the information that it was his suggestion to the Board's attention.

3. Buswell says, "Dr. McIntire said of me, 'He told us in that Board meeting

30 Churches Act for BPCA

From the time the first announcement concerning the Bible Presbyterian Church Association was made, 30 churches have already acted and individuals have signed up from a number of others.

The Bible Presbyterian Church Association was received in Fort Worth on April the 25th by the American Council of Christian Churches as a constituent body, replacing the Bible Presbyterian Synod.

From the responses indicated, it appears that more than a majority of the churches will continue in the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches, and that there will be individuals in almost every church who will also continue in fellowship with the councils.

that if he was removed from that Board, he would take the issues and spread them before the whole world, and that there would be started another council of churches. . . ." This statement of Dr. McIntire's is false."

We are witnesses to the fact that this statement of Dr. McIntire accurately represents what Dr. Buswell said, with considerable vehemence, before the Board. We testify also that during some of the sessions of the Board we called Dr. Buswell's attention to things which he had said in our presence and which he, in our presence, also denied that he had ever said. It was this condition which we saw in Dr. Buswell that seriously complicated our dealings with him and was one of the factors that finally led the Board in its unanimous decision to remove him as president.

Signed:

GEORGE F. KURTZ
JACK W. MURRAY
H. E. HAMMER
JAMES E. BENNET