

THE FREE PRESS

VOL. 2 — No. 1

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

July 6, 1956

The following is photographically reproduced from a folder circulated by *The Presbyterian Outlook*, journal of the Southern Presbyterian Church.

The articles on the next five pages are photographed from the same folder.

The folder is composed of reprints of articles appearing in *The Presbyterian Outlook* of April 30 and May 7, 1956.

The column at the right is photographed from the "Letters to the Editors" page of *The Presbyterian Outlook* of June 18, 1956.

Bible Presbyterians Repudiate McIntire

A long-smoldering battle in the Bible Presbyterian Church over the leadership of Carl McIntire, Collingswood, N. J., pastor, has resulted in withdrawal of that denomination from both the American and International Councils of Christian Churches which have been led by McIntire. Bible Presbyterian leadership, through McIntire and his colleagues, has been the central influence in the efforts of both councils.

Both the ACC and ICCC have attracted Fundamentalist members and have been made up largely of splinter groups. *The Christian Beacon*, edited by McIntire, and sent free of charge through the mails, is the organ of this movement.

The 8,000 member Bible church was formed 19 years ago, a year after a break from the Presbyterian Church, USA, when the schism produced two new churches—Orthodox and Bible. After 20 years both groups have only a few thousand members. McIntire was deposed from the ministry by the Presbyterian Church, USA.

"Exaggerated Claims"

Most publicized leader in the Bible church has been McIntire who has collected under his domination an assortment of Fundamentalist groups to form the high-sounding American and International Councils. One reason for the recent walkout of the Bible church from these groups was McIntire's claim to have

far more members in the ACC and ICCC than Bible church leaders said could be accounted for. He claimed 220,000 for the ACC and 1,100,000 for the ICCC. They also protested "undemocratic leadership." This, they said, was shown in expulsion of any critics of McIntire's policies from leadership in various institutions and agencies.

The trouble spread even to the Collingswood congregation where a small group broke off to form another church. In the group, it is claimed, were some of "the most loyal and capable officers and leaders" of the Collingswood church who "had objected to the policy of the liquidation of the loyal opposition."

Result of the recent action taken at the synod meeting in St. Louis will be the founding of a new college and seminary (Covenant) in that city. There are rumors that some faculty members of Faith Seminary (of whose trustees McIntire is chairman) and Shelton College (of which McIntire is a trustee) will resign and join the faculty of the new institution.

McIntire was told by one of the Bible Presbyterian pastors (and the charge was printed) that if he did not attend the St. Louis meeting he would show that "you are yellow. You will prove yourself a coward by sulking in Collingswood." He did not go to the meeting. The vote in St. Louis was 76-16.

3Ps vs. McIntire

TO THE OUTLOOK:

Send 18 copies of "They That Sow the Wind" (OUTLOOK, May 7).

I congratulate you on this illuminating article on the deplorable activities and attitudes of Dr. McIntire. This pamphlet will clarify things for many fair-minded people who have been confused over many of these issues.

JESSE M. BADER.

World Convention of Churches of Christ,
New York.

May I join in a song of praise and congratulations to you for your May 7 issue. Your article was factual and written in a most scholarly vein. It certainly was not vindictive nor hateful, though it would be very easy for many opponents of Dr. McIntire to wax into hot temper. . . .

CHARLES M. FITZ, JR.

Reading Pa.

I am deeply grateful to you. . . . Your thorough work regarding the schismatic group known as the "Bible" Presbyterians is very relevant to this area. . . . I hope you will print all possible information as to the further movement of this pathetic group.

NEIL M. HIGBEE.

Lemmon, South Dakota.

. . . I have always felt that a few schismatics will have much to answer for, in heaven, for the deplorable activities they have engaged in. You have rendered the church a signal service in publishing this full account.

R. W. GILBERT.

Fremont, Neb.

EDITORS—As would be expected, all responses are not so enthusiastic as the foregoing. "Orthodox" Presbyterian readers, for example, were told in *The Guardian* about our article as follows:

". . . The editors had apparently come into possession of some private letters and have obviously given attention to gathering quite a bit of material. [Incorrect; everything we carried was based upon Bible Presbyterian privately published accounts.—Eds.] . . . While we have felt the lash of McIntire's tongue and pen on more than one occasion. . . . in the matter of historic Christianity . . . we and McIntire are on the same side. . .

When a journal which makes a pretense of some standards of decency and ethics stoops to the level which characterizes *THE PRESBYTERIAN OUTLOOK* in its May 7 issue, the only solution is for its readers to cancel their subscriptions and let the paper fold up. . . . We doubt that *THE PRESBYTERIAN OUTLOOK* has hurt McIntire. We are sure it has hurt itself."

The flood of appreciative expressions and orders for thousands of extra copies of this article continue to mount. Only from "Orthodox" Presbyterian sources has any other word come.

THE BATTLE GOES ON, THE ISSUES ARE JOINED

What led the *Presbyterian Outlook* to devote six pages to this feature, "Bible Presbyterians Repudiate McIntire"? The answer is that the battle with the apostasy rages. The testimony with which Dr. McIntire has been so intimately related through the years has had its telling effect. The blows which have been struck have been vital.

When Jesse Bader, secretary of evangelism of the National Council of Churches, writes for his extra copies of the *Outlook*; when the Council of Churches in Tulsa, Okla., sends a copy of this six-page reprint to every minister in town; when it is translated into Portuguese and circulated throughout Brazil to hinder the coming conference of the Latin American Alliance of Christian Churches and to embarrass Dr. Israel Gueiros in his great fight for a new seminary in the northern part of Brazil—the battle is joined. This is ammunition which the enemies of the Gospel think that they can use to hurt the advancing separatist movement. They cannot face the facts presented by McIntire, but they can use "repudiation" by his brethren!

The document carries a number of phrases which are testimony to the effectiveness of the forthright and bold attack which has been made through the years by the *Christian Beacon*, the American Council of Christian Churches, and the International Council of Christian Churches. We read: "Many an attack upon the boards or agencies of the churches and upon the National and World Councils has been planted through the *Beacon*." Praise God! And again: "Many of the objections to union which were heard from U. S. members came first from the *Beacon*." Praise the Lord! In the Southern Presbyterian Church many God-fearing, Bible-believing people, anxious to get the information which the *Beacon* has been publishing, have subscribed for it; they have sent it to pastors and friends; the *Christian Beacon* has been used to this end. And now the modernist leaders in the Southern Church think that they have something which will divert people's attention from the separatist cause. "The *Christian Beacon* has also had some unseen ties within these churches, chiefly in the U. S., where reactionary groups, unhappy with the church's policies, found a soundingboard for their displeasure." Praise God!

The battle has been joined. A repudiation of McIntire by the Bible Presbyterians is not going to end the battle. The little group in the Bible Presbyterian Church which has turned aside in its rejection of the *Christian Beacon* and the agencies which God has raised up to join this great fight will find their comfortable place in their softer approach, but the great current and tide of the hour will move on out as this battle is waged for Christ's sake. This is the spirit that gave the church birth. This is the spirit which God gave a little group, discarded, sitting by the wayside, and through it sought to lift a testimony

(Continued on page 7)

Why are Outlook readers being told this miserable story??

LEST it not be clear why so much space is devoted to the current troubles in the Bible Presbyterian Church, some explanation may be in order.

Because the Bible and Orthodox Presbyterian Churches came out of the USA Church, first as one body, then dividing a year later, they have always been hypercritical of the parent body. *The Christian Beacon* and *The Guardian*, their papers, have been like watchdogs over any supposed mis-steps and have trumpeted their findings to their constituents.

More than this, BP pressures, particularly, have been constantly directed at USA and U. S. ministers, calling them to attempt to draw their congregations out of "apostate" bodies and to join them. A few ministers have left the U. S. church and some the USA under such circumstances and there have been some judicial cases where efforts were made to take church property into the BP denomination.

Some ministers from the BP and Orthodox bodies have looked with longing eyes toward the U. S. and USA churches and some presbyteries have become a sort of haven for these men. In other presbyteries the warning flag was erected and notice was given that schismatics and men of harsh and critical attitudes, unwilling to cooperate in the denominational program, were not wanted. Largely because of approaches of these men it has become routine in many presbyteries to require ministers of questionable background to declare their unreserved readiness to support the church's program.

Some USA men judged by the *Beacon* to be sound in the faith (like Clarence Macartney, Donald G. Barnhouse and others) have been summoned to come out of an "apostate" church and join a "sound" church like the Bible Presbyterian. Because they paid no attention, some of these men have been subjected to unscrupulous attacks.

Some Unseen Ties

The Christian Beacon has also had some unseen ties within these churches, chiefly in the U. S., where reactionary groups, unhappy with the church's policies, found a soundingboard for their displeasure. That paper has been circulated through the mails on a second-class mailing permit, obviously by thousands of

copies, but it would be difficult to find a minister or an elder who has paid any kind of subscription himself. (Mailings under second-class rates are forbidden unless an actual subscription has been paid either by the individual or as a gift of someone else.)

Many an attack upon the boards or agencies of the churches and upon the National and World Councils has been planted through the *Beacon*.

Other old-line churches have been attacked in the same way in efforts to draw BP, American or International Council support or to cause dissension within these established bodies.

Other church publications have considered *The Beacon* to be almost constantly in violation of accepted ethical standards. It has not hesitated to pirate copyrighted materials of any sort. It photographically reproduces all kinds of articles without permission. And it sometimes reproduces them in a distorted form. For instance, it printed one *OUTLOOK* page some years ago and told its readers the page had appeared in that form in these columns when the *Beacon* had actually stripped onto the page completely different wording, changing the meaning entirely.

Usual procedure, however, has been to ignore it and its claims. But it has continued to flood the mails, going into countless homes to attempt to stir up disloyalty and schism.

Fought Presbyterian Union

Especially did the *Beacon* busy itself during the discussion of Presbyterian union, actually printing some of the separate materials which were circulated in opposition to union. Many of the objections to union which were heard from U. S. members came first from the *Beacon*.

Finally, just before the vote on union was decided, Bible Presbyterian leaders (Thomas Cross of National Missions) provided a letter that was circulated by friendly helpers throughout the U. S. church, calling for the opponents of union to take the initiative and to attempt to purge the Southern church with a series of heresy trials (*OUTLOOK*, Jan. 31, 1955), looking eventually to a complete change in membership of institutional and agency boards.

"The tongue can no man tame. . . . Therewith bless we God, . . . and therewith curse we men."—James 3:8, 9.

● A story of a schismatic Presbyterian group that has come upon days of turmoil and trouble

"They That Sow the Wind"

DURING the past 20 years there has been no more tireless foe of Christian cooperation, as represented by the efforts of the major church bodies of this country and the world, than the separatist, Fundamentalist group led by a deposed Presbyterian, USA, minister named Carl McIntire.

Always, with a keen sense of publicity values, McIntire has oversold the movement from the beginning until in the spring of 1956 his own church decided it had had enough of his leadership and pulled out of the inter-church organizations which he dominated.

In severing this tie, the Bible Presbyterians made it clear that they had not forsaken their doctrines nor their insistence on "separation" from churches or churchmen that do not hold to the purified faith which they claim. They indicated merely that they had their fill of the "undemocratic leadership" and the "exaggerated claims" which marked the McIntire regime. When their repeated protests and their efforts from within the movement failed, they left McIntire in the whirlwind which he himself had helped to start a long time before.

Nuisance Strategy

This separatist movement has exercised a sort of nuisance strategy, trying to edge into the spotlight playing upon the great, worldwide "ecumenical reformation" of these times. It has scheduled its meetings just before the World Council of Churches in the same center or nearby and has confused newsmen with its high-sounding releases from some "International Council of Churches." In this country it has called press conferences to snip and snap at declarations of the National (Federal) Council of Churches or to seek to besmirch some of the honored Christian leaders of that movement by charging them with Communist sympathies or unsound doctrines. It has operated as the "American Council of Christian Churches" and it has tried to appeal to theological and economic forces that include conservative and reactionary elements.* It has tried to get into congressional hearings by offering its own self-calculating charges against Christian leaders and trying to provide inside in-

*McIntire proudly tells of his recent efforts to embarrass World Council of Churches leaders in Australia and says: "In this country, Fulton Lewis, Jr., referred to the journey and mentioned Dr. McIntire and the International Council by name on his coast-to-coast broadcast."

"For they sow the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind."—
Hosea 8:7.

formation to tear them down.

Therefore, when the Bible Presbyterian Church, which McIntire has influenced as much as anybody, took itself out of the movement, over the pleading of its onetime dictator, observers felt that a watershed was to be marked.

A Gathering Storm

Last fall, in the gathering storm, one supporter of McIntire tried to threaten Hayes T. Henry, who was supported by the synod-controlled National Missions Committee of which McIntire disapproved. Henry was urged by a supporter to leave the committee but he refused. As he did so, recognizing that this man's future support would be stopped, he reviewed the record of the movement through the years—the formation and work of the American and International Councils. Then he said:

"Ours, the Bible Presbyterian Synod, until now has led the movement. It has been able to do so because of its moral and intellectual and spiritual strength. It has been the labor of the whole church as together we have prayed, given our time and money and efforts, and as Carl McIntire has led with others too. But now this leadership has turned against its support and is weakening the church with discord and confusion. . . . It seems to me finally that our Synod has matured sufficiently to think for itself and to reject the opinions of some of our brethren, even of such leadership and stature as Carl McIntire, when these opinions were not to the best interest of Synod."

McIntire admits that the Bible Presbyterians are the key to the ACC and ICC. He describes it like this:

"The Bible Presbyterian Church, in the history of the separatist movement, has provided leadership for that movement on the world level and also on the national level. The president of the Associated Missions of the ICC, representing 21 different missionary agencies, is Dr. J. Gordon Holdcroft, also president of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. And the president of the International Council of Christian Churches, now representing 57 Bible-believing denominations, is Dr. Carl McIntire, pastor of the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood. Dr. McIntire is in his position by virtue of being an official delegate of the Bible Presbyterian Church to the ICC and having been elected by the ICC to serve as its council president."

The pivotal question, apart from McIntire's domination, had to do with the church's institutions and agencies—

whether they should be controlled by and responsible to the church itself (the synod) or operated by independent boards. McIntire wanted no part of the closer relation to the synod. He was the kingpin of the crucial independent agencies—chairman of the board of trustees of Faith Seminary, a member of the Independent Board for Foreign Missions, the trustees of Shelton College, Highland College, the American Council, and in absolute control of *The Christian Beacon*. So he wanted no change in the established pattern and he has waged a running battle during the year to show that independent agencies are the God-appointed method of doing the church's work. As for church-controlled agencies, he claims, "The Bible nowhere commands such agencies, nor does it give evidence of the existence of similar procedures in apostolic times." However, he does not show just how independent agencies can claim Biblical or apostolic authority.

The precipitant for the recent breach came in the summer of 1955 at the St. Louis Synod where efforts were made to relate the national missions program more closely to the life and program of the church and to gain a greater support for it. At the same time the synod called for an official magazine which McIntire saw as an evil omen, and it gave a greater emphasis to its Christian education committee. This McIntire saw as a step toward the kind of agencies existing in the Presbyterian Church, USA, which 20 years ago deposed him from the ministry. There was also a motion actually to leave the American Council of Churches but this lost.

Given credit (or blame) for leading in this revolt is Robert G. Rayburn, Synod Moderator in 1953 who, until he was put out, was president of Highland College serving the BP church. McIntire credits Rayburn with "the first public attack." This came "when he questioned the integrity of the members of the executive committee of the American Council of Churches," charging them with "deliberate deception" in their numerical claims as to the membership of the ACC. Much of the unhappiness in the BP constituency appears to have been occasioned by what the 1956 Synod called "exaggerated claims" of this character.

Rayburn and Buswell

Rayburn was once a Presbyterian, USA, pastor in Gainesville, Texas, where he led a schismatic movement toward the BP church. He continues to demonstrate his basic allegiance to the BP church,

though he differs with McIntire at a crucial point. When he was put out as president at Highland, he was asked in what respect he differed from Carl McIntire in the doctrine of separation. He replied:

"I do not believe that I differ from Carl McIntire at all in the doctrine of separation, but I do not accept the doctrine of separation as defined by Carl McIntire; I accept the doctrine of separation as defined by the Word of God."

Along with him in the recent movement, and with wide influence, is J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., former president of Wheaton College and more recently, until also ejected, president of another institution serving the BP church—Shelton College. Buswell was Moderator of the 1955 Synod and served the faction that broke away from McIntire's own congregation in Collingswood, N. J., recently.

Numbers of others have defied the McIntire policies—like a former Presbyterian, U. S., minister, Flournoy Shepperson of Greenville, S. C., who, with his Session, saw in the efforts against McIntire a needed courage "to face these issues which have threatened for a long period of time the peace, harmony and progress of the Bible Presbyterian Movement. . . . This Session views with alarm the manifestation of over-lordship in regard to the work of the Synod by a few who would rule or ruin our Bible Presbyterian Movement."

Shepperson, along with Rayburn, was thereafter purged from membership on the Independent Board of Foreign Missions, and replaced with McIntire supporters.

From among the Faith Seminary trustees went L. G. Gebb, former Presbyterian, U. S., and Hayes T. Henry to be replaced by sympathetic men. However, this maneuver was followed by the resignation of E. Archer Dillard, Boone, N.C., and P. W. Edwards, St. Louis, in protest.

New Set of Papers

All these activities have been carefully reported in a set of completely outside publications, keeping the storm out of the columns of *The Beacon*. McIntire led off with his own personal paper called *The Free Press*. In reply came *The Bible Press* and later the *Bible Presbyterian Observer*, published by the First BP church of St. Louis.

In column after column McIntire and principally Allan A. MacRae of Faith Seminary have tried to defend the actions. But the handwriting was being written for all to read and even McIntire appeared to recognize the fact.

In the spring before the synod was to meet, he felt that his opponents had taken unfair advantage of him. When the 1955 synod adjourned, the power to set time and place for the 1956 meeting was left in the hands of the Moderator—Buswell. What this might portend was not recognized at the time—until an earlier date (in April) was set in St. Louis, where

the fatal blow had been struck the year before. McIntire made appeal after appeal showing why it would not be right to meet as scheduled. In fact, he circulated a petition to stop the meeting and he insisted that such a contingency had never been anticipated. He wanted the meeting held in nearby Harvey Cedars, the conference center, and much closer to his Collingswood congregation which boasts a membership (1,600) larger than four BP presbyteries combined. In fact, in N. J. Presbytery, besides the Collingswood church, there are only 614 members in ten other churches.

When he saw that he would not be able to prevail, he asked:

"Why has all this attack come upon me? It looks now as though we are headed straight for a great disaster. . . . When God gives to a man a position of responsibility in a movement, does that make him a pope or a dictator? Does that mean that he likes publicity for himself or that he cannot receive criticism? God forbid such a thought. . . . I have never in my life endured such personal abuse. To be called a liar, 'yellow,' a 'coward' and other things by the brethren whom you love and to have stories of this nature circulated about you, and then to have them come into the hands of the enemies to be used against you is hard to endure. I know how to be abased and I know how to abound, and I can say with Paul that I have counted all things loss. An effort has been made to make it appear that we are grasping for power and that there is a power sweep. Nothing like it has happened, I assure you, beloved. . . .

"We are human; we are frail; we make mistakes. We have made them, and we have always been ready to correct and apologize in a spirit of meekness before the Lord. . . .

"I want to see our church preserved and be strong and free and go on with the tremendous challenge before us. The

BP & Orthodox Statistics . . .

Among the most carefully guarded secrets of recent years has been the numerical strength of Bible and Orthodox Presbyterian bodies. No official has been willing to release these for use in the routine tabulations of denominational bodies. However, in the current difficulties in the BP church, some of these figures have come to light—ostensibly to prove that the BP church is in a healthier condition than the Orthodox church.

The Orthodox church is shown to have had 106 ministers in 1936 and only 115 today, including 35 of the original (1936) number. It reported 17 missionaries in 1955, supported by a budget of \$62,630. Total number of churches: 72, with 5,079 members. Of this number, 55 have less than 100 members.

Bible Presbyterians boast 8,428 members after 19 years. They report 198 ministers and 86 churches. They have 86 missionaries and a missions budget of \$325,290.

doors are open everywhere. There is more unrest in the apostate denominations than there has ever been any time in the history of the movement. . . ."

Softening Approach

In his final plea to the Moderator he tried to soften up an explanation of his petition to stop the synod meeting. He wanted it understood that this was merely an effort to:

" . . . cause you, as Moderator, in all propriety and fairness to seek a time when in the interests of both sides to the conflict in the church we could amicably sit down together in a lawful synod and face the problems confronting us, in the spirit of our Lord."

He had come to make the plea, not of the over-riding majority, but of his minority. He was concerned for issues that are "at stake that may divide and destroy the unity of the church and have far-reaching consequences in the lives of all of our brethren and in the welfare of all of our churches."

But Buswell stuck to his program. He said that if McIntire persisted in seeking to dissuade members from attending the Synod, "I fear that the Synod will be compelled to find him in contempt." Too many men remembered too much that had happened in the past. They knew what followed the 1955 synod meeting when McIntire called his group of supporters together and formed a "Committee for True Presbyterianism" which was designed to thwart the action which the synod had just taken.

"Fleas on a Dog's Tail"

They remembered a lot more. Some of the younger men never had gotten over what they interpreted as a cutting slur of McIntire in a letter in which young pastors who had criticized him were accused of acting from motives of jealousy, frustration and envy. But, more than anything else, they resented a blast made by James E. Bennet, McIntire's right-hand man who was his counsel when he was put out of the USA church in 1936. As they read the statement, they were sure that they were being called "fleas on a dog's tail":

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

McIntire cried out that Bennet was being smeared, the victim of a trick in interpretation, but the younger ministers simply gave McIntire credit for the same sentiment.

Buswell was strong in defense of these younger men. After all, he said, it was

far harder and more perilous for them and for their wives to enter the BP ministry than for the older, more established men. These men, he said, have renounced all possibility of stepping into a comfortable pastorate in a well established church. "When an older man in a public 'rally' calls sincere young men 'mosquitoes' the effect is miserably disintegrative."

Some Presbyterian Principles

They remembered also some Presbyterian principles and they insisted that the fact that they formed an independent board for their foreign missionary work was not to be taken as indicative that the only possible way of working was through independent agencies. Buswell put it this way:

"The basic issue in the present discord is between the Scriptural, democratic processes of Presbyterian church government on the one hand, and on the other hand, domination, through interlocking directorates, by a small group."

Another time he said the issue was one of

"an irresponsible autocratic fundamentalism, the leaders who 'speak distorted

things to draw away disciples after themselves.' . . . This sinister power reaches into colleges, missions, local churches, encouraging dissent against faithful pastors, and it is responsible to no one. It seeks to persuade God's people not to support a struggling committee for National Missions, directly responsible to the ministers and elders of a sound denomination, and it sets up a board, a close(d) corporation, responsible to no one, dominated by one man who controls great power and influence."

They remembered also that McIntire's group seeking "True Presbyterianism" had, in the past year, formed an Independent Board for Presbyterian Home Missions. Some men called this "contempt" of the Synod. Others used milder terms. Buswell reminded McIntire that the men serving the mission churches "who will be deprived of support because of the attack on the denominational committee will suffer most." The Collingswood church had stopped its gifts to the BP National Missions Committee, amounting to one-fourth of its total receipts, and had switched its support to the new independent committee. It was in connection with this step that division came to the Collingswood church.

To McIntire this development was incredible. In amazement he cried:

"I never dreamed that anything like this would come to Collingswood. We saw Charlotte divide, Grove City, Tacoma, Wilmington, and then we saw an effort made, a determined effort, to cause a sizable schism in the Collingswood church."

He discounts the fact that some pulled out but it is evident that he does not minimize the symptom of a deep trouble. Tom Cross, the National Missions executive, he says, started it, and Buswell acted as pastor of the new church, though New Jersey Presbytery, dominated by McIntire and his group of elders (the Collingswood church has nine votes in the presbytery), would not recognize Buswell in the meeting nor hear the petition of the Covenant church that was composed of 46 former Collingswood members. Even there the vote was close. If the new church and pastor were received, the control would be reversed.

Leading member of the new group is McGregor Scott—the only New Jersey member of the board of the new synod-controlled college in St. Louis. McIntire hastens to point out, to show the evil working of any synod-controlled agency, that N. J. Presbytery has been ignored in its representation, that Mr. Scott is not a member of the synod because he withdrew from Collingswood and is a member of a church not affiliated with the presbytery. (Mr. Scott is a strong supporter of the Rayburn-Buswell group.)

ACC and ICCA Troubles

Even in the American and International Councils there have been evidences of trouble. Chief executives of both groups have quit in recent months: Francis A. Schaeffer of the ICCA and Miss Haines as a protest, both related to the Independent Foreign Missions Board; and Harlee Bordeaux of the ACC.

BP leaders have charged McIntire with accepting "into the movement noted extremists just because they are willing to make a lot of noise about separation. These persons have hurt the cause nationally and in several parts of the International Council."

He was told in an open letter:

"(You) are gradually alienating more and more persons and groups. (You) are stifling the movement which God used (you) to found, and (you) are making the names ACCA and ICCA even the very word 'separation' a stench in the American church world, fundamental world at that. (You) are not winning, but alienating—and it need not be.

"For this reason many are openly, or in secret, repudiating not only your leadership but, far more tragically, are cooling off on their enthusiasm for the ACCA and ICCA. . . . If (members of the Synod) felt free to express themselves this is what you would hear. I feel free to express

BP & Orthodox Origins . . .

Many people today do not know the situation out of which the Bible and Orthodox Presbyterians came in 1936. The best factual story of this entire movement is told by Lefferts A. Loetscher in *The Broadening Church, A Study of Theological Issues in the Presbyterian Church Since 1869* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 195 pp., \$4.75).

All too briefly, let it be said here that the long struggle in the Presbyterian Church, USA, came to its climax in the fundamentalist-modernist controversy of the 1920s and continued into the early '30s. Much of it centered in the Princeton Seminary faculty and trustees. Finally, the fundamentalist element, led by J. Gresham Machen, saw itself losing its power in the church at large and Westminster Seminary was organized in Philadelphia in 1929. Later, this same group formed an Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions in 1933 because they did not believe the USA Board to be doctrinally sound.

This independent board proved to be the *cause celebre* in the long proceedings and continues to this day as a primary source of difficulty even with Bible Presbyterians. The (USA) General Assembly of 1934 ordered that the independent board stop its work, that ministers and laymen terminate any relationship with it and that presbyteries take disciplinary action against any who failed to withdraw from it.

In the central case of interest Dr.

Machen was suspended from the ministry, followed by others, so that in June, 1936, 34 ministers, 17 elders and 79 laymen organized the Presbyterian Church of America, with Dr. Machen as the Assembly's first Moderator. By November the church had drawn out a total of 106 ministers from the USA body.

Historians looking at the long development differ in explaining the root causes. One able observer sees the outworking of the rigid theological and ecclesiastical positions of Professor B. B. Warfield of Princeton. Others are impressed by the fact that many of the extreme conservatives in the movement were premillennialists in their beliefs.

Anyway, the new church did not last long as such. A split occurred in 1937 which saw the Bible Presbyterian Church created. One of their men explains:

"One of the causes of the division was the doctrine of eschatology [premillennialism]. Another was the question of the use of alcoholic beverages on the part of Christians [BPs were more strict on this point]. A deeper cause existed, however. It was one of attitude. Is it necessary for all to subscribe to the same point of view on every doctrine which a given group considers to be cardinal.—G. Douglas Young, dean of Northwestern College and School of Theology.

By 1939 the Presbyterian Church in America was not allowed by the courts to use that name, so it chose the present Orthodox name.

myself in view of the fact that I am not involved in any of your agencies."

The writer was G. Douglas Young.

Despite a strong challenge to be in the St. Louis meeting, McIntire did not go and he tried to keep his sympathizers from going. James Miller, BP pastor, in Lemmon, South Dakota, was obviously skeptical that he would face that show-down, for he wrote him:

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

But he didn't go. The synod voted 76-16 to repudiate him.

What of the Future?

How far-reaching the present difficulty will be is a subject of speculation. It is claimed that members of the faculties of Faith Seminary and Shelton College will be going to Covenant in St. Louis. Only member of the Faith faculty who has disagreed with McIntire in public is R. Laird Harris—who was elected Moderator of the recent St. Louis meeting! Both Buswell and Rayburn will be associated with Covenant.

Whether this will mean a split in the BP church, resulting in still another "Presbyterian" faction is the major question. Some within the movement have said they see no way to avoid it. Some actually seem to be encouraging it—like McIntire's long-time counsel, Bennet.

McIntire Announces Release From Promise Not to Publicize B. P. Difficulties

At the 1955 General Synod, when the discussion of the internal controversy in the Bible Presbyterian Church came to the floor, it was insisted by the Synod that no secular press should be admitted. Dr. Carl McIntire and Dr. Robert T. Ketcham, who were both present, were asked concerning the reporting of these activities in their journals. Dr. McIntire promised that he would not report them in the columns of the *Christian Beacon*. He has faithfully kept this promise to the Synod and nothing has appeared in the columns of the *Christian Beacon* about the internal conflict within the Bible Presbyterian Church.

However, information was given by Bi-

In a letter to Donald C. MacNair, St. Louis pastor, Bennet pointed out the logic of MacNair's "ultimatum." MacNair had written that if at the close of the St. Louis Synod meeting the control of the independent agencies had not been relinquished by the McIntire group, 61 of his members in the St. Louis church "may withdraw from the BP Synod and they will be empowered also to invite any other churches of like mind to join" them.

Bennet scoffs at such an idea: "Did you really expect that we, who joined in the organization of these independent agencies and have helped to maintain them during all these years, would resign because 61 members of your church voted that we should resign?"

With an indication that he wished he had used his power long before to keep MacNair out of the ministry, he says:

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

Second or Fourth Degree?

For a good many years outsiders have seen as the logic of such separatist tendencies the probability that division after division would create more and more smaller bodies. Insisting upon uniformity of thought or rigidity of policy or of dominating conception of "purity" of the church, these groups have made much of "second-degree separation." Some of their critics have contended that this would finally become "fourth-degree" separation where one individual has no dealings with anybody else.

Most definite indication of what was happening came after the 1956 synod from the formation of the Bible Presbyterian Association which McIntire is leading. Among the first steps was a rally held in the Collingswood church in an effort to pull out individuals, churches

and presbyteries to bolster up the ACC and ICCC.

Now . . . for Brotherhood

It did not require a long memory to look back at the beginning of the present cycle. From the time in the 1930s when stout resistance was offered the Presbyterian, USA, Board of Foreign Missions to 1956 when the Bible Presbyterians' agencies were riddled by their own people—the same ones who felt themselves to be leading a holy cause in the '30s—the judgment of 20 years ago was being repeated. McIntire now declares what he did not see then:

"What do people think about individuals who upset things so in their denomination that the whole separatist cause can be blamed when such is not necessary at all among Christian brethren who have love, confidence, and mutual concern for the cause? . . ."

"The people in the grass roots in the churches are hurt. . ."

"All of this was unnecessary and could have been avoided, had there been a spirit of brotherly love. . ."

No Recent Beginning

This whirlwind, however, did not begin this year or last year or with some resolutions in Greenville, S. C. It began more than 20 years ago and those who now can see how disastrous such warfare is among Christian brethren should be able to remember some fundamentals. Hayes T. Henry, who was purged from the board of trustees of Faith Seminary, is still loyal to the separatist BP principles, but there are meanings in his statement that he himself may not have recognized when he wrote:

"I am a Bible Presbyterian and loyal to my church because I believe her and her boards to be loyal to Christ and his cause. I have no confidence in independent boards—least of all one such as the new home board which springs out of spite and schism. We see reason, restraint, justice and responsibility in a board controlled by synod. This is true Presbyterianism in being subject to our brethren in the Lord, and under this subjection we are most willing to labor."

ble Presbyterians, including Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., to *Christian Life*. The moderator of the 1956 General Synod, Dr. R. Laird Harris, gave a report to the *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, which carried a lengthy story. A rally was held in the Westmont, N. J., fire hall two blocks from the Collingswood Church, at which a reporter from the *Camden Courier-Post* was present and information was given to him which appeared on the front page of the paper.

Dr. McIntire now feels that, in view of the activity of these men in carrying the story of Bible Presbyterian difficulties to the public press, he should be released from any

commitments made to the 1955 General Synod. He wants it to be known that he feels himself free to report these activities, as he feels led, in the columns of the *Christian Beacon*.

The Rev. Carl McIntire, D.D., is responsible for this edition of *The Free Press*.

(Photographed from the Camden, N. J., *Courier-Post* of May 3, May 3, 1956)

Aftermath of Synod Vote:

24 Elders Back Dr. McIntire In Bible Presbyterian Rift

Public support of the Rev. Dr. Carl McIntire was voiced today by 24 elders of the Bible Presbyterian Church following a meeting in Collingswood.

Their signed statement was issued as an aftermath of a vote of the church synod in St. Louis in early April to disassociate from the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches.

Dr. McIntire, pastor of the Collingswood church, is one of the principal founders of the Bible Presbyterian Church, past president of the ACCC and president of the ICC.

The elders issued the following statement:

"Many false and erroneous statements have been made recently concerning the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood and its beloved pastor, Dr. Carl McIntire. Inasmuch as some of these statements have appeared in the public press and have been given over the radio, the session of this church feels that it is proper to correct these misrepresentations and give the public the truth.

"1. The session, composed of 24 elders, together with a membership of more than 1600 members are, we believe, solidly back of Dr. McIntire as their pastor, and readily support him in all of the activities of the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches. He has been president of the latter organization since 1948, and God has wrought wonders through this world-wide ministry.

"2. This church is a member of the ACCC and ICC and is

still officially connected with the Bible Presbyterian Synod. Neither this church, nor its pastor, has been "thrown out" of the Bible Presbyterian denomination. We believe that far more than one-half of the 8000 members of the Bible Presbyterian denomination are in hearty sympathy with Dr. McIntire. A small dissatisfied group—less than 4 percent—has left the local church and joined with Dr. J. Oliver Buswell Jr. in opposition to Dr. McIntire. Since that time the Collingswood Church has received more new members than the number which left.

"3. Our church is being blessed under Dr. McIntire's ministry. He has been our pastor for 22 years. We have a new Sunday School building, all paid for, and in the very near future will break ground for a new church building to better accommodate the congregation. Our recent financial canvass was the largest in the history of the church, amounting to more than \$121,000. Half of the budget is given to missionary work. More money is being given for missions than ever before.

"4. This church is entirely satisfied with Dr. McIntire's ministry as he has served under the guidance of our Lord. We truly believe that God has raised him up for such an hour as this to be a courageous defender of the Word of God and a champion of our American freedom."

Those who signed the statement were listed as:

Weidner Titzcek, 550 Grant ave., West Collingswood; A. Donald Pidgeon, 124 Fern ave., Collingswood; George C. Eckert, 403 Cold Spring ave., Oaklyn; Robert T. Lore Sr., 121 Penn ave., Collings-

wood; Robert J. Myers, 242 E. Knight ave., Collingswood; Robert L. Boertzel, 300 New Jersey ave., Collingswood; Lawrence L. Dimmick, 1537 W. High st., Haddon Heights; Edward M. Faubell, 944 Oriental ave., Collingswood; R. S. Wigfield, 111 Linden ave., Collingswood; Clayton A. Bancroft, 425 Beechwood ave., Haddonfield; James I. Logue, 1111 Haddon ave., Collingswood; Gildon E. Kille, 1700 Maple ave., Haddon Heights; James S. Mattson, 229 Burrwood ave., Collingswood; Robert L. Isaacs, 427 Lees la., Collingswood; Robert E. Baker, 1450 Bellevue ave., Camden; B. J. Bashaw, R.F.D. Markkress rd., Haddonfield; Robert P. Willits, Kresson rd., Willowdale Farm, Haddonfield; Claud B. Annesley, 14 Ardmore ter., Collingswood; Ora W. Jordan, 501 Maple ave., Haddonfield; Clyde Monroe Blazer, 136-B Summerfield ave., Collingswood; John D. Henry, 650 Maple ave., Collingswood; Walter F. Thompson, 636 Linwood ave., Collingswood; Matthew N. Johnson, 803 Colford ave., Collingswood, and Frank J. Seider, 915 Stokes ave., Collingswood.

The session pointed out that last week the American Council of Christian Churches, at Ft. Worth, Texas, adopted a resolution, saying:

"The American Council of Christian Churches in session at Ft. Worth, Texas, April 27, 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 those 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 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."

"Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time: casting all your care upon him; for he careth for you. Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour: whom resist stedfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world. But the God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a while, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you."—1 Peter 5:6-10.

THE BATTLE ...

(Continued from page-2)

that would be heard around the world. It has been heard; praise God! It is being heard, and this hour of attack is no moment for weakness. It is a time to rally all the forces that remain who see the vital issues of the day and who are not ashamed to stand up and be counted in a battle where the bullets are real.

The enemies of our Lord, those who deny His deity, question His blood, dispute His birth, mock at His blood, talk of a spiritual resurrection, are responsible for the loss of thousands of souls and the degradation of the church!

God's people all over the world are now to be confronted with this "repudiation of

McIntire," and those who stand in the separatist movement need to see through the attack and realize exactly what has happened in the Bible Presbyterian Church—an effort made on the part of a number of the brethren to soften the separatist position, to make the movement more palatable for NAE-minded brethren, and for a little more complimentary attitude on the part of NCC leaders. There can be no compromise with the apostasy, no compromise with those who are disobeying the Lord's command in remaining in fellowship with the awful iniquity of the day.

Let every Bible Presbyterian who has an ounce of loyalty to Christ and the cause which gave the church birth, an ounce of blood left in his veins that stirs when men mock Christ, let him now join in a tremendous testimony to deliver the Bible

Presbyterian Church and to save it from the disintegrating forces which are seeking to make a different kind of organization out of it. When a man is in a position of leadership, as Dr. McIntire is, naturally he is going to bear the brunt of the attack, and one of the tests of his place of leadership is that he can take these attacks, meet them, spar them off, drive to the heart of the enemy as he comes to destroy and confuse. It is this that Dr. McIntire has been doing on the world level and will continue to do, by the grace of God, with absolute loyalty to his convictions and loyalty to Jesus Christ as He is set forth in the Scriptures.

Instead of repudiating Dr. McIntire in this hour of terrific conflict, Dr. McIntire should have the prayers, the love, the as-

(Continued on page 8)

A Call to Prayer and Humiliation

Every Bible Presbyterian should read this issue of the *Free Press*, see for himself how the enemies, the modernists, are using the difficulties which have arisen within our church to blaspheme the name of the Lord. The entire separatist movement is scandalized. The *Presbyterian Outlook*, the modernist voice in the Southern Presbyterian Church, has capitalized upon this in order to protect and defend the ecumenical movement and its interests in the Southern Assembly. What the *Outlook* is striking against is what it calls "a dominating conception of 'purity' of the church." The very thing which the Bible Presbyterian Church has set out to build historically—a church which would be true and pure in its doctrinal beliefs, faithful to the commands of Christ—is now mocked, and the enemies of that magnificent Scriptural command rejoice. It is a tragedy, but it has come to pass, and reality confronts every Bible Presbyterian. What are we going to do? What must be done to bring honor to the name of Christ? All who stand in the separatist movement are embarrassed, grieved, shocked.

This situation calls for action, and it is our firm belief that all should turn in a real time of prayer to confession and humiliation before God, that our precious testimony, built at tremendous cost, suffering, abuse, and the object of attack of enemies, shall not now be turned into a scandal. The men who are responsible for it may think that they are bringing out of it a new concept of a church, but it will take years and years for them to

live down or to overcome what they are doing. The most terrible enemies that Christ has today within His church are blaspheming.

Every Bible Presbyterian must get to the heart of this and see exactly what has happened, why it has happened, and then rise in strength to defend the faith and to clear the good name of the testimony. This is no time for confusion or softness! It is a time for action in absolute loyalty and love to Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church.

Up to the present time, we have seen no evidence of regret, have received no letters from any Bible Presbyterian connected with the opposition expressing any regret or sorrow for what has occurred or suggesting that anything be done to reply to the attack.

McIntire has been repudiated—that is exactly what the brethren did at St. Louis. The *Presbyterian Outlook* has described it perfectly. It was believed that if McIntire could be repudiated, the cause could be delivered and helped, but it has not worked that way and it is not going to work that way because the case built up against McIntire in the minds of these brethren is largely a product of their own imagination and creation. McIntire continues to remain the same individual with the same deep, abiding convictions of loyalty to the truth of the Gospel that he has always had.

HAS DR. MCINTIRE BEEN REPUDIATED?

HAS DR. MCINTIRE BEEN REPUDIATED?

He unquestionably has been by a number of the ministerial leaders in the Bible Presbyterian Church who are endeavoring to direct the affairs of the Synod, but he has not been repudiated, nor have the things for which he stands been repudiated by many of the churches and, we believe, by more than a majority of the people in the church who are gradually waking up to what has taken place and what is going on. Daily he receives assurances of Christian affection, understanding, and love, and announcements that recent information brought to individuals has finally opened their eyes.

Dr. McIntire has been a leader in the Bible Presbyterian Church. He has stood from the very beginning for the broad policy of advancing the work of Christ in all of its interests. The *Christian Beacon*, which he has edited, has joined the issues squarely at place after place in the Christian world, dealing with the apostasy, helping the whole separatist movement. For this, he has won the affection, the confidence, and the encouragement of separatist leaders in all fields. What, then, has been repudiated?

1.

The International Council of Christian Churches. The 19th General Synod withdrew from the ICCC without giving any specific reason. The main reason

(Continued on page 9)

THE BATTLE ...

(Continued from page 7)

sistance, the mutual concern of his brethren.

The *Presbyterian Outlook* even attempts to raise questions concerning the *Christian Beacon's* observance of the law of the land. This is serious. The *Beacon* has been meticulously careful in abiding by all regulations relating to second class mailing matters. Its record is clean and clear. But the *Outlook* will stop at nothing, and the enemies of the separatist movement, of course, would like very much to get some occasion before the law against the *Christian Beacon*. There seems to be nothing that these men are not willing to do. It all prefigures and is an advance of more serious persecution which awaits those who are going to stand upon an infallible Bible, and having done all to stand. This is no time for brethren to be repudiating McIntire.

But why the silence? The enemy comes in with a terrific blow, and the little boys who struck their matches and started their fire and then fanned it to see it burn, discovered that their house is aflame, there is no fire department to call, and they stand around "standing together." Some of the churches leave, others are split and divided, and confusion abounds. It is time now for Carl McIntire and some of the other brethren really to provide some leadership in

the Bible Presbyterian Church, and it is in that spirit that Dr. McIntire accepts the challenge which has been laid down and comes to the members of the Bible Presbyterian Church with an earnest plea and an appeal to get the facts and then do their duty in standing by the testimony of the church.

Come on, brethren, this hour calls for courageous rallying together. Christ will help us; Christ will deliver us. Christ is the Head of the Church. Let us ask His forgiveness, train our guns on the modernists where they should be trained, and cooperate in passing the ammunition, not in throwing it at one another.

We have been confronted with a very serious decision for which we have been asking God for guidance. We promised the Synod in 1955 that we would not report in the columns of the *Christian Beacon* the problems which had arisen. We feel now that that promise has been seriously violated by others. Dr. Buswell has gone to *Christian Life*; Dr. R. Laird Harris, the moderator, has given a statement to the press. Now that the National Council of Churches and the National Association of Evangelicals whose paper has reported also the same story that appeared in the Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin*, quoting Dr. R. Laird Harris against Dr. McIntire, are publishing the story, the time has come when it simply can no longer be kept out of the pages of the *Christian Beacon*. The Lord's

people in the separatist cause must have the answer and the explanation. The *Christian Beacon* must carry a story explaining exactly what has happened. This we intend to do. In that story we are going to reveal the operation of the "underground" and the plot to remove Dr. McIntire. This is documented by letters from the file of Highland College, the office of the American Council of Christian Churches in New York City, and the office of the American Council of Christian Churches of California.

The plot and the intrigue that went on before the first open public attack upon Dr. McIntire at the Bible Presbyterian Synod in Greenville are utterly amazing. Men were scheming and planning among themselves how they could remove Dr. McIntire and break the influence which God has given him. The leaders in this plot were Dr. Francis A. Schaeffer, Dr. Robert G. Rayburn, and the office of the National Missions Committee, including the Rev. Thomas G. Cross and Mrs. Myrtle Anna Brown, secretary to Mr. Cross. We are confident that the revealing of what actually went on preliminary to the open attack upon Dr. McIntire will give the explanation that people are waiting for.

The story is almost unbelievable. It involves lengthy letters written by Dr. McIntire's assistant pastor, George Soltau, as a member of the "spy ring," to Dr. Robert Rayburn on stationery of the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood.

REPUDIATED?

(Continued from page 8)

seems to be that Dr. McIntire, Dr. J. Gordon Holdcroft, key Bible Presbyterian leaders, are leaders in the ICCC. The world-wide movement which has been built up at great sacrifice and considerable cost has been repudiated, without any apologies, regrets, or words of appreciation for past services, or of sympathy to those who are left behind. The Bible Presbyterian Synod left forthwith, and informed the Council immediately by telegram that it was not to be considered any longer represented by it.

How can a local church, or people in that church, who have been supporting the ICCC and praying for it, rejoicing in its keeping the mission doors open, suddenly, simply because their Synod decides to withdraw without explanation, turn against the ICCC? Well, it just does not happen that way, and it is not happening, for which we praise God.

2.

The American Council of Christian Churches has been repudiated. For a denomination which has had such a prominent part in helping the ACCC through the years, providing its first president, and encouraging its testimony, to withdraw forthwith and give no reasons for doing so raises questions in people's minds. On the side, they questioned statistics, but the statistics have been completely verified and they are truthful. Dr. Robert T. Ketcham's reports have been checked, verified, and unanimously accepted by the ACCC. And as for "undemocratic leadership," the leadership has been democratically provided and elected. Instead of attacking the leadership, the Bible Presbyterians ought to rejoice that there are such men as Dr. Robert T. Ketcham, Dr. Carl McIntire, Dr. J. Gordon Holdcroft, Dr. Allan A. MacRae, Dr. W. O. H. Garman, and others, who have weathered many storms and who are men of integrity.

A movement has to have leaders, leaders who cannot be bribed or pressured into changing positions or intimidated by threats. The ACCC is where it is today in the Christian world because there has been a courageous, forthright leadership, unafraid to challenge the terrific power of the National Council of Churches in the field of radio, propaganda, and all that it is seeking to do to mislead the country.

It is a shame and a disgrace that the Bible Presbyterians would even think about repudiating such a magnificent testimony. It is not perfect; mistakes have been made; but these have been acknowledged. But even these in themselves should not be sufficient to take a denomination out of the Council in an hour of terrific battle!

3.

The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions has been repudiated. This action goes to the very foundation of the Bible Presbyterian movement. The very first document historically that exists so far as the Bible Presbyterian movement is concerned is the Articles of Association. In

those Articles one of the reasons given for the formation of the church was that it might support the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Now, after 19 years, the Synod declined to give its endorsement and approval to the Board. It did commend the missionaries in an effort to drive a wedge between the missionaries and the Board itself, and it deplored "the actions of the Independent Board in dropping Drs. Rayburn and Shepperson without due cause." The Board's action in declining to re-elect these two gentlemen was documented on the basis of public statements and articles by them which are fundamentally at issue with the basic position and principles of the Board. Instead, the Synod should have congratulated the Board and commended it on its determination to be faithful to its charter and its historic position.

There is in this more than a repudiation of the Independent Board. There is in it an abysmal lack of appreciation of the historic position and principles which gave birth to the Board and to the movement which brought into being the Bible Presbyterian Synod.

4.

There is a repudiation of Faith Theological Seminary. The Articles of Association also mentioned Faith Seminary. These two independent agencies—the Independent Board and Faith Seminary—were mentioned in the first historic document and commended to the churches for their support. Now, after 19 years, Faith Seminary is discarded. An effort was made in the case of the Seminary to commend the teachers but not the Board, and four of the teachers in Faith Seminary have resigned to go now to the Synod-controlled college and seminary. Yet Faith is committed to the position of being independent. Its charter demands that it be not subject to any ecclesiastical pressures or control. Four of its professors are going to the school which is under the entire direction, pressure, and control of an ecclesiastical body. One wonders, as many have, how men can believe in the position of Faith Seminary through the years and turn so readily to an institution that is built on an entirely different basis. Faith Seminary stands for the ICCC and the ACCC, but the new Covenant Seminary is not in favor of the ACCC and the ICCC, for it has to take the position of the General Synod which controls it.

5.

There has been a repudiation of the *Christian Beacon*. This paper, without any explanations, was withdrawn from the list of approved publications, yet it has done more than any other single instrument to build the Bible Presbyterian movement. It is primarily through the *Christian Beacon* that the Lord's people have been led to cease their giving to modernist and compromising agencies and to direct their funds into the separatist cause. It is through the *Beacon* that multiplied thousands and thousands of dollars have come into the support of the Bible Presbyterian Church and its many activities. Yet, the Bible Presbyterian Church repudiated the *Christian*

Beacon, with a weekly circulation of over 20,000, and, instead, it has its own official organ, which has less than 2,000 circulation monthly. What is there to replace the *Christian Beacon* and to reach out into the broad field where the apostasy is rife and gather up the support to help those who are being disillusioned and to encourage them to find refuge and rest in a true Bible-believing fellowship?

6.

Finally, the Bible Presbyterian Synod has repudiated its own history. It is becoming a different kind of church. It is now going to command only its Synod-controlled agencies. This is the practice at the present moment! It has only Synod-controlled agencies which it endorses and commends to the churches for their approval. Oh, yes, it does say that it believes in independent agencies, but it cannot support a single independent agency that now exists or which has been used of God to help build the church itself through the years. This is a radical revolution and it has taken place in two short years. God's people must have more reason than "Synod says so!" to forsake these faithful works.

Those who are watching the development can thank God that the independent agencies were not under the control of the Synod, for, with the taking over of the control and the direction of the Synod as this new group has, everything would have been lost. As it is, the Independent Board still supports the ICCC and the ACCC. Faith Seminary is going to continue its same position of fellowship and testimony in the separatist cause, bearing witness to the Reformed faith.

Think for a moment what would have happened if the Independent Board had been under the control of Synod. If the Synod had broken its tie with the ICCC, then all through the mission fields the ties would have to be broken with the ICCC's regional councils and activity. As it is now, the Synod has placed some of the missionaries in a difficult position. Are they going to be loyal to the Synod, subject themselves to the brethren, and repudiate the ICCC as the church has done, or are they going to continue to be loyal to the position and testimony of the Board under which they serve?

What is left? A group in the church which at the present moment has control of the machinery of the last Synod, working primarily through its National Missions Committee, is setting up an ingrown, narrow, restricted, more powerful, centrally controlled church. It is our experience that people who leave the apostasy do not want to get back into a denomination that is controlled by an ecclesiastical machine and which has tremendous power at the top with which to crack down upon preachers and individual congregations.

"O keep my soul, and deliver me: let me not be ashamed; for I put my trust in thee. Let integrity and uprightness preserve me; for I wait on thee."

— Psalm 25:20, 21

The Issue

There are many, many things in the *Outlook* article which could be discussed. They will have to pass. However, the conclusion of the article is perhaps the most significant part of the entire feature. The modernists in the Southern Presbyterian Church agree with the position of Synod-controlled agencies—the denomination controlling all of the agencies. This is the way they want it because their machine then can control not only the Church but all the agencies of the Church to accomplish their purposes.

The *Outlook* quotes the statement of Hayes Henry, which goes to the very heart of the great struggle, as the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions faced it in 1934, 1935, 1936, with the Northern Presbyterian Church. There an independent agency challenged the position that to be Presbyterian the agencies had to be under the control of the denomination. It was this statement of Mr. Henry that led the members of the Board of Directors of Faith Seminary not to re-elect him to a term on the Board. The modernist paper says, "There are meanings in his statements that he himself may not have recognized when he wrote." There are meanings in his statement which he himself *did* recognize when he wrote, and also meanings which he probably did not understand historically in light of what happened with the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Mr. Henry's statement in full reads:

"I am a Bible Presbyterian and loyal to my church because I believe her and her boards to be loyal to Christ and his cause. I have no confidence in independent boards—least of all one such as the new home board which springs out of spite and schism. We see reason, restraint, justice and responsibility in a board controlled by synod. This is true Presbyterianism in being subject to our brethren in the Lord, and under this subjection we are most willing to labor."

This is the line exactly that was used in the Northern Presbyterian Church against the members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Men claimed they were loyal to their Church and therefore loyal to Christ, that they had no confidence in independent boards, that they had to be subject to their brethren and obey the actions of the General Assembly. Thus men were called upon to obey the Mandate of 1934.

All of this is in direct contrast to the glorious view of a minister being a servant of Jesus Christ. The modernists in the Southern Presbyterian Church see the issue at this point. They want the tightly controlled denomination, which they will control. The men who started the Bible Presbyterian Church 18 years ago were determined that they would never build that kind of Presbyterian church again. Now the group in the Bible Presbyterian Church, which is being led by Dr. Robert G. Rayburn, Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., and others, is already building just that same type of denomination. In fact, at the present moment, Synod controls everything except the Board of Foreign Missions. But the attacks

The Rev. Linwood G. Gebb, pastor of the Bible Presbyterian Church, Lakeland, Fla., has been one of the active leaders in the Bible Presbyterian Synod against Dr. Carl McIntire. The last issue of *The Free Press* carried a statement by the Rev. W. B. Goebel of Kannapolis, N. C., explaining why he stood with Dr. McIntire and others against the centralization of power in the Bible Presbyterian Church. Immediately, Dr. Gebb wrote Mr. Goebel. This letter is printed in full in order that the line that is being pursued against Dr. McIntire may be fully seen. In reply to Dr. Gebb's letter, the Hon. James E. Bennet of New York City wrote him June 18, and also Dr. McIntire wrote him June 16. All of these letters now appear in full.

GOEBB'S LETTER TO GOEBEL

Dear Brother Goebel:

Yesterday *The Free Press* came. How disturbed I was to read some of the things and to note some of the slanted emphasis. The article "Christian Reports—Spirit" was published in such a fashion as to indicate that such things were said at Synod. The quotations from George Christian's paper were almost nauseating. How he could have written such a thing is beyond me. After writing it and distributing it among the brethren he was called to task by the Synod and he apologized for his act. There was quite a bit of discussion over the matter and a very pronounced spirit of sadness overwhelmed it. Of course Dr. McIntire really had something and has played it up without stating that Synod deplored it.

I am certain that you would not have written the letter that you wrote to Dr. McIntire, had you attended Synods in the last few years, or were acquainted with the reprisals which Carl has taken against many of his brethren "which is no less dictatorial" than you and I experienced in the Southern Presbyterian Church. Had you attended Synod you would not say it "has brought about the same conditions that existed in the old Church."

Further evidence that you have been ill-advised by what you have read is shown in "I shall continue to stand for our Independent Agencies." There was no inference made by anyone at any Synod that we were doing away with Independent Agencies. That was another of Dr. McIntire's "strawmen." Every action of Synod concerning Agencies supported independent ones as well

upon the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions have multiplied and the stage is set now for Synod to erect its own foreign board and cast aside the whole independent setup, which developed historically and was so greatly blessed of the Lord.

We see so clearly what is at stake. The modernists also see what is at stake. And we want all of God's people in the Bible Presbyterian Church to see the change which is taking place in the Church and to join with us in resisting the building of a tightly controlled Church. We do not want it, and the experience of history testifies against it.

LETTERS

as church-related ones, except where malicious acts and shameful reprisals had been made against the brethren under the cover of an Independent Agency. I need not relate to you Highland College, Shelton College, Faith Seminary, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and scores of brethren who are now having trouble in their churches because of the action by a clique, which has run Independent Agencies.

Brother Goebel, if you had attended some of the ACCC meetings you would have said, these are not our people, we cannot condone such action.

I have written Dr. McIntire several letters in which I commended him for his great work in the past, and pled with him not to follow this course of chopping off heads, and forming cliques whenever he could not control. Personally, I begged him to admit that the BPC had grown under the providence of God, and as a Presbyterian Church it is run by Presbyters and not by a clique. I begged him to be careful lest he should cause the great church, which he has built, to crash in upon his own head. Yet he has followed the course of disregard for his brethren while he cries "We must have mutual love and confidence in one another."

Dear Brother, find out what you are joining before you join any of these Councils or the BPCA.

Yours in Christ,

L. G. GOEBB

BENNET'S LETTER TO GOEBB

Dear Mr. Gebb:

I have read a copy of your letter to Rev. W. B. Goebel of May 8, 1956 and am amazed at your statements.

You refer to HIGHLAND COLLEGE, SHELTON COLLEGE, FAITH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY and the INDEPENDENT BOARD FOR PRESBYTERIAN FOREIGN MISSIONS. I am on all of these Boards. There were no malicious acts or shameful reprisals made by any of those Boards and your statement is wholly without foundation in fact.

In HIGHLAND COLLEGE Dr. Rayburn started the whole trouble himself. He made a mountain out of a molehill, in reference to criticism of himself by one of the students. He followed this through and took 44 students and several professors away from the College, as a result. I wrote him at the time that it looked to me that he had planned this thing from the beginning, and had taken this small incident as a lever to break up Highland College. He was highly indignant and wrote me it was not true and he had no idea of forming a separate college. I wrote him that I would await the results. The results have proved that I was correct.

Dr. McIntire has brought money and students into SHELTON COLLEGE, more than any other one man. The Trustees would have discharged Dr. Buswell in

(Continued on page 11)

LETTERS

(Continued from page 10)

July, 1955, and the only reason they refrained from doing so was because Dr. McIntire pleaded with them not to do so. He succeeded in holding off any action against Dr. Buswell until Nov. 15, 1955, when the indignation against Dr. Buswell by the other trustees was so great that Dr. McIntire could not prevent action. Dr. Buswell's statement issued on Aug. 10, 1955 that he had been asked to resign because of reprisals was absolutely untrue and he knew it, because, at a later meeting of Faith trustees, he admitted that there was no basis of fact for his claim about the reprisal, which he had stated as facts in his circular letter of Aug. 10, 1956. He attempted to justify himself, however, by saying that he believed that Dr. McIntire and the trustees would proceed against him because of reprisals against Anderson and Smick. Events, however, proved to Dr. Buswell that this was not the fact, and he withdrew the statements which he had previously made about reprisals. This was done in the presence of the other trustees and was accepted. However, he and his friends have continued the false story of reprisals.

Also, in reference to Shelton College, you wrote a general letter in which you stated that Dr. McIntire and I had tried to give Shelton College to Jack Wyrzten, and you severely criticized Dr. McIntire for this. When I wrote you, telling you that Dr. McIntire had nothing to do with it, at all, but that Dr. Buswell in my presence, and over my objection, had made the offer to Jack Wyrzten, I also requested you to give wide publicity to this statement, as you did to the other. You never acknowledged my letter, and you did not make any correction.

I was not present at the meeting of Faith Seminary when the vote was taken on re-electing members of the Board, but because of the above incident, where you were totally unfair to Dr. McIntire and to me, and showed no spirit of repentance whatever, and made no effort to correct the completely false statement,—I made it plain to other members of the Board that I would not vote for your re-election on our Board, as I did not think that you were the kind of man that we needed on the Board. It was not a reprisal. It was just good sense and righteous opinion.

We had put Hayes Henry on the Board with some other younger men graduates of the Seminary, thinking that they would be helpful to us. Mr. Henry turned out to be a complete absentee but wrote articles, and, I presume he spoke orally, things which were detrimental to our Seminary, as an independent agency. I could not vote for him for re-election. This was not a question of reprisal, but also was of good sound judgment.

I was one of the charter members of the INDEPENDENT BOARD FOR PRESBYTERIAN FOREIGN MISSIONS, and have always worked with the others to maintain the standards which we had in the beginning. When the terms of Dr. Rayburn and Dr. Shepperson expired, there was plenty of evidence that neither of them were in harmony with our standards. There-

fore, I personally made the motion that they not be included in the list of directors to be re-elected, and substituted names of others who were in complete harmony with our standards.

This was not the action of a "clique." In the very beginning the Lord gave certain men and women instructions to organize the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, Faith Theological Seminary, the American Council of Christian Churches, and the International Council of Christian Churches. These persons have been faithful to the trust, notwithstanding persecution, malicious attacks and false accusations of others who try to change the standards of these agencies.

There is a small clique which has been trying to take power away from the founders of these agencies, but our Lord has interposed and the conspiracy has been completely frustrated.

In reprisal, however, this new small clique which has been grasping for power, is forming new agencies, ostensibly under Synod control, but, inasmuch as the clique controlled the Synod, these so-called Synod-controlled agencies are really being formed and controlled by this small clique. What motivates them, other than the desire to grasp and wield power, I do not know, but the effect is exactly the situation that we faced in our difficulties with the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

SHELTON COLLEGE is not only an independent agency, but its bylaws provide that there shall not be more than five of its trustees at any time who are members of the same denomination. It is neither a Bible Presbyterian, nor a Baptist college. It is strictly Christian and it adheres to the standards of faith, principles and practices of the American Council.

Yours very cordially
In His faithfulness,
JAMES E. BENNET

McINTIRE'S LETTER TO GEBB

Dear Lindy:

In the providence of God, He has been putting in my hands some of these letters that you have been writing about me. I know have the letter of May 8 to W. B. Goebel. I am utterly amazed that you can write so about a brother and be so definitely in error. I can see, Lindy, if you really believe the things that you write in this letter, how you and others are so determined to "repudiate" McIntire.

You speak of "the reprisals which Carl has taken against many of his brethren 'which is no less dictatorial' than you and I experienced in the Southern Presbyterian Church." How amazing! It could not possibly have been that way. But suppose it were true? I am just one man. God is going to take me one of these days to be with Himself. But when you build up the dictatorial system in the hands of a hierarchy that carries itself on to control a church, you have something that abides and continues, and I have lived to see the rise in the Bible Presbyterian Church of "a hierarchy, which works out its plans in advance and then goes to Synod to put them through.

Similar conditions are developing that existed in the old church. And you ought to be among the first to help resist it.

You speak of: 1) "malicious acts" and 2) "shameful reprisals." Lindy, as far as I am concerned, there have been no "malicious acts" against any of our brethren. I got into this whole thing by trying to defend myself from unjust and serious charges against my integrity and there certainly have been no "reprisals," much less "shameful reprisals." This is the line that the brethren are endeavoring to produce in order to justify some of the things which they have done and are doing.

Take the case of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. The action in declining to re-elect two members of that Board is documented and is stated. There is nothing malicious about it and nothing of a reprisal nature. The Board was simply seeking to maintain its historic position as an Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Please, Lindy, look at the issue, look at the principles, see the facts, do not twist them and give them such a turn as this and then be a party to a crusade based upon such falsehoods. The Independent Board is a glorious testimony and I believe that God is going to continue to use it, but such misrepresentations as you give here hurt the cause.

The Shelton College case, the whole thing, is perfectly documented. The action of the Board was unanimous in dismissing Dr. Buswell. It could do nothing else if it was going to save the school. Dr. Buswell became unruly in his dealing with the Board.

You have built up the idea that some small clique has been trying to run things. That simply is not true. It is a part of the figment that has been created by some of the brethren. I, personally, on the agencies that I have been connected with, have worked along with the brethren in a real spirit of co-operation. God has led in the establishment of these independent agencies and has blessed them. And this last Synod in St. Louis did not endorse a single independent agency, Lindy. It took action designed to separate the missionaries from the mission board by commending them and not endorsing the Board. And yet, all of this was done in such a sweet atmosphere of humility and love, as you indicate. This clique that you talk about in the independent agencies is not trying to run the Bible Presbyterian Church. It hasn't. It has not even attempted it. One of the charges that you brethren have against me is that I have not been attending the Synod meetings and the like, and there simply has not been any "chopping off heads." What has happened, Lindy, is that people in the Bible Presbyterian Church, the God-fearing people who have seen the issues and stand by the testimony of the ACCC and ICCC and rejoice in our separatist position, have of their own accord and on their own responsibility risen up against this attempt to "sack" McIntire and to drive the Collingswood Church out of the Synod.

Here you are, you get the *Free Press*, and immediately you sit down and write Goebel a letter. That is what is happening. Wherever any man anywhere expresses him-

(Continued on page 12)

The Bible Presbyterian Church Association

The Bible Presbyterian Church Association is an independent agency formed for the purpose of maintaining constituent membership in the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches. It has touched the heart of many of the Lord's people in the Bible Presbyterian Synod and has brought a most affectionate response. Letters have come from individuals saying that if there had not been such an association they would have withdrawn from the Synod and gotten into a church which would be a part of the Councils and their leadership in the Twentieth Century Reformation movement. The people rejoice in it, and we do thank God for it.

It is now clear that one of the reasons why the Synod had to have its special meeting in April was that it was in the plans of some of the brethren to withdraw from the ACCC so that the Church would not be represented at the Forth Worth meeting later in April. And this, then, would embarrass Dr. McIntire in his position in the Council and would embarrass the Council, too.

What was not anticipated and expected was that the Bible Presbyterian Church Association would be formed and that there would be such an instantaneous response—27 churches voted to affiliate by the time the ACCC met in Forth Worth. This development shocked and astounded the brethren who were against the ACCC. The people in the pews, the rank and file in the Church, had not been brought up to date on the attacks concerning Dr. McIntire.

Immediately, the brethren who were opposed to the ACCC sought to find some way in which they could further keep the churches from belonging to the ACCC. It

was fully expected on the part of some that a withdrawal from the ACCC and ICCC would force Dr. McIntire to leave the denomination. They never anticipated the formation of the Bible Presbyterian Church Association with Dr. McIntire still continuing in the Church. It is this unexpected dilemma which carried a certain degree of frustration for the brethren who had been doing their planning behind the scenes.

The first attack on the Bible Presbyterian Church Association came from the Carolina Presbytery, where a resolution was presented to the effect that a person could not be in the Church and be a member of the Bible Presbyterian Church Association. In fact, to be in the Bible Presbyterian Church Association, it was said on the floor of Presbytery, was to be in defiance of the Synod. Church authority, church power, was waved over the heads of people to try to keep them from affiliating with the ACCC and ICCC. Please note that men are trying to use church power to "control" or to "stop" people from being in the ACCC and ICCC.

The pastor of one of the churches actually told his people that if they became members of the Bible Presbyterian Church Association their names would automatically be dropped from the roll. This, of course, was absurd, but it was used to threaten the people, and it simply indicates something of the spirit that the brethren have in their attempt to crush the ACCC. But God does not let things happen that way. His people are to be free to serve Him! Are the people free?

The second attack came in the Great Plains Presbytery when an effort was made under the leadership of the Rev. George Soltau to maintain that a local church could

not even affiliate with the ACCC or ICCC, because that power belonged only to Synod. In answer to these charges, a few facts remove any doubt. First, the Bible Presbyterian Church Association is not a denomination; it does not claim to be the Synod; nor does it claim to represent the Synod in the ACCC-ICCC. It is an association, independent, formed for one purpose—to provide constituent membership in the ACCC and ICCC for individual churches which join the Association. The idea of the more powerful Synod restricting the local churches and taking liberties and rights away from them gains more strength as men seek to find some way by which they can, in the name of the Church, block the local churches from being in the two Councils.

Furthermore, the Bible Presbyterian Church Association did not even take the place of the Bible Presbyterian Synod in the ACCC-ICCC. The constitutions of both the Councils indicate that "constituent membership" may be maintained by denominations or associations of Bible-believing churches. So, when the Bible Presbyterian Synod withdrew as a denomination, the Bible Presbyterian Church Association went in, not on the basis of being a denomination, but on the basis of being an association of Bible-believing churches, and it maintains constituent membership on that particular basis and not on the basis that it is a denomination, because it is not. The individual churches of the Bible Presbyterian Church, as well as the individuals themselves, are perfectly free to associate themselves in independent agencies to advance the work of the Lord, and the brethren of the Synod have, by resolution approved of the right of independent agencies. Now

(Continued on page 13)

LETTERS

(Continued from page 11)

self, men who are lined up with you immediately go to work on him to put pressure with these false tales concerning me and others. There is entirely too much misinformation, hearsay, and then just downright prejudice and ill feeling which enter into the creation of this picture which is called "a pattern." You write him to keep him from joining any of the Councils or the B.P.C.A. I thought you were for the Councils. I thought you stood for the great things these Councils stand for. You should have been among the first, Lindy, to cry out against this using of the false statistics charge, when the statistics have been demonstrated not to be false but based upon the most reliable information available and given by the denominations and the churches to the Council. Please halt, Lindy; reconsider this whole picture, and realize what you are doing and what you are a party to. Mutual love and confidence are what we need but are not created by accusing men of "malicious acts and shameful reprisals." Do you think that mutual love and confidence can exist when such allegations are being made against men

who have sought earnestly, sincerely, and in real brotherly love to advance the cause? Be done with this double dealing, saying that you are for independent agencies and then not a single independent agency being endorsed. Covenant College is being built on the principle that Synod must control the college and seminary. Shelton College and Faith Seminary are being attacked to build the Synod schools! If Synod control works this way, there is no place for Faith Seminary and the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. If the principle that the church must control the agencies is right, then you have acceptance of the principles which the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. enunciated in its Mandate and judicial decisions of 1934 and 1936.

You speak of the ACCC meetings. If my memory is correct, out of its last five meetings you attended one! You and some of the brethren are so "sanctimonious" about the ACCC, and you turn and impute to me "malicious acts and shameful reprisals." You cannot read my heart as to "malice"! It is time for some plain speaking, Lindy.

I write you in love and in a spirit of real grace. God is giving me grace!

The *Free Press*, in regard to the quotation from Christian's paper, made it very clear: "Excerpts from this paper are here reported as an indication of things which were being said around the Synod about Dr. Carl McIntire." It was clear that it was "around" the Synod, not the Synod, and you cannot deny it because Christian testifies to it that these things were being said "around" Synod. Is there not just a little hypocrisy when things are known to have been said and known to be going on, to try to make out that this was not the spirit of some of the brethren? May the Lord show you, Lindy, what you have done and what you are doing to harm a great cause. When you finish with all this "repudiation" of me, what will you gain for Christ?

And yet, Lindy, you wrote Miss Jeanette Gang in the letter that I have from her: "I cannot bring myself to take sides in the issue." How does a man take sides, if you have not taken a side in this struggle against me? When, brother, you are championing a side to another lady, no, you are not taking sides! Just what are you doing?

Yours sincerely,

CARL MCINTIRE

Buswell's Latest Attack on McIntire

An example of how Dr. Carl McIntire is being misrepresented and seriously abused by brethren in the Bible Presbyterian Church, who are endeavoring to force him and the Collingswood Church itself out of the denomination, is seen in a circular letter which Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., has written reporting a meeting of the New Jersey Presbytery, May 12, 1956. This meeting broke up. It was unable to do business and things reached such a pass, as a result of the actions of Dr. Buswell and his disorderly conduct, that the Presbytery either had to summon a sergeant of arms or else adjourn. One of the elders arose in the meeting and asked Dr. Buswell if he would retire with him from the meeting and let the Presbytery go ahead with its business. Dr. Buswell refused. Thereupon the meeting adjourned. The minutes of the previous meeting had not even been approved.

Dr. Buswell wrote: "But the 'impossible' can come to pass! The Moderator, Dr. Carl McIntire, simply ruled that in this case the Constitution of the Church does not apply. His exact ruling was that the protection of minorities guaranteed by the paragraph above quoted applies only to 'affirmative' actions! The vote to sustain the Moderator's first ruling was a 'Yes' vote, i.e., affirmative, and the Moderator's first ruling was an act of violation of the Constitution and of the decision of the Synod in a formal administrative case; but this made no difference. The Moderator insisted that the Constitution does not apply."

Not for one instant did the moderator ever insist that the constitution did not apply! He insisted that the constitution did apply and that the Presbytery, as well as the General Synod, had to conform its conduct to the specific provisions of the constitution. This type of attack on Dr. McIntire is what has misled and caused so much confusion.

The moderator, at the opening of the Presbytery's meeting, had ruled that the *pro re nata* meeting of the Presbytery, called at St. Louis by four of the minority element in the Presbytery, was in violation of Form of Government, Chapter 9, Paragraph 6, of

the constitution. This paragraph provides that "when any emergency shall require a meeting sooner than the time to which it [the presbytery] stands adjourned, the moderator, or, in case of his absence, death, or inability to act, the clerk, shall, with the concurrence, or at the request of two ministers and two elders, the elders being of different congregations, call a special meeting. For this purpose he shall send a circular letter. . . ."

The call for the *pro re nata* meeting in St. Louis was sent out without being presented to the moderator or sent to the moderator, even though he was present, not dead, and he was able to act. The stated clerk took it upon himself, without informing the moderator or advising him that such a call was even in existence, to proceed to issue the call. The moderator did not even have an opportunity to discuss it or to know what it was about, or even to turn it down. He simply did not know it existed. When these facts were presented to the Presbytery by the moderator, in support of his ruling, the Presbytery voted 20-15, maintaining that the call for the St. Louis meeting was in violation of the constitution.

The St. Louis meeting had received Dr. Buswell and taken a number of other actions, with only the minority present. The Presbytery, in its stated meeting, May 12, did not recognize Dr. Buswell as one of its members and declined to recognize his vote, though he proceeded to vote, tried to make motions, second motions, make speeches, and constantly interrupted, with his voice at times lifted to a rather high pitch.

The minority signed a complaint against Presbytery's action in declaring the call illegal, but the required one-third to "stay" any action was not filed until the Presbytery itself actually adjourned. But there was considerable discussion concerning a "stay." Dr. Buswell insisted that the "stay" permitted him to be a member of Presbytery and to vote. The moderator insisted that the "stay" stopped everything at the point of the action, which was that the *pro re nata* meeting was in violation of the constitution and

that a stay could not make the meeting constitutional and give Dr. Buswell the right to vote. Under no circumstances could one-third of a Presbytery have the power to create ballots and give men membership in a Presbytery. A stay could restrain a Presbytery from proceeding with some affirmative action which it had taken involving the future, but it could not stay an action which was negative in its effect to the extent of making that negative action an affirmative action. A stay could not make a ruling that a matter was unconstitutional mean that the matter was constitutional, with the Presbytery operating as though it were constitutional.

Dr. Buswell claimed that Presbytery's decision was also in violation of the decision of the Synod in a formal administrative case. This was not the case at all. There was no administrative case of any kind before Synod concerning the moderator's ruling. What happened was that near the end of Synod, when word reached the stated clerk that the moderator had informed the members of the Presbytery in writing that when they met he was going to rule that the *pro re nata* meeting at St. Louis was in violation of the constitutional provision, the stated clerk carried this to the floor of the Synod, asked the Synod for a ruling upon the moderator's ruling which he had not yet made, and the Synod then proceeded to rule, without the moderator or his position being heard at all, that the *pro re nata* meeting was legal. The Synod itself has no power to overrule the specific provisions of the constitution. But in order to bolster the Synod's decision in this matter, because there obviously was some doubt in some people's minds—since it was known to the stated clerk and others that he had not sent the notice to Dr. McIntire, the moderator, as required by the constitution—the Synod then proceeded to direct the Presbytery to meet at St. Louis. There is nothing in the constitution that gives the Synod power to order a presbytery to meet, and at the 1955 Synod in St. Louis, when the Carolina Pres-

(Continued on page 14)

Association

(Continued from page 12)

when we have such an agency, which has as its function clearly defined purposes, they are twisting and perverting and adding to the constitution, and an attempt is made to scare people or to forbid people to be in the ACCC and ICC.

Actually, the Bible Presbyterian Church Association is the best way to be represented in the ACCC and ICC. First, only the churches in the Synod which approve of the Councils need to be in it. When the whole Synod was in it, those churches which did not desire to be in it were embarrassed by their presence in the Councils. It is far better to have those churches which want to be in the Councils to be free to be in them, and surely the Councils themselves

desire only those churches in them which really want to be a part of the testimony.

Second, there are other advantages for fellowship in the Councils through the Association. It means that reports are made not to a meeting once a year, and the matters are dropped, but reports are made regularly to the individual churches. The local churches are more closely related to the Councils, have reports made directly to them, and they are enabled to become more vitally interested in the activities and program of the Councils both for prayer and financial support. So this has advantages which the other approach did not have.

If the Bible Presbyterian Synod meets and denounces the Bible Presbyterian Church Association, that still will not disserve it, or in any way hinder its purposes. Or, on the other hand, if the Synod meets and commends the Councils and the Bible

Presbyterian Church Association, that will not put the Synod in the Councils.

It might also be pointed out that Dr. McIntire is not even the chairman of the delegation among the delegates in the ACCC. When the representatives of the Bible Presbyterian Church Association met to choose their ten delegates, Lynn Gray Gordon, president of Highland College, was named unanimously the chairman of the delegation, not Dr. McIntire. Dr. McIntire has previously said that he did not even need to be a delegate to the American Council. His desire has been that as many of the brethren as possible participate in the ACCC, attend all of its meetings, and through experience and fellowship with the brethren of the other groups prepare themselves for places of more responsible leadership in the movement. This is as it should be for the glory of Christ.

Buswell

(Continued from page 13)

bytery had neglected to issue a call for its own meeting and Synod was requested to call the presbytery into session, it was pointed out and ruled that Synod did not have authority to direct a presbytery to meet. In 1956 it was different, and, when Synod directed the New Jersey Presbytery to meet, Synod knew that only the minority of the Presbytery was present in St. Louis and could meet.

The direction of the Synod to the Presbytery to meet made no provisions for the notification of the members of the Presbytery and the Synod was fully aware of the fact that only a small minority of the Synod was actually present to act for the Presbytery whose majority was absent. Not a single member of the majority group in the Presbytery was in attendance at St. Louis and the Synod knew this. A group of brethren in the Synod was working through a small minority in the Presbytery to force their will, as they tried to do in the name of the Synod, upon the majority of the Presbytery of New Jersey, without the Presbytery of New Jersey having an opportunity to defend itself or even to be properly notified that it was summoned by the Synod to meet. This matter Dr. McIntire brought out on the floor of Presbytery and said that Synod was in violation of the constitution, and that it was just as much bound by the constitution as was the Presbytery or any member of the Presbytery. It was these facts and arguments that led the Presbytery to sustain the moderator's ruling that the call for the *pro re nata* meeting was in violation of the specific provision of the constitution.

A part of this whole picture was the fact that Dr. Buswell and the minority were working together in the calling of the St. Louis meeting of the 19th General Synod. At the meeting of the Presbytery in January, the Presbytery voted 18-8 not to recognize the St. Louis Synod meeting as a "proper meeting," declined to have an adjourned meeting of the Presbytery in St. Louis, and provided for its next meeting to be held on a stated date in May. Knowing, therefore, that the majority of the Presbytery would not attend the St. Louis meeting, the minority proceeded to issue its call, without even carrying out the constitutional provision of sending it to the moderator.

The minority also proceeded to take a complaint of several items against the Presbytery to the Synod. These items included the action of the Presbytery in laying upon the table the question of receiving the Haddonfield Church, consisting of some 40-odd people who had broken away from the Collingswood congregation. After long discussion, the Presbytery had laid the matter on the table, expressing the view that, if there could be a restoration of fellowship and a spirit of co-operation, the church could be admitted in the future. It was hoped that rather serious charges made against Dr. McIntire and the Collingswood session by the group in Haddonfield would be withdrawn. The Presbytery laid this and several other matters on the table, took no

action upon them, looking to God to lead and to work for the peace of the Presbytery. A complaint was taken against the laying of these actions on the table and the Synod in St. Louis, without the majority present to defend itself, proceeded to enter into the merits of the case and then instruct the Presbytery of New Jersey what to do, when the Presbytery itself had not even decided what it was going to do.

Dr. Buswell, it must be recalled, was the moderator of the Synod and it was on his authority that the St. Louis meeting was called, and he was working in close collaboration and actually counselling the members in presenting the complaint from New Jersey. In fact, he became the attorney for that group before Synod.

Dr. Buswell said in his letter that "the majority of the 19th General Synod did everything possible to give Dr. McIntire's views a full and fair hearing." This could not possibly have been true. Dr. McIntire and others appealed to Dr. Buswell to hold the meeting of the Synod when both sides could be fully represented, and Dr. Buswell declined to do so. It was a part of the plan which was being followed, many of the details of which were unknown to Dr. McIntire and others, that the Synod would meet, work with the minority of the Presbytery, and use the power of Synod to try to force the Presbytery's majority to do the will of the minority. This is ecclesiastical politics and maneuvering of the old-school type. It is not in the spirit or the framework of the constitution of the Bible Presbyterian Church, which appeals to brethren to operate with a sense of fairness and mutual love and confidence.

Dr. Buswell's letter further speaks about Dr. McIntire's "special support," accuses him of having powers of "patronage," and finally takes issue with those whom he thinks would make Dr. McIntire a party to idolatry. He said: "A letter was recently circulated in which a follower of Dr. McIntire likened him to Moses, and implied that God would, or should, strike dead those who sometimes oppose him. Now Moses was particularly inspired of God to write Scripture. . . . To call a human leader today a Moses, in the sense that God should strike his critics dead, is idolatry; and for a man to acquiesce, or keep silent in receiving such adulation, is to be a party to idolatry." This is the type of twisting which is going on against Dr. McIntire. Whatever article Dr. Buswell is thinking about, no one has even so much as suggested that Dr. McIntire was operating on a level with Moses or could be compared to Moses' position and authority. God forbid such a thought! But for Buswell to indicate that, since Dr. McIntire kept silent about that particular matter, he was a party to such idolatry, indicates how matters are pressed to extremes.

Brethren, when is there going to be some balance, proper perspective; and why must matters be placed in such extremes as these in order to discredit a brother and to try to turn people against him?

Dr. Buswell writes: "I would do anything in my power to preserve Dr. McIntire's great testimony against apostasy, but to fail to protest against his serious wrong-

doing is not the way to preserve his testimony." Dr. Buswell has perverted, twisted, and misrepresented facts, and accused Dr. McIntire of wrong-doings of which he is not guilty. These things have been used, used even by Dr. Buswell, to hurt Dr. McIntire's great testimony against the apostasy. He wrote a statement which was sent to *Christian Life*, denouncing an "autocratic irresponsible fundamentalism." But when the Board convinced him that there was no reprisal and he was not removed at that time, he withdrew his statement. It was only the attitude of members of the Shelton Board regarding Dr. Buswell himself, personally, that made him talk about "autocratic irresponsible fundamentalism." But the fact that he withdrew the statement did not change the publication of it by *Christian Life* and its use against Dr. McIntire in his world-wide struggle against apostasy. The climax of this came in the Presbytery meeting on May 12, when Dr. Buswell refused to recognize the decency and the order of the Presbytery. The moderator repeatedly told him he was out of order, but he continued to make his speeches and to talk on. He made motions, he seconded motions. He simply would not behave himself and await the orderly appeal to a Synod where he could have full opportunity to explain his position and case against the New Jersey Presbytery. He did all this even before he had secured the stay, which, he argued, would have given him a vote. It is this type of activity on the part of Dr. Buswell and those associated with him, for many believe the things that he has been saying, that has caused so much damage in the "repudiation of Dr. McIntire."

But when Buswell says, "The Moderator insisted that the Constitution does not apply," he is stating the complete opposite of that which the moderator did insist upon in the Presbytery of New Jersey. The moderator was trying to uphold the constitution in the protections which it gives to the presbytery, to the local churches, and to the individuals in the presbytery, both majority and minority sides. It is indeed a strange political maneuver whereby Dr. Buswell thought that he could obtain a vote in a presbytery, whereby he could enter into discussions and debate simply because one-third of the Presbytery wanted him to have it. A minority of a presbytery can never, under any circumstances, admit a man to a presbytery and give him the right to vote on controversial issues, some of which even involve the status of that man himself. Buswell tried to vote on the moderator's ruling, which involved the action of the illegal meeting of the Presbytery at Synod when Dr. Buswell himself was received. By all standards of ethics, he should have abstained. The Presbytery refused constantly to count his vote or to recognize him as a member of the Presbytery.

The attempt to use the power of the Church through manipulation by a minority to gain its will is a serious question before the Church's Head and King, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Furthermore, the constitution clearly states that Synod can receive and issue all

(Continued on page 15)

Covenant College and Seminary

During the week of June 3, the *Bulletin* of Covenant College and Theological Seminary was received through the mail by various brethren. It announces that its faculty includes four of the professors of Faith Theological Seminary. A church bulletin, "The Inside News," Indianapolis, May 27, 1956, edited by the Rev. Edward T. Noe, a member of the Board of Directors of Covenant College, reports: "We have kept a full presentation of this news pretty well under wraps . . . but now all is ready for the widest possible newscasting." Mr. Noe announces that these Faith Seminary men, together with others, are on the faculty.

The time has now come when the members of the various Bible Presbyterian churches must see exactly what has happened in the formation of Covenant College, and, particularly, the Seminary, and what it means for the future of the denomination under such leadership.

1.

Covenant Seminary, a Synod-controlled institution, is being established by taking men away from an independent institution, Faith Theological Seminary. One of the charges which has been made is that the Synod-controlled agencies will be built up by tearing down independent agencies. This charge has been repeatedly denied, but now here is evidence. Obviously, a concerted effort was made to get men from Faith Theological Seminary to leave and to go to Covenant College.

Peter Stam, who is the dean of the new college, has also been serving as dean and registrar of Faith Seminary, and, on June 12, he wrote to the Board of Faith: "I should like to add that those of us who have accepted positions with Covenant College have done so only after long and serious consideration, and months after we had been urged to do so." Stam's resignation was dated May 14 and presented to the Board of the Seminary on May 22. Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., dean of Covenant's graduate faculty, though not connected with Faith, was seen around the Seminary many, many times over a period of weeks. He was seen going over files and papers. He held conferences with the men who have

now gone to Covenant Seminary. On the day the Seminary Board met, May 22, Dr. Buswell was on the campus and it was on that day that John Sanderson reports that he finally decided to accept the invitation to leave. There is little doubt but that plans for Covenant Seminary were actually discussed and unfolded within Faith Seminary's own buildings and property. And Buswell, representing Covenant, put pressure on the Faith men to leave, and may have influenced their conduct at Faith itself!

Faith Seminary is committed in its charter to the position that it will never be subject to the dictates of an ecclesiastical body. This clause was placed there by its founders after bitter experience through the years, and it was the position that the late Dr. J. Gresham Machen took when he left Princeton and helped form an independent seminary. The men who are now leaving Faith are going to a seminary which is Synod-controlled and under the complete and total direction of an ecclesiastical body.

Where is Covenant to get its students, since it has gotten such a valuable portion of its faculty from Faith? The answer is that there has been constant pressure in one form or another placed upon the students at Faith Theological Seminary to consider Covenant Seminary, to leave Faith and go to the new Synod-controlled institution! It is our opinion that it is not proper or right and that God's people will not honor this effort to undermine a great institution which is sound and faithful to its charter. It has not changed its policy or position in the slightest; and there ought not to be "proselyting" against it by those who have been keeping their activity "under wraps."

Is it right to build up a Synod-controlled institution by tearing down an independent institution? Is this the spirit of the people in the pews? Let God's people who believe in fair play answer that question before the Lord. Faith Seminary has been gloriously used to train men who are serving the Lord faithfully in many areas. It has been the primary source of ministerial supply for the Bible Presbyterian Church, and the last thing that the Bible Presbyterian Church ought to try to do, directly or indirectly through its

Synod-controlled institutions, is to undermine and tear down Faith Theological Seminary. Of course, men will openly deny that this is what they were doing, but such is the effect of their actions and conduct, and all can see it. When Faith Seminary is so committed to the independent position in its charter, how is it possible for men who have been committed to that position through the years to turn from that position to give their years of service now to an institution which is the direct antithesis of Faith so far as its control is concerned? Their action raises basic questions concerning their commitment to the position of the charter of Faith Theological Seminary.

2.

Covenant College now becomes the "official" Synod-controlled college and seminary of the Bible Presbyterian Church, and, as such, the institution is not free to have a position, opinion, or "conscience" of its own. The institution has to maintain the position of the Church which directs it, the position of the shifting majority! Its policies are determined by the Synod and its board of directors are not free on their own initiative or responsibility to differ with the position of the Synod. It is bound by its charter to the Synod. This means that the college is committed to indoctrinating the students in the belief that the Synod-control of the college is proper, best, and to be desired above other kinds of control, for Synod says so by directing it.

This means that the college is not and cannot be associated with the American Council of Christian Churches. The denomination has repudiated the American Council of Christian Churches and the school of the denomination, therefore, is not in a position to commend or favorably present the American Council of Christian Churches to its pupils. Leaders and spokesmen of the American Council of Christian Churches will not be free to visit the institution and to present the claims of the American Council of Christian Churches before the student body. Synod has withdrawn and repudiated the Council. As a matter of fact, if the school is consistent,

(Continued on page 16)

Buswell

(Continued from page 15)

appeals and complaints that "affect the doctrine or Constitution of the Church, and are regularly brought before it from presbyteries. . . ." The question of laying a matter on the table, such as was involved in the complaint from the New Jersey Presbytery in January, did not involve the doctrine or constitution of the church. It was purely a matter of parliamentary procedure which the Presbytery employed in its discretion in seeking to handle a problem which it was hoped in God's providence could be worked out peacefully. The Synod took these matters in its own hands and proceeded, without the Presbytery's presence to defend it-

self with the proper facts, to order the minority of the Presbytery to put them into effect at an illegal *pro re nata* meeting, the legality of which could not be established by an order from the Synod in illegally ordering the Presbytery to meet. This is the tangle to which Dr. Buswell has led the Church in his drive against Dr. McIntire.

We are confident that, if the Church can ever meet in a spirit of grace and love, and these issues can be soberly and honestly discussed and considered, many things will be resolved and God's people will be able to see the great injustice that has been done to Dr. McIntire as he has sought simply to stand for what he has always believed the Church has stood for in its freedom, its order, and its commitment to Christ. Sad and disastrous as it has been, an effort was

made by Dr. Buswell and those associated with him to make it appear that a pattern was being developed by a little clique which was cracking down on men, and they launched a holy crusade to deal with this through the power of the Church and they had to do it with political manipulating, exercising powers not given in the constitution, and, we believe, going beyond the constitutional restraints.

With this sort of development, what protection is there in the Church for a local church and minister against a group set on discrediting and driving them from the Church? What will it mean for questions of church property, too? Already "a fight" for the property has been going on in some churches!

Covenant

(Continued from page 15)

it will teach the pupils that they should not be interested in supporting the American Council or have anything to do with its rallies or its activities. Students will be told "officially" what is wrong with the ACCC, rather than why it merits support and prayer! The school and its students must be loyal to the actions of Synod.

We are stating this rather bluntly and frankly in order that God's people may realize what is now arising within the Bible Presbyterian Church. This is the position of some of the brethren who have turned away from independent agencies.

This means, too, that the College and Seminary must take the Synod's attitude in regard to the International Council of Christian Churches and its world-wide testimony of Christian co-operation. Leaders of the Council, including missionary leaders, will not be free to visit the Seminary and to present the testimony and activity of the ICCC. Synod has ruled against the Council. People will be sending their children to this school so that they can be instructed in the position and activity of the Bible Presbyterian Synod itself.

As is pointed out elsewhere in *The Free Press*, Dr. McIntire has been repudiated by the actions of Synod and it is perfectly obvious, in view of this, that he would not be invited to speak at the College to present the testimony of the ICCC and ACCC with which he is related and which the Synod has repudiated. If he were to speak in this Bible Presbyterian institution, it would be necessary for him to restrict his message to matters which the Synod approved, for to use the rostrum of the Seminary to present a program in defiance of the Synod's position would only cause dissension and conflict. We wonder if the Bible Presbyterians realize what has happened in the establishment of this school where liberty is going to be so completely restricted to the position of the Church? Knowing that the school is so committed to the denomination's position, anyone who went in and abused his liberty by attacking the denomination's position in the denomination's own sheltered institution would be denounced as being "ungentlemanly," "unethical," "a wrong spirit in not recognizing the propriety of the situation." The Bible Presbyterian College is not free to differ with the Synod which established it and directs it, and it is this condition which develops inevitably the desire on the part of those who lead the College to determine the position of the Church, so that there will be no conflict with the desires of the leaders of the College. Thus, the ecclesiastical machine develops to control Synod's policies. This is the inevitable development when Synod goes into the business of directing all the agencies.

In the section, "History and Purpose," of the college and seminary, the first sentence reads: "A logical product of the maturing testimony of the true church in our generation is COVENANT COLLEGE." The "maturing testimony of the true

church," according to the Covenant College position, is a church that controls the agencies.

But the "maturing testimony" of the true church in former generations did the same thing. The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., as it "matured," took over the control of all boards and agencies, and then the modernists took these over through their ecclesiastical machine. It was through the boards that the more liberal leadership began to run the church. When the Bible Presbyterian Church was formed, a break was made with this development of the past, and independent agencies were established.

There is far more to this than the ordinary person could possibly imagine. It does not look as though the Bible Presbyterian Church is maturing; it is pretty well split, torn, divided, churches are leaving it, pastors are at odds with their people, individuals are turning away in disgust, the world at large is laughing, and the modernists are blaspheming.

At the heart of this disruption was the drive for a Synod-controlled college so that there could be a repudiation of the independent agencies such as Faith Seminary. The development now reveals it all. This writer does not belong to the "party" in "the know," and until wraps are removed we do not know what the machine is planning!

The way the church was founded and has operated through the years is best. It is far better, freer. And the Lord's people must realize where the leadership that is now directing the Bible Presbyterian Church is taking the denomination. A college cannot be built on an anti-McIntire platform. A seminary cannot be carried on on a program of repudiating McIntire's leadership. What is the cause of this college? How has it been formed? It is, in the minds of some of its supporters, "a vindication of Rayburn."

Highland and Shelton Colleges stand faithful to the position of doctrinal purity of the visible church. The difference has been on the question of "the will of man." Dr. Rayburn led a group of students out of Highland. The solution of that problem, some thought, was a Synod-controlled college. And so the drive and the arguments developed to turn the mind of the Church so that there would be some support for such a college. It is one thing, however, to get the Synod to take some action; it is another thing to get the people to give the money, especially when they wake up to what has happened and what terrible confusion and disaster has been brought to the church over the struggle. When the school was incorporated, it was reported by one of the members of the board of directors that there were 34 students. The catalogue, which gives for the first time the actual student situation, reports only 12 students: no freshmen, three seniors. There are 10 special students.

Although the leaders of Covenant Seminary claim to represent the Bible Presbyterian Church, they represent only a portion of it. Though they got the action of Synod in support of it, there are large groups in the church which do not believe in it, will not support it, and feel that it represents a

force within the denomination which can only cause further division and strife. The hypocrisy and sham that exists on the part of some of the brethren is further indicated when they say they are in favor of both types of agencies but will endorse and approve only one and spend their time denouncing the independent agencies and arguing at length for the Presbyterian necessity for Synod-controlled agencies.

The next step in the unfolding of this attack upon the independent agencies will be the establishment of a Synod-controlled board of foreign missions and an effort made to win missionaries from the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions itself. When a Synod-controlled college or seminary endeavors to take away professors from an independent institution, urges them and sends their representative to the campus to put pressure upon them, spending much time in conversation with them, what will they not do to divert missionaries from the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions to their Synod-controlled board of foreign missions?

Let God's people in the Bible Presbyterian Church take heed. The independent agencies have been owned and blessed of God and they truly have been shown to be of His building. Why must they now be torn down when they are doing a good work for the Lord? Why must Covenant College and Seminary be built and established by an attack upon Faith Theological Seminary? Is that the way the work of the Lord is to be done in peace and for His eternal glory?

Do the families in the Bible Presbyterian Church want to send their children to an institution where they will get into the middle of a battle like this? Must they be taught against McIntire, Holdcroft, MacRae, Bennet? Let our children not be taught a narrow, sectarian view of living for Christ and promoting the Gospel. Let them not be taught that it is their obligation to do the will of Synod and to accept its judgments. Rather, let them be taught that the Word of God, the Word of God alone, must be their guide, and that synods and councils have erred and do err and are not to be made the rule of faith and practice.

As Covenant is established, there is to be an emphasis upon "the Church," the maturing church! As Faith has been carrying on its work through the years, the emphasis has been upon the Bible and Jesus Christ! When men are right toward the Bible and right toward Jesus Christ, they will have the right attitude toward His Church. But where the emphasis is upon the Church and loyalty to the Church's actions, then there is great danger of one's relationship to Christ and the Bible being in serious error. This error is already in our midst!

Let us stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free and be not involved again in any yokes of bondage! Let the Bible Presbyterians cherish their heritage of freedom and maintain that heritage of freedom, as they have enjoyed it until these attacks developed upon the free institutions. Covenant College is not free as a college;

(Continued on page 17)

History Repeated in Brazil

Included in this issue of *The Free Press* is the letter of Dr. Israel Gueiros and Miss Margaret Harden's statement which appeared in the *Christian Beacon* of June 28. It is being included in order that God's people may see just how the conflict in the Bible Presbyterian Church and the *Outlook* article are being used against a great soldier of the cross. As it is read, we trust that it will stir again, in the hearts of Bible Presbyterians, something of the early spirit which was theirs when the denomination came out of great tribulation and ecclesiastical fire, such as Dr. Gueiros is going through. Gueiros has been called to trial because he is starting an independent seminary and because he is associated with the International Council of Christian Churches.

The details of this heroic stand which he is making for the faith are given in a letter from him to Dr. McIntire, dated June 16.

"We are in the midst of a great battle for the Faith which centers here in Recife, Brazil!

"Since arriving here from the States on May 10, I have had no time to sit down and write to you because the fight has been so strong against me.

"As you know, I took the decision to start a new Seminary here, due to modernistic influences in the old one, and due to compromisers and inclusivists. I have been fighting modernism since I became a pastor, almost 25 years ago, and the fight grew stronger and stronger until I was put out of the Presbyterian Seminary in Recife six years ago. The pressure of the missionaries under the modernistic Boards in the U.S.A. was the cause of this. They, tried by all means to close my mouth, and make me not to speak against the modernism coming into the Presbyterian Church in Brazil.

"The Presbyterian Church in Brazil took the decision to withdraw from the World Council of Churches only to avoid a split which was about to take place if the Church did not do that. But their so-called 'equidistance policy' could not be maintained because the Boards are under the World Council influence. The Evangelical Confederation of Brazil and the International Missionary Council and the World Presbyterian Alliance are all a part of the Ecumenical Movement and a part of the World Council of Churches. The Presbyterian Church is working to unite with these organizations. That is the reason why it was

not possible to maintain the so-called 'equidistance.'

"The Presbyterian Church never took any decision against me during the last six years because my interest and connections with the ICCC were only formal and personal and therefore did not affect the material interests of the Presbyterian Church. However, just as soon as I had succeeded in raising some money in the U.S.A. to start a new fundamental Seminary, they discovered that my connections with the ICCC were a proof that I had broken my ordination vows! Immediately upon my return from the U.S.A. when I publicly advertised the Seminary, my Presbytery received orders to put me out. The president of the Church, Rev. Jose Borges dos Santos, Jr. (who was in the U.S.A. at the same time that I was), came all the way from Sao Paulo to attend the Presbytery and presented me with an ultimatum, saying that I had only two ways to follow: give up all my connections with the ICCC and the new Seminary, or leave the denomination. I did not want to leave the Church because I was trying to save the majority of the pastors in the Church who are as fundamental as I am, but who are not as well

(Continued on page 18)

Covenant

(Continued from page 16)

it is bound to the shifting majority of a Synod from year to year. Synod's program is to be taught in the college and that program is to be determined by an ecclesiastical machine which will run the Synod. Let Christian people face it. In our 19 years of history, the independent agencies have not changed—Synod has! In the present testimony, the independent agencies have proved their stand—and merit!

It is our experience that, when people have left the apostasy with all that is involved in the authoritarian power of the denominations, they want their freedom, individually and for their church. It is our opinion that the present group leading the Bible Presbyterian Church is limiting that freedom and taking it away in a measured degree from the members of the church.

Even to write this way is to incur the displeasure of the ruling clique in the church, and what possible justice could there be at the hand of a judicial commission or an assembly controlled by such a group, against one who would dare challenge so basically

PASTORS REFUSE TO ANNOUNCE ICCC-ACCC RALLY

Several Bible Presbyterian pastors in the East refused to announce the protest meeting in Philadelphia sponsored by the International Council of Christian Churches. This meeting was one of four great rallies protesting collaboration with the Red clergymen from Moscow and their coming to the United States as guests of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. The Philadelphia rally was the largest ACCC-ICCC meeting ever held in the Philadelphia area and attracted people from many denominational groups. The Bible Presbyterian pastors, including Robert Auffarth, pastor of the Newark Bible Presbyterian Church, Newark, Del., indicated that they refused to announce the ICCC gathering because the Bible Presbyterian Synod had withdrawn from the ICCC and they felt they should abide by the Synod's decision.

and expose so directly what is involved in what they have been doing?

You cannot build an institution by tearing down other sound and good institutions!

HEDEGARD OF SCANDINAVIA REPLIES TO BUSWELL

Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., Ph.D., dean of Covenant Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., and a vigorous opponent of the leaders of the ACCC and ICCC, in a letter to Dr. David Hedegard, ICCC leader of Sweden, June 24, sought to ferret out difficulties in the ICCC. He said:

"I have recently heard in a round-about way that you have been involved in difficulties with the International Council of Christian Churches. I am perfectly confident that you have not deviated in the slightest degree from the great principles, but I want you to know that we are praying for you and I should like to have news of the way in which the Lord is leading you in Scandinavia."

Dr. Hedegard replied:

"Thank you very much for your letter of June 24. I understand that you have heard rumors that I have had difficulties with the ICCC. I am glad to tell you that these rumors are completely false. In Scandinavia we have only had good experiences from our connections with the ICCC. The regional

(Continued on page 22)

History . . .

(Continued from page 17)

informed as I am. The hate in the hearts of those who felt a new Seminary was a real risk to the old Seminary caused them to do everything they could to smear me by telling several lies—as you Americans will discover.

"As soon as I returned to Recife, the Seminary published a paper called a 'Defense,' and also several articles whose purpose was to make me out a liar. Even a special edition of the mission paper, *O Norte Evangelico*, came out full of information about me, which also gave the report of the article about you from the *Outlook* [Southern Presbyterian Journal]. I became the most important name in the Presbyterian Church of Brazil—a man to be fought! Threats were made in a veiled way to several of our friends, and they sought to trick my friends into giving false testimony against me. When two or three pastors saw their names in the 'Defense' and how they had been tricked into seeming to go against me, they sent me special declarations of their solidarity with me and that they took the decision to start a new Seminary with me.

"A special meeting of the Presbytery of Pernambuco was called for June 14 to investigate me—but in reality they had already investigated me and had decided to put me out. The Presbytery which was called for investigation was transformed into a Tribunal and a move was made to depose me. The meetings lasted for two days—two days of questions and answers, or arguments and insults—two days of a stand for the Faith. I had prepared my defense to the false accusations against me, but they still gave me a list of questions to answer. On the afternoon of the second day, when I was answering questions, the first question asked was: 'Will you submit to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church of Brazil?' My answer was: 'Yes—to the Presbyterian Church of Brazil, faithful to the old principles, the symbols of Faith, and to the Word of God.' After much discussion,

this was interpreted as my being insubordinate to the Church, so that they could put me out. They fought terribly and tried to insult me in such a way that I could not stay, so I withdrew from the meeting, with the decision in my heart not to return any more ever. After my withdrawal, they transformed the *pro re nata* meeting of Presbytery into a Tribunal to depose me from my offices. The vote was eight to six, eight to depose me and six not to depose me. There was one vote which no one could read. They made so much fun of the poor man of his inability to write (perhaps he was excited as all were!) and were so rude and discourteous that when the second vote was taken it was 9 to 6 in my favor. Therefore nothing was done at this meeting.

"The pastor who was presiding in my place (I could not preside over a meeting called to investigate me, the president of the Presbytery—although on the first day I had opened the meeting, and led the devotional) got mad and left the chair, but the Presbytery took the decision to call another session of the Tribunal to meet on June 25 when I *must* be deposed. They are also trying to divide my local church but until today they succeeded in having only 12 positive votes against me.

"At the present moment, my local church, by the word of the vice-president, the Elder Dr. Zacarias Maia, also a medical doctor, told the members of the Presbytery that the church will not receive any other pastor but Dr. Israel Gueiros.

"A few pastors will come out with me in due time. I cannot tell how many churches and groups will withdraw from the old denomination. Once more, modernism has succeeded in dividing a strong and fundamental denomination by ways of infiltration and by supporting financially the Seminaries and pastors and many other causes in the denomination. If real Christian people in America would cease giving to their modernistic Boards, perhaps we poor Brazilian pastors could be freer to follow the Lord Jesus Christ. Where do the modernists get all their money?

"Our new Seminary, the Brazilian Theological Seminary, will start classes the first of August, 'BY FAITH, FOR THE FAITH.'

"Please publish this letter in the *Beacon* so that all my good friends may know the real situation I am facing here. I need your prayers. I need your sympathy and I need *especially some material help in a hurry* to face the problems over here.

"It is very evident that the Presbyterian Church of Brazil is being led into the World Council of Churches—the missionaries and the Boards are leading them in that direction. Modernism has infiltrated every part of our church life and the poverty of our people here in the North makes it almost impossible for them to react as they should and throw off the modernist yoke. Please remember that *Brazil is still a foreign mission field*. Our pastors are very poor. When the buildings in which the congregations worship, put up at such sacrifice to them, are claimed and taken by the modernists, the people are discouraged. When small churches are divided, it becomes impossible for the faithful remnant to support their pastors without some outside aid. We need money very badly to support the Seminary, and also to help our poor pastors who will be put out without their churches.

"In a country as large as Brazil, where post office and telegraph service is so uncertain, and where so many of our people are very uneducated, our pastors are not as financially independent as those in the States. It will take a long time for the news of what is happening here in Recife to get to all the churches in Brazil. We must have a regular newspaper to teach the issues and to present our 'Defense.' We will appeal to the Synod and also to the General Assembly so as to have as large a hearing as possible and so that all the humble Christians may know."

Miss Margaret Harden, one of the missionaries of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, writing from Recife, Brazil, June 16, says:

(Continued on page 19)

CAROLINA PRESBYTERY'S RESOLUTIONS

The following resolution was adopted by the Carolina Presbytery in Greenville, S. C., at its regular Spring Meeting, May 1, 1956. This resolution was submitted to the Presbytery by a Special Committee consisting of L. G. Gebb, E. A. Dillard, F. Shepperson in response to a verbal communication presented by P. P. Phillips. Following the adoption of this resolution, motion was made and carried that notification of this action be sent to all the clerks of presbyteries in the Synod.

WHEREAS, a "Bible Presbyterian Church Association" has been circularizing members, elders, and pastors of the Bible Presbyterian Church, seeking to destroy confidence in the governmental structure and disturbing the peace, purity, and unity of the Church;

AND WHEREAS, membership in such Association gives approval to its action;

AND SINCE the "Bible Presbyterian Association" holds constituent membership in the American Council and the International Council of Churches;

AND SINCE Synod is a deliberative body of the highest court of the Bible Presbyterian Church, and that court has found sufficient cause for withdrawing from the Councils;

AND WHEREAS, the "Bible Presbyterian Church Association" claims that a majority of Bible Presbyterians support their position of opposition to withdrawal from the Councils, yet they have not taken action to protest the 19th General Synod's action through the official courts of the church, nor sought to call a *pro re nata* meeting to reverse this action;

Therefore, Carolina Presbytery recognizes that no person can hold membership in the Bible Presbyterian Church and "Bible Presbyterian Church Association" at the same time.

And further, Presbytery would discourage any sort of membership in these Councils, since such membership would

Significance of the Resolution

The resolution that the Carolina Presbytery adopted is published in full as the Stated Clerk has sent the communication to the clerks of the other presbyteries of the Bible Presbyterian Church.

Let there be no mistake. Here is high-handed, arbitrary popery inside the Bible Presbyterian Church. This is the spirit of the brethren who are attacking the independent agencies.

1. We are told in the plainest of language that any sort of membership in the Councils "would seem to hold in contempt the highest court of our church." Anyone who goes into the Councils after the denomination has taken him out is in contempt of the highest court of our church! What is this highest court? What kind of authority do these men think it has? Since when do men have to obey it and bow down before it? Is it the lord of a man's conscience? When it comes out of the Councils, is it contempt for people to go back into the Councils of their own volition? This is the spirit of popery. It represents an attempt to give to the General Synod power which it does not have and an authority which men would like to have it have, so that they can get their own way since they control the highest court.

2. For a Presbytery to decree and recognize "that no person can hold membership in the Bible Presbyterian Church and the 'Bible Presbyterian Church Association' at the same time" is a usurpation of power and presuming to make laws by virtue of its own authority. The terms of communion in the Bible Presbyterian Church are faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to Him, and not obedience to the majority that is running the General Synod. The relationship of Christ's own sheep to His own church is seriously fractured by an arbitrary ruling that you cannot be in the Bible

seem to hold in contempt the highest court of our Church.

The following requested the clerk to record their names as voting in the negative: J. A. Pond, H. C. Fullerton, L. V. Bradley, W. O. Armes.

Presbyterian Church and the Bible Presbyterian Church Association at the same time.

Where is this kind of popery going to end? One thing is sure, those who enjoy the liberty which is theirs in Christ are not going to go along with this concept of the church. It was this very concept upon which the members of the Independent Board staked their ecclesiastical lives and refused to accept in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in the Mandate of 1934.

Slanderous and false accusations are made against the Bible Presbyterian Church Association. Nowhere and at no time has the Association sought "to destroy confidence in the governmental structure" of the Bible Presbyterian Church. It is a gratuitous assumption. The Bible Presbyterian Church Association has not disturbed the peace, purity, or unity of the church. This is a serious allegation. It has provided a lawful and practical way by which Christian people may continue their relationships to the American Council and International Council without being represented through the Synod. If any peace has been disturbed and any unity disrupted, it has been by a summary action of the denomination itself in taking everybody out of the ACCC, and particularly the ICCC, without any previous discussion or intimidation of the same! Christian people are not used to being pushed around, hauled around, and moved around with such alacrity by a church court.

It is this exaltation of the authority of the "highest court" that we found in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., and which those of us who helped form the Bible Presbyterian Church thought that we were getting away from, when we wrote into the constitution that the new denomination was a fellowship, entirely "voluntary, based only upon mutual love and confidence, and in no sense to be maintained by the exercise of any kind of force or coercion whatsoever."

Here in this resolution is clearly an attempt to coerce the people in regard to their relationships to the ICCC and ACCC.

(Continued on page 20)

History ...

(Continued from page 18)

Dr. Israel Gueiros "has been terribly mistreated and persecuted and has suffered a lot. . . . He and his church have faced the worst, which is losing all property and having nothing, and still wish to go all the way. But it is terrible not to have resources to fight with and get the word out to all the Christians. . . .

"He plans to start his Seminary the first of August. It is

a great undertaking and he needs much financial backing. . . .

"Don't believe all they say about us until you get the truth from us, for they have twisted words and even lied about us both. Our enemies had copies of ALL of the letters that both of us had written, *Beacon* articles, our Seminary advertising. I am sure that some Southern Presbyterians in the States began to question Darby Fulton, who in turn sent word down here to the missionaries. It was admitted in the 'Defense' of the old Seminary that Dr. Fulton had inquired of

these things from Rev. Langdon Henderlite, Southern Presbyterian missionary here. So they had all the information.

But these missionaries have gone to every length to hurt and wreck this new Seminary. It is evidently going to be a great instrument in the hands of the Lord! Please pray for the \$30,000 which we need for the property. It is ideal and will be a Seminary and Conference Center for our new churches. It is very necessary."

INDEPENDENT BOARD FOR PRESBYTERIAN FOREIGN MISSIONS WRITES TO ITS MISSIONARIES

TO MISSIONARIES SERVING UNDER
THE INDEPENDENT BOARD FOR
PRESBYTERIAN FOREIGN MISSIONS
AND IN THE BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCH

Dear Brethren:

In view of the controversy which has developed in the Bible Presbyterian Church over our Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, the Board feels that it is necessary to ask each of its missionaries two questions:

1. The Bible Presbyterian Church has recently withdrawn from the International Council of Christian Churches. The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions is affiliated with the International Council of Christian Churches and is a member of the Associated Missions of the ICC. This Board is committed to the position, testimony, and program of the International Council of Christian Churches. The president of the Board is president of the Associated Missions. Under these circumstances we would like to know whether you still feel that you can continue conscientiously and wholeheartedly to support the International Council of Christian Churches and to co-operate with its activities.

2. The 19th General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church has failed to approve and commend the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions to churches for their prayer and support: [This is the first time since the Bible Presbyterian Church has been in existence that the denomination has failed to recommend the Board itself to the Church.] The Articles of Association of the Bible Presbyterian Church included the Independent Board as an agency the Bible Presbyterian Church would support. In view of this occurrence we would like to ask whether you feel that you as a missionary are able to continue wholeheartedly to endorse and support this Board and to commend it to others for their prayers and support.

If there are missionaries whose consciences are unable to support and recommend the Board under which they now serve, we believe that they should let the Board know immediately.

The Board itself has not changed its position, activity, or its testimony. It is the object of attack and it is known that some who previously supported the Board are refusing to contribute because they are following the action of the 19th General Synod, and there is considerable discussion among Bible Presbyterian groups concerning the place and value of independent agencies. Since this Board's position in this field of activity has been clear from the beginning, we take this survey of our present

How About Church Property?

One question which is increasingly being asked is, How does all this affect the property of the church? Under the constitution as written, each church owns and holds its own property, and has the right to withdraw at any time for reasons sufficient to itself. However, what is increasingly concerning the Lord's people who are becoming informed is that the group which has taken over the "power" of the Synod and proceeded to break with the independent agencies is the group which led in seeking to have the constitution of the church amended, altering the provisions relating to property and liberty.

At the General Synod meeting in New York, held in Shelton College in 1952, proposals were presented for the amending of the constitution, all under the claim that only minor changes were being effected. One of these so-called "minor changes" was an alteration in the paragraph which deals with the right of the churches to withdraw at any time for reasons sufficient to themselves. This was to be changed to "withdraw at any time for Scriptural reasons." The question was raised, Who would determine the Scriptural reasons? Dr. McIntire, among others, realized the import of this change and the questions which it immediately presented, and vigorously opposed the proposed amendments. He was successful in leading in the laying aside of the attempt to amend the constitution on the grounds that it was going too far and would actually make a tighter church with more control in the hands of the church courts.

Following that Synod, there were those who actually said, "Give us time." Time has elapsed, and the Synod-controlled setup has come into being. Without constitutional amendments, Synod has arbitrarily usurped authority in directing a Presbytery to meet, ordering a church to divide itself and give letters to people who left it, and other things. If the group continues to run the Synod as it is now doing, it is our prediction that it will not be very long before the necessary amendments will be introduced, with the necessary two-thirds of the presbyteries, to make constitutional the desires which were expressed in 1952.

missionaries. We assure them that the Board will not send out any missionaries under the auspices of the Board whose consciences will not permit them to support and co-operate with the ICC, or whose consciences will not permit them to endorse and recommend the Board to others for their support and prayers.

The Board feels that this step is necessary just now in order that we might clarify the atmosphere and strengthen before the entire Christian world our testimony in the Twentieth Century Reformation movement of which the ICC and this Board are so definitely a part.

Yours faithfully,

THE BOARD

This would take away from the people the liberty to withdraw on their own terms, as is the case now, and place in jeopardy their property. If there is to be a tightly controlled Synod, that Synod cannot enforce its will without the aid of the well-known "property club." It must be made difficult and not too easy for people to withdraw. The argument is that they should not be permitted to leave too easily, or without listening to Synod or the Presbytery.

The liberty which was granted in the constitution to the local church and to the people who are the church is seriously in jeopardy in the present complexion and development of the Bible Presbyterian Church. How these leaders ever expect to get new people to join the church and to come in under such terms, especially when they have just fled from the tyranny which the modernists in many instances have exercised through their Synod-controlled or Assembly-controlled setup, is more than we can comprehend.

Let the people in the pews realize where the church is going!

Significance ...

(Continued from page 19)

threatening them with expulsion from the denomination, since they cannot be in the denomination and the Bible Presbyterian Church Association at the same time. What self-respecting Bible Presbyterian, who gives his money to support the agencies that the Lord has raised up, can possibly condone or approve of such abuse?

Then again, concerning this very issue, the constitution specifically says: "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."

How, then, could anyone be in contempt of Synod because he cannot accept its deliverances, etc.? One reason the brethren who are exalting Synod's power feel so strongly against *The Free Press* is that *The Free Press* is bringing such vital facts and information to the people throughout the Church, so they can take their stand with those who are seeking to preserve the Church according to its constitution, in liberty and in peace.

"To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. . . . Only let your conversation be as it becometh the gospel of Christ: . . . that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel."

— Philippians 1:21, 27.

As to Government Subsidies to Mission Hospitals in the Belgian Congo

BY DR. J. GORDON HOLDCROFT

On many occasions various critics of the American Council of Christian Churches have stated that the ACCC had falsely charged or deliberately implied that certain missions, and particularly the Africa Inland Mission, had examined or agreed to examine prostitutes for licensing, in order to obtain from the Government subsidies in aid of their medical work.

Actually these charges against the ACCC are completely erroneous, for the ACCC never charged any specific mission or hospital or missionary doctor with so doing.

What did occur is this:

The ACCC committed to one of its members the task of investigating the relationship of certain faith missions to the International Missionary Council—World Council of Churches' setup. In that investigation it was discovered that certain faith missions were members of the Protestant Council of the Belgian Congo. The Protestant Council is, in turn, a member of the International Missionary Council; and, as everyone knows, the IMC and the WCC have proclaimed themselves to be like "the two arms of one body," one operating on the mission fields, the other operating in the church field both at home and abroad.

I.

In the course of these investigations, the ACCC Committee discovered that in the Belgian Congo there was a Government system called "Medecin Agree" by which mission hospitals and doctors who met the Government requirements were appointed as "Medecin Agrees" and under that system each doctor connected with the recognized hospital, received a very considerable subsidy for his work. One paragraph in the contract form which the Government used was very objectionable, or should have been, to every ethical sense.

The revelation of this condition shocked many, but some charged that the ACCC had no scintilla of proof for its revelations. For instance, a statement recently put out by the pastor of the Wilmington Bible Presbyterian Church says: "A report presented to the American Council and recorded in the *Christian Beacon* discusses the alleged examination of prostitutes by mission directors of the Congo Christian Council. The evidence seems to be against any such thing ever having occurred and the mention of it by the American Council does not help to commend us to missions in the Congo Council which we want to win." This proof has been given in various ways before, but read this whole article and see for yourself. Some charged that the ACCC had falsely accused certain missions, or one specific mission, with stooping to unworthy practices. All we can say is that the ACCC never accused any mission or any doctor of being guilty of this thing, although we be-

lieve a perusal of the quotations from certain letters the ACCC has received will prove that some missions and hospitals were guilty. Which ones the ACCC never said and indeed for a long time never knew.

II.

In the immediately succeeding paragraphs of this article we make a number of statements which are borne out by letters, already referred to, which are in the possession of the ACCC, and in order that all may see that these statements are authentic, we include lengthy quotations from these letters. Also, each statement given below is numbered (1), (2), (3), etc., and these same numbers are inserted at the appropriate place in the quotations given from the letters. Thus each reader may see at a glance whether the statements, as numbered below, are justified by the information received. Possibly each reader may wish to read the entire quotations first, and then come back to this portion of the article and read the statements seriatim, and check each one against its like number inserted in the quotations from the letters.

(1) It was discovered that every hospital or doctor appointed under the "Medecin Agree" system was expected to sign a contract form, which form at one time (we do not know for how long a period) contained a paragraph by which the signer agreed to examine prostitutes for licenses "to ply their trade."

(2) It was discovered also that some hospitals and doctors evidently did sign such a contract.

(3) One mission at least refused to sign that contract and all their doctors were "dropped as Medecin Agrees and no subsidy with the exception of certain free drugs was received for some time."

(4) In the case of the one mission that refused the contract, theirs was "the only mission making application which refused to sign contracts stipulating that they would examine prostitutes."

(5) After some time this mission which had refused to sign the contract was offered by the Government a new contract form with the paragraph requiring them to examine prostitutes left out. This contract was signed and subsidies received again.

(6) After these conditions came to light, the Congo Protestant Council, at the urging of one of the missions, protested to the Government on this matter, and still another form of contract was prepared with the paragraph requiring the doctors to examine prostitutes for licenses omitted.

(7) Whether those who had signed the old contracts had new ones offered them is not known.

Letter June 26, 1952—J. Benton Bell

GIVING AID AND COMFORT TO THE ENEMY

The *Christian Century* of July 4 reports under the head, "Bible Presbyterians Withdraw From McIntire Councils"

"Conflict in the Bible Presbyterian Church over the leadership of Carl McIntire has ended in the withdrawal of the 8,000-member group from the American and International councils of Christian churches, which are led by McIntire. The Bible church was formed 19 years ago, a year after the break with the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., which also produced the 8,000-member Orthodox Presbyterian Church."

Some of the very words and phrases which the modernists have been using in attacking Dr. McIntire are now being employed by the Bible Presbyterian brethren against him.

A leader of the International Council of Christian Churches in Europe writes: "Our enemies are using these things very eagerly, as we have experienced already; and still I am convinced that we should not be dismayed."

to W. O. H. Garman (excerpt therefrom)

"About three years ago my wife and I made a trip to the American Presbyterian Congo Mission (Southern Presbyterian) station at Bulape in the Congo for medical aid for Mrs. Bell. Dr. Mark Poole of that mission, and at that time of that station, cared for us. We were there for several days, including a Sunday, due to Mrs. Bell's illness, and at the "white" service that Sunday they asked me to speak. I did and spoke on the apostasy, the WCC and the effect this was having on the mission fields of the world. I spoke of the situation in Kenya Colony and of the situation in the Congo and the threat the Congo Protestant Council made to us as a separatist mission. It caused quite a stir. (1, 4) Following this I had a long talk with Dr. Mark Poole who told me that in order to receive certain medical subsidy from the Government they were asked to inspect prostitutes (2) and of those missions seeking that subsidy, theirs was the only one who refused to do this and so were forced to carry that expense as a mission that would otherwise have been taken care of in the subsidy. Later we were at their Luebo Mission Station and I understood that they were still without that subsidy due to their refusal to inspect licensed prostitutes. I do not have his statement in writing [received later—see letter from Dr. Mark Poole, quoted below] and I do not know what missions were involved nor do I know whether the situation has changed since then.

"I am writing Dr. Poole—I understand that he is now on the field—and asking him for a statement regarding the situation as it was then and as it is now if any change has been made. If he gives me

(Continued on page 22)

In Belgian Congo

(Continued from page 21)

such a statement I shall forward a copy on to you."

Mr. Bell did write to Dr. Poole and Dr. Poole replied as below—Letter July 8, 1952. Mark Poole to J. Benton Bell (from Bulape) [excerpt therefrom]:

"Your letter of June 26th arrived today and I hasten to give you the information you ask for. You are correct in our attitude toward subsidy for the medical work. (1) We refused it when the new contracts had a paragraph requiring the medicin Agree to examine prostitutes in relation to their licenses to ply their trade. (3) All of our doctors on the field were dropped as Medecin Agrees and no subsidy with the exception of certain free drugs was received for some time. (5) After that, the Government offered our doctors new contracts with the paragraph requiring us to examine prostitutes left out. We accepted the new contracts and all of the doctors are now again Medecin Agree on our Mission. (2, 7) Whether the doctors who signed the old contracts had new ones proffered to them, I don't know. (6) After the stand that the A.P.C.M. took on the matter, the C.P.C. made a very strong protest to the Government concerning the practice. I have since been informed that the Government has done away with the whole program so I suppose it will not be any issue with new doctors who wish to be Agrees. The subsidy now amounts to 5,500 francs a month with certain travel expenses on top plus the drugs amounting to about 35,000 francs a year. This is for each doctor. Since the natives pay taxes to the Government, we feel that the Government should rightly help with their medical care to this extent. At no time has the Government attempted to tell us how to use the money. There has been no interference with our evangelistic work associated with the medical work."

III:

In addition to the information contained in the letters from which quotations are given above, the ACCC also learned, eventually, the following facts:

In August of 1954, at the request of Dr. Peter Stam, Jr., a meeting of certain men who were available was called and this whole matter, so far as information was in hand then, was discussed. At one of the sessions of that meeting Dr. Stam stated, and gave the doctor's name, that one Africa Inland Mission missionary doctor, in order to obtain Government subsidy, had signed the contract which stipulated that he must examine prostitutes for licensing, but had taken his pen and drawn a line through the word "prostitutes."

In addition to this, at that same meeting another letter was submitted by the Rev. Marion H. Reynolds, from an Africa Inland Mission missionary, dated August 20, 1952, in which this man said: "There are subsidies. I am one of those receiving money for the

medical census and examinations in the villages . . ." What this man did in regard to the objectionable requirement is not known, but at least he wrote a long letter in which he admitted that he received subsidies and used them in his work and he did not state that he had crossed out the word "prostitutes" or had in any way objected. Of course, since his letter is dated August 20, 1952, it is possible that this was after the Government had changed its policy on this matter, for Dr. Mark Poole, writing on July 8 of that same year, states, "I have since been informed that the Government has done away with the whole program so I suppose it will not be any issue with new doctors who wish to be Agrees." However, it is also possible that this man signed his contract before July 8, 1952.

IV.

In conclusion, we believe that the evidence given in the above letters and statements is irrefutable and completely convincing that there was such a contract, and that some mission doctors accepted and signed it. It ought to silence permanently the charges that the ACCC had no proof for its revelations.

Further, the revelations made by the ACCC re-enforced the courageous protest made by Dr. Mark Poole and by his mission, the A.P.C.M. After these revelations were made the A.I.M. also, we understand, raised the question in the Congo Protestant Council with the result that that Council took up the matter with the Government and the Government finally drew up a revised contract and put it into use.

In all this, the Rev. J. Benton Bell, Dr. Mark Poole, and the A.P.C.M., and Dr. W. O. H. Garinan, and the ACCC deserve the commendation of all right thinking Christian people rather than the condemnation that has been visited upon some of them, for these, first, and in the face of real opposition took up this matter and persisted in their efforts until this shameful situation was corrected.

HEDEGARD . . .

(Continued from page 17)

conference, held in Jonkoping, Sweden, last summer, was a blessed conference. It brought together Bible-believing groups and individuals in Scandinavia who have not earlier met, and it raised a standard for the truth.

Perhaps the rumors you have heard have reference to the Swedish Bible League ("For Biblical Faith"). The Danish correspondent of the *Christian Century* has reported in that paper about some difficulties in this organization. I formed this League 20 years ago and I have been the editor of its bi-monthly all the time (without any remuneration). By and by some members of the board have taken a more or less compromising position. One of these men, formerly my close friend, started a bitter propaganda against me, and succeeded so far that about half of the board followed him. They de-

"Mandate of 1956"

The "Mandate of 1956" directing a special committee of Synod to meet with officers of the Committee on True Presbyterianism and then to initiate charges, judicial discipline, against the men in their respective presbyteries, if the committee deems it necessary, has brought a refusal to meet from men on the Committee for True Presbyterianism. The last issue of *The Free Press* discussed in full the Mandate of 1956.

The Rev. F. Burton Toms, a member of the Committee on True Presbyterianism, writes:

"We should not meet with the commission of the supposed (April) 'Missouri' Synod.

"Like Paul before Festus (Acts 25:10) we need not stand trial before any lesser group of leaders than the highest court of hearing. If the Synod wants to know what we maintain, let it hear us at a regularly timed meeting, with a proper proportion of elders present.

"Messrs. Gebb, Horner, Rayburn, and Dillard cannot represent Synod to us, nor report on us to Synod. We'll be heard ourselves, or not at all."

manded that I should take a softer attitude, attack nobody, etc. Of course, I declined to listen to this. Then these men left the board, went to the big modernist Swedish paper and gave it their criticisms of me. Of course, this paper got a real day of triumph. But I must add that no real harm was done to the League. We got many new subscribers.

"This modernist paper had another day of triumph some time ago when it could report that the Bible Presbyterian Church had repudiated the ICCC and Dr. McIntire. You will understand how these actions of the B. P. Church are used everywhere in the world against individuals and organizations who have connections with the ICCC. The modernists rejoice, the Bible-believers are confused. The action of the B. P. Synod is a terrible blow dealt to all persons and groups who have connections with the ICCC. The Synod must have understood this and felt that we deserved this blow.

"In Mr. Gray's excellent periodical, THE WITNESS, I read some time ago that Dr. Laird Harris was elected moderator of the Synod. I have always respected Dr. Harris as a fine and honest man, and I wrote him a letter but have got no answer.

"I hope that the action of the Synod has nothing to do with the propaganda from Mr. Francis A. Schaeffer. He has first introduced the ICCC in Europe, he has been a guest in my home, and I have introduced him to my friends in Scandinavia. But in 1954 I found that he had become an enemy of the ICCC, doing everything within his power in order to undermine it (although he maintained: 'Our principles are right'). I was deeply hurt to find that he gave his criticisms also to the Scandinavians who I had brought to the Philadelphia conference. Nothing good could be promoted in such dishonest ways.

(Continued on page 24)

Ketcham Explains ACCC Statistics

Dr. Robert T. Ketcham, national representative of the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches and chairman of the Committee on Statistics of the American Council of Christian Churches, on May 9 issued a sworn statement before a notary public relative to statements and statistics made by Dr. Robert Rayburn concerning statistics and Dr. Ketcham. The full text of the letter follows:

May 9, 1956

Dr. J. Gordon Holdcroft
246 W. Walnut Lane
Philadelphia 44, Penna.

Dear Dr. Holdcroft:

You advised me recently that at the meeting of the Bible Presbyterian Synod in St. Louis, Missouri, in April, several statements were made concerning me by Dr. Robert Rayburn. You stated that on the floor of the Synod, discussing the matter of American Council statistics, he said, "We haven't yet got an answer thoroughly honorable to present to the American public."

You advised me that Dr. Rayburn also said that at Grand Rapids, Michigan, last fall several Bible Presbyterian men came to me to discuss this matter, and that in reference to a paper he (Rayburn) had written, I had made the remark, "Everything you said in that paper is true." You advised me that Dr. Rayburn reported that he then said to me, "Well then, why haven't you done anything about it?" to which I was supposed to have replied, "If we did, it would be under pressure." You further advise that Dr. Rayburn said that I had admitted in his presence that the American Council's statistics were not completely honest.

As I analyze these reported remarks by Dr. Rayburn, they seem to present three propositions: (1) that the American Council statistics were dishonest, and that I had so admitted; (2) that I had stated that everything he said in a certain article he wrote was true; and (3) I had declared that I had done nothing about it because I would not do so under pressure. To these three propositions I would like now to address myself and in doing so, shall seek to be as brief as possible, but I shall not sacrifice clarity for brevity.

In reference to the statistics of the American Council of Christian Churches I simply do not know what more I can do or say than I have done and said for the last two or three years since I have been chairman of this statistical committee. I went back through the files and secured the listings of all of the various membership classifications in the American Council as of 1948, using as the figures the actual reports from the various classifications of membership involved.

In Boston, in 1954, I made a full report, going back to the figures reported by the various membership bodies in 1948. I then took the figures which had been given me by these same bodies in 1953, which was my first year as chairman of this committee, placing the 1953 figures over against

the 1948 figures, and listing under two separate columns the gains or losses for each body. I then gave a supplemental report for the year 1954, based upon the actual reports from various membership bodies. In that report, which comprised some ten pages, I went into extensive detail, analyzing every membership classification, quoting at length from letters received from some membership bodies whose classification had been questioned, explained in detail the basis for the figures represented in individual auxiliary membership, and making certain recommendations for the gradual elimination of that membership classification. This report was adopted unanimously by the entire voting delegation in that Council meeting. I could not expect Dr. Rayburn to be too accurate concerning his statements about this report as he walked out of the meeting in the midst of its presentation. However, so far as I know, the rest of the Bible Presbyterian delegation voted to accept it, and the Rev. Max Belz stood to his feet, and expressed his exceedingly great appreciation of the work I had done, and the fairness and clarity of the report I had rendered. All subsequent reports which I have given at the annual meetings have been based upon the actual figures in the reports given me by the constituent bodies, and upon the handling of other membership classifications as was voted in the Boston meeting.

It is a matter of record that Dr. Rayburn has never ceased his representations that the statistics of the American Council, as I present them, are not true, and that as a Council we are not presenting an honest report. Apparently he has kept at this until he has convinced a sizable number of his Bible Presbyterian brethren that such is the case. Naturally I cannot be responsible for Dr. Rayburn's continued activities along this line. I can only be responsible for the accuracy of the statistical reports. If Dr. Rayburn and some of his Bible Presbyterian colleagues insist that the reports are not correct, then I can only point out that all the other 13 constituent bodies were unanimous in their statement that they were and are correct, and at no meeting of the American Council has Dr. Rayburn been able to persuade even a majority of his own delegation to question the honesty and accuracy of the reports. Surely Dr. Rayburn does not mean to imply that the ability to be honest and to detect dishonesty rests solely with a minority of the Bible Presbyterian delegation.

Now, concerning the second proposition, namely, that I had agreed that everything he said in a certain article was true. The article to which Dr. Rayburn evidently referred was one from his pen appearing in the *Bible Presbyterian Observer*, issue of November, 1955, entitled, "American Council of Christian Churches—Its Statistics."

At the 1955 fall meeting of the American Council in Grand Rapids, Dr. Rayburn and three or four of his Bible Presbyterian brethren came to my hotel room to discuss various matters. It was during that meet-

ing there in my room that the article by Dr. Rayburn was discussed. He declares that I admitted that everything he said in it was true. Here are the facts. I had with me a copy of that issue of the *Observer* carrying numerous marginal notes which I had placed on it in my office back in Chicago. It was this marginal-noted issue which I had in my hands during the discussion. Let me give you some of those marginal notations and the text of Dr. Rayburn's article to which they apply, and then see if by any stretch of one's imagination I would be at all apt to say to Dr. Rayburn that everything he had said was true. In that article Dr. Rayburn said, "There followed, however, on the Boston Convention floor a lengthy explanation of how the original figures had been reached, all of which seemed to be an attempt to defend the honesty of those who had compiled them and published them." On the margin I had made this notation—"Not so!" It was an attempt to show that the figures were right—not necessarily a person!" Dr. Rayburn's article says, "... however, any questioning of the right of the Council to count certain reported figures was immediately seized upon as a challenge of the personal integrity of ACCC leaders. This immediately involved the group in personalities and the principles under discussion were overlooked." Opposite this remark on the margin I had noted the following, "We counted only as ordered by the constitution." The constitutional requirements for counting the various classifications of membership had been written into it from the beginning. If the Council did not have a "right" to thus count them it seems strange that not even Dr. Rayburn or any of his Bible Presbyterian colleagues raised a question about it for a period of over ten years!

Dr. Rayburn, in his article under discussion, objects to the Council including in their constituent membership figures, certain individuals who are included in the statistical reports from the constituent bodies. He refers to the Sunday school enrollment of some of the denominations and condemns the American Council for including them in their constituent membership. He says, "For example, the Bible Presbyterian Church is listed as providing 15,662 of the American Council membership in this category. Our statistician reported that we had only 8,428 actual members and 7,234 additional people in our constituency to whom we minister in some way." He then asks the question, "How can people who are not members of the Bible Presbyterian Church be counted as actual constituent voting members of the American Council as Bible Presbyterians?" He then adds, "Many do not feel they should be counted, but if counted at all certainly not in this category."

On the margin of the paper which I had in that room that day I have the following notation: "Then why do you include them in your report?"

At this point I would like to quote from the statistical questionnaire which goes out

(Continued on page 24)

Ketcham ...

(Continued from page 23)

to all constituent bodies every year. Question No. 4 reads as follows:

Total present membership of your churches. (By "present" we mean the last available figures in your possession. By "membership" we mean only those who are actually members of your churches.)

Question No. 5 reads as follows:

Number of other "members." (By "other members" we mean those whom you may consider as active in your church, but who are not as yet actually members. For instance, in some denominations it is customary to include in their statistical figures their entire Sunday school. Other denominations do not. If your group is one who does, then we should like, if possible, this figure under Question No. 5, but not included in Question No. 4.)

Nothing could be plainer in the world than the fact that if the actual constituent bodies themselves do not consider their Sunday school in their total statistics, then all they have to do is to leave Question No. 5 blank. In the 1953 statistical report, signed by the Stated Clerk of the Bible Presbyterian Synod, under Question No. 4, appears the figure 8,222. Under Question No. 5 appears the figure 8,416, which makes a total of 16,638.

In the statistical report of 1954, the Bible Presbyterian Synod report, signed by the same Stated Clerk, under Question No.

4, has 8,428. Under Question No. 5, they have the figure 7,234, or a total of 15,662.

In 1955, the report from the Bible Presbyterian Synod leaves the answer to Question No. 5 blank, and under Question No. 4 has a figure of 8,869. It is as clear as daylight that the Bible Presbyterian Synod, over the signature of their own Stated Clerk, had been carrying their Sunday school constituency in their report to the American Council—this in spite of the fact that the questionnaire calls specific attention to the fact that some denominations do not do this, but that if the group in question is one which does, then both figures should be given. Dr. Rayburn severely condemns the American Council for carrying this classification of Bible Presbyterians, and then he raises the question, "How can people who are not members be counted in the American Council statistics?" The answer is self-evident. Just don't include them in the denominational statistics. But as long as the denomination does so, where is the justification for impugning the honesty of the American Council? Apparently the Bible Presbyterians finally acted on this matter, as their 1955 statistical report leaves Question No. 5 blank. Dr. Rayburn's article raises a question about the classification of the Fellowship of Brethren Churches in the American Council statistics and says, "This is another item which has distressed many. It should be corrected." On the margin I had already made this note: "I told you in Boston in my report that it would be." Of course, since Dr. Rayburn walked out on the report in Boston he probably didn't hear that.

Other marginal notations appear on my copy of the *Bible Presbyterian Observer*

but I have given sufficient quotations which make further discussion unnecessary. Let it be remembered that these notations were placed on this copy of the *Observer* in my Chicago office, and taken with me to Grand Rapids for the express purpose of either discussing them with Dr. Rayburn personally, or, should I find it necessary, to take them to the public floor of the Convention.

Now the question I would like to raise is this: "Can anyone possibly conceive the idea that, sitting in that hotel in Grand Rapids, with this article before me, with all of these notations of error and misstatement staring at me from the margins, that I would be apt to say to Dr. Rayburn, that everything he said in the article was true? I said no such thing. Neither do I have the slightest memory of making any statement, or referring to any such thing as "being under pressure." It seems to me that Dr. Rayburn is hardly qualified to be an authority on what I have said or haven't said. He walked out on my report in Boston in the fall of 1954. He walked out of the discussion in Memphis, Tennessee, in the spring of 1955. He walked out of the sessions of the Council meeting in Grand Rapids in the fall of 1955, and when I was guest speaker at the meeting of the Presbyterian Synod in St. Louis in June of 1955, he walked out of the meeting, and did not listen to my address.

This letter, I think, covers the case of the misrepresentations of Dr. Rayburn at the April Synod meeting.

With every good wish, I am

Yours and His,
ROBERT T. KETCHAM

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. 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 may, by the

signing of the following form, 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.

Fill in the form and mail it to

Box 218

Collingswood 7, N. J.

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

HEDEGARD ...

(Continued from page 22)

"Mr. Schaeffer stressed especially the lack of spirituality in the ICCC. I agreed: we need all to be more spiritual, but when I found out what Mr. Schaeffer was doing I told him: 'You work for spirituality in unspiritual ways. . . .'

"Dear Dr. Buswell, you will understand that the action of your Synod has caused the greatest harm to the cause of Christ in many parts of the world. Is it completely impossible that these actions could be reconsidered?"

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