

B.P. PRESBYTERY OF NEW JERSEY SENDS LETTER TO LAKELAND SYNOD

129 E. Palmer Avenue
Collingswood 7, N. J.
May 28, 1958

22nd General Synod
Bible Presbyterian Church
Lakeland, Florida

Rev. Robert Hastings, Stated Clerk

Fathers and Brethren:

The Presbytery of New Jersey of the Bible Presbyterian Church addresses you in the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. We come to you out of a deep sense of grief and concern for the public scandal which has been brought to the name of the Bible Presbyterian Church. We come, out of a deep sense of humility and brotherly love, with an appeal to you to make right the grievous wrongs which we believe you, in recent synods which you recognize, have done against this Presbytery, its churches and ministers.

In view of the conflict which has brought about such heartbreak in our Bible Presbyterian Church and the recognition and non-recognition of different synods, we feel that some record of our grievances should be formally presented, with an appeal that they be made right before the Lord, in the light of His blessed commandments.

1. This Presbytery has maintained its existence since its formation before the first General Synod and has carried on its work under the name—Presbytery of New Jersey of the Bible Presbyterian Church.

On Tuesday, May 4, 1957, the *Courier-Post*, published within the bounds of this Presbytery, carried a three column, front page story, "Rev. McIntire Is Dropped by the New Jersey Bible Presbytery." The first sentence read, "The Rev. Dr. Carl McIntire, pastor of the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood, has been dropped as a member of the New Jersey Presbytery of the Bible Presbyterian Churches." Similar stories in other papers in the community reported that other members of the Presbytery were also dropped from the denomination. They included—Charles Richter, Earle White, Joseph Misicka, John Fulton, Emanuel Peters, Dana Chrisman, Paul Abbott.

This open, public attack upon members of the Presbytery of New Jersey came as the result of an administrative decision of a synod which you recognize. A minority element in the New Jersey Presbytery had filed a complaint against administrative acts which your synod proceeded to receive. But

(Continued on page 10)

Union of B.P.'s and R.P.'s

By CARL McINTIRE, D.D.

The announcement that leaders in the Columbus Synod have agreed to a union of the Bible Presbyterian Church with the Reformed Presbyterian Church (General Synod) represents a development, the full import of which should be understood by all Bible Presbyterians.

According to the statistics published in the *Year Book of American Churches*, 1958, the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America (General Synod) is "a group of Presbyterians, carrying on the Covenanter tradition of Scotland, holding to restricted communion and to the principles of 'dissent from all immoral civil institutions.'" It consists of 11 churches and an inclusive membership of 1,279, 11 Sunday schools with a total enrollment of 1,117, and ordained clergy having charges are listed as 5. This information, according to the *Year Book*, was of the latest statistics, 1953.

1. The first observation, therefore, which must be made is that the Reformed Presbyterian Church with its 11 local churches is to be absorbed into the much larger group recognizing the Columbus Synod, but that the name "Bible Presbyterian" is to be dropped and the new body established will continue with "Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America (General Synod)" as the name.

2. The Reformed Presbyterian Church has never identified itself with the American or the International Councils of Christian Churches. In fact, the *Bible Presbyterian Reporter*, March, 1958, in an explanation of the Reformed Presbyterian Church (General Synod) by the Rev. Harry Miners, states in reply to the question, "What mission program does the Reformed Presbyterian Church maintain?" that the Rev. Gordon R. Taylor "has recently been appointed student director for North India by the Evangelical Fellowship of India." The Evangelical Fellowship of India is the National Association of Evangelicals' or-

(Continued on page 11)

Pray and work for the
FOURTH PLENARY CONGRESS
INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF
CHRISTIAN CHURCHES

to be held in Petropolis, Brazil,

August 12-21, 1958

PLAN TO ATTEND

Write at once for information and
reservations to

Transportation Committee
Box 36, Collingswood 7, N. J.

HOLDCROFT GIVES DETAILED REPLY TO WORLD PRESBYTERIAN MISSIONS

By J. GORDON HOLDCROFT, D.D.

On February 24, 1958, the Rev. William A. Mahlow released a letter addressed "to those who may have questions concerning the accusations made against missionaries and employees of World Presbyterian Missions, Inc., in the *Free Press* of January 31, 1958." In that letter he says: "My first inclination has been to put it aside and simply commit the brethren who wrote it to the mercy of God. God can forgive and overrule the false accusations and the misrepresentations." He also states farther down, "Such grave injustices have been done in this *Free Press* that I feel I must correct at least some of them." Also the letter has many accusations of that nature. Mr. Mahlow states that his reading of the *Free Press* left him with a heavy heart. I wish to state that my reading of his letter has left me with a heavy heart because of the accusations and misrepresentations it contains, and also because similar charges have been made previously without any real foundation whatever.

THE MATTER OF COMITY

In this reply I shall follow very largely the presentation made by Mr. Mahlow, although to do that will require the mention of certain matters several times. The first question which he raises, under the general head of principles, deals with the subject of comity. It is quite plain that Mr. Mahlow thinks that The Independent Board has been inconsistent and also that it refuses to others the freedom it claims for itself. Both ideas are entirely mistaken.

The basic idea of comity is courtesy, consideration. A broader meaning is agreement, in which sense it has come to be used in political and ecclesiastical circles as a general, formal undertaking on the part of a number of nations or churches to respect each others' territories, laws, and usages.

In mission and church circles, it denotes a general agreement by which the missions or churches involved grant to each one an exclusive area, each mission or church agreeing to keep out of all the areas assigned to or belonging to others. Such comity agreements have been fostered by the International Missionary Council, if not originated by it. With that Council The Independent Board has no working agreement whatever.

This Board has never entered into any such comity agreements. Two supposed cases to the contrary have recently been cited, one by Mr. Mahlow in his letter of

(Continued on pages 2-8)

HOLDCROFT ...

(Continued from page 1)

February 24, the other in a letter written by an ex-missionary. These two cases are Peru and Kenya. Let us see what there is to these allegations.

As to Kenya, the then general secretary of the Africa Inland Mission informed the I.B.P.F.M. through Dr. Holdcroft that the A.I.M. had claimed a district in Kenya which for 25 years it had hoped to occupy, but had never been able to do so. He said that they would be glad to see The Independent Board enter that territory if it could man it. Practically, that was a notice to us that that area was unoccupied by anyone and had never had an adequate opportunity to hear the Gospel. On that suggestion and invitation therefore The Independent Board entered that area. The A.I.M. was not then in the Kenya Christian Council which was linked with the International Missionary Council, which in turn, as soon as the World Council of Churches was organized, announced that it, the I.M.C., was like a second arm of the one body. But the A.I.M., not being a member of the Kenya Council, there was no hindrance from that standpoint and we looked forward to very happy relations with the A.I.M. Later, to The Independent Board's surprise and disappointment, the A.I.M. rejoined the Kenya Christian Council under conditions practically the same as those that had led it to withdraw from it. Why they did this we have never been able to understand. We regretted their action and remonstrated with them and relations became somewhat strained. But our entering that field was not a comity agreement; it was the entering into an unreached territory in response to a friendly suggestion.

As to Peru, the quotations which Mr. Mahlow makes from letters and publications of The Independent Board are all correct. However, the case in regard to Peru and our presence in the two "Departments" of Ayacucho and Huancavelica is not as represented; and, as will be shown, The Independent Board has not taken the position which Mr. Mahlow thinks it has.

The Independent Board was given to understand originally that the Evangelical Union of South America, and particularly the Peruvian Evangelical Churches, were really Presbyterian in everything but name; so, in the early days of the Board's contact with the E.U.S.A. and with the Peruvian Evangelical Churches, after consultation with them the Board entered the two Departments. This was, at the time, agreeable to both the E.U.S.A. and The Independent Board.

Then, to its surprise, The Independent Board found that the Peruvian Evangelical Church was not Presbyterian. It was immersionist, for one thing. It did not countenance infant baptism and there were other

matters. But by that time the Board had become established in Ayacucho. When the Board told the E.U.S.A. that it could not continue to work toward the building up of a union church with it on these lines, the secretary of the E.U.S.A., a Dr. McNair of Great Britain, asked that the Board withdraw from these Departments. Being established there, the Board declined. Later, much later, headquarters were moved from Ayacucho to Huanta.

That is all there is to the claim that we have entered into comity arrangements. These two arrangements are far removed from the general comity agreements with all sorts of missions—sound, middle-of-the-road, modernist—to which the Board is and always has been opposed. The Board does seek to maintain friendly relations with sound missions wherever it is at work, and it has consulted with such missions before entering new fields. But that is a different matter.

WHAT IS HAPPENING IN PERU

Now, as to the claim that we demand for ourselves what we refuse to grant others, the case as between W.P.M. and the I.B.P.F.M. is far from that. We would not deny W.P.M. access to that mountain region. The number of Quechua Indians there who need the Gospel has been estimated all the way from 500,000 to perhaps a million. Certainly we would not keep the Gospel from them.

But what is happening is this. Despite every claim made by Mr. Mahlow, the Peru missionaries not only wrote all the letters that are quoted in whole or in part as from them in the *Free Press* of January 31, but in addition, in a conference three of them had with the executive committee of the I.B.P.F.M. on February 22, 1958, they advanced the very irrational and hitherto unheard of claim that the I.B.P.F.M. as such has no right to consider the work in Peru as its work in any sense. They said to us that the work is the Holy Spirit's to which of course we agree; but they claimed that under the Holy Spirit it was primarily the missionaries' work and not that of the Board at all. Then, claiming it to be the missionaries' work, they claim also the right to leave one Board and join another, or do with the work anything that seems good to them and to the Holy Spirit whom they profess to serve in this matter as in others. The function of the Board, therefore, in their opinion, is simply to raise money and send it to the missionaries. That would make of the Board merely a transmitting agency. There are such agencies, but that certainly is not what this Board was set up to be.

THE BOARD'S POSITION VERSUS THE PERU CLAIM

We tried to show these men that The Independent Board has a Charter and a Manual, which bind us *all*—Board, missions, and missionaries—to very definite principles of work. Both the Board and its missionaries

took a solemn pledge to observe that Charter. We also tried to show that therefore Board, missions, and missionaries are all *an organism*, and no one party, therefore, can say to the other, "I have no need of you," or, "You are of no concern to us." I do not for a moment think that even W.P.M. would agree to that idea. But we made no impression upon these men and they continued to claim that the work and the responsibility for it was all theirs and that therefore they could do as they pleased with it and turn it over to whomsoever they chose, to obtain support.

We have said that that position is irrational. Certainly all would admit that the Board originally formulated standards, initiated the work, appointed the missionaries, including every one of those who have resigned, sustained the missionaries in the field, made suggestions from time to time as to how the work could be strengthened, that is, brought into fuller alignment with what appeared to be the Holy Spirit's guidance and the Board's standards.

To be sure, the missionaries made contributions of various kinds. They preached the Gospel, they taught and sought to train converts, they raised some of the money, they suggested lines of effort and advance. But every new policy, every increased expenditure of money, they very well knew needed Board approval, such propositions coming up perhaps from the individual missionary to the mission, then, when passed upon by the mission, they came to the Board and had to have Board approval before they could be put into effect.

Why is this the process followed? Because the Board is and must be the ultimate guardian of the principles and purposes enunciated in the Charter and must be the final authority in financial expenditure. No Board, unless it be merely a collecting and disbursing agency, could stand on any other principles. Both the Board's Charter and its Manual are very clear on this point and all our missionaries know it. We repeat, we do not believe that World Presbyterian Missions, nor any responsible Board, would accept the surprising theory advanced by these resigned Peru missionaries that a Board has so little responsibility for, or claims upon, the work that it becomes merely a financial transmitting agency.

WHAT HAS BEEN TAKEN AWAY?

In the next section of Mr. Mahlow's letter (*I. i B. Board Proprietorship*) at the head of page 2 there are several important questions raised. The first is that of The Independent Board's use of the term "our work." Mr. Mahlow thinks that the Board has used this term "in exclusive terms." What we have said above in regard to the Board, missions, and missionaries as being an organism and that no one party therefore can say to the other, "I have no need of you," ought to be sufficient answer on this point. We have not used the term "our work" in

"exclusive terms"; we have used it all through the years to denote the work of an organism. It is a common practice among all Boards, and our very proper insistence is that the Board has rights and obligations that no group of missionaries and no Board, W.P.M. or any other, has the right to take away. Actually World Presbyterian Missions has appointed these missionaries and is all set to do with them in that exact area precisely that which The I.B.P.F.M. had been doing for 21 years! To do that, takes away from this Board a duty and an obligation which God gave it; and we do not believe World Presbyterian Missions has any right to take it away. We have been told that World Presbyterian Missions itself, at the time it appointed these missionaries, had some compunctions about taking them on as their missionaries to work in Peru before these missionaries had actually settled the problems that by their actions arose between them and The Independent Board. We were further told that it was at the repeated insistence of one of the missionaries that finally W.P.M.'s hesitancy was overcome and it agreed to their appointment at that time. Their general secretary now is put in the position of having to try to justify procedures which have very definitely supplanted the I.B.P.F.M. without W.P.M. even saying to the I.B.P.F.M., "By your leave."

HAS PROPERTY BEEN TAKEN AWAY?

It must be pointed out here that when reference was made in the *Free Press* to "stealing" a work, much more was involved than simply the property, far more. The resigned missionaries who conferred with The Independent Board's executive committee on February 22 did actually disavow any intention of remaining in permanent possession of that property. We have said, and stand by our statement, that the early communications sent by these resigning missionaries to the Board certainly indicated that they intended to hold that property even to the extent of challenging The Independent Board to take legal means of dispossessing them. We are glad, however, that they now disavow such a purpose, and one of them, at least, in speaking upon this point on February 22, said that "hindsight is better than foresight." He meant, we take it, that he had not realized the implications in his communications. We accept that disavowal and that part of the difficulty is perhaps surmounted, whatever may be done about the property in the future. Yet they still remain in possession despite The Independent Board's request that they advance a plan satisfactory to this Board for the protection of its property. No plan has been advanced and they remain in possession and, despite any representation to the contrary and Mr. Mahlow to the contrary notwithstanding, their correspondence reveals not the slightest hint that they are in the property simply intending to protect it until The Independent Board can take possession.

HAS THE FIELD BEEN TAKEN AWAY?

But property is not the only thing involved. We have pointed out that *the Board, as an organism, had a work in Peru*. By the actions of the missionaries and of W.P.M. that work is made practically impossible at the present time. W.P.M. missionaries are present in the mission station, others now in the United States intend to go back there. These missionaries, of course, being the direct agents of the organism, consisting of Board, missions, and missionaries, have had the closest contacts with the people. They have led many of them to Christ; they have taught them the Scriptures. The missionaries have, therefore, the confidence of the Christians. Any missionary that The Independent Board could send to that territory, certainly recognized by all (up until a few months ago) as being, in the organic sense, the field and work of The Independent Board, would now be under such severe disadvantages as to make his task all but impossible. He would lack acquaintance with the people, who have little or no knowledge of conditions which have precipitated this matter. Far from supplies in that primitive region, he would be dependent upon the very missionaries now gone over to W.P.M. for knowledge as to what to do and how to live. Thus he would be at an almost impossible disadvantage.

HAS THE CONFIDENCE OF NATIONAL LEADERS BEEN TAKEN?

Not only that, there has been recently formed in Peru, among the churches in "our" field (ours in the organic sense) a National Presbytery. That, of course, The Independent Board ardently desired, but some very serious questions arise as to certain matters that have transpired in that Presbytery. Mr. Mahlow says that "the National Church has officially invited the continued co-operation of these missionaries and of World Presbyterian Missions, Incorporated." It certainly is pertinent to ask how has this come about! Where did the National Church get the information not only that the missionaries had resigned, but that World Presbyterian Missions was taking over? It is unthinkable that they drew this information simply from the air or from the public press. They might have drawn it from certain printed statements of W.P.M. or those in close connection with it. It is almost unthinkable that they could have gotten it from any other source than the missionaries themselves, particularly when it is known that the Rev. George R. M. Gilchrist was in Peru advising and counseling the resigned missionaries and the Peruvian national Christians at the very time the Presbytery met. The I.B.P.F.M. was not represented at all. It had not even been informed of the meeting. Even if a representative had been there he would have had to go before the Presbytery as a stranger. He might even have had to have his remarks interpreted. Every advantage in that instance

was with the resigned missionaries and the new Board that they then spoke for and represented. Naturally the Peruvian leaders wish to see the work of the Gospel continued. They did invite the missionaries and W.P.M. to carry on the work that had heretofore been done by those same missionaries under the auspices of the I.B.P.F.M. They had some regard for propriety, for they endeavored to meet the situation in a way that would give to The Independent Board and its future missionaries, perhaps, an opportunity to work *with* the Peruvian Church, but of course under vastly changed circumstances. They sent to the I.B. a communication stating that they had invited the resigned missionaries to cooperate, and also W.P.M. They then stated that other missionaries who might be sent to that territory would need also to be voted upon by the new Presbytery. That resolution can be interpreted as wishing to keep the door open to future Independent Board missionaries. We appreciate the action of our Peruvian Christian brethren. Nevertheless, the whole situation resolves itself to this: the very evident threat to continue in occupation of the property is perhaps past, and we repeat, we are glad that the missionaries said that the intent of their correspondence is not that which appears so clear. But it is not only the property, *it is the whole field in Peru*, and at the very least it can be seen by anyone who has eyes to see that The Independent Board has been put in an almost impossible situation.

Let it be borne in mind that it never was merely the property that was in question. Apologists for these resigned missionaries and for W.P.M. have objected to the phrase, "pious banditry." They objected to the softer word, "stealing." We are willing therefore to use an even softer term. Let us say that the rightful work of The Independent Board *has been taken away*, and the I.B., as an organism, dispossessed of that field and put at a tremendous disadvantage if ever it should seek to send other missionaries to continue the work that it once had!

Moreover, this is not merely loss to the I.B.; it is a loss to the militant defense of the faith in all that region of South America. With the attitude taken by the Columbus Synod in withdrawing from the International Council of Christian Churches, in its discountenancing the formation of any association that would allow its members to continue their constituent membership in the Councils, with the very little that has been done along that line by these missionaries, even when they were under the I.B.P.F.M., it is as plain as anything could be that the whole influence of the W.P.M. setup in Peru will be opposed to any participation in this movement which from the standpoint of the militant defense of the faith was and is the most hopeful thing in that line that has developed in South America since Protestant missions began to go modernistic!

Let us come back to our very soft term, "taken away." In that connection, a few weeks ago in one of the heavy snowstorms in Philadelphia, at my home we hired a young fellow to shovel snow. He didn't have a shovel, so he borrowed ours. The shovel wasn't returned. It later transpired that without our knowledge he had taken our broom also to clear the walks of some of our neighbors down the street. To return to his own home, he had to walk right by our house, but he carried both the shovel and the broom with him. We waited several days, and before we learned that he had taken the broom as well as the shovel, we phoned him and asked why he had taken away our shovel. He protested that he hadn't *stolen* the shovel. He said he had only "taken it away." Two or three days later, we found the shovel had been brought quietly and left at our front door. The broom hasn't appeared yet. It is still "taken away." It probably never can be repossessed. That was a very small thing, but can the I.B.P.-F.M. be blamed that it feels that something very precious has been taken away from it? There is the declaration, of course, that part of what appeared to be taken away will be returned. Some of that which has been taken away can never be returned unless there is a very great change in the thinking and in the actions of certain erstwhile fellow workers, both missionary and members of W.P.M. The missionaries were like the arms of a body. They cut themselves off and they and W.P.M. are both endeavoring to graft them on another body. Is it just? Is it right? Can it be done?

It is stated by Mr. Mahlow that the missionaries now with W.P.M. would be the first to deny that the work is theirs. We have answered that. They claim, and we, no less than they, that the work is primarily that of the Holy Spirit, but we have shown that by the representations those missionaries made to the executive committee of the I.B.P.F.M. on February 22 they actually mean that, while the work of course is primarily that of the Holy Spirit, the Board as such has had and now has no part nor lot in it. But we leave it to any who read this article to say whether or not theirs is a true and just position and whether they and W.P.M. had a right to dispossess The Independent Board entirely.

ATTEMPTS TO JUSTIFY THESE ACTS OF DISPOSSESSION

In that connection, one further sentence in the paragraph of Mr. Mahlow's letter we are now considering needs particular attention. Of the resigned missionaries he says, "These men were all Bible Presbyterians and were supported, at least in part, by Bible Presbyterians." That is true, but does that give these missionaries, W.P.M., and the Columbus-Wilmington Synod the right to seize fields and dispossess The Independent Board? Was The Independent Board merely the hired servant of the Bible Pres-

byterian Church so that that church, or rather just one section of that church, could not only dismiss that servant at any time it would wish but could also say, "We are the ones to whom the work belongs?"

Strange reading! Yet this is the attitude shown by some of the advocates of Synod control from the beginning of their effort to supplant The Independent Board. We have for some time felt that there was, so to speak, a hand reaching in, a body trying to edge itself in, to dictate what The Independent Board should and should not do. Had the Board consented to this dictation even now it would not only be dispossessed of one of its fields but part of its world program would have been discarded and it would have started down the path of stultification, for it would have not only surrendered its independence but would also have violated its Charter and therefore become like so many institutions that began well on a thoroughly sound Christian basis but as time went on betrayed their trust. Actually, we ought to thank Mr. Mahlow for bringing this out so plainly, for he argues that, being Bible Presbyterian and being supported by Bible Presbyterians (at least in part), there should be no objection to what they, the missionaries, aided and encouraged by W.P.M. and a Synod that wants "to take over," have done! Will that stand the test of the final assize to which we all go?

There is also another observation post which throws light upon present actions of the "take-over-ists" whose tribune Mr. Mahlow has become. It is this: while there is a sense in which the word "our" can be used by any who have close connections with the missionary, certain Columbus Synod publications have spoken of certain missionaries who are definitely with the I.B.P.F.M. as being Bible Presbyterians with no mention whatever of the fact that they are serving with the I.B.P.F.M. To a reader unacquainted with the facts it would appear that here was another missionary who had abandoned the principle of independent agencies and embraced that of tight church control and perhaps gone the whole way with the Columbus Synod.

If the word "our" must be hedged about with all kinds of explanatory notes, should not these B.P. publications at the very least be careful to explain that these particular missionaries are with, and happy to be with, the I.B.P.F.M., and are one with the Board's whole program?

It is the failure to do this, or shall we say it is this double standard of requirement, that has occasioned in many minds doubt of the fairness or even the integrity of some who so insistently proclaim their own high spiritual standards.

The next criticism presented by Mr. Mahlow is that the missionaries themselves "raised a great deal of the money for the work. They sacrificed, living under pioneer

conditions on low salaries." Certainly this is all true, but certainly it is also true that The Independent Board has always, from the first, had very great concern for all of its missionaries. It sought to do the very best by them that the Lord made possible. It was always ready to consider what it could do to improve the conditions under which they lived. At the Peru Mission's request the Board early bought a piece of property in Huanta to enable them to do that very thing. It was found that that property could not be used for the purpose for which it was purchased. The Board also approved estimates for the purchase or building of homes for them. It did all it could to increase their safety and their comfort. But first, as to salaries, the Peru missionaries knew that the Board gave to the missions the power of initiating proposals for changes in the amount of salary necessary to enable them to live without undue hardship or undue anxiety. At times, however, when the Board thought a mission needed an increase in salary or funds for their work, or anything else, it wrote to such a mission inviting it to review the situation and send in estimates. And again and again salaries and other appropriations for one field or another have been increased.

In this respect, however, there are one or two considerations which all should bear in mind. First of all, when houses or schools or equipment of any kind is needed, the Board's Manual requires that the mission, as a mission, should send in requests with a definite estimate of the amount of money required. Then the Board goes over these requests, and items that are approved for buildings or equipment, or what-not, are placed upon an approved list. Every mission knows that this is true. Being on the approved list means that the Board will do all that it can to raise the money. It means also that missionaries and the mission have the right to endeavor to raise the money, and, because the Board and its missionaries form an organism, we have always encouraged them to exercise such prerogatives. But the mere fact that an item has been placed upon the approved list never has meant that immediately the mission on the field, or the missionary, if it is only one missionary concerned, is authorized to spend up to the amount that has been placed on the approved list. It is always made clear that expenditures can only be made as money comes in designated for that item, or as the Board may be able to appropriate funds out of its General Fund. When such monies have come in the mission concerned is notified and if the work is being done, or ready to be done, the money is sent to them and can be expended, but, *and this is very important*, unless the Board specifically approves the borrowing of money, the missionary and the mission are not at liberty to borrow funds, and, if one happens to have private funds and puts them into the cost of the particular item in question, it has always been recognized that he does that on his own responsibility and without any promise made

or implied that the Board will stand good for that amount before it comes into the Board's treasury. No Board could long exist, financially speaking, if it did not have rules of this kind. I happen to have had 37 years of experience in connection with, or as a member of a large mission, and I knew the practice of several other missions, and that was uniformly the practice. No Board can stand otherwise, for financial needs and possibilities for the use of money far outrun income in almost every case.

In this connection one further idea might have occurred to Mr. Mahlow. He was sitting in the I.B.P.F.M. as general secretary. It was his duty, along with the treasurer, of course, more than that of any others to watch these things and see that they were kept in harmony with the rules and with the specific actions of the Board from time to time.

One further comment in regard to this particular phase of the matter. Every missionary who goes to the foreign field, especially to live under primitive conditions, knows that he and every member of his family runs great physical risks. It is a part of the sacrifice made for Christ. I am sure that The Independent Board, as in the case of every responsible Board, has the health and the physical welfare and the development in Christ of all the children of missionary families at heart. Indeed, individual members of the Board have often suffered with missionaries who in their own persons, or in the persons of their children, have suffered. These things are often beyond the power of any human being. We believe the Board has done its utmost, and I know of far more than one case where individual members of the Board have contributed extra funds in order to take care of some case where there seemed to be special need along this line.

One final thing in regard to Section B. Mr. Mahlow asks, "Does The Independent Board feel that the missionaries best equipped for this work should forsake this need because they are no longer under the direction of a certain group of men meeting in Philadelphia? Thank God we have missionaries ready to obey the commands of God, not of men."

There are two replies to these rather gratuitous implications. First, some consideration should be given, both by the missionaries concerned and by W.P.M. to the rightful interest and responsibility that the I.B. has had from the first, and steps should not have been taken that would remove this Board entirely from that interest and responsibility. Call this what you will, The Independent Board has been dispossessed. Second, a great consideration in every situation is to provide things honest in the sight of all men, and in line with that principle all should be careful not to build upon another man's foundation. This is not to say that the whole foundation was of The Independent Board. The foundation is Christ Jesus, none other Supreme Foundation can be laid.

We are grateful that the missionaries called the attention of the people to this great Foundation. At the same time, both they and W.P.M. should take to heart what Paul says in Romans 15:20, "Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation." Actually, it is these missionaries and W.P.M. which have brought this difficulty, this possibility of setback, to the ongoing work in Peru. God is our Judge, and I say it with all solemnity, that we have given no cause to any of the missionaries in Peru to take the action that they have taken. Nor can we comprehend how W.P.M. would so readily take them on before they had made any settlement of these grave questions with the Board they were leaving and without W.P.M. even saying to the I.B.P.F.M., "By your leave." We know it is required of stewards that a man be found faithful. We have earnestly sought to be faithful. We have found some of our work taken away, and I think we might apply some of the words that Paul applies to himself and probably to his companions, in the 4th chapter of First Corinthians: Do not say that this is the spiritual pride of "a certain group of men meeting in Philadelphia," or that these men have been trying to enforce their own will rather than to obey the commands of God! We know that we shall all stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ. So also shall these missionaries and members of World Presbyterian Missions. We feel that there are those who have tried to make us "fools for Christ's sake," to make us despised, to bring us under revilings and defamation. As Paul said, "We do not write these things to shame you, but as our beloved companions of former days to warn you."

A HAND REACHING IN

Under the next section of Mr. Mahlow's letter (I. C.—*Wholehearted Co-operation with Men and Organizations*), Mr. Mahlow brings out into the open some of the very serious problems as they exist between a certain section of the Bible Presbyterian Church (and W.P.M. as an agent of that section of the church) and The Independent Board, and again he tries to make it appear that there has been no interference on the part of W.P.M. or by the Columbus Synod with the Board's commitments and activities. Much of the criticism that he voices in this paragraph centers around the activities of the International Council of Christian Churches.

The I.C.C.C. is its own best defense. It is true that The Independent Board, and also a great many Bible Presbyterians, greatly deplore the shortsightedness, or one might say the almost total blindness, of those who have taken it upon themselves to discountenance and, if possible, to thwart the I.C.C.C., and to keep member churches and individuals who believe that they have been called of God to work for the things to which the I.C.C.C. is committed from doing

so. As concerns The Independent Board, this is another instance of how that section of the Bible Presbyterian Church and W.P.M. have reached into policies and commitments of The Board and have demanded a change that would bring, and has brought, confusion into the minds of many of our missionaries. They object, for instance, to *wholehearted* co-operation with the activities of the I.C.C.C. We have asked sometimes if they mean that only halfhearted co-operation should be given! Certainly their demand is open to that interpretation. Further, the only ground of withdrawal stated by the 19th Synod as being fact (supposed fact) was that the leadership of the I.C.C.C. was much the same as the leadership of the American Council of Christian Churches. Even that statement was not true, and even if it was, there is nothing in the activities of the A.C.C.C. that warranted the withdrawal of the St. Louis Synod if it had had any unprejudiced and real desire to promote the defense of the faith, as it ought to be promoted in our day and age. Be that as it may, the withdrawal from the I.C.C.C. was based on a representation which simply is not true. Anyone looking over the roster of I.C.C.C. officers would realize that it is not true.

Further, Mr. Mahlow states, "No claim is laid to the missionaries except as they are members of Presbyteries of Synod and supported by them." That puts the finger on and *admits* one of the serious difficulties that has been brought into this situation. It is this, Does the fact that missionaries belong to certain Presbyteries of Synod, etc., mean that those Presbyteries have the right to reach into the policies of any Board and direct what those policies shall be? Does that claim extend to every Board or organization in which members of B. P. Presbyteries work? If Synod had ever come, or if it can now come, and honestly convince the Board that its withdrawal, its opposition, in reality its hostility, to the I.C.C.C. is adequately based, that would be one thing. Up to the present it is a mere charge without substantiation. We have answered that charge honestly and can find no ground that warrants a plain hostility to the one movement that has done most to defend the Gospel of Christ on a world level of any of the organizations that have been brought into being in the past 60 or 75 years. We certainly therefore do object and cannot agree to giving assurance that missionaries who are members of The Independent Board shall allow themselves to be subject to the requirements of a body which has shown itself so blind and prejudiced and unfactual as has that section of the Bible Presbyterian Church which has withdrawn from the I.C.C.C.

Mr. Mahlow follows up his criticism of the Board in that respect by trying to draw a contrast between The Independent Board and W.P.M., all to the disadvantage of the I.B.P.F.M., representing or implying that its convictions, its activities, and its require-

ments are but the ideas and activities of fallible men, while those of W.P.M. move upon a high moral plane. Let it be said right here that W.P.M.'s own Charter and Manual tie up its missionaries in a number of ways even more tightly than the I.B.P.F.M. has ever done. But that is at present beside the point. The point is that the section of the Bible Presbyterian Church which has withdrawn from the I.C.C.C. has itself acted in a tyrannical, oppressive, unfair manner calculated to thwart the very necessary objectives for our day stated in the constitution and shown in the activities of the I.C.C.C. It further insists that nothing ought to be done by member churches or individuals belonging to the Bible Presbyterian Church, if they are loyal to that Church, to carry on activities which they, notwithstanding the strong deprecation of the church, believe are God-directed and blessed of the Lord. To give no reasons, to discountenance activities of local churches or even Presbyteries, to make requirements of a Board and its missionaries who feel that God has called them to support those objectives and activities, is, we submit, to attempt to exercise a tyrannical control over the whole Church. It is also to try to bring confusion into a body of men and women who have, through those activities, created a testimony and accomplished a work in this day that we confidently believe has God's deep blessing. We cannot conceive of how a group of men who state that they want to be completely obedient to the Holy Spirit of God can shut their eyes to these accomplishments of the I.C.C.C. and its related councils. Loyalty to Christ is first, obedience to His Word is a *sine qua non*, but in this day one of the greatest disloyalties that can be shown by any group of professing Christians is to turn away, on no adequate grounds, and on but one stated but untrue ground, from such an effort to defend the faith as is represented in the I.C.C.C. and its related organizations. We, too, know that men and organizations fail and are not to be absolutely equated with the Lord's truth and testimony, but it is a calumny to declare or to imply that this is being done by The Independent Board. It is a calumny to imply that, whereas W.P.M. is not trying to build a super organization, the I.B. is! We agree that we should be wholehearted toward Christ, His Word, its principles, its standards. But we believe also that we should be wholehearted in any service that we believe is wholehearted toward our Lord and to all the things of Christ. But to turn away upon the flimsiest ground, or no ground at all, and to denounce others that remain true is one of the disloyalties so prevalent in our age. It is a pity that any Christian organization should lend itself to such an effort.

MORE ABOUT PROPERTY, USE OF FUNDS, TRAVEL

In regard to Section I. D. of Mr. Mahlow's letter which deals with *Property*, most of these assertions have been answered above. We have shown that other things

besides property are concerned; we have explained that finally the missionaries, in conference with the I.B.P.F.M. executive committee, disavowed that they intended to take away the property from the Board, but they never until February 22 made it plain that they did not claim full ownership of the property. The communication they did send, October 23, is certainly a threatening letter. The Board had intended to send an official representative to Peru until that letter was received. It never asked for the abandonment of the property to the Roman Catholics. To assert that it did is a grievous misstatement. It actually asked the very opposite, that some plan should be worked out by which the property would be protected. The answer the Board got to that request was a threat never explained until the meeting of February 22.

We have explained also the rules under which appropriations are made for any project. As far as we can find there was no request by any of these missionaries that the Board should make itself responsible for the money that they borrowed, or personal funds which they put into the houses. If the Board had been fully apprised of the full seriousness of the situation as now presented and if the mission had requested that borrowed or personal funds might be used, certainly the Board would have considered those requests with full sympathy and in all probability would have acceded to them. But without that agreement and authorization of the Board, the Board has no legal responsibility for the payment of such monies to the missionaries. What it will finally do, however, has not yet been determined. If it cannot occupy the field which is now "taken away" from it, it would be completely justified in asking W.P.M. to reimburse this Board fully for property which its actions have helped to take away.

Finally, it is strange reasoning that "it might further be noted that funds which had passed through the I.B.P.F.M.'s hands were given to the missionaries who are now working with W.P.M. and, while the money cannot be demanded back, we feel that the magnanimous thing to do would be to allow those buildings to continue to be used for the purpose for which the money was given, mainly the work of the missionaries now having other organizational connections but continuing the same ministry." What that actually says is that "We" (meaning either W.A.M. himself or possibly W.P.M.), now being in residence in those buildings and the field taken away from the I.B.P.F.M. through the actions of the missionaries and of W.P.M., The Independent Board should now turn the other cheek and say, "You have taken away our field, now take our buildings also." This tends to renew the conviction that the missionaries and W.P.M. intend to take all they can get—missionaries, field, property—all. To go back to the illustration about the snow shovel and broom, it is much as if that young man should say to us, "Well, the

shovel is yours, *I won't insist that I keep it*, but since I have the broom, I feel that the magnanimous thing would be that you should give me the shovel also."

Under Section E, *Travel Funds*, Mr. Mahlow quotes a section from W.P.M.'s Manual which he calls "a general principle" in regard to resigning missionaries, and states that this principle *could* apply. He also states that it has been applied in the past by responsible Boards. But this certainly has not been applied in the past as a general principle by all responsible Boards. When The Independent Board's Manual was drawn up, we examined a number of such manuals. In not one of them did we find the provision which now W.P.M. has put into its manual, which is, that "the Board will provide such portion of the entire cost of the round trip as the period of the field service rendered in that term bears to the shortest regular term for that field, the missionary providing the remainder." That has been a comparatively recent revision by a number of Boards.

In addition to this, when this question occurred in Peru, I got into communication with another Board which I knew had had similar experiences to those The Independent Board was facing and asked if they would be willing to tell me what their practice had been in this regard. They mentioned several experiences that they had had and stated that they had not previously paid such return expenses but that, all things considered, they later had come to feel that it was better to pay them than to have a resigned missionary "constantly in their hair." Moreover, The Independent Board never expected a situation of this kind. It does not believe that it is justified now, but, be that as it may, The Independent Board's Manual states:

"In case a missionary must return home prior to the regular furlough, other than for health reasons hereinafter provided for, it must be upon recommendation of the Mission to the Board. . . . All expenses of travel for such leave shall be borne by the missionary, who shall receive during such leave, field salary and other benefits as if actually upon the field."

The Board, therefore, acted in accordance with its Manual which was (or ought to have been) perfectly well known to the missionaries. The Manual is in process of being revised and its rule may be changed, but since The Independent Board has acted in accordance with a long standing rule, it cannot be charged with being arbitrary.

CONSISTENCY IS A JEWEL

In this connection also, it ought to be realized that here again *W.P.M.'s* own grant for any return travel for a resigning missionary "will be available only within the time limit set by the Board, not exceeding three months from the date on which the resignation becomes effective." Moreover, that Board will not be responsible in any way;

financial or otherwise, for a resigning missionary beyond the date of resignation except as mentioned in the preceding sentence which I have quoted from the W.P.M. Manual. Where is the essential difference between what W.P.M. stipulates that it will do and what The Independent Board's executive committee offered to do for the resigning Peru missionaries if they would come home within a stipulated time? Mr. Mahlow may say that the time stipulated was too short. But the missionaries knew in September that they would resign and would not reconsider. If they had ever had any serious intention of leaving The Independent Board field, they could have, and ought to have, begun to make plans then. Moreover, after they had resigned, The Independent Board never dreamed that they would act in the way that they have, and by remaining they have put obstacles before the Board which were not there, and might not ever have been there, to prevent it from continuing work for the Peruvian people to whom we believe the Lord commissioned The Independent Board before He commissioned any one of the resigned missionaries.

The Peru Presbytery met in January. If the missionaries had returned at the time the Board stipulated as the time within which it would pay their expenses home, it is very doubtful to us if that Presbytery would ever have taken the action that it now has taken. In other words, to put it plainly, don't tell us that the missionaries, Peruvian and Chilean, had no influence and made no proposals or suggestions toward getting the resolution that the Presbytery passed acted upon favorably.

While we are speaking of these matters that involve proprietorship, property, appropriations, and travel funds, it's well to remind everyone again that in this respect the Manual of W.P.M. goes farther than The Independent Board has ever gone and demands that personal property be *deeded to the Board by resigning missionaries*, as Mr. Clark said in *The Free Press*. To quote that section again, it says: "Property on the field shall be held for the Board by the Mission according to the laws of the country in which the Mission is working. *Missionaries may purchase real estate and erect buildings thereon at personal expense only on approval of the Mission and the Board.* In doing so they may not obligate the Mission or Board in any way therefor, and they must bear in mind that their own stationing is always a matter for Mission decision." Missionaries may erect buildings at personal expense on Mission property *with the approval of the Mission and Board* (italics ours), but in the event that the missionary resigns or is recalled (!) the building ownership should be deeded to the Board with the proper financial remuneration made to the missionary." Mr. Clark, in *The Free Press*, well added to that statement of W.P.M. the reflection, "What it now expects of its own, it should expect its own to accord this Board to which they recently belonged." Also incidentally, it is worth noting that W.P.M. stipulates

that it has the right to *recall missionaries*. So evidently even W.P.M. which so strongly upholds these missionaries does not concede to them that the Board is to be a mere finance transmitting agency!

Mr. Mahlow takes up much space in speaking of the Gilchris' and Cochran's travel funds, and of the Bragdon's also, "all under certain specific *arbitrary* conditions." May we ask what could be more *arbitrary* than W.P.M.'s own stipulations? In addition it is a gratuitous reflection, altogether unjustified, for Mr. Mahlow to state that these conditions stipulated by the I.B. "were not in the nature of general sound principles but rather they appeared to be an attempt to force the missionaries to make decisions on the basis of financial considerations rather than on principle." Far from being what Mr. Mahlow insinuates, The Independent Board has attempted to act upon principle, upon provisions which all missionaries knew, and, in the case of Mr. Bragdon and his family, it even went farther on the generous side. It did indeed ask very properly a question of Mr. Bragdon. One who claimed to know told the Board that 80 per cent of The Independent Board's missionaries were going to resign. The Board had a right to ask its missionaries whether this were true. We are glad to find out that it was far from true, but in addition we had heard that the Peru missionaries had changed their minds from a year ago and that they did expect to resign. The Board therefore had every right, indeed had a duty, to inquire as to whether the Bragdon's intended to go back to the field under the I.B.P.F.M. Their *furlough* was not due. The Board had every desire, however, under the sad circumstances they faced, to make it possible for them to meet the situation which was coming upon them. Certainly this therefore is querulous criticism. Its author knows as well as anyone that something is owed to the Board under which a missionary serves as well as to the missionary.

MORE QUERULOUS CRITICISM

Finally, in this section of Mr. Mahlow's letter he speaks of the final date as having been set for December 1, 1957, up until which time the Board would pay the return expenses of the missionaries. He has some further drastically querulous remarks to make upon that. Actually, these missionaries knew that they were going to resign from early September on. They had plans to stay right in Huanta and to take away at least the field from The Independent Board. Mr. Mahlow says, "Ordinary common sense would indicate, etc." Well, we would say that ordinary common sense would indicate that when a whole Mission resigns it ought to know that it was bringing about a very serious situation and should not be so naive as to expect that the Board should bear the whole brunt of any situation the Mission might create, whatever contumely that threw upon the Board. The missionaries, knowing that they were going to resign, ought to have had sufficient forethought to make

preparation for the situation that would immediately arise. Instead, they acted in such a way as to raise questions of their wisdom and integrity, and W.P.M. should have stood aloof and never have appointed them before they had settled those questions. Had it waited until then, some doubts as to its own wisdom and integrity would never have been raised. If this whole matter could be laid before a panel of responsible and impartial mission boards, great amazement would be expressed at the course pursued by W.P.M. thus far.

One further reflection in regard to this section of Mr. Mahlow's letter. He speaks as though The Independent Board was willing to abandon the property to Roman Catholics. This is an example of the amazing, but unfounded, charges some of our opponents so gratuitously allow themselves to make. Actually, the Board from the first sought to prevent any such thing. It first asked the missionaries for a plan whereby the property could be safeguarded. After receiving the threatening letter of October 23rd from the Peru Mission, the Board then refrained from sending a representative to Peru for the very reason that it looked as though legal proceedings would have to be inaugurated to obtain possession of the property. We have stated that the Peru missionaries have now disavowed intention of remaining in permanent possession. But the reasons why they did not comply with the demands of The Independent Board are certainly not as Mr. Mahlow has stated them. His very statement is arbitrary and unfair and illustrates a persistent attempt to assign wrong motives to the I.B.

WHOSE ARE THE INACCURACIES AND MISREPRESENTATIONS?

We now come to Section II, *Inaccuracies and Misrepresentations*. What inaccuracies and misrepresentations there are, are made not by The Independent Board but by Mr. Mahlow. The matter of "taking their brethren to law in a Roman Catholic country," has been answered. That certainly is an inaccuracy or a misrepresentation. So we will not go farther into that.

Another "inaccuracy and misrepresentation," however, is his statement about the Board having "fired a missionary and he was immediately publicly advertised as a saboteur without giving time to attempt reconciliation and understanding." That charge is false, and Mr. Mahlow knows it. What happened was that, after the Board learned something of what that particular missionary had done, the executive committee called him before it and asked what he had done. He stated he had written a letter to Chile counseling missionaries there to resign. The Committee asked if he would produce that letter and he did. It was read and he admitted that he had sent copies to Peru, to Japan, and to India suggesting that they also should resign. We said, or to make it more specific, *I said* immediately that that was sabotage. The next morning that mission-

ary came to me. He admitted that what he had done was sabotage. He said he thought he ought not to have sent copies to Peru, India, and Japan and perhaps he was foolish for having written any letter. I was greatly interested and beginning to be encouraged but waited or him to go on just one step farther. Had he said that he was sorry for what he had done, I would myself have proposed that he be reinstated. He did not say that, but, on the contrary, he very definitely said that he was of the same opinion still. I saw no way by which the harm that he had attempted to do in Japan, India, and Peru could be corrected if he did not feel his opinions were wrong, and for that reason I could not propose reinstatement. I hoped even for some days that he would come back and state that he felt that he had been mistaken, but that did not happen. In *The Free Press* of January 31, in mentioning this incident, I regret that I used the pronoun "they." I should have said "he," for his wife had no part in this, did not come before me or the committee, never said that she admitted it was sabotage. I regret that in that article I slipped up in using the plural pronoun. What was actually said was by the husband alone, but, I repeat, he gave me no basis on which I could ask for his reinstatement. The missionaries in Peru did not have precedent to expect "rough" treatment. In January, 1957, they knew all that had taken place that far. They thanked Dr. McIntire and me for having come. They said they had been saved from a great mistake and one at least said she hoped that they would not again defect. Nothing happened in all the intervening time before their resignations reached the Board to change their then expressed confidence, except that (at the Board's direction) I had written a letter to all the Board's missionaries, in view of the purported information that was given us by one of the then members of the Board, that 80 per cent of our missionaries were going to resign. I asked that each one let us know whether that were true in his case or not. No loyal missionary would have resented that question, and we thank the Lord that very few did. Had our Peru missionaries been in the frame of mind that they were in January, 1957, they would have been glad to declare their full allegiance to the Board. We have pretty good reason to think they had been "worked upon" in the meantime.

As to Mr. Mahlow's assertions in regard to questions between himself and me, I would say only two things. First, I reported nothing whatever to the missionaries as to Mr. Mahlow's attitude until after his resignation and then did so only because it would never have done to pass by his resignation in silence. There had sprung up serious difficulties between Mr. Mahlow and the Board, but in that letter I told nothing beyond what Mr. Mahlow himself had admitted to me at various times. He cannot in honesty deny that he told me those things. Some of his actions were very questionable in the position he held. He knows that I stood up for him making what explanations

I could, but sometimes I felt that he himself should have made those explanations and not have left it to me. There were two of his communications involved. One, some considerable time before he resigned, the other after he resigned. I believe that Mr. Mahlow should face up to his own shortcomings.

The second thing I equally dislike to say, but while I believe that amiableness, in subordination to adherence to principle, is an admirable quality, I believe that Mr. Mahlow's amiableness sometimes leads him to overlook principles. The Independent Board has a set of very definite and clearly expressed principles. To repeat what I have said in many places, the whole history of the difficulties that have come to the I.B.P.F.M. proves that the Board has acted all the way through to maintain principles which each member of the Board, the general secretary, and the missionaries also solemnly vowed before God and usually before the whole Board that each would maintain. Experience forced me to believe that Mr. Mahlow never saw these principles clearly, or that if he did he placed amiableness above principle, perhaps unconsciously, but certainly very definitely. And so, I repeat again that he is as much responsible as any other person for the difficulty that finally we all are encountering. His letter of February 24 confirms that impression.

"SOFT APPROACH" AND "HIGH-HANDEDNESS"

Mr. Mahlow devotes his closing paragraphs mainly to two subjects: the matter of a soft approach and the expelling of members from the Bible Presbyterian Church.

He says the phrase "soft approach" is a cliché (worn-out idea or trite expression) "used as a criticism . . . of those who cannot accept leadership of the I.C.C.C. any longer" and asserts that World Presbyterian Missions and the men of the Columbus Synod stand for tenderness, love, meekness in dealing with a brother who may be overtaken in a fault, for uncompromising loyalty to Christ also, separated to Him in life and doctrine and in defense of the faith.

We will not argue this point except to say, "By their fruits ye shall know them," and also to point out that Scripture demands first, faithfulness to God and to *all* His commands. Among these commands are many statements such as that to Ezekiel (chap. 3:8): "Behold I have made thy face strong against their faces, and thy forehead strong against their foreheads. As an adamant harder than flint have I made thy forehead: fear them not, neither be dismayed at their looks, though they be a rebellious house." These were words of admonition and encouragement to Ezekiel for the hard task for which he was commissioned against the modernists of his day. The compromise and apostasy of our age is as deep as that of Ezekiel's day, and soft words to hardened modernists, united efforts with them, and silence where sterling testimony is needed make no headway in this hard but

necessary battle. God's people may betray the Gospel by being soft where firmness is needed, and often they have.

Mr. Mahlow would like everyone to believe that the erasing of names of Presbyterians was not "high-handed" and blandly assumes that joining the Collingswood Synod was joining a body other than the Bible Presbyterian Church. This is not merely nonsense: it is contrary to fact. If the men of the Columbus Synod really believe in and want to practice the precepts of tenderness, love, and meekness ascribed to them by Mr. Mahlow, why did they not approach the Collingswood Synod and ask to sit down and confer about all these important matters before taking action which they must surely have known would make division a certainty. It looks as though they wanted such a division and were ready to take advantage of any circumstance that might afford an opportunity of bringing it about, even though it required a forced interpretation of an act to lend any semblance of justice to their course of action. Almost anything can be given a semblance of justice by such procedure and certainly the expelling of everyone who felt that the course of the St. Louis-Columbus Synods was a great and grievous mistake placed the "tight church" party in full control of at least one section of the Church. Further, although some men were, by Presbytery, given an opportunity to speak before the Columbus Synod's counsel was executed, the actual demand was for complete and unconditional surrender which would have been tantamount to repudiation of some of the basic guarantees of the Bible Presbyterian Church's constitution. That demand was "high-handed" in itself. It was also in violation of the Bible Presbyterian Church's constitution. Thus when now the constitutionality of the two sections of that Church is considered, it is adherence and conformity to the constitution more than anything else that determines constitutionality. Otherwise adherence, obedience to the ephemeral decisions of the highest body of the Church, even if no such power has been granted to that body, or even explicitly withheld by the constitution, becomes the criterion of constitutionality. And the very demand for such obedience is the precursor of tyranny in Church as well as in State. It is tragic that so large a part of a Church dedicated to liberty so willingly surrenders its liberty to the very ideas which were a very considerable factor in bringing about its formation.

There is one further consideration involved in these matters which vitally affects The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. It is that what the Bible Presbyterian Church, or any section of it does, or does not do, The Independent Board is committed by its Charter, its constitution, to the principle of freedom from ecclesiastical control. To maintain its integrity, therefore, that Board must maintain that principle or be guilty of betraying a solemn trust. That it will not do.

"OCCUPY 'TILL I COME"

(Luke 19:13)

By the Rev. IRWIN W. STEELE, D.D.

The phrase, "Occupy 'till I come," is found in the context of the parable of the pounds. The parable represents the Lord Jesus as delivering to each one of His servants equal means with which to serve Him until He comes again. One of the servants was very diligent in his use of the means with which he was entrusted and when his Lord returned his gain amounted to ten times that which he was originally given. Another servant, having received the same as the first, gained only fivefold. Still another of the servants made absolutely no effort of any kind with that which was entrusted to him and thus he had gained nothing whatsoever. When the Lord returned He rewarded each of His servants in exact accordance with the manner in which he "bought up his opportunities" as represented by the gains he had made. Two had occupied until He came. One, however, had occupied far more than the other. The third servant did nothing at all, and his condemnation is recorded in the parable. Thus, it seems to me that the clear teaching of the parable is that there are differing rewards for differing diligence and for "buying up the opportunities" that are presented to each one of us.

Of course, the message of the parable is particularly applicable to missionaries. There are differing degrees of diligence displayed among us. There are differences in the extent to which we buy up the opportunities that are afforded us. And there will be, moreover, differing rewards in exact accord with the works we have done.

Furthermore, it seems to me that in the matter of buying up our opportunities the question of discernment as to the opportunities that God has given us and the fullness with which we enter into those opportunities are involved. In the Great Commission we have the command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." The task contemplated by this command is world-wide. Thus, as a denomination or a local church should never settle down to its own little work without any thought or activity with regard to the world-wide aspect of the Gospel, so no missionary should ever become so engrossed in only his particular work or field that he fails to consider and act with regard to the larger aspects of the work to which he is committed by the Great Commission.

Another related thought in this whole matter is found in the following verse, "I shrank not from declaring unto you the whole counsel of God" (Acts 20:27, A.R.V.). Down through the ages in the history of the church there have always been times when certain aspects of the "counsel of God" received special emphasis because of the circumstances through which the church was going at the time. In Luther's

day there was a strong emphasis on justification by faith. Later, in the great missionary age, the emphasis turned to getting of the Gospel to the uttermost parts of the earth. In these, the final days of the age, our Lord Himself asks, "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find the faith on the earth?" (Luke 18:8—"the faith" is according to the Greek.) The paramount obligation of every true child of God and certainly of us, the missionaries, is still to get the Gospel to every creature. But it is alarmingly evident that in these days of widespread apostasy, when men in almost every sector of the Protestant Church are ever-increasingly denying the most basic tenets of the Christian faith, they are thus bringing about the great, false, universal church of the Revelation as well as its beastly world government. Therefore, considering the tragic circumstances that have come over the church of the living God, there is the greatest need for us to emphasize that portion of the "counsel of God" which relates to contending for the faith once delivered to the saints.

There are such men as Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of the Methodist Church who openly and blatantly deny the substitutionary atonement of our Lord Jesus and the sacrificial element of His death on the cross. Such a man as this (as well as many others) is not born again, although he is one of the ranking bishops of what was once, at least, a great church. Not having the Spirit of God, it is no wonder that he is utterly confused as to the meaning of the Book of which the Spirit is the Author. Yet his influence is powerful, not only here in the homeland but in every mission field where there is a Methodist Church.

The same can be said of many a Presbyterian. And when one considers that the influence of these men through the ecumenical movement is no longer confined to the denominations of which they are members but reaches out and extends itself to the whole Protestant world, one can readily see how that the knowledge of "the faith," "the faith once delivered unto the saints," is today over the entire earth rapidly diminishing to the point where the query of our Lord will become a present reality—"... shall he find the faith on the earth?"

Some missions and their missionaries take no cognizance whatever of this state of affairs other than to lament it. They preach only a "positive" Gospel, but greatly oppose any "negative" preaching. This is in clear opposition to the practice of our Lord and His apostles (see Matt. 23). These are the middle-of-the-road, National Association of Evangelicals type. Others there are who have seen their Scriptural duty of separating themselves from apostate denominations. There are missions as well as de-

nominations, not only here in the United States but in other parts of the world, that are like crystal-clear drops of water sprinkled on a surface. They are absolutely pure in doctrine, separate from everything and everybody else, and doing their own little work as fine as it is for the Lord. They are "occupying 'till he come" far more so than that first group of missions, missionaries, and churches which only lament the increasing unbelief but who remain in communion with it. On the other hand there is a third group which sees the truth of the Scriptures, sees that we are not to be ingrown, self-sufficient, separate-unto-ourselves in the matter of the alarming apostasy, but are to give a world-wide testimony against it. As the Gospel is world-wide in scope, so is the application of every part of it world-wide in its scope. "The whole counsel of God" must be given in the whole world. And when vast sections of that counsel are denied and set at nought by evil men (although great church leaders) in the exertion of their world-wide influence, just so those portions under attack must be upheld in a world-wide way. This simply cannot possibly be done by small, ingrown missions and churches. Only a world-wide plan of activity with regard to it will satisfy the demands of the case.

To meet this emergency, God has raised up the International Council of Christian Churches to do that very thing. That He has raised up no other organization on the world level to do any such thing is evident to us all. The tragedy of the hour in the case of the Bible Presbyterian Church and, in that which affects us, The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, particularly, is that so many brethren have withdrawn themselves from the God-given opportunity in the I.C.C.C. to give that necessary world-wide testimony for the faith as is commanded in the Scriptures. If God has truly raised it up for this purpose in accordance with His will as seen in the Scriptures, would it not be His will for us to buy up that opportunity and in that way fully occupy 'till He come? Satan does not want any world-wide attack on his world-wide false church and beastly government. Would it not be actually doing Satan's will, doing what he wants (whether wittingly or unwittingly), to refrain from any world-wide attack on his two prime objectives in his latter-day program? These brethren have not only withdrawn themselves from the organization that God has raised up in these days for this purpose, tragic as that is, but many of them are actually heading back toward a NAE position. It is reported, for instance, that Tom Cross cooperated with Billy Graham and that he served as a counselor for the latter. He is

(Continued on page 10)

B.P. PRESBYTERY ...

(Continued from page 1)

the minority absented themselves from this Presbytery and proceeded to call themselves "the New Jersey Presbytery of the Bible Presbyterian Church." They placed the names of the majority members of this Presbytery, without their knowledge or consent, on the roll of their presbytery and then proceeded formally to drop the names of these brethren from the "Bible Presbyterian Church"!

This Presbytery has been deeply grieved that brethren would so scandalize the name of our testimony and injure publicly the testimony which our brethren in this Presbytery have to our Lord. All this has created a confusing and unworthy testimony before the unbelieving world. And the minority group is using the identical name on the same radio station, in close proximity, in a weekly broadcast, to a well established program which has been carried on through the years and identified publicly with the Bible Presbyterian Church and its New Jersey constituency.

2. A previous synod which you recognize presumed to call a meeting of the Presbytery of New Jersey.

There is no constitutional provision of any kind that empowers a synod to call a presbytery meeting, and this was recognized by earlier synods. Under the limitations of power set forth in the Constitution, "All powers not in this Constitution specifically granted to the courts of the Church are reserved to the congregations respectively, or to the people" (Chapter 1, Section 9); before a synod could lawfully undertake such an action it would have to have specific designation of power to do so. According to the Constitution, a presbytery shall "meet on its own adjournment" or upon a regular call for a pro re nata meeting. (Ch. 9, Sec. 6.) The meeting, therefore, of the Presbytery called by the synod at St. Louis, one thousand miles outside the Presbytery's bounds, with only a minority of the Presbytery known to be present at the time, and without notice to the other majority members of the Presbytery; and at which meeting certain acts were taken, known to be contrary to the expressed position of the Presbytery itself, involved a serious fracture of the bonds of order, fellowship, and love, which are to be maintained in the Bible Presbyterian Church among brethren in the Lord.

3. The attempt of a synod to force upon the Presbytery of New Jersey a congregation, the Covenant Bible Presbyterian Church of Haddonfield, involved a serious usurpation of power, and denial of the rights of a presbytery and of the local churches in a presbytery, under our Constitution.

The attempt to force the church on the Presbytery, when the Constitution says specifically, "The relationship is voluntary,

based only upon mutual love and confidence, and is in no sense to be maintained by the exercise of any kind of force or coercion whatsoever" (underscoring added), was a specific violation of this basic requirement of fellowship with the churches.

The Presbytery, seeking to ascertain and maintain the estate of "mutual love and confidence" required by the Constitution, laid on the table the application of the church for membership of the Presbytery for the time being. But the minority present immediately carried a complaint to the synod and the decision from that synod denied the Presbytery's responsibility and discretion under the Constitution and seriously contributed to the difficulties which had been created. Such disregard of the Constitution has grievously wronged this Presbytery. No synod has power to force a condition of "mutual love and confidence," or to force a church into a presbytery without "mutual love and confidence."

4. In a similar case originating in the Presbytery by the minority, and not originating from the Collingswood Church or its Session, the synod sought to compel the Collingswood Session to place the names of individuals on the church roll and to force the Collingswood Session to give letters of dismissal to a particular church. The Session of the Collingswood Church, in keeping with the power granted to it by the Constitution (Ch. 8, Sec. 6), dropped the names of certain individuals from the roll of the church, who had withdrawn from the congregation and had become members of the Covenant Bible Presbyterian Church of Haddonfield. To establish the power of a synod under the Constitution of the Bible Presbyterian Church to instruct local churches to add names to the roll of the congregation when, under the Constitution, property is controlled by majority vote of the local congregation, involves a most fundamental and basic fracture of the whole structure of the Bible Presbyterian Church and the guarantees given to the local congregations concerning their properties and their freedom of action.

Communication of the synod's action to the Collingswood Church, directly, through the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery, a member of the minority, without a report to the Presbytery, manifested a tyrannical power over an individual congregation, not granted or allowed in the Constitution, which specifically declares, "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" (Italics added) (Chap. 10, Sec. 5).

5. This Presbytery considers the action of a previous synod which you recognize, speaking through its Judicial Commission, in re-

gard to the Bible Presbyterian Church Association, as a denial of the liberty guaranteed under the Constitution to the Presbytery of New Jersey. When the synod which you recognize withdrew from the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches, the Presbytery, in the exercise and enjoyment of the liberty which it has under the Constitution, took the proper steps to maintain its fellowship and its agreeable churches with these councils through an independent agency known as the Bible Presbyterian Church Association. Chapter 9, Sec. 4, declares, "The presbytery has power . . . in general, to order whatever pertains to the spiritual welfare of the churches under its care, always respecting the liberties guaranteed to individual congregations and persons under the Constitution."

Under this provision the Presbytery united with the New Jersey Council of Christian Churches and has co-operated and supported interdenominational and joint church endeavors. For a General Synod to presume to deny the right of this Presbytery under the Constitution, in itself and with its agreeable churches, to have fellowship with the American Council and the International Council of Christian Churches, transgresses and denies previous liberties written into the Constitution and designed to protect the churches and lower courts from just such usurpation of power by a particular synod.

The above mentioned five cases all relate

(Continued on page 11)

"OCCUPY ...

(Continued from page 9)

reported to have said that the emphasis of the church was from now on being positive and that they would not deal with the issue. Moreover, time and again, this writer has been told that pastors of the Columbus Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church who once preached against the apostasy no longer do so!

"Occupy 'till I come." "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find the faith on the earth?" The faith is disappearing, many are not only withdrawing from the fight and the world-wide testimony, but are actually returning to the unscriptural NAE position. And yet God has raised up a world-wide door of opportunity through the I.C.C.C. in entire conformity with the universality of the Great Commission to which we are bound. We are all occupying, some fivefold, others tenfold—and all in between. It is the desire of my life to occupy as diligently, as effectively, and thus in as world-wide way as possible, and in so doing obey to the fullest extent I know how the exhortation, "Occupy." To me that is the distinctive glory of the Collingswood Synod, of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, and, I count it, of my own service for Him, in this way to "occupy 'till I come."

B. P. PRESBYTERY ...

(Continued from page 10)

to actions directed against the interests and testimony of this Presbytery.

Other actions which concern the witness and work of this Presbytery need also to be called to your attention.

6. The *Bible Presbyterian Reporter*, February 1958, makes specific reference to this Presbytery, identifies its moderator as one of the leaders in the denomination who "refused to meet for informal conferences with Synod's representatives, refused to 'hear the church,' (Matthew 18:17) in the matter (italics added) whether informally or through the constitutional agencies of Synod, and finally formed another Synod to their own liking." Dr. McIntire has testified to this Presbytery that he who was thus signally singled out, with others, has not so violated Matthew 18, but has sought to honor the Word of God. And, instead, the record shows that he actually sought conferences with leaders in the church, including the moderator of the Judicial Commission, which were declined.

No charges have been filed against him or any of the other brethren, and neither have they been convicted of any such offense as violating Matthew 18. And to publish such a statement in the "official organ" indeed is a serious reflection upon this Presbytery and the members of it who maintain membership and have maintained their membership in this Presbytery.

Such references of this kind, accusing individuals of offenses before God, with specific references to Scripture passages, reflect upon ministries which men in this Presbytery seek to have in good conscience before the Lord.

The report that they "formed another synod to their own liking," completely misrepresents the effort of this Presbytery and others to have a synod in our church which would recognize and honor the liberty guaranteed to us under the Constitution.

1. This Presbytery rejoices in the ministry and the testimony of the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches. We praise God that from the formation of these agencies the Bible Presbyterian Church has had an important and significant place in the world wide fight against apostasy and in carrying the banner for the purity of the church. We have rejoiced in our co-operation and Christian fellowship with other branches of the church (F.G. Chap. 2, Sec. 3).

The actions taken by a previous synod against these councils have done grievous harm to the separatist movement and to this cause throughout the world. It is indeed significant and a testimony to the effectiveness of this company of valiant churches that the official organ of the International Missionary Council, April 1958, says, "I do not think we have taken sufficient account of

the mischief caused by the activities of such a body as the International Council of Christian Churches." Also, that the official organ of the World Council of Churches, the *Ecumenical Review*, April 1958, says, "the International Council of Christian Churches is a small body, which has repeatedly sought to denigrate the World Council. . . Its literature is widely distributed in a number of countries." The grievous wrong which has been done against this movement without, we believe, adequate cause or basis in facts, should be confessed and repented of before the Christian world.

8. The Presbytery of New Jersey further believes that previous synods which you recognize have done grievous wrong to the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. This agency, raised up of God in the midst of fierce controversy, has stood faithful to its charter and uncompromising in its stand for the faith. The withdrawal of endorsement and the setting up of an opposing missionary agency which has secured missionaries as a result of attacks upon this agency in one form or another has grievously hurt the separated missionary cause.

These matters we bring respectfully to your attention. We desire only that this Presbytery of the Bible Presbyterian Church may continue loyal to Christ, and stand fast in the liberty which Christ has given to us in the Scripture, and with the full freedom guaranteed to our local churches and individuals in the Constitution, which maintains restraints upon the courts of the church under our Bible Presbyterian concept of the kind of a Presbyterian Church which was originally established.

We pray, in sending this communication, that it may be received in the gracious spirit in which it is sent, and that your synod shall make redress and correct the grievances and wrongs which have been committed against this Presbytery, its ministers, and its churches.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH F. MISICKA

Stated Clerk

Presbytery of New Jersey

of the

Bible Presbyterian Church

Approved unanimously at a pro re nata meeting of the Presbytery of New Jersey, at Audubon, N. J., May 28, 1958.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS AND INQUIRIES
MAY BE ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-
TREASURER OF THE COMMITTEE FOR
TRUE PRESBYTERIANISM, THE REV.
ARTHUR G. SLAGHT, 1630 S. HANOVER
ST., BALTIMORE 30, MD.

Union ...

(Continued from page 1)

ganization operating in India, which actually co-operates with the National Christian Council of India.

3. Here is an illustration of how a majority in a particular synod can take with them into a desired union all the agencies and institutions which have been established and placed under the control of synod. Now, according to plan, this is to be done. This is exactly what the United Presbyterian Church has just done in the union with the Northern Presbyterian Church. All of its agencies, schools, and everything, with one stroke, have been taken into the new union.

In contrast to all this, the original system, upon which the Bible Presbyterian Church operated, honored and supported the independent agencies, and none of these agencies can be taken into the proposed new union. The work and testimony that they have established may continue uninterrupted and according to the original charter. There is real merit and freedom in the independent agency system! All is not lost when a shifting majority in a synod wants to take all into some union!

The proposed plan of union involves amendments and changes in the constitution, the basic law of the Bible Presbyterian Church. One change which is clear is that the name "Bible Presbyterian Church" is to be abandoned. That name means something! It has meant a great deal to Bible Presbyterians who rejoice in the history, the formation, and the glorious banner that God gave to the Bible Presbyterian movement, as a movement. The Bible Presbyterian Church claimed, in its first general synod, that it is the spiritual successor of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. And now that the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. has ceased to exist by virtue of its union with the United Presbyterian Church, and it has become the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., the distinctive connection that the Bible Presbyterians have had with that great current of Presbyterian church history stands out more important than ever.

4. The proposed union will definitely split the Bible Presbyterian Church. At last, the division, which was apparent in the church and which was visualized in the two different synods that were recognized by different congregations of the denomination, will become a permanent schism, with a section going off and uniting with another body to form a church with another name. A portion of the church will cease to be Bible Presbyterians, and pastors will now be Reformed Presbyterian ministers.

5. The press release published elsewhere in this issue continues to propagate the line of the Columbus group and to attempt to put Carl McIntire in an unfortunate position, by claiming that the name has "re-

(Continued on page 12)

Union ...

(Continued from page 11)

cently been subject to some confusion since Dr. Carl McIntire of Collingswood, N. J., with a minority group, formed another body using the same name but identifying itself as the Collingswood Synod." But this is what Carl McIntire and the group that recognize the Collingswood Synod have refused, denied, and repudiated. No "other body" was ever organized or formed, in the sense that another denomination had been established. There was a division within the church over the question of the synod, and which synod churches in the Bible Presbyterian denomination would recognize. But under the constitution of the Bible Presbyterian Church there are certain truths and facts that support the position which the churches and ministers who recognize the Collingswood Synod have maintained.

First, a synod is not the church or the denomination. The church is the entire body with all the local churches and people subscribing to the constitution and living under it. The constitution is clear that a local congregation and a minister join the Bible Presbyterian Church; they do not join the Bible Presbyterian Synod. A synod meets for a brief period, it adjourns, and that synod is lead. Members of a particular synod are those who attend, who enroll, and under the constitution only 15 individuals, half of whom must be ministers, are required to constitute a synod.

The powers of synod are specifically limited and the constitution makes it clear that all powers not specifically granted are reserved to the congregations and to the people. Because a different synod was raised up challenging the 19th General Synod, its equality and its unconstitutional actions, it in no way meant that the Bible Presbyterian Church had been repudiated or forsaken, or that the group that recognized the Collingswood Synod had formed another denomination or another body.

The effort on the part of the Columbus group to force such a position on the Collingswood men or to claim that such another denomination had been organized was a gratuitous assumption contrary to fact and was done in direct defiance of the well-known position which has been repeatedly emphasized. But this is characteristic of the type of treatment which has been dealt to the brethren who have sought to maintain the liberty, the testimony, and the constitution of the church, and have refused to recognize the Columbus Synod because of its unconstitutional actions and procedures. But now, the overt act to unite the Bible Presbyterian Church under the leadership of the Columbus Synod with the Reformed Presbyterian Church means that the church itself will formally split. When unconstitutional procedures are employed, amendments are made, and a different body is actually recognized, then the split will have actually and finally occurred. Let it be said

that those who are responsible for the splitting of the church are the leaders of the Columbus Synod. It is clear from their action that there is no disposition or intention on their part to be reconciled to their brethren inside of the Bible Presbyterian Church and to seek to resolve the differences so that one synod could again command the allegiance and confidence of the whole church.

In view of these significant developments, we earnestly appeal to all Bible Presbyterians to remain with the church and not to leave it. Our testimony has been glorious. The battle that God has given to our movement must continue. The willingness and readiness of these brethren to forsake the name and to go out and be identified with another name and testimony raises the very fundamental questions which have been in the hearts of many Bible Presbyterians.

Who is it that has built the Bible Presbyterian Church? Who is it that has the real concern of the Bible Presbyterian Church at heart? Who is it that wants to see the constitution of the church maintained? The answers to these questions are ready at hand. There have been four great issues in the present conflict.

First is the drive for the tighter church and the denial of liberty to presbyteries, sessions, local congregations, and individuals. This has manifested itself as the leaders of the Columbus Synod have sought to usurp and claim for that synod power, under the general theme that there is a system of graded courts. But restraints and checks were placed upon these graded courts by the constitution when the denomination was formed.

Second is the softer approach in dealing with the issues of the apostasy. The softer approach has been manifested in the relaxed position toward the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and the Billy Graham inclusivist campaigns. The attitude of various pastors openly professed that their approach is now "positive" and that they do not carry these issues any longer into their pulpits. The very struggle in which the Bible Presbyterian Church was born is being quietly laid aside, as the element in the church that has resented the strong, militant stand settles into a more comfortable and "respectable" position.

Third is the repudiation of the councils—the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches—and their position of fellowship and co-operation with those of other denominations beyond the circle of just "Reformed" fellowship. It was alleged that the councils were transgressing upon the life and the emphasis of the church, and these very factors entered into the repudiation of these councils which have done so much to lead the 20th Century Reformation testimony.

Fourth, the independent agencies were repudiated. The last to feel the sting of this unjustified attack has been and is at the present moment the beloved Independent

Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, the vanguard of them all. The long-term plan to take over the Independent Board and bring it under the control of the synod was thwarted. Men deserted it, set up their synod-controlled board, and now their synod-controlled board, according to plans, will be combined with the synod-controlled board of the Reformed Presbyterians, under the name of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America.

All of these developments now present a more clearly defined picture of what was actually involved and what has been involved from the very beginning.

We rejoice with those who rejoice that the Bible Presbyterian Church shall not die, but shall continue to live. And we weep with those who weep because any hopes of real reconciliation and the recognition again of one synod within the denomination are to be permanently dashed. It must be clear to all who it is that has turned aside, who it is that has forsaken the councils and the agencies, the position of freedom, the militant battle which has been pressed, and who is now changing the constitution in order to unite with another body.

It has been very unjust to represent to the Christian world, as the Columbus Synod has done, that Carl McIntire and those associated with him went out and joined another denomination. Having decreed such by their Columbus Synod, they proceeded, as in the case of Carl McIntire, to set up another presbytery, place his name upon its roll without his knowledge or consent, and proceed to drop his name publicly, as they said, from the Bible Presbyterian denomination!

According to their allegation, McIntire went out and formed another denomination, and, in recognition of this fact, they threw him out of the Bible Presbyterian denomination! The enemies of the separatist cause and those who rejoice in the ecumenical apostasy have used this false allegation and these actions all over the world to bring comfort to the enemies of Christ and embarrassment to the little remnants who have sought to stand together for the faith of the Gospel. For this scandal these brethren must give an account some day.

The Lord, in His own time, will reveal the righteousness of the position of the International Council, the American Council, the independent agencies, and the historic stand of the Bible Presbyterian Church, which Carl McIntire and others have sought to maintain in the midst of misrepresentation, in the midst of attacks which have twisted words, misjudged motives, and scandalized a holy cause. But the Bible Presbyterian Church has been delivered. It has stood. Thank God!

May the Bible Presbyterian Church long live to fulfill its mission and to honor the Lord Jesus Christ.

Our appeal to all Bible Presbyterians is that they should remain Bible Presbyterians,

(Continued on page 13)

"Bible Presbyterian Church to Unite With Reformed Presbyterian Church"

QUOTED FROM "EDITORIAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES"

The full text of a press release reporting the contemplated merger of the Bible Presbyterian Church with the Reformed Presbyterian Church is given below. This same text with brief deletions was also printed in the *Bulletin News Supplement* published by the Publications Department of the Bible Presbyterian Church. The release follows:

Long steps toward a possible union of two conservative church bodies were taken May 15th at Coulterville, Illinois, when the Committee on Fraternal Relations of the Bible Presbyterian Synod, Inc., met with a similar committee of the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America, and formulated preliminary plans for such a union in the form of a statement which was unanimously adopted the following day by the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in session at Coulterville.

Informed sources indicate that it is probable that the Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church which meets in Florida late in June will make similar ratification of preliminary steps.

Dr. Robert G. Rayburn, president of Covenant College and Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, addressed the Synod as official delegate from the Bible Presbyterian Church to the Reformed Presbyterian body. Presiding over the joint meeting of the Committees on Fraternal Relations were the Rev. R. W. Stewart (RP) and Dr. Laird Harris (BP), chairman for their respective denominational committees.

Moderator for the Reformed Presbyterian Synod was Dr. Charles F. Pfeiffer, professor of Old Testament at the Moody Bible Institute, Chicago. The Rev. John Morton of Philadelphia was appointed official Fraternal Delegate to the forthcoming BP Synod. Bible Presbyterians participating in the discussions were Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., dean of the Graduate School of Covenant Seminary, the Rev. Thomas G. Cross, general secretary of the National Missions Committee of the BP Church, the

Union ...

(Continued from page 12)

join hands, close ranks, and go on in the liberty which we have in Christ, to build a true Presbyterian movement in this country. The Bible Presbyterian Church, with its recognition of independent agencies and the freedom that the local churches have, cannot be taken with one sweep by an ecclesiastical machine into some kind of church union enterprise such as the Columbus Synod group is now seeking to do with that portion of the church which recognizes it.

Rev. Jay Adams, Haddonfield, New Jersey, and Dr. Peter Stam, Jr.

(History of the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America goes back to 1774, stemming from a group then known as the Reformed Presbytery, which had a direct descent from the Reformation in Scotland. The Bible Presbyterian Church was organized in 1938 and its name has recently been subject to some confusion since Dr. Carl McIntire of Collingswood, New Jersey, with a minority group, formed another body using the same name but identifying itself as the Collingswood Synod.)

The statement approved by the RP Synod and now to be submitted to the BP Synod:

"That our combined Committees on Fraternal Relations (of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America, General Synod, and the Bible Presbyterian Synod, Inc.) propose that our two Churches pursue steps toward union:

"That the two Committees be continued, or re-constituted as a geographically convenient manner, to formulate in detail a Plan of Union which may be submitted to the Presbyteries and Congregations of our respective Communion, and which shall become effective if and when ratified by a three-fourths majority of the Presbyteries of each of our Churches, and by our two Assemblies, with satisfaction of the constitutional requirements for amendments in each of our two Communion;

"That the suggested doctrinal basis of the union be the Word of God as the only infallible rule of faith and life by which the Church is to be guided, and the historic Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms in an appropriate form; with all ministers and ruling elders required to subscribe to the inerrancy of the Scriptures and to the system of doctrine contained in the subordinate standards;

"That the suggested name of the union be The Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America, General Synod;

"And that the various organizations of our two Churches be continued until they may be united by mutually agreeable arrangements."

HEAR the right, O LORD,
attend unto my cry, give
ear unto my prayer, *that goeth*
not out of feigned lips.

Let my sentence come forth
from thy presence; let thine eyes
behold the things that are equal.

CORRECTION

BY THE REV. J. PHILIP CLARK

In the "Peru Story" which I wrote for the last issue of *The Free Press* I made the statement concerning Mr. James Gilchrist, "James has refused to make a financial adjustment with us." This was based upon the fact, as I stated, that we had not had a reply from Mr. Gilchrist to a request for financial accounting. We were all embarrassed this spring to discover that a letter had been received from Mr. Gilchrist last summer, at a time when Dr. Holdcroft was abroad and before I arrived in The Independent Board office to take up my work. The letter was put away in a desk pending Dr. Holdcroft's return, and there fell into a hidden place, from which it was recovered when the desk was cleaned recently. I would like now to express to James, in as public a way as I spoke of him before, that I am sorry for this wrong which we have, no matter how unconsciously, done him. Mr. Gilchrist in writing to us presented several demands as conditions to his repaying any part of that which The Independent Board felt he owed. It now would be better, and accurate, to say that James has not agreed to making a financial adjustment with us.

PRESERVE me, O God: for
in thee do I put my trust.

THE INDEPENDENT

BOARD FOR

PRESBYTERIAN

HOME MISSIONS

TO EVANGELIZE THE LOST

TO CHALLENGE THE APOSTASY

TO BUILD NEW CHURCHES

Support this Board by

PRAYER — CONTRIBUTIONS — TESTIMONY

Address all communications and contributions to

REV. ROBERT H. DUVALL
311 S. NEW STREET
WEST CHESTER, PA.

Prayer for Doctor for Kenya Answered

On the occasion of the celebration of its 25th anniversary the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions rejoiced also in a remarkable answer to prayer.

Some years ago, in order to secure a grant of land in Kenya Colony, Africa, for the work of the Board, the Board agreed to establish a hospital there and to have it staffed by a competent doctor not later than August, 1958. The hospital was started. The Lord gave a doctor, and then He took him. Among the many prayers and burdens of the Board has been a constant petition to the Lord that a doctor would be provided, that the contract agreed to could be met, and that the Gospel testimony in Kenya would be able to grow. Doctors have been interviewed and sought. Announcement of the need has been circulated far and wide.

On Tuesday night, May 20, 1958 the Board announced the appointment of and also commissioned as its missionaries, Dr. and Mrs. Matthew E. Johnson of Collingswood, N. J. "Ruth and Matt," as they are affectionately known in Collingswood, have been in the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood for

many years. He is an established physician in the borough with a splendid and appreciative practice. They have four children—Deborah, 13 years; Linnea, 11 years; Carol, 10 years; Eric, 7 years.

The announcement that Dr. Johnson would leave Collingswood for Africa, that he is going in response to the call of God, comes as a distinct and glorious answer to the prayers of many in the Board's missionary family around the world.

Dr. Johnson, 39 years of age, was graduated from Temple University. He served four years in the armed services. He took his medical course in Jefferson Medical College, and his intern work at Jefferson Hospital, Philadelphia.

He is a member of the Board of Deacons of the Collingswood Bible Presbyterian Church, and a member of the Board of Directors of the Bible Presbyterian Home for the Aged in Delanco, N. J.

The Johnsons have announced that they are ready to leave as soon as possible and plan to be in Africa on or about the last of August.

Dr. Johnson and his wife will receive missionary salaries and Board allowances for their children. The total cost per year of the family at the present standards of the Board is approximately \$4,800. This must all be underwritten by churches and friends before they can go.

In view of the fact that time is so short and the need so great, we are suggesting that individual readers of the *Christian Beacon* and Sunday school classes and churches concerned about getting the Gospel to the ends of the earth consider their responsibility, and join in helping.

The cost of transportation and the gathering of the necessary equipment to send the family also is in the neighborhood of \$4,800. Approximately \$10,000 is needed immediately to get this consecrated family, all of whom are missionaries in faith and in spirit, to their chosen field of service.

To complete the Roland K. Armes Memorial Hospital, which will be Dr. Johnson's charge, the sum of \$5,000 is needed, and \$3,800 additional is required to provide a suitable vehicle for transportation for safari.



MISSIONARIES TO KENYA, AFRICA
Dr. and Mrs. Matthew E. Johnson and Family
Deborah, 13; Linnea, 11; Carol, 10; Eric, 7

MINISTRY OF 20th CENTURY REFORMATION HOUR COMMENDED BY LISTENERS

Listeners to the five radio stations on which the 20th Century Reformation Hour is broadcasted have written their approval of the program to the director, the Rev. Carl McIntire, D.D. Some of the letters received recently follow.

"The ladies of the new Faith Bible Presbyterian Church of Arlington, Va., which you organized in February, held their first missionary society meeting last Thursday. All agreed that in order to show you how much they enjoy your radio broadcast over Station WFAX, Falls Church, Va., the entire collection of \$25 be sent you for that purpose. We wish it were possible also to be able to hear it on Saturday as so many do not go to work then.

"We have been greatly inspired and enlightened by the fine sermons of those ministers who have been so gracious as to make the trip to our Sunday services, but especially so of Rev. Douglas S. Dunzweiler. He is tops!

"The *Christian Beacon* is a very worthwhile and helpful publication.

"In fact, your work in all its facets is wonderful, and we are so thankful for 'thinking men' like you in our world today.

"God bless you and keep you!"—*Arlington, Va.*

"Praise the Lord for you and your program on WFAX. There are many people who believe right but are in these churches, unawares.... I'm sending out the cards for WFAX. I'll send more if you send them to me.

"The Lord is on our side as long as we believe in Jesus Christ, and the great 'I am' will help us. Isn't it wonderful to know the Lord?"—*Springfield, Va.*

"I enjoy your broadcasts each morning. I will continue to pray for your success. It is quite an undertaking. It is so good to hear someone speak the truth over the air. I know we are going to have a better informed people in this area. God bless you for standing up and for not being afraid to be counted."—*Latrobe, Pa.*

"Am certainly blessed by your program and the wonderful job you are doing. I would like to have a small part in this ministry. Would you send me your envelopes and I will try to send a dollar a month as the Lord provides. I pray the Lord will multiply it as He did the loaves and fishes. Lord bless you richly."—*Lawn, Pa.*

"Will you please send me the literature for Operation Liberty Bell. I feel this is one way I may be able to help....

"I know what you mean by being a lonely prophet. I used some material from the *Christian Beacon* at a Bible class meeting (monthly), speaking about how we are being engulfed. The class was quite disturbed, saying frankly they did not come to hear such topics. They thought there were enough sweet thoughts in the Bible, without me picking such disturbing thoughts. They said they could not sleep and didn't want to hear it.

"God bless you in this gigantic undertaking, and I promise to help where and when I can."—*Yeadon, Pa.*

"I am interested in your offer which you call Operation Liberty Bell. I believe I could use this information in

teaching my Sunday school class.

"It seems to me the Communists have been routed from some of their former areas of operation and have now turned to the church, where they feel they have a safe field of operation. And it looks to me as if this is so, unless Christians wake up and throw them out."—*Kulpsville, Pa.*

"I am very much impressed with the danger this country is facing and the effort you are making in bringing the facts to the people.

"May the dear Lord give you strength to carry on this work."—*Philadelphia, Pa.*

"We listen to your broadcast almost every morning and are grateful that there are still prophets raised up by God to

show His people their sin.... We praise the Lord for the depth of love manifested by the Johnsons as they prepare to go to Africa.

"Praying for your broadcast to reach coast to coast and for a true revival of heart purity in our nation toward Jesus Christ."—*Lansdale, Pa.*

"Thank you for your messages on Amos.... It would be for the glory of God if we had some Amoses today. Thanks also for the information on the conditions in the churches and the working of the Communists in this country. I cannot understand why all the pastors and people that stand for the truth of God's Word do not band together and see this 20th Century Reformation through."—*Camden, N. J.*

20th Century Reformation Hour

ITS PURPOSE

1. To exalt Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord.
2. To honor the Scriptures as the inerrant Word of God.
3. To stand for the historic American heritage of freedom.
4. To promote personal righteousness and patriotism.
5. To warn of threats to our faith and freedom.
6. To inspire to enthusiastic service to our Lord and land.

ITS DIRECTOR

The Rev. Carl McIntire, D.D.

Sounds a warning, preaches Christ, exposes error, answers questions, keeps the faith.

ITS STATIONS

WVCH, Chester, Pa., serving the Philadelphia metropolitan area
740 kc., 7.45 to 8.15 a.m., Monday through Saturday

WGCB, Red Lion, Pa., serving southeastern Pennsylvania
1440 kc., 7.30 to 8 a.m., Monday through Friday

WMUU, Greenville, S.C., serving the Carolinas
1260 kc., 8.30 to 9 a.m., Monday through Friday

WFAX, Falls Church, Va., serving Washington, D.C.
1220 kc., 8 to 8.30 a.m., Monday through Friday

WAVL, Apollo, Pa., serving Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania
910 kc., 7.30 to 8 a.m., Monday through Friday

WIBU, Poynette, Wis., serving Madison and Southern Wisconsin
8.35 to 9.05 a.m., Monday through Friday

Headquarters: Box 218, Collingswood 7, N. J.

"ICCC"

Ten Years -- For God's Glory!

1948 - 1958

BY CARL McINTIRE

Something of the impact of the International Council of Christian Churches can be seen when the catalogue of the years is considered. An uncompromising, consistent, vigorous witness has been felt in many sections of the world "for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ" (Rev. 1:9 b). This chronicle is a record of praise to God for His faithfulness and a report of issues joined and battles engaged in for the faith of the Gospel. For ten short years, men of faith have lifted a testimony on this earth in behalf of "the common salvation" (Jude 3), and against the apostasy, the inclusivism, and the "filthy dreams" (Jude 8) of men as they seek to build a one-world, Babylon church (Rev. 17:3-5).

1948—Amsterdam, August 11 to 21. The First Congress and the formation of the International Council of Christian Churches, meeting in the English Reformed Church. Attendance—150, from 21 countries. Theme: The Christ of the Scriptures.

1949—Buenos Aires, Argentina, July 18 to 30. A 14-member ICCC team went to attend the Inter-American Evangelical Conference, were locked out, held a separate meeting, and issued a call for the Pan-American Evangelical Conference in 1951, in Sao Paulo, Brazil.

1949—Bangkok, Thailand, December 4 to 11. An ICCC team of 17 attended the East Asia Christian Conference, were roped out, held a separate meeting, and issued a call for the Conference of Christian Churches in Asia in Manila in 1951.

1950—Geneva, Switzerland, August 16 to 23. Second Plenary Congress of the ICCC. Attendance—450, representing 43 nations. Theme: Twentieth Century Reformation.

1951—Sao Paulo, Brazil, July 16 to 24. Pan-American Evangelical Conference, resulting in the formation of the Latin American Alliance of Christian Churches. Delegates—450, representing 16 countries; established first continent wide council of churches for Latin America.

1951—Manila, Philippines, November 25 to December 2. Conference of Christian Churches in Asia, resulting in formation of Far Eastern Council of Christian Churches, in the First Baptist Church, Manila. Attendance—250, from nine Far Eastern nations; established first council of churches for the Far East.

1952—Edinburgh, Scotland, July 24 to 30. British Isles Regional Conference of the ICCC. Attendance—350, from 11 countries.

1952—Beirut, Lebanon, August 7 to 11. Middle East Missionary Conference, resulting in the formation of the Middle East Bible Council. Attendance—210, from 12 countries.

1953—Toronto, Canada, June 18 to 23. ICCC Canadian Regional Conference; organized the Canadian Evangelical Protestant Council. Delegates—166, from six provinces of Canada and four countries.

1953—Karuizawa, Japan, July 26 to August 2. Second assembly of the Far Eastern Council of Christian Churches. Attendance—160, from 12 Far Eastern countries.

1954—Santiago, Chile, January 11 to 18. Second conference of the Latin American Alliance of Christian Churches. Attendance—150, from nine Latin lands.

1954—Philadelphia, Pa., August 3 to 12. Third Plenary Congress of the International Council of Christian Churches. Attendance—1500, from 45 countries. Theme: The Historic Christian Faith.

1955—Bethlehem, Jordan, August 18 to 23. Second meeting of the Middle East Bible Council. Attendance—274, from 12 countries.

1955—Jonkoping, Sweden, August 1 to 7. Scandinavian Evangelical Conference, resulting in the formation of the Scandinavian Evangelical Council. Attendance—340, from 12 countries.

1956—Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, July 16 to 24. Third conference of the Latin American Alliance of Christian Churches. Attendance—200, from ten Latin lands.

1956—Singapore, Malaya, August 5 to 12. Third Assembly of the Far Eastern Council of Christian Churches. Attendance—200, from 12 countries.

1957—Nahr es Safa, Lebanon, July 19 to 25. Third meeting of the Middle East Bible Council. Attendance—125, from nine countries.

1957—Hillerod, Denmark, August 1 to 7. Second conference of the Scandinavian Evangelical Council. Attendance—400, from 12 nations. The ICCC European Alliance was formed following this conference.

1958—Quitandinha, Petropolis, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, August 12 to 21. Fourth Plenary Congress of the International Council of Christian Churches—the climax of them all! Theme: The Christ of the Scriptures.

There are 61 denominations and associations of churches, 22 missions, and 17 regional and national councils in the ICCC.

Add to these international and regional meetings the annual and semiannual meetings of the various national Councils, Bible Leagues, Consultative Committees in the Netherlands, United States, Canada, England, Australia, New Zealand, India, Japan, Chile, Brazil, Singapore, Hawaii, Jamaica, British Guiana; and add to this the launching of thousands of Bible Balloons over the Iron Curtain every year since 1953; the team of eight ICCC leaders who toured Australia, Sydney to Tasmania, and from Melbourne to Perth, in January, 1956; and then consider the extensive tour of the United States of the team of refugee clergy under the joint sponsorship of the ICCC and American Council of Christian Churches in the spring of 1957, and one can begin to see something of the total impact which has been made in land after land in behalf of the united testimony among Bible-believing churches and Christians.

It is this impact that has recently led both the official organ of the International Missionary Council and the official organ of the World Council of Churches to give expression to most revealing opinions concerning the International Council of Christian Churches.

Dr. Norman Goodall, joint secretary for the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches, wrote, "I do not think we have taken sufficient account of the mischief caused by the activities of such a body as the International Council of Christian Churches" (*International Missionary Review*, April, 1958).

Dr. Ernest A. Payne, vice-chairman of the central committee of the World Council of Churches, said, "The International Council of Christian Churches . . . is a small body, which has repeatedly sought to denigrate the World Council. Its . . . literature is widely distributed in a number of countries" (*Ecumenical Review*, April, 1958).

In ten years God has used, tested, and blessed the ICCC. Let all of God's people thank Him for the standard which His Holy Spirit has raised up (Isa. 59:19). God uses the weak and foolish things to confound the wise and the mighty!