

An Appeal to All Bible Presbyterians

BY CARL McINTIRE

The time has come when all who have called themselves Bible Presbyterian need to consider before our blessed Lord the on-going testimony of this historic movement.

God raised up the Bible Presbyterian Church. He has used it in a singular and glorious way in this twentieth century day of apostasy.

Because of differences which arose within the church over what came to be called "the softer approach" in dealing with the apostasy and those who compromised with it, over independent agencies versus Synod-controlled agencies, and over the Councils, including the American and International Councils of Christian Churches, two different Synods began to be held each year — one called the Columbus Synod and the other the Collingswood Synod. Both Synods operated under the same constitution, the same name. A synod is not the church or the denomination. During this time there was still one Bible Presbyterian Church but two different Synods. Neither group, as such, had left the Bible Presbyterian denomination. All were operating under the same constitution and name, with different portions of the church recognizing different Synods. Efforts at reconciliation were vain, and differences deepened.

THE NAME

Now the group known as the Columbus Synod has changed the name, amended the constitution, amended the doctrinal standards, and with the support of presbyteries and local churches has indeed become a new denomination. This came to pass in July, 1961. It is now the Evangelical Presbyterian denomination.

This has left that portion of the church operating under the constitution, which has refused to support the ideas and policies of the Columbus Synod, to itself and with the constitution and the name. This body remains under the constitution without any changes or amendments, and continues to operate as the Bible Presbyterian Church. This church has always operated — supporting independent agencies, retaining membership in the Councils, and carrying on a vigorous, uncompromising stand in the great battle against the apostasy. It is now the Bible Presbyterian denomination — all that did not go into the Evangelical Presbyterian Church.

There are, therefore, since the action of the Columbus Synod and its supporting presbyteries approving the Evangelical Presbyterian Church, two separate denominations, each going its separate way. The Evangelical Presbyterians are operating now with a different constitution, the old Bible Presbyterian constitution which they have amended and changed to their satisfaction. The Bible Presbyterian Church continues as the Bible Presbyterian Church under the same constitution, with presbyteries and churches maintaining their status without any change in name or constitution.

Already, since the break has been made final, several things have taken place.

First, the Bible Presbyterian Church of Albuquerque, N. Mex., by unanimous decision, voted to withdraw from the Evangelical Presbyterian Church into which they had been taken, and to retain fellowship in the Bible Presbyterian Church. The Westminster Presbyterian Church of Mexia, Texas, which joined the Columbus Synod presbytery, in a duly called congregational meeting unanimously declared its fellowship with the Bible Presbyterian Church. Now, of course, the sub-designation of Collingswood Synod is no longer needed in the church. There are no

(Continued on page 2)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

An Appeal to All Bible Presbyterians	1
The Names	1
The Change of Doctrine	5
"Neutral"	6
To Answer Your Questions on Japan	6
Attempt to Divert Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference, Inc.	9
Certificates of Incorporation	10
After Five Years	11
The Bible Presbyterian Church	14
What Is the Difference Between the Bible Presbyterian Church and the United Presbyterian Church?	16

THE NAMES

What is represented in the names "Bible Presbyterian Church" and "Evangelical Presbyterian Church"?

Bible Presbyterian Church. Here the emphasis has been upon the Bible. The great struggle which gave the church birth in the modernist-fundamentalist battle of the twentieth century was over the authority and truth of the Word of God. No more appropriate or choice name could have been selected — Bible Presbyterian.

The Bible Presbyterian Church had the distinct honor and privilege in the history of American Protestantism to be one of the two denominations that initiated and established the American Council of Christian Churches. This Council has been in a place of leadership in the forefront of the great battle for the faith and the challenging of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. Now the National Council of Churches is under a greater shadow than at any time in the history of the ecumenical movement and it has been freely admitted that it has been the leadership of the American Council and those in the Bible Presbyterian Church who have had a significant part and place in awaking the nation to the modernism, inclusivism, social gospel, and socialism that is involved in the National Council of Churches.

The Bible Presbyterian name has been identified with sound Gospel evangelism and its churches have found a unity in the use of the name "Bible Presbyterian" in every section of the country.

"Bible Presbyterian" has a history. The name, the church, its leaders have been under attack in vicious abuse by the liberals, the modernists, the middle-of-the-roads, the compromisers, and the National Council of Churches.

"Bible Presbyterian" has come to stand for the spirit of faith and uncompromising witness to the Word of God.

Evangelical Presbyterian Church calls to mind other matters. "Evangelical" in the name has had no particular significance in the twentieth century struggle in the United States. The conflict was between the modernists and the "fundamentalists."

The name "evangelical" has been associated, since 1943, with the National Association of Evangelicals. This was adopted to be expressive of a more mod-

(Continued on page 2)

An Appeal ...

(Continued from page 1)

longer two Synods operating under the constitution of the Bible Presbyterian Church — only one Synod remains to serve the whole church.

To us have come letters and calls indicating that there is unrest and dissatisfaction in the new Evangelical Presbyterian Church. Local people in the churches did not realize what was happening, and do not even yet understand the full impact of the change. Many do not yet know they have ceased to be a Bible Presbyterian Church and are without their consent an Evangelical Presbyterian Church!

The Evangelical Presbyterian Church, with its Synod-controlled agencies, so far as its organization is concerned is a miniature of the United Presbyterian Church. The very tightly controlled system which the Bible Presbyterians threw off when the church was established has now been re-established. But the Bible Presbyterian Church continues, in the goodness and grace of God. It has been preserved. Let it be said that, had it been a Synod-controlled church from the beginning, with the caucuses and scheming that went on to control the Synod, virtually nothing would have been preserved, but maybe a few remnants here and there. (Now the Evangelical Presbyterian Church is all set to take everything into any church union decided upon!) But all the agencies and their activities would have been under the control of the machine which developed in the Bible Presbyterian Church and sought to use the power of Synod and the judicial commission to force churches to do their will. Yet, because of the freedom of the churches, which the churches attacked refused to give up, and because of the protections of the constitution and the independence of the various agencies, the church has been saved in its original position and its historic stand. Today there are around 100 ministers in the church.

For this, of course, there is thanksgiving to Almighty God. Indeed, the opportunities that have now come to us in the Bible Presbyterian Church are beyond anything that has ever been anticipated. The doors are open everywhere. The need is for many more pastors, ministers. People in various sections of the country listening to the 20th Century Reformation Hour broadcast (now on 208 stations) are writing continually asking for help, information, and the request for Bible Presbyterian Churches is coming with increasing number. We love the Bible Presbyterian name and church.

The very thing that the men in the Columbus Synod objected to — the strong militant stand — is that which God is using now to bless and strengthen the

THE NAMES

(Continued from page 1)

erate, softer position, as opposed to the vigorous stand of the American Council of Christian Churches in contending for the faith.

"Evangelical" has been associated in recent years with what is called "The New Evangelicalism," of which Dr. Harold John Ockenga is the father. This again connotes a serious compromise with doctrine and involves a departure from the historic position of the fundamentalists in their battle with the modernists.

"Evangelical" Presbyterian Church has no history. It has no background. It is not identified in any way with the struggle against the apostasy of the United Presbyterian Church, or the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. "Evangelical Presbyterian" is a weak name.

To place the word "evangelical" alongside of "Bible," to compare or contrast the two, shows unmistakably the strength and the testimony of the name "Bible."

church as never before. The ACCC and the ICCC are growing — the ICCC now with 72 denominations!

THE MISSION BOARD

On the other hand, there is, of course, great sorrow that brethren have changed and turned away. They have injured a great cause and taken with them a portion of a great, free church. They no longer support the Councils which are being used so greatly of the Lord. They have actually engaged, many of them, in a direct campaign attacking personalities and seeking to discredit individuals. It is not a very good testimony to see a Presbyterian mission board under the control of the Synod build itself up by tearing down the work and activities of another Presbyterian mission board. The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions has had the most glorious history and testimony of any missionary agency of the Twentieth Century Reformation, and yet the Evangelical Presbyterian Church's foreign board, under the leadership of William Mahlow, has built itself up by attempting to dismantle the Independent Board. If the Independent Board were modernist, there could be some justification, but it is a sound, true, Presbyterian missionary agency, and none can deny it!

In Peru, the missionaries under World Presbyterian Missions, the Synod-controlled agency, actually took possession of the property (title was in the name of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions) and the work of the Independent Board. In Japan, missionaries supporting the Columbus Synod,

What is so distressing about all of the difficulty is that men became so offended with the militant, uncompromising stand of the American Council of Christian Churches, the International Council of Christian Churches, and Bible Presbyterian leadership, that they were willing to give up the word "Bible" and substitute for it the word "evangelical." Yet it was the Bible which called for the militant, faithful stand.

In these last days, these great days of apostasy, with such confusion with the new Bible, the Revised Standard Version, with the NEB, the New English Bible, and the controversy centering around the perversions which have been introduced by the liberals into the translations, the emphasis of the Bible Presbyterian Church upon the Word of God gives to the Bible Presbyterian Church a position of distinction, of signal recognition, and of honor among the people of God.

May all Bible Presbyterians retain the name and remain with the Bible Presbyterian movement.

some of whom are now under WPM, actually diverted (in plain language—stole) the property of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. This whole story is told in this issue with careful documentation by the general secretary of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

HARVEY CEDARS

The spectacle of seeing Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference, Inc., completely diverted from the Bible Presbyterian movement is one that ought to shock every true and honorable Christian. The director of the Conference, the Rev Albert Oldham, admitted before the General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church (Collingswood Synod) that he had said that if any group were to have the Conference the BPC-Collingswood Synod was entitled to it. But he and others on the Board were a party to amending the charter and diverting it from its original Bible Presbyterian trust and purpose. This, however, has now been challenged, and attorneys have been secured to prosecute the matter, if necessary, to the end. To divert property which has been dedicated to the Bible Presbyterian denomination (as the charter of Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference, Inc., so clearly commits it) is a clear violation of trust and of the holy commandments of our God.

It has indeed been a great grief to see men with whom we have had precious Christian fellowship and whom we love in the Lord turn aside to a softer and weaker stand in regard to the awful apos-

tasy of the day and to be used against us by the enemies of the Gospel.

CHANGE OF POSITION

The Synod in Tacoma which changed the name to Evangelical Presbyterian Church actually had as one of its speakers, as announced in the press, the president of the National Association of Evangelicals of the Pacific Northwest. NAE is compromise. It takes the middle of the road! Leaders of the World Council of Churches commend it! Some of the pastors of EPC have now gone back into the ministerial associations which include ministers who are members of the National Council of Churches. Co-operative programs are being undertaken in different places with churches which are in the apostasy. The whole stand is being compromised and let down. There is not the clear, strong opposition to ecumenical evangelism that the Bible Presbyterian Church has always maintained, and which the Collingswood Synod has consistently maintained throughout these days as we have seen the ecumenical movement drive in its tremendous power to build the one-world church.

Now the Evangelical Presbyterian Church has become just another Presbyterian Church. There is nothing in the individual names of the local churches to distinguish them, in many instances, from the regular Southern or Northern Presbyterian Churches.

The name "Bible Presbyterian" which has customarily been used in the titles of all our churches has given us a singular position, and because of this Satan has been vigorous and furious in his attack upon this movement. The sad part is that men have yielded to these attacks, thinking that by shifting ground they would gain advantage.

Now it is clear to us that those who have stood firm and have sought to maintain the Bible Presbyterian testimony consistently and gloriously are being graciously cared for, and this indeed is being commended to the consciences of men in our Church and Synod. Many can see more clearly now which group was truly right.

The introduction of a new doctrinal declaratory statement into the constitution of the EPC leaves the Church really at sea on the doctrine of the premillennial return of Christ. Each minister, each church, is free to believe almost anything he wants to about the Lord's coming. A special article has been written to analyze this whole development.

CONSTITUTION VIOLATED

There are two other features in the conflict which need to be presented. The name of the Bible Presbyterian Church

has always been "Bible Presbyterian Church." The Columbus Synod began to call itself "Bible Presbyterian Church, Incorporated." Actually, the Synod had itself incorporated as a Synod, which is provided for, but that did not incorporate the Church. The presbyteries also may be incorporated, and local churches may be incorporated, but, for the churches to call themselves "Bible Presbyterian Church, Incorporated," the constitution should have been amended, so that such a name could be properly used; but it was not. Now we read that they are calling themselves Evangelical Presbyterian Church, Incorporated, but this incorporation has not been added to the name, and the name of the church is contained in the constitution of the church. A Synod may set itself up a corporation to hold property, in a very limited sense with which a Synod can hold property.

Not only was the constitution violated in this addition to the name, but there are certain unamendable provisions of the Form of Government of the Bible Presbyterian Church. Chapter 20, Sections 4 and 5, are "unamendable and irrevocable." Yet Section 4 has in it the clause, "without any rights of reversion to the Bible Presbyterian Church, its presbyteries, synods, or any other courts hereinafter created, its trustees or other officers." Now that the Evangelical Presbyterian Church has come into existence, this paragraph which cannot possibly be amended has apparently been nullified. There is no question of reversion to the Bible Presbyterian Church any more, so far as the EPC is concerned. It would have to be reversion to the Evangelical Presbyterian Church. But in order to introduce such a question into the constitution, another section would have to be added which in itself could not be amended or revoked. In Section 4, the name Bible Presbyterian Church is "unamendable and irrevocable."

I feel that some of this information must be given to the Bible Presbyterians, Our denomination, our Synod, our presbyteries, our local churches — our great movement is going on! We have a history, a heritage, a struggle and we are in the midst of the terrific battle in which God has placed us.

COUNCILS REPUDIATED

In July, I flew down to Lima, Peru, to take part in a meeting of the Latin American Alliance of Christian Churches. This special meeting of the directorate had been called to challenge the Second Latin American Evangelical Conference which was organized to promote the ecumenical movement and the World Council of Churches in South America. World Council leaders were there. The finances back of the conference came from mission

agencies connected with the National Council of Churches here in the United States through the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America, which is a part of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. The issues were joined. Now *The Christian Century* admits that the World Council failed, because of us, to organize a continent-wide council! A tremendous impact has been left in Latin America as a result of the Latin American Alliance of Christian Churches. But, do you know, my friends, two of the missionaries of World Presbyterian Missions came to our meeting; they arose and said that they wanted to make it very plain that neither they nor their mission board were a part of our meeting or our activity! Their Board refused any kind of co-operation. We were told they did not approve of the "method." This was the old line of the fundamentalists who stayed in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. They always agreed in principle but not in method, and so stood against us! Our meetings were open and they were there simply as visitors and to observe. But they also went and were admitted to the conference of the World Council's group!

We have also the sad spectacle in Korea—where God has used the International Council of Christian Churches in such a glorious way in helping the great Korean Church to leave the World Council of Churches—of finding missionaries of WPM actually opposing the International Council of Christian Churches. In our world-wide struggle, the missionaries of the Evangelical Presbyterian Church, as they are called—they are under the Board of that denomination—are being used to oppose the work of the ICOC. So far as the issues of building the one-world church are concerned and the ecumenical apostasy, when they are joined in given conflict by the International Council of Christian Churches, these missionaries for the sake of the Gospel ought to join and be a part of that testimony. But, no! Yes, there is a difference. They have taken the "softer approach." There is evasion. There is also double talk! They have moved more into the middle-of-the-road position and this is apparent now.

APPEAL

It is our appeal to all Bible Presbyterians who have sacrificed and suffered and are bearing the reproaches of the separatist movement that we stand together and remain together in the Bible Presbyterian Church. We need each other. The issues are now plain. The Bible Presbyterian Church will go on its historic way.

The Evangelical Presbyterian Church has now prepared the way, with the changes which they have made and the

resolutions that they have adopted, modifying the stand of the Church on the "separated life" for a union with the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and also the Reformed Presbyterian Church. But the Orthodox Presbyterian Church is negotiating also for a union with the Christian Reformed Church, and the shifts and changes which are fully apparent are designed to the end that ultimately they may all be gathered up in some larger united church, with a different history, a different tradition, and, of course, a different stand on the great separatist issues of the hour. Satan has fought the Bible Presbyterian Church because of its stand and militant warfare for Christ.

When God called us out, He said, "Come out from among them and be ye separate, and touch not the unclean thing." The Evangelical Presbyterians are deeply involved in the realm of "touching" the "unclean thing." Time and time again the leaders of the NCC and WCC have used the attack of the Columbus-Synod leaders upon the Collingswood Synod's battle against the apostasy to discredit the Collingswood Synod leadership. Never has it been the other way around!

All who are truly Bible Presbyterian we invite and call to stand with us, and to work with us in building the Bible Presbyterian Church for God's glory! The consistent, forthright position of the Bible Presbyterian Church God is using now in a singular way as a witness in these latter days.

What our people need to realize is that what has now happened was all outlined in the beginning in the document called "The Ideological Division Within Our Church," prepared in the summer of 1955 by Dr. Robert Rayburn. There was a definite effort to change the Bible Presbyterian Church and make out of it a different kind of denomination. Attempts to amend the constitution, to bring about a slight shift in the beginning were defeated. A group headed by three individuals, nothing less than what is called an organized, planned program or conspiracy, developed. In the document, "The Ideological Division," Dr. Rayburn wrote: "We contend that the present division within our Church is ideological in nature, and therefore beyond reconciliation." He insisted that it "cannot be harmonized." And he declared, "This means that the Bible Presbyterian Church must decide whether to continue its outward organizational form, within which this irreconcilable division is certainly to be perpetuated, or to go their separate ways."

Those who were following his leadership took issue with the very nature of the Bible Presbyterian Church. He declared, "However, 1938 may have been

the year that a hybrid mixture of Congregationalism and Presbyterianism was effected. In fact, our present ideological division became apparent only after men began to recognize the hybrid structure of the Bible Presbyterian Church."

Dr. Rayburn even went so far as to question Chapter 1, paragraph 9 of the Form of Government, page 129 of the constitution, which reads: "All powers not in this Constitution specifically granted to the courts of the Church are reserved to the congregations respectively, or to the people." He proceeded to argue that this type of church government was not Presbyterian, but was essentially Baptist.

What the Bible Presbyterian Church did when it was formed was to return to the original concept of Presbyterian responsibility before the long evolutionary process developed which ended in the hierarchy of the General Assembly directing with unrestrained power the whole church! The Bible Presbyterians went back to the original development of the Presbyterian movement in this country, the responsibility of the local churches owning their own property, and the agencies actually being independent of the General Assembly. What the Presbyterians forget is that for 100 years they supported the New England Congregational Board for their missionary activities, and had none of their own under the General Assembly's power. Power at the top and centralization brought disaster!

Rayburn's article even went so far as to claim that The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions was Congregational, the same charge made against the Board by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. when the attack was made upon Dr. Machen in 1934. Rayburn wrote, "We are objecting to the attempt to picture independently controlled agencies as Presbyterian rather than as Congregational."

Unable to attain these desires by perverting the entire Church, the conspiracy developed within the Church. It was led by Robert Rayburn, Francis Schaeffer, Tom Cross, George Soltan, who was an accomplice of theirs as assistant pastor in the Collingswood Church under Dr. Carl McIntire. This group came within two votes of capturing The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

Now, it is clear. They have been successful in taking a portion of the Bible Presbyterian Church and making out of it the Evangelical Presbyterian Church with its Synod-controlled agencies with no connection with the broader Twentieth Century Reformation movement through the ACCC and ICC, and with its softer approach dealing with

the apostasy. That this is what they intended was clear from the beginning. They have now been successful in taking a portion of the Church. Instead of leaving the denomination and starting one which would be in accordance with their new ideas, they were successful in taking a sizeable portion of the Bible Presbyterian Church, and changing it into another denomination.

The famous Soltan-Rayburn letters reveal the active underground and the conspiracy itself. These were letters which Dr. Rayburn, as president of Highland College, exchanged with George Soltan, assistant pastor in the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood, and in God's providence were left at Highland College. Soltan revealed that he was a spy and a spokesman for this group, undermining Dr. McIntire and the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood. In his confidential reports to Rayburn of the Session's meetings and other gatherings he admitted that he was having great difficulty in not being detected. "At times I feel as if I were walking across Niagara Falls on a tight rope," he wrote.

When these issues came to a head in the New Jersey Presbytery, those aligned with Dr. Rayburn were in the minority. They walked out; set up their own presbytery, claiming to be the true Presbytery, and proceeded to enroll Dr. McIntire in their Presbytery without his knowledge or his consent, and then they proceeded to discipline him by removing him from the Presbytery. They gave the story to the public newspapers, and the local *Camden Courier* carried a three-column, front-page headline, "McIntire Dropped From Bible Church." This rump Presbytery also proceeded to enroll the Collingswood Church without its knowledge or consent, and duly notified the Collingswood Church. The furor which this created was so great that the matter was quietly dropped. They did not attempt to put the Collingswood Church out of the Bible Presbyterian denomination as they tried to do its pastor, Dr. McIntire and the Collingswood Church were all members of the Presbytery which continued intact. For this scandalous conduct and offense, no word of regret or apology has even been offered. What actually took place has been an organized, concentrated campaign to discredit the leaders in the Bible Presbyterian Church and then to take as much of the Bible Presbyterian movement — the denomination, the independent agencies, the mission fields — as possible over into the new concept of what Dr. Rayburn and his associates wanted to make out of the Bible Presbyterian denomination, and were unsuccessful in doing by way of proper amendment within the Church. All of this is now clear as never before to God's people.

THE CHANGE OF DOCTRINE

When men did not agree with the Bible Presbyterian Church or like the way in which its constitution was organized, they should have quietly stepped aside and started another church according to their own ideas, instead of trying to take a church, or as much as possible of that church, which they did, and make something different out of it.

That which misled so many people was the very pious and hyperspiritual emphasis used as a cover that attended all of this activity. Under cover of being "more spiritual" very unspiritual things were done. When the missionaries took possession of The Independent Board's property in Peru, "the Lord led" them, they said. When Addison Soltan was removed as a missionary he went back to the property of the Mission Board in Japan and took up his abode. This, too, was the "guidance of the Lord." Missionaries who took solemn vows to the charter of The Independent Board were "led of the Lord" to violate those vows in relationship to the Board's work and possessions. Much that the Evangelical Presbyterian Church now has in missionary activity it was "led of the Lord" to take away from The Independent Board. Under cover of sweet expressions of love they conducted a game of grabbing all they could from the Bible Presbyterian Church that it might be their own Evangelical Presbyterian Church.

All this was simply carrying out Dr. Rayburn's original pattern as outlined in "The Ideological Division Within Our Church."

When we think of the noble and glorious principles which gave birth to the Bible Presbyterian Church and compare them with the reason for which the Evangelical Presbyterian Church was formed at the price of disrupting the Bible Presbyterian Church, we recognize that there is no similarity.

In the meantime, those of us who are determined to preserve the Bible Presbyterian Church as founded have sought to give the people the facts, but we have continued to go ahead with the great struggle and the great movement. The battle of the day God gave to the Bible Presbyterians, and it is still, by the favor of God, in their hands.

It is most significant that it has been since the attacks of the leaders of the Evangelical Presbyterian Church that God has opened the door for the expanding radio ministry of the 20th Century Reformation Hour. Since these attacks began, this broadcast has reached out until it is now being heard in many sections of the nation on at least 208 radio stations. This is a gift of God. It is God's doing! Some day, some day, we pray, the brethren who launched the attack and were able to take a section of the

The 1960 Columbus Synod, after it had adopted the proposed doctrinal basis of union, eliminating premillennialism entirely, agreeing to a neutral concept, proceeded to adopt what it called "a declaratory statement of the Confession of Faith." This became an amendment to the constitution. The Declaration indicated, "We declare that subscription to the system of doctrine of our church upon the part of all presbyteries shall be understood as leaving them and our churches and members free to hold and to teach any eschatological view which includes the visible and personal return of our Lord to earth. . . ." Premillennialism, amillennialism, postmillennialism, no reference to the millennium whatsoever. Moreover, it may be a pre-tribulation rapture, a mid-tribulation rapture, a post-tribulation rapture — "any eschatological view" which is not otherwise inconsistent with the system of doctrine. To find out, therefore, what the teaching of the Church may be on these matters, it would be necessary to find out the views of a given individual pastor and a local church. Thus it may vary from congregation to minister, from minister to congregation. There is and will be no unity of teaching concerning this glorious doctrine of the premillennial return of Christ.

What makes this whole declaration so misleading is that it is introduced by a statement, "Although our standards include the premillennial view of that blessed hope, the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and we hold this view to be taught in God's Word; nevertheless. . ." But the "nevertheless" section contradicts

Church into their different idea of a Presbyterian Church — some day, we pray they will recognize the great wrong done to the cause of our Lord. May God grant them such grace!

Moreover, the Bible Presbyterians continue steadfast. They are the great focal point of attack from the modernists, the NAE, the new evangelicals, and many others who are not willing to take the consistent Biblical stand required by the doctrine of the purity of the Gospel and the purity of the church.

We close with an appeal to all Bible Presbyterians to join with us in continuing in advancing this blessed testimony until the Lord comes.

The Bible Presbyterian Church is free. It is a church of our blessed Lord, and it has suffered from the "modernists" and the "evangelicals." It will by God's grace continue to be a blessed standard for the truth and against the great apostasy of Christendom. May God grant it!

this statement and opens the door for all these other views which are not taught in the Word of God. This is double talk, and this contradiction is made an amendment to the Constitution. In reality, each individual may hold "any eschatological view which includes the visible and personal return of our Lord." So the Church and its doctrine of the Lord's return is changed!

It is most significant that this declaratory statement was adopted after they had already gone on record in favor of a "neutralist" position on the doctrinal basis of the proposed union.

Thus there is more double talk, contradiction, inconsistency; and one wonders just where the Word of God comes in in this particular question.

More than that, the blessed Bible Presbyterian Church as originally organized gives a clear and straightforward, consistent witness on this matter of the second coming of Christ. Now we have seen a section of the original diverted to an Evangelical Presbyterian Church which is in the position of not knowing what it does believe in these matters or what its various pastors and churches will teach in these matters.

The doctrine has been changed. Do the people in the Bible Presbyterian Church who love the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ and that Blessed Hope of the imminency of the Rapture understand that this is what has happened to the testimony of their Church? We are thankful to God that what is known as the Collingswood Synod and which continues in deed and in truth the Bible Presbyterian Church has made no changes whatsoever and stands as the Church has always stood from its first day holding up these blessed doctrines of the Holy Scriptures.

THERE is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.

For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh:

That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit.

For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace.

"NEUTRAL"

There can be no doubt whatsoever as to how the Columbus Synod leaders feel concerning the premillennial return of Christ. In the minutes of their 1960 Synod the doctrinal basis for a union with the Reformed Presbyterian Church was actually adopted. According to this basis, all references to the premillennial return of Christ in the Confession of Faith and as adopted by the Bible Presbyterian Church, have been completely eliminated.

The actual recommendation which was adopted reads: "Further, that the doctrinal basis of union be the Confession of Faith in an early American Form, the Shorter Catechism in its original form and the Larger Catechism with the following changes to make them clearly neutral as to millennialism."

Thus, the Confession of Faith, as adopted by the Bible Presbyterian Church and the Larger Catechism, as adopted by the Bible Presbyterian Church, have been abandoned. The Synod itself approved all this!

It is not a question of the Catechism's confessing what the Bible teaches; it is a question of adopting a Catechism which will be "neutral" on this matter. But the Bible is not neutral; neither are the doctrinal standards of the Bible Presbyterian Church. Here is a weakness in confessing Christ which is not a part of the Bible Presbyterian doctrinal statement.

Changes were made in Questions 86, 87, 88, 89, and 90 in the early American Form of the Larger Catechism so as to make sure that they would be neutral.

Question 88, as it appears in the Bible Presbyterian constitution, as adopted at the formation of the Bible Presbyterian Church, reads as follows:

"Q. 88. What shall immediately follow after the resurrection?"

"A. Immediately after the second resurrection shall follow the final judgment of men and angels, the destruction of the earth by fire, and the ushering in of the new heaven and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."

But this same section, as changed by the Columbus Synod so that it would be fully neutral, reads as follows:

"Q. 88. What shall follow after the resurrection?" (The word "immediately" is removed.)

"A. After the resurrection of the just and unjust shall follow the final judgment of men and angels. That all may watch and pray and be ever ready for the coming of the Lord, the day and hour thereof no man knoweth."

To Answer Your Questions on Japan

BY J. PHILIP CLARK

It has become widely known that The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions no longer has a ministry in Tokyo, Japan, a ministry begun in 1949, and that it has been deprived of its Tokyo properties. Since many, who have through the years contributed to our work in Japan and who have aided us in obtaining properties in the Tokyo area, have asked searching questions as to why we are no longer ministering in Tokyo and as to why we have seemingly lost the properties they helped us obtain, it is time that we give a complete answer, though we sincerely regret the necessity of making such a statement.

THE CHARTER

We must first understand that The Independent Board has, since October 17, 1933, operated under a charter. That charter gave the corporation power "to establish, maintain, support, and otherwise encourage such schools in foreign countries as may be necessary or essential to effect the purpose or purposes for which the organization is organized." The charter also stipulated that "any property, real or personal, which may at any time be bequeathed, devised, conveyed or transferred to and accepted by the corporation shall be received, held and used by it in furtherance of the purposes expressed in Article 3 of these Articles and not otherwise, and/or in accordance with such conditions and provisions, not contrary thereto or to the con-

Thus, there is no second resurrection. Destruction of the earth by fire is eliminated. The ushering in of the new Heaven and the new earth is also dropped out. These essential parts of the eschatological teaching of the Bible are eliminated from the Confession of the Church in its doctrinal standards.

This is a serious change.

The Bible Presbyterian Church when it was formed was made up of groups that delighted in the Blessed Hope which, to all of these churches, was the imminent return of Christ in the clouds of heaven—the Rapture, when the dead in Christ would rise first and we which are alive and remain would be caught up to meet them in the clouds. Now the church would be neutral, neutral, neutral. And the Columbus Synod is on record, officially, as having approved all of this neutrality of faith when it comes to Christ's blessed return.

stitution or laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, as may be imposed thereon by the terms of the gift or conveyance whereunder such bequest, devise, conveyance or transfer shall have been made."

Article 3 of the charter just referred to outlines the purposes of the Board as follows: "The corporation is formed for the purpose of establishing and conducting truly Biblical Missions among all nations, in clear opposition to all forms of belief or practice which are contrary to the Bible or are indifferent to the necessity of acceptance of the doctrine that the Bible contains. Being convinced that the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., in the form which they possessed in 1933, contain the system of doctrine taught in the Bible, the corporation is to encourage the work of all missionaries who shall truly believe and cordially love and therefore endeavor to propagate and defend, in its genuineness, simplicity and fullness, that system of religious belief and practice which is now set forth in the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., and which is involved in the fundamental principles of Presbyterian church government; and thus to perpetuate and extend the influence of true evangelical piety and gospel order."

In this way The Independent Board was given power to establish and maintain a theological seminary in Tokyo, Japan; it was given the responsibility of assuring that property obtained through the gifts of its donors should be maintained or disposed of at the will of the Board, which would also insure that the property would be used to further the purposes for which the Board was established.

Since the beginning of the Board, members and missionaries alike have been required to sign or publicly make the following statement: "I hereby solemnly declare in the presence of God and of this Board— (1) that I believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice, (2) that I sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., in the form which it possessed in 1933, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, (3) that, approving the charter of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, I will faithfully endeavor to

carry into effect the articles and provisions of said charter and to promote the great designs of the Board."

RESPONSIBILITY OF MISSIONARIES

Our purpose in quoting all of the above is to make clear the moral responsibilities of missionaries appointed by this Board and assigned to seminary work in Japan, to hold properties, which this Board legally owns, for the Board and to use those properties for the Board's purposes.

Because of the Board's experience in losing property in Peru it made the missionaries' obligation even more clear by a resolution passed on February 23, 1959, which resolution was made a part of the Board Manual under which all our missionaries operate. The resolution is as follows: "Where The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions maintains property in the form of real estate and buildings in some foreign countries, it is necessary to establish holding organizations consisting of our missionaries, whose purpose it is to hold these properties for this Board. Often, in the eyes of these foreign governments, the holding organizations are sufficient in themselves and are not subject to the dictates of an American board of missions.

"In all such cases The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions expects that the articles of the corporation shall have its approval and that all officers of these holding organizations abroad shall be completely subject to the home board and responsible to its direction. No action shall be taken by any one of these organizations without the prior agreement of the Board or of its officers. All proposed members of these organizations shall be approved by the Board before they are elected to office. In the event any missionary member of one of these holding bodies shall cease to be a missionary of this Board, he shall immediately relinquish his membership.

"Even though certain governments do not recognize such instructions as these to be legally binding, this Board considers them to be binding upon each missionary serving under this Board."

EARLY DAYS IN JAPAN

The first meeting of the Japan Mission of The Independent Board was held on February 21, 1949. The missionaries quickly set themselves to the task of establishing a theological seminary which would provide Japan with well-trained national Christian leadership. They, with this Board's guidance, entered into an association with the Rev. Roy Hasegawa, a capable national

leader and a graduate of Faith Theological Seminary. However, there quickly arose the question, among others, as to how the missionary homes and buildings for seminary work built with Board funds should be held. The first dormitory became a point of issue. The Rev. John M. L. Young, a missionary transferred from our China Mission to Tokyo, wrote Dr. Holdcroft in October of 1950: "If our Board raises the money for the building, what is more reasonable than that it should be registered in our name? Fujii and Goto are both on the faculty now and both felt that this was the thing to do." Since, at this time, Mr. Hasegawa was in America, Mr. Young also wrote to Mr. Hasegawa as follows: "It [the dormitory] is to be registered in the name of The Independent Board and loaned to the seminary. If our Board wants to give it to the seminary board, or to you personally, that is up to them and to you. But the only thing we feel that we have the right to do now is to register it that way, passing on the decision to the home Board." A few months later Mr. Young again wrote Dr. Holdcroft on this matter: "From the beginning he [Hasegawa] argued that our ownership of the new dormitory, and even this house and the one Fujii is living in, bought with Palmer's money, are not rightfully The Independent Board's, but should belong to the seminary board! His effrontery in these things has astounded us."

Though The Independent Board had thought at the first that the Japan Seminary should be a co-operative venture between The Independent Board and Japanese nationals, and though a committee comprised of Drs. Buswell, Bennet, and Holdcroft was formed to work out a seminary charter along these lines, it became evident to The Independent Board as early as January, 1951, as reported by Dr. Holdcroft to the Japan Mission, "that we must proceed with a plan for the seminary wholly under The Independent Board auspices, holding it open, however, for co-operation with others as that becomes possible if it is not possible now." And again Dr. Holdcroft reported to the Japan Mission in March, 1951, that the executive committee of the Board "felt that the seminary had better be and could only be under the control of The Independent Board." "When co-operation with Mr. Hasegawa entirely ceased and the presently existing seminary was begun under a new name, it was begun under a plan similar to the charter under which Faith Theological Seminary operates, an institution independent and free from ecclesiastical control.

Just before our missionaries in Japan

broke with Mr. Hasegawa, Dr. Holdcroft, a recognized authority in the doctrine of the indigenous church, gave a statement to the Japan Mission which clearly gave his, and the Board's, view of an indigenous seminary:

"One other thing ought to be impressed upon Roy Hasegawa. He makes a great point, with me, of asking whether we do, or do not, desire to build up 'indigenous' institutions and uses this argument to induce us to turn over all funds raised here to the Japanese, whether to himself or to some committee I am not sure. However, a really indigenous work is self-supporting and to ask for American funds to be sent over without any strings is not to build a self-supporting seminary.

"Moreover, we have no church constituency in Japan that is able to support a seminary. The whole thing precludes an 'indigenous' seminary as long as that condition exists. Roy ought to realize this. So there is no point in arguing that not to turn over all funds that come through the Board to the seminary is to violate our own principles of building indigenous institutions. If there is any violation of those principles it is in starting a seminary before we have a native supporting constituency. However, while we are firmly committed to indigenous principles we do not believe in rigid rules, for the rule's sake; and I believe conditions in Japan generally justify the establishing of a seminary such as we have in mind."

That a great amount of support was sent from America is not questioned. The property was purchased and buildings were built with funds passing through the treasury of The Independent Board and subject to its control. The seminary early came under the support of the Board with regular monthly gifts. Some large sums were contributed for this work through the Board by the organization of Dr. George Palmer who, because of his personal friendship with Phillip Foxwell, made the needs known over his radio broadcast. But much of the support came from those who more fully believed in the Board's militant stand against apostasy and who were in favor of its distinctive testimony in the Christian world. One gift of \$1,000 came to the Board designated for a vehicle which would aid the work of Mr. Ralph Cunningham in India. When the needs for the Japan seminary were made known, this donor asked that her gift be redesignated to help in the construction of one of the seminary buildings. Actually this was a time when the strong appeal from Japan caused the Board some embarrassment.

The Japan Mission of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions organized itself into a religious corporation to hold the property of The Inde-

pendent Board in Japan, and it drew up a constitution. This constitution was carefully reviewed by a special committee of Board members including Dr. James E. Bennet, one of the original members of the Board and long its legal counsel, after which it was approved by the Board and put into effect. All the property of The Independent Board, including the homes of its missionaries as well as the buildings used primarily by the theological seminary, were held by this subsidiary corporation of The Independent Board.

DIVIDED LOYALTY

By 1957, the members of the Japan Mission found themselves in opposition to members of The Independent Board in matters pertaining to the Bible Presbyterian Church. In late August, 1957, all the members of the Japan Mission signed a letter directed to the members of The Independent Board in which the missionaries asked the Board to use its good offices to persuade Dr. Carl McIntire, who had been under special attack from the Columbus Synod leaders for his strong and consistent stand, to resign from its membership. During this same period Japan missionaries gave comfort to missionaries in Peru who had taken from the Board its work and property in that country. From this time until the last missionary of our Japan Mission in Tokyo parted from the Board, the attitude of these missionaries toward the Board and its officers became increasingly critical. In the fall of 1957, Mr. and Mrs. Kurt Ribl resigned from the Board. When asked by the Board to state their reasons, Mr. Ribl wrote in such abusive terms that the Japan Mission was instructed to immediately discontinue their services in the Seminary. The Japan Mission refused to take action.

When it became evident that a missionary's loyalty to, and agreement with, that portion of the Bible Presbyterian Church known as the Columbus Synod meant that that missionary would be in continual conflict with The Independent Board, its purposes, and policies, it was determined by the Board in June, 1959, to withhold from the field any missionary who wished to continue his relationship to that Synod. At this time Mr. and Mrs. Addison Soltau were home from Japan on furlough. At the end of the furlough year, during which they had been under full support, Mr. and Mrs. Soltau returned to Japan without first resigning from The Independent Board and without receiving the Board's permission to return. As a result of this action the Soltaus were dismissed from the Board's missionary body. They, nevertheless, returned to the house which had been provided them by the Board; they continued to teach in the seminary in which this Board had primary interest, and they were supported in these actions by the

remaining members of our Japan Mission.

Mr. and Mrs. Philip Foxwell were in this country during the fall of 1959 and the spring of 1960. The Foxwells resigned from the Board in June, 1960, after having been granted a full year of furlough at Board expense, and returned to Japan the next month again to take up their residence in the house provided by the Board, and they returned to the work to which they had been appointed by the Board more than ten years before.

Meanwhile, the Board of the Japan Christian Theological Seminary, under the leadership of Mr. Young, expecting that there would soon be no missionaries of The Independent Board remaining in Tokyo to serve on the seminary board and faculty, petitioned The Independent Board in February, 1960, to assist the seminary in implementing a new constitution, a draft of which they sent us. This constitution sought to establish a school corporation to replace the mission corporation, the school corporation to have complete ownership and control over all properties then owned by The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. In replying to this petition the president of The Independent Board wrote: "The Japanese Church is, when all is said, a very small Church, hardly able to carry alone so great a responsibility, although I agree that eventually that is what under satisfactory conditions we would hope to do. You have some good men, very good men, but, after all, they stand almost alone as individuals and there is no very large or well established body of churches behind them. So I think that any such development is for the future under less hazardous circumstances. This, of course, means that the Board, if it follows my advice, will not feel that the time has come to surrender all its interests and its stake in the Japan Theological Seminary in a setup such as would surely, under present circumstances, ensue, should it agree to the proposal made."

This statement of Dr. Holdcroft's was made with a letter of April, 1959, at hand from Miss Anne Wigglesworth to the general secretary of the Board. Miss Wigglesworth had written: "I might add that I don't think there is any likelihood that we will recommend any change in the property situation of the Seminary in the near future. From the point of strong Japanese leadership the [Seminary] Board is no more 'mature' than it was ten years ago, when it was first organized. Finding suitable men to serve on it is a real problem. The best hope seems to be our own graduates, when they themselves have matured." This statement should help all those who read this statement to understand why The Independent Board felt that the proposed new constitution for the Japan Christian Theological Seminary was designed by our missionaries, and

former missionaries, to divest this Board of its interests and its property rather than truly to assign its property to the prepared and mature leadership of a responsible national church body.

BOARD'S RESOLUTION

The Board, meeting on June 15, 1960, concluded that the situation then existing in Tokyo demanded that it act to protect its resources and investments in conformity with its charter. The following resolution was passed:

"Therefore, it is resolved:

"1. That the general secretary shall instruct the members of our Japan Mission to inform the Board of Directors of the Japan Christian Theological Seminary that this Board is opposed to having missionaries who could not work within the fellowship of our missionary staff continuing in their previously held positions with the Board or faculty of the Seminary founded and sponsored by this Board, and that we cannot continue our appropriations for the work of the Seminary, or continue to assign missionaries to minister with it as long as this situation continues;

"2. That the general secretary also instruct those missionaries who serve in accordance with Article XIV of the constitution of the Religious Juridical Person of the Japan Mission of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions on the property-holding organization, that they retain the property contained in the Religious Juridical Person for the use and purposes of this Board as the Board shall instruct them;

"3. That we inform all our friends who stand with us in Japan, America, and in every part of the world, that our love for those Christians in Japan who have been partners with us in the Gospel continues unchanged, that we will uphold their hands as we are able, consistent with the principles of Scripture upon which we are founded, and that it is our desire to continue and advance the work of the Seminary just as soon as we may conscientiously do so."

DISLOYALTY

Despite the clear provisions of the charter which the missionaries had sworn to uphold, despite the resolution of the Board dated February 23, 1959, in which missionary members of property-holding corporations abroad were again called upon to hold our properties exclusively for the Board and its purposes, in spite of the last quoted resolution of the Board which specifically demanded that our missionaries in Japan "retain the property contained in the Religious Juridical Person for the use and purposes of this Board as the Board shall instruct them," the re-

maining members of our Japan Mission did revise the rules of the religious corporation under which all our properties had been held for almost ten years, effectively to eliminate all the interests of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. This act was accomplished by the responsible officers of the corporation, Miss Mary M. Johnson, Mr. John M. L. Young, and Miss Anne Wigglesworth, the last named acting as the representative and responsible officer. In the summer of 1960 these missionaries, representing themselves before the government of Japan as being our missionaries and therefore acting in our behalf, eliminated the name and all references to The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions that were contained in the constitution of the property-holding corporation.

For instance, the name of the corporation was previously, "The Japan Mission of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Missions." On August 11, 1960, the name was changed to "Japan Presbyterian Mission." Article XV of the constitution designated those who could serve as members in the corporation: "The membership shall be constituted by the missionaries appointed to this Mission by the home Board who accept the Holy Bible and the historic Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms. The members shall be registered on the Missionaries' Roll." On August 11, 1960, this was revised to read, "The membership shall be constituted by those who accept the Holy Bible and the historic Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms and who are registered on the Missionaries' Roll of this Juridical Person, upon approval of the meeting of responsible officers and general meeting of members." These changes which gave the missionaries joint personal ownership (not the Japanese nationals) were made by those who represented us before the Japanese government without first requesting our permission, and after the changes were effected the Board was never notified by the Mission.

In September, 1960, Miss Anne Wigglesworth and Miss Mary Johnson were dismissed from the Board and on October 1, Miss Anne Krauss left the Board's missionary family. The only remaining missionaries assigned to work with the Japan Christian Theological Seminary were Mr. and Mrs. John M. L. Young. (Mr. Young was soon after to receive an honorary degree from Covenant College and Seminary, and was then to become the moderator of the Evangelical Presbyterian Church.) Mr. Young met with the executive committee of The Independent Board on November 23, 1960, and there ensued a general discussion of the many problems that had arisen in our relationships with the Japan Christian Theological

ATTEMPT TO DIVERT HARVEY CEDARS BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN CONFERENCE

The Columbus Synod majority on the Board of Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference, Inc., has formally changed the charter with the State of New Jersey. This, however, is being challenged by the original incorporators and those who desire to maintain the conference according to its original charter and trust.

The two Certificates of Incorporation are reproduced in full. The changes consist of the following:

First, the name is changed to Harvey Cedars Bible Conference, Inc. It is no longer a "Bible Presbyterian Conference." It is independent — no longer Bible Presbyterian, independent of Synod control.

Second, under the section entitled,

Seminary and the missionaries assigned to our Japan Mission (Tokyo). The discussion continued for some time without any information having been offered by Mr. Young as to the changes then existing in the property holding corporation. It was not until he was asked the direct question as to whether he had taken any part in effecting changes in the corporation so as to eliminate the interests of The Independent Board that Mr. Young finally did admit with some embarrassment that he had taken part in this act. The Board demanded of Mr. Young that the missionaries return the property to The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Soon after this encounter Mr. Young left the services of this Board.

PRESENT STATUS

The last official communication this Board has had from the Japan Mission (Tokyo), a mission which is no longer in any way a part of this Board's testimony, was a letter dated January 17, 1961, and signed by Miss Mary M. Johnson, secretary. In this letter the missionaries offered the Board \$15,000 for its interest in the missionary homes and the Japan seminary property, one-half of the original investment, an investment which has now tripled in value, and this offer was made without any admission of or reference to the fact that the missionaries had already taken those legal steps necessary to place all the property under their joint personal ownership.

Perhaps Dr. Young, and the missionaries who stand with him, will better understand our feelings at having our properties taken from us if he can recall his own feelings of righteous indignation when in January, 1951, he wrote concerning Mr. Roy Hasegawa who at that time only expressed the opinion that the properties of The Independent Board should rightfully belong to the Seminary Board.

"Purposes," all references to the Bible Presbyterian denomination in any capacity are completely removed. The Conference is no longer to "conduct religious services according to the doctrines and tenets of the Bible Presbyterian denomination," but, "under the supervision of the trustees of this corporation."

The Conference is no longer "to maintain Christian youth conferences under the guidance of the Bible Presbyterian denomination," but, "to maintain and operate Christian Bible Conferences. The 'youth' have been left out, and, of course, 'guidance of the Bible Presbyterian Church' has been eliminated.

(Continued on page 15)

Dr. Young's statement at that time was, "His effrontery in these things has astounded us."

Several of these missionaries, formerly of our Japan Mission, have now turned to World Presbyterian Missions of the Evangelical Presbyterian Church. The actions of these missionaries in Japan are only a part of a much larger picture. They followed the steps of those missionaries in Peru who, in 1957, left the company of this Board to join World Presbyterian Missions. Actions of missionaries who have left this Board in returning to the very locations in which they labored previously under this Board's sponsorship, has led to heartache, confusion, and to division in national churches. We do not question the sincere motives which compel these men to go into difficult places and sacrifice their lives for Christ. However, we sincerely doubt that the Holy Spirit has led the church or the mission board which these missionaries now represent, or the missionaries themselves, to use such means (in the case of Japan — taking that which does not rightfully belong to them) to accomplish their ends.

Former missionaries of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions have therefore:

1. Refused to submit to the lawful directives of the Board to which they voluntarily submitted at their appointment.
2. Not kept the solemn vow which they made to uphold the charter of the Board.
3. Taken property in violation of the Eighth Commandment.

The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions assures its many friends and donors that it will use every proper and lawful means to regain the property, that it may be used in accordance with its original trust and the charter of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

ORIGINAL CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION

CHANGES IN CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION

CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION OF HARVEY CEDARS BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN CONFERENCE, INC.

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that the undersigned do hereby associate themselves into a corporation under and by virtue of the provisions of Title 15, et seq., of the Revised Statutes of New Jersey of 1937 known as "Corporations and Associations Not For Profit".

A. The name or the title by which this corporation is to be known in law is "Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference, Inc."

B. The purposes for which it is formed are as follows:

1. To conduct regular services of religious worship according to the doctrine and tenets of the Bible Presbyterian denomination.

2. To maintain Christian Youth Conferences under the guidance of the Bible Presbyterian denomination.

3. To maintain a Home and give aid to members of the Bible Presbyterian denomination and such others as are deemed worthy and proper persons for aid and assistance, and in general to use any lands and premises owned by the association as a place for the dispensation of all manner of charity, recreation and religious education, without any pecuniary profit to the community where the lands and premises are situated, to the Bible Presbyterian denomination, or to the members of this association.

C. The principal place where said corporation is to be located is in Harvey Cedars, Ocean County, State of New Jersey, but the activities of the corporation may be conducted anywhere in the United States or foreign lands.

D. The number of trustees of the corporation shall be six and the names and post office addresses of the trustees selected for the first year of the corporation's existence are as follows: John W. Murray, 1415 Washington Avenue, Chester, Pa. Carl McIntire, 426 Collings Avenue, Collingswood, N. J. Ralph S. Wright, 426 Ritchey Avenue, West Collingswood, N. J. Charles A. Burkett, Collings & Bettelwood Area, Collingswood, N. J. Roland K. Arnes, 793 So. 48th Street, Philadelphia, Pa. G. Douglas Young, 2125 So. Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. The agent of this corporation in this State, upon whom process may be served, is Weidner Titcock, 709 Market Street, in the City and County of Camden and State of New Jersey.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, we have hereunto set our hands and seals this 7th day of May, 1961.

Signed, Sealed and Delivered in the presence of: /s/ Rev. John W. Murray, /s/ Rev. Carl McIntire, /s/ Ralph S. Wright, M.D., /s/ Chas. A. Burkett, /s/ Roland K. Arnes, /s/ Rev. G. Douglas Young

STATE OF NEW JERSEY: COUNTY OF CAMDEN

BE IT REMEMBERED that on this 7th day of May, 1961, before me the undersigned authority, personally appeared John W. Murray, Carl McIntire, Ralph S. Wright, Charles A. Burkett, Roland K. Arnes and G. Douglas Young, who, I am satisfied, are the persons named in and who executed the foregoing certificate, and I having first made known to them the contents thereof they did acknowledge that they signed, sealed and delivered the same as their voluntary act and deed.

WEIDNER TITCOCK M.C.C. of N. J.

Endorsed Filed and Recorded May 10, 1961 Thomas A. Mathis, Secretary of State

Recorded Ocean County Clerk's Office May 9, 10:00 A.M., 1961 Book 5 of Corporations, Page 3314 John A. Emerst, Clerk

(Copy made September 16, 1961)

CERTIFICATE OF CHANGE OF NAME AND AMENDMENT OF ORIGINAL CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION OF HARVEY CEDARS BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN CONFERENCE, INC.

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that on the 26th day of May, 1961, the non-profit corporation, known and designated as "Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference, Inc.", duly adopted the following resolution:

"The members of Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference, Inc., by a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the members having voting powers, do hereby resolve and declare that it is advisable to change the corporate name of this corporation to 'Harvey Cedars Bible Conference, Inc.', and to amend the certificate of incorporation as follows:

A. The name or title by which this corporation is to be known in law is 'Harvey Cedars Bible Conference, Inc.'

B. The purposes for which this corporation is formed are as follows:

(1) To conduct regular services of religious worship under the supervision of the Trustees of this corporation.

(2) To maintain and operate Christian Bible Conferences.

(3) To maintain a Home or Homes and give aid to such persons as are deemed worthy and proper for assistance.

(4) To use the lands and premises owned by this corporation as a place for religious education and wholesome recreational activities and for the dispensation of all manner of charity.

(5) To receive, hold, care for, invest in and operate real and personal property and to use, distribute from time to time, all the income and all principal, as well, which it shall receive in charitable gifts, to be applied consistently with the by-laws of this corporation, for the benefit of an indefinite number of persons, by bringing their minds and hearts under the influence of the Christian faith, by relieving their bodies from disease or suffering and by assisting them to establish themselves in life. Such funds may be used and distributed for one or more such purposes within or without the State of New Jersey. It is the intent and purpose that this corporation shall be conducted exclusively for religious, charitable, educational and recreational purposes, and no part of the assets, whether real or personal property, or the earnings therefrom shall inure to the benefit of any member or officer of this corporation or to any other individual. No substantial part of the activities of this corporation, or of any recipient of its funds, shall be to carry on political propaganda or otherwise to attempt to influence legislation.

(6) To unconditionally hold, lease, purchase, mortgage and convey real and personal property in any state, territory or colony of the United States and in any foreign country or place.

(7) To borrow or raise money by the issuance and sale of bonds, mortgages, or debentures of this corporation, and to invest any money so received as the Board of Trustees may determine.

C. The principal place where this corporation is to be located is in the Borough of Harvey Cedars, County of Ocean, State of New Jersey; but the activities of this corporation may be conducted anywhere in the United States or in foreign lands.

D. The number of trustees of this corporation shall be twelve (12) in number; that each trustee after those elected at the annual meeting in 1961 shall hold office for a term of three years; that the trustees shall be designated by three classes of approximately equal number; that in order to implement the continuity of the Board of Trustees, the first class of trustees elected at the annual meeting in 1961 shall hold office for a term of one year; the second class of trustees elected at the annual meeting in 1961 shall hold office for a term of two years; and the third class of trustees elected at the annual meeting in 1961 shall hold office for a term of three years, and thereafter the successors of each class of trustees shall hold office for the customary three years; provided that anything to the contrary notwithstanding, each person who is or shall hereafter be elected a trustee of this corporation shall hold office until his successor to such class of trustees shall have been duly elected and qualified, or until the office is declared vacant at the end of the current term by the Board of Trustees. The incumbent trustees shall have the exclusive voting power of this corpora

(Continued on page 11)



AFTER FIVE YEARS

BY J. GORDON HOLDCROFT

Five years and more have passed since that section of the Bible Presbyterian Church Synod which, for clarity's sake, we called "The Columbus Synod," made its tragic decision to withdraw from both the American and the International Councils of Christian Churches. Indications of what that decision and others along similar lines portended were sufficiently clear during and immediately after the sessions of that Synod for most people to discern their meaning, take their stand, and determine their line of action. But now, after five years, purposes, trends, and effects are so clear that even the way-faring man, whatever he be, can see and understand what then took place.

One very significant effect of the decisions then taken was to make that section of the Bible Presbyterian Church which adhered to the Columbus Synod (now The Evangelical Presbyterian Church) a tightly controlled Church and thus, in that respect, no different from the United Presbyterian, U.S.A., denomination or any of the ordinary run of Presbyterian Churches. That is one distinctive definitely lost, and that despite the freedom guaranteed by the Bible Presbyterian Constitution.

CONSTITUTION IGNORED

Two sections of the Bible Presbyterian Constitution were ignored and violated by both the 18th and 19th General Synods, both of which met at St. Louis, Mo., and both of which were under attack of the "tight control" party, although they were not mentioned in the attacks. The first of these provisions is found in Chapter 10, Section 3 of the Form of Government, which provided that the General Synod should "constitute the bond of union, peace, correspondence, and mutual confidence among all our churches."

Certainly these Synods violated both the spirit and the letter of that provision. Indeed, their proceedings became what one intelligent observer declared the 19th Synod's actions to be, viz., "Operation Demolition," and this despite the second very explicit provision, Chapter 10, Section 5, which 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."

This latter provision, and the liberty it was designed to safeguard, was clearly perceived and admitted by some of the leaders of "Operation Demolition." They knew, and some of them admitted, that liberty was guaranteed; but, when it was acted upon by those who could not in good conscience accept and acquiesce in the decisions of these two General Synods, it was quickly repudiated. And as for "constituting the bond of union, peace, . . . and mutual confidence among all our churches," it is evident today that this provision was not then, nor ever since, given any weight by the Columbus Synod men. For them it has become a dead letter.

Years ago that same thing occurred in the U.S.A. Presbyterian Church — all power, despite the constitution, was taken over, actually usurped, by the Church's highest representative body, the General Assembly. The Columbus Synod's churches in acquiescing in similar circumstances lost everything governmentally distinctive that they once possessed. At the 19th General Synod, utterance was given again and again to the phrase, "Let the Church be the Church." That phrase was used to prod the Synod into the action it took in "Operation Demolition." It did not seem to dawn upon most of the delegates to that Synod that that phrase was used originally in recent times by a dis-

CHANGES IN CERTIFICATE (Continued from page 10)

tion, including the election of their successors; and shall be vested with full authority to carry on all the spiritual, business and temporal affairs of its corporation. The number of trustees may be increased or decreased in accordance with the By-laws of this corporation, but in no event shall the number of trustees exceed twelve. Each trustee, as a condition to his qualification to serve, shall annually subscribe in writing to the System of Doctrine of the Westminster Confession of Faith, as Adopted by the First General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church in 1937.

E. The agent of this corporation in this State, upon whom process may be served is William K. Dickey, Jr., 122 Haddon Avenue, Collingswood, New Jersey."

The said resolution was duly approved at a 2/3 majority of the members having voting power in this corporation, upon 10 days notice given personally or by mail, which notice set forth a summary of the foregoing resolution.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this corporation has caused these presents to be signed by its President, attested by its Secretary and the corporate seal affixed hereto, this 26th day of May, 1961.

HARVEY CEDARS BIBLE
PRESBYTERIAN CONFERENCE, INC.

(Sgd.) William J. Bonner
William J. Bonner, President

Attest: (Sgd.) John H. Kay, Jr.
John H. Kay, Secretary

STATE OF New Jersey :
COUNTY OF Camden : SS.

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on this 26th day of May, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-one, before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared John H. Kay, who being by me duly sworn, upon his oath says: That he is the Secretary of Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference, Inc., the within named non-profit corporation, and that William J. Bonner is the President; that deponent knows the common or corporate seal of said corporation and that the seal annexed to the within certificate is such common or corporate seal; that said certificate was signed by the said President and the seal of said corporation affixed thereto in the presence of deponent; and that said certificate was signed, sealed and delivered as and for the voluntary act and deed of said corporation for the uses and purposes therein expressed, pursuant to a resolution of the members thereof adopted by a two-thirds majority vote of those present and entitled to vote; and at the execution thereof this deponent subscribed his name thereto as the witness.

(Sgd.) John H. Kay, Jr.
John H. Kay, Jr.

Sworn to and subscribed
the day and year aforesaid.

(Sgd.) Anna E. Fiedler
Anna E. Fiedler
Notary Public of New Jersey
My Commission Expires April 14, 1965

RECEIVED June 8, 1961
AND RECORDED IN THE CLERK'S
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY OF CAMDEN
IN BOOK 199.....PAGE.....
..Corp.....PAGE.....

(Sgd.) Frank J. Sutkall.....
CLERK

(This document consisted of six legal size pages with the imprint on each page as follows:

William K. Dickey, Jr.
Counselor at Law
122 Haddon Avenue
Collingswood 7,
New Jersey

tinct modernist theologian. But it also indicated a desire and a determination to have as tightly controlled and directed a body of local churches as are the churches of any Presbyterian denomination. However, in the formation of various agencies and institutions, all controlled by the Synod, and in the acquiescence of the churches that adhere to the Columbus Synod, that is precisely what the Columbus Synod section of the Bible Presbyterian Church obtained. These churches and their Synod became, governmentally, merely a miniature model of the denomination out of which most of them originally came.

All this cannot but remind one of the ancient Israelites who, despite the high calling of God, wanted to be like the nations around them, at first, of course, only governmentally. But not long after God granted their wish for a king, they began to desire to be like the surrounding nations in worship also.

Let us hope and pray that the Columbus Synod churches will not become like all the Presbyterian Churches around them in other respects. Nevertheless, naturally, already there have appeared in the picture some other very disturbing things.

DISTINCTIVE TESTIMONY REPUDIATED AT HOME

To understand this fully, one must realize that God gave the Bible Presbyterian Church one of the greatest opportunities that ever faced any small denomination. Those who formed that Church realized this and formed it to be a militant Church. Our Christian forefathers used to speak of "the Church Militant" and of "the Church Triumphant." The Church Triumphant will be the church enthroned in Glory with Christ, when God's redemptive purposes are fulfilled. The Church Militant is the true church here on earth engaged in two principal conflicts. The first is to carry the Gospel to all the world, always seeking the lost at home and abroad by every means possible and leading them to Christ. The second conflict is of equal importance. It is to defend and maintain the Faith! History records more than one instance of the entire loss of the Faith over vast areas because God's people in their day did not rise to its defense as they should have done. But to defend and maintain the Faith in our own lives, in our own denomination or association or fellowship of churches, and to defend and maintain it in the whole Church over the whole world as far as God makes it possible to do so, is an imperative obligation; and God, in our day, has made that possible in very large degree. Beyond all question this is the teaching of Scripture, as the following quotations and Bible references prove; and these are but a few of those that might be given.

JUDE, v. 3. "Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."

VERSES 22 AND 23. "And of some have compassion, making a difference: And others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire; hating even the garment spotted by the flesh."

PHILIPPIANS 3:18. "For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: whose end is destruction, . . . who mind earthly things."

2 JOHN, v. 10. "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed."

1 TIMOTHY 1:18 AND 19. "This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, . . . that thou . . . war a good warfare: holding faith, and a good conscience; which some having put away concerning faith have made shipwreck."

2 PETER 1:20 TO 2:3; TITUS 1:10, 11, 13, 16; HEBREWS 11:32 TO 12:4; HOSEA 5:1-15; JEREMIAH 1:4-10, 17-19; 9:11-16; 11:1-23 are some of the other passages which ought to convince everyone.

Not only is this the teaching of Scripture, it is also sound strategy in every army that expects and is determined to win any war.

For a Church to prosecute such a militant defense of the Faith, such defense should be conducted in a manner that can be readily understood and intelligently participated in by the whole membership of the Church, and not limited almost solely to men who are ordained to the ministry and to the eldership or other official board from which delegates to Synods, General Assemblies, and Conferences are sent. These Synods and General Assemblies and Conferences take many actions which most denominations in our day have no way (and evidence seems to indicate that the leaders want them to have no way) of enlisting the whole body of lay members in intelligent understanding of, and participation in, issues and causes. "Theirs not to reason why," theirs but to accept and support financially.

The Bible Presbyterian Church, however, provided a liberty of action for all which made its government very different from the ordinary run of churches in our day. The General Synod's actions were not to be followed blindly; nor Presbytery's either. If Christian conscience and judgment approved, enlistment in a cause was eagerly welcomed; but if not, freedom was guaranteed to the individual church

and member. This was both an incentive to study any proposal made by Presbytery or Synod, and a check upon the actions of those bodies. The aim was that the whole church membership should intelligently understand and actively participate in every cause that commended itself to the conscience and judgment, including the militant defense of the Faith; and that, through non-co-operation, if conscience and judgment so directed, an effective check on unwise, or hasty actions could be exercised.

The 19th General Synod and following "Columbus Synod" meetings said no to all this constitutional freedom, and to any militant defense of the Faith that might spring from that freedom. The actions of these Synods in actuality meant, "Accept Synod's pronouncements or else!"

This was soon proved. Two illustrations will suffice.

The Columbus Synod ere long notified all presbyteries in which there were those who did not go along with the Columbus Synod party that these presbyteries should notify all such that, unless they, within 60 days, returned to what that Synod was pleased to call their rightful allegiance, their names should be stricken from the rolls of such presbyteries, and this was subserviently done on the grounds that these men and churches had joined another denomination! In the New Jersey Presbytery where Columbus Synod men were in a minority, that minority actually met and "restored" to their rolls the names of the men who composed the majority party and then "dropped" them. This, of course, was mere child's play unworthy of serious Christian men, especially Christian leaders. And then this supposed information was given to at least one newspaper in that vicinity and published.

The second incident is that the very men who at the meeting of the 19th General Assembly in St. Louis freely admitted that individuals or local churches which could not in good conscience surrender their rights of membership in the American and International Councils of Christian Churches had the constitutional right to continue that membership, nevertheless, soon reversed their opinion. This occurred when the Bible Presbyterian Church Association was formed. That Association was formed for the reason that constituent membership in these Councils can only be held by denominations, associations, or fellowships of churches, and, by the formation of that Association, churches and individuals who so elected to belong to those churches could continue to be constituent members of the Councils. Nevertheless, that action was denounced and advised against in strong terms, even by the judicial commission of the Columbus Synod whose chairman was one of those

who but a short time before had definitely stated that churches and individuals who so elected had constitutional right to continue their activity in the Councils.

DISTINCTIVE TESTIMONY REPUDIATED ABROAD

Nevertheless, injustice and all violation of constitutional rights usually bring effects upon the offender as well as upon the victim, and thus, in seeking to take away the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of local churches and members, "the Columbus Synod" deprived itself, renounced in advance, one of the greatest services that any small denomination was ever offered, we believe, by God Himself. This was a call to participate in one of the most definite and far-reaching works of the Holy Spirit of our day. Had the Columbus Synod not renounced this particular part of the task to which the whole original Bible Presbyterian Church was dedicated, that whole church might have shared in the great opportunity that came to the International Council of Christian Churches and to that part of the Bible Presbyterian Church which had remained true to the original Bible Presbyterian heritage, in the appeal that was made to these bodies by that part of the Korean Presbyterian Church which withdrew from the World Council of Churches in 1959. No one should minimize the magnitude of that opportunity, for the end is not yet.

Actually, the whole Korean Church is out of the World Council of Churches and by far the greater part of it will remain out. Under the leadership of ecumenically-minded missionaries, a small part of that church may and probably will again join the World Council of Churches when it sees that the greater part of the church is definitely determined never again to join that Council. But when leaders of by far the greater part of the Korean Presbyterian Church had learned with dismay of the things to which the World Council of Churches is committed, they knew to whom to appeal. That was not by any means to the Columbus Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church. It was to those who remained true to the vows that they had taken in joining the Bible Presbyterian Church, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, and the American and International Councils. The day will come when many of the members of the Columbus Synod will bitterly regret the spiritual cataracts which blinded their eyes and prevented them from seeing the great opportunity which would have been theirs had these cataracts of prejudice and renunciation not given them a myopia which prevented them from having any significant part in assuring the Korean Presby-

terian Church that it had done right in leaving the World Council of Churches.

More than that, World Presbyterian missionaries constituted a definite negative influence against the International Council of Christian Churches when Korean Presbyterian leaders were considering joining it and still are.

Other instances of spiritual myopia which led to the loss of other great opportunities could be mentioned, for in many parts of this world God is giving opportunities to faithful minorities to give testimony and to accomplish tasks of which Columbus Synod followers have deprived themselves entirely. The testimony so recently given by the ICCS team in Formosa and the necessary, timely, and impressive witness made in Peru are cases in point.

Before we leave the subject of foreign missions, it ought to be pointed out, and if necessary pointed out again and again, that the Columbus Synod's agent, World Presbyterian Missions, has been as derelict as its parent Synod. Naturally so, for, like parent, like child. The above instances, although lying in the field of foreign missions, are also in the area of general testimony to the integrity of God's whole purpose and whole work of redemption. They, therefore, affect the strength or weakness of Christianity throughout the whole world. Further, both the Columbus Synod and its foreign mission board are responsible for many sad things that have taken place in Chile, in Peru, in Japan, and to a lesser degree in other countries also. How any Board could split national churches, appropriate work belonging to another Board, and seize property without even notifying the Board in whose name that property was held, is something we feel must be accounted for at the Judgment Seat of Christ. But we will not deal with that question here, except to say that another article in this *Free Press* will give a clear description of some of these things.

IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

But what of other areas of Christian life? Christian education is another area of great importance. Some things can be seen now that were not in full view five years ago. For instance, Covenant College, with the addition of a theological department (which was added not even by order of the Synod, but was acquiesced in with every mark of meek and delighted gratitude), is an important field of service which ought to, and does, yield an index as to how things are developing.

Two very deplorable things were expected in the founding of Covenant College. One was the ruin of Faith Theological Seminary. Indeed, everything possible was done to accomplish such ruin. In the providence of God, however, Faith was

saved and today has a more efficient teaching staff than it had before the desertion of those who left it, most of whom went to Covenant. The second deplorable purpose was the ruin of Highland and Shelton Colleges also. Both these schools have experienced hardship, but God has preserved them and neither would wish to go back to the old days for any inducement that might be offered.

There seems to be, however, a third factor which we hope is not, but looks as though it is, a definite signboard. This has recently developed and was reported in *The Sword of the Lord* for June 9, 1961. The information therein given was not meant as a direct indictment of Covenant College, but it had to do with a symposium sponsored by the Division of Science of Wheaton College, on February 17 and 18 this year. To the amazement of many, it was reported (and we quote exactly from *The Sword of the Lord*): "Outright theistic evolution was taught from the platform of this symposium without contradiction by college authorities. The faculty of the Science Department participated and most of the leaders of the college administration were on hand for many of the sessions." Further, the article states: "Yet there was no protest at the evolution taught except by one of the professors from the Bible Department. He was politely rebuked from the platform for his stand for the orthodox literal interpretation of the Genesis account of creation." Then the article continues to report that on the last morning, "A former student at the college and now teaching at *Covenant College* [underlining ours] took part in the panel discussion." Further, it is stated that this man "believes that the Australopithecines, the famous South African 'ape men' were early enough to be in the ancestral line of man." Moreover, this man is reported to hold "that Genesis 1 is 'literary' and not subject to hermeneutics."

The article in *The Sword of the Lord* also states, and we agree with it, that to say that Genesis 1 is literary and not subject to hermeneutics "is another way of saying that Genesis 1 is poetic and not to be taken literally." He is also right in stating that "calling parts of the Bible poetic and figurative is how modernists have for years been explaining away many portions of Scripture. If the Genesis accounts of creation are poetic and figurative, then what is to stop us from assuming that the account of the fall of man in Genesis 3 is poetic and figurative? This allowing sections of the Bible to be explained away has historically been the beginning of downfall for many schools once fairly orthodox and fundamental."

There you have it. Covenant College would profess to be thoroughly funda-

mental, but it will be interesting and revealing to see what it will do in the light of this event. It will not exonerate Covenant to declare that this teacher was a student of Faith Theological Seminary. He was; but he abandoned Faith for Covenant in the disruption that followed after the decisions of the Columbus Synod in 1956 and if he holds the above opinions and Covenant does nothing about it that will indict Covenant as well as this teacher.

UNION MEETINGS

Whatever may be Covenant College's reply, there are other instances of slipping and of "war weariness" on the part of Columbus Synod men and some churches, in that some have gone a certain way toward compromise which once they never would have contemplated. Three instances come to mind. One such church is reported to have held a union Easter service with the very church from which it had separated on the ground of apostasy in that church's denomination. Another united in a union evangelistic campaign with the church from which it had come out and with other churches of denominations just as bad. We have a picture of the pastors of those churches and the Columbus Synod pastor is among them. A third church is said to have had a pastor of the denomination it had left —

ostensibly to witness to the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ — speaking in his pulpit. It all creates the impression that they seek to be rid of what they seem to think is the burden of a constant, militant fight against modernism and even a descent into downright paganism on the part of many denominations of our day. Yet we have never heard of any action by Presbytery or Synod to admonish these churches.

EARLY CONVICTIONS LOST

Since all this has occurred within a period of five years, what will ten years, or twenty, or fifty bring forth? Surely this indicates a gradual disintegration of conviction which if not immediately checked will reduce the testimony of those churches adhering to the Columbus Synod to the level of so many other churches of our day. That would be a great spiritual tragedy! But, certainly, it looks as though first steps in that spiritual tragedy have already been taken. We ought to pray for our erstwhile colleagues in the Columbus Synod and we ought to take advantage of every opportunity we have, or may make, to remonstrate kindly but firmly with any who we have reason to believe would listen to such remonstrances.

Another thing: Is it not significant that the Columbus Synod has now changed its name? It will no longer be a Bible Pres-

byterian Church unless the local churches giving allegiance to it positively reassert their lost constitutional liberty to refuse to acquiesce in the change which makes it now The Evangelical Presbyterian Church. However, the change puts an end, once and for all, to the completely groundless claim put forward for five years by the Columbus Synod that those who did assert their constitutional liberty by refusing to go along with the Columbus Synod's actions and had enrolled in the Collingswood Synod had joined another denomination. Those claims, of course, confused, or ignored, the fact that the Synod in the Bible Presbyterian Church is not the Church. There might be a dozen Synods in a Church and they would still be Synods and not the Church. For this reason the constitutional party of the Bible Presbyterian Church which has sent delegates to the Collingswood Synods, while greatly regretting that the division came in the way it did, can rejoice that no one need any longer be confused, for the Collingswood Synod and the churches adhering to it have been, and are, The Bible Presbyterian Church! That Church and that Synod still stand for the things to which the whole Bible Presbyterian Church committed itself from the first, namely the whole counsel of God throughout the whole world. Wherefore, we thank God and take courage!

The Bible Presbyterian Church

BY CARL MCINTIRE

As we come to this moment in church history, God, in His blessed providence, has brought to a special place of testimony and usefulness the Bible Presbyterian Church. When the church was formed in 1938, the word "Bible" was placed in front of the name "Presbyterian" because the great fundamentalist-modernist controversy had centered around the Bible. Presbyterians have always believed that the Bible is God's Word. Chapter I of the great Westminster Confession of Faith is devoted to this testimony. We believe the Bible to be the Word of God upon the authority of God Himself.

The name, therefore, "Bible Presbyterian," has taken on a definite connotation in the country. It is both loved and hated. It is both honored and scorned. It is a good name; we like it. We thank God for it, and we praise God for the history which He has given to it.

1. The Bible Presbyterian Church is directly related to the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (which now has become the United Presbyterian Church), and most of its churches came out of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., or were formed by people who came out and have sought to maintain a Presbyterian Church faithful to the Scriptures.

2. The Bible Presbyterian Church is a missionary church. This emphasis is only natural because the great conflict which brought issues to a head centered around the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and the trials of the members of the Independent Board, including Dr. J. Gresham Machen, the president, and others.

3. The Bible Presbyterian Church is a militant church in defense of the faith. It has not permitted the issues

which gave it birth to die, and it has taken an active part in the ongoing struggle as it has advanced from stage to stage. At the time of its birth, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions was the foremost agency worthy of support. But God led in the formation of a theological seminary that would carry on the great traditions of Princeton and maintain the high standards of scholarship—this was Faith Theological Seminary. He has used it to train leadership under the direction of perhaps the greatest Old Testament scholar in America today, Dr. Allan A. MacRae.

4. The Bible Presbyterian Church has extended its hand of fellowship and co-operation to the other separatist groups arising in the country in this 20th century, and took part in the formation of the American Council of Christian Churches in 1941. This Council joined the issue and continued the struggle that Machen led. The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., the citadel of apostasy, then the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, was challenged, and without abatement the movement and battle continued, receiving increased recruits and strength. As a part of this picture, the circle expanded to include the world-wide fellowship and the rise, in 1948, of the International Council of Christian Churches, which challenged the World Council of Churches. Since that day the struggle has been intensified as never before between what is known as the Twentieth Century Reformation, to which the Bible Presbyterians belong, as well as a number of other separatist groups, and the ecumenical movement which includes the modernist, inclusivist, apostate churches which are seeking to build their one-world Babylon church.

5. The Bible Presbyterian Church is a Bible preaching and evangelistic church. It has sought to nurture its members in the Reformed faith. Its ministers have emphasized the Word of God and have sought faithfully to proclaim it from their pulpits. Precious souls have been

saved in evangelistic campaigns. Young children reared in its homes have come forward to make their confession and to be received into the communion of the church.

6. The Bible Presbyterian Church is a church that recognizes the covenant privileges presented in the Scriptures and honors the practice of infant baptism as a sign and seal of this covenant which God made.

7. The Bible Presbyterian Church is a free church. It was determined at the foundation of the church that the relationship would be on the basis of mutual love and confidence. It is a voluntary association. Churches may withdraw from the fellowship at any time for reasons sufficient to themselves. The constitution also was careful to include a provision born out of the bitter experience with the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. The constitution says, "All powers not in this Constitution specifically granted to the courts of the Church are reserved to the congregations respectively, or to the people." There are no reserved powers. This is the states' rights principle. The property of the local church is guaranteed, under provisions of the constitution which are unamendable, to the local church itself.

8. The Bible Presbyterian Church is a confessional church. It accepts the historic Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms, including the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. It seeks to present the whole counsel of God as revealed in the Scriptures.

9. The Bible Presbyterian Church has sought to carry on its work, in the main, through independent agencies, leaving the presbyteries and synods as places for fellowship,

for maintaining the doctrinal integrity and purity of the church, and for giving witness for Christ and against the apostasy. By this system, from the very beginning, it endorsed such independent agencies as the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and Faith Theological Seminary. Bitter experience has shown that, when a church becomes bureaucratic and a denomination seeks to control and run all of its agencies from the top, we not only have a form of ecclesiastical socialism but we have inefficiency, an increasing sense of irresponsibility, and the rise of an ecclesiastical machine within a church seeking to obtain certain ends through powerful agencies. As a result, the agencies seek to dominate and control and direct the affairs of the church, instead of the church directing the agencies. It is within the genius of freedom that the Church should support agencies, not because of some ecclesiastical sanction, but because the agencies merit their support because of their stand and efficiency of operation. This system means, of course, that, when trouble develops in the church, all the movement is not lost with one struggle. There are checks and restraints and both the local churches and the individuals who are a part of the independent agencies feel a greater sense of responsibility for the movement and for the church.

10. The Bible Presbyterian Church, in its 20 years of history, has seen these principles tested, and it stands today in a better position than ever before to command the respect and confidence of those who desire to be a part of a continuing and true Presbyterian Church which exalts the Word of God.

ATTEMPT TO . . .

(Continued from page 9)

Point No. 3 likewise has eliminated the Bible Presbyterian denomination.

Thus, according to the names and purposes, any responsibility to the Bible Presbyterian Church, so far as the incorporated trust and purpose are concerned, has been completely eliminated. The Conference is simply an independent Bible conference, with no connection or identification with any particular denomination of any kind or description.

There continues to be, however, a Bible Presbyterian denomination in this country and the founders of the Conference who have continued to be Bible Presbyterian are members of this Bible Presbyterian denomination.

There is a requirement, "That each trustee shall annually subscribe in writing to the system of doctrine of the Westminster Confession of Faith as adopted by the First General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian Church in 1937." But this is the system of doctrine which is in all the Westminster Confessions of Faith and it may be subscribed to by Presbyterians, Reformed, Independents, and a variety of other denominational representatives who would subscribe merely to the system of doctrine. There is no adherence here to the constitution of the Bible Presbyterian Church which includes the Form of Government, Book of Discipline, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. In fact, the document known as the Westminster Confession of Faith, adopted by the First General Synod of the Bible Presbyterian

denomination in 1938, in no way connects the Conference or the individuals who may be trustees with the Bible Presbyterian Church. (The charter as amended is in error as to the date. There was no such document in 1937.) As a matter of fact, the trustees now in control have no connection with the Bible Presbyterian denomination. They are members of the Evangelical Presbyterian Church.

Thus, Harvey Cedars Bible Conference, Inc., which has taken over the Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference, Inc., its property and possessions, is no longer in any way identified with the Bible Presbyterian denomination. It is no longer identified with the separatist movement, while the Bible Presbyterian denomination in its tenets most assuredly is! A minister, for instance, of the United Presbyterian Church or the Southern Presbyterian Church who would subscribe to the system of doctrine of the Westminster Confession of Faith could, under the present charter, be elected to membership on the Board of Trustees. The separatist stand of the Conference has been completely eliminated so far as any charter provisions or protections are concerned. This is most significant.

This constitutes a perversion of property. It constitutes a violation of the commandment of the Holy Scriptures.

The Eighth Commandment reads, "Thou shalt not steal." The exposition of this Eighth Commandment in the Larger Catechism reads, "The sins forbidden in the eighth commandment, . . . are, theft . . . fraudulent dealing; . . . removing landmarks, injustice and unfaithfulness in

contracts between man and man, or in matters of trust. . ."

All of the property of the Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference has been established in trust by a charter which bound it to the doctrines and tenets of the Bible Presbyterian Church, and to be used under that charter in young people's conferences under the guidance of the Bible Presbyterian denomination.

All of this trust has now been violated by the majority of the trustees.

The minority who desire to preserve the Conference according to its original trust consist of Dr. Carl McIntire, Dr. Jack Murray, Mr. Matthew N. Johnson, and Mr. David Slaght. Mr. Johnson was continued on the Board by the majority but has refused to be a party to the diversion of the property from its original charter. Mr. Johnson, Dr. McIntire, Dr. Murray, and Mr. Slaght have formed themselves into the continuing Board of Trustees of the Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference, Inc., and with the backing of Bible Presbyterian churches, leaders of the General Synod are prepared now to press the matter through the civil courts, if necessary. Those members of the Columbus Synod, now the Evangelical Presbyterian Church, and members of the Board who have been a party to this diversion include William Bonner, John W. Buswell, III, John M. Kay, William Mahlow, John Sanderson, William Shay, and George Schmidt.

Legal counsel has been retained by the Harvey Cedars Bible Presbyterian Conference, Inc., and other parties.

Jan 5 - 6

Something to Do for
Nov 30

Ken Clark

GAI
Bing Nov. 26

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE

BETWEEN THE BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
AND THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH?

The momentous issues facing individual Christians in the twentieth century may be seen in the history and struggle involving these two churches.

● The Bible Presbyterian Church is, in the main, a break from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.; and the United Presbyterian Church represents a union between the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and the United Presbyterian Church. The names are indicative of the positions held.

● The Bible Presbyterian Church introduced the word "Bible" before "Presbyterian" because the modernist-fundamentalist controversy that brought the church into existence centered around the Word of God. The United Presbyterian Church has introduced and accepted the word "united" because it is indicative of the ecumenical movement's emphasis upon the ultimate union of all churches.

● The Bible Presbyterian Church is a confessional church, accepting the historic Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms and seeking to maintain the integrity of the confession. The United Presbyterian Church accepted the inclusivist principle and has broadened itself to include in its leadership in the ministry men who reject the most fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith.

● The Bible Presbyterian Church consists of congregations, many of which have withdrawn from the United Presbyterian Church, giving up their properties and sacrificing all to be loyal to the faith once delivered unto the saints. The United Presbyterian Church has laid claim to all properties, has called various congregations into civil court, and, without the approval of the congregations, included in their new constitution the stipulation that no church could sell its property without the consent of the presbytery.

● The Bible Presbyterian Church preaches the Gospel of salvation with its emphasis upon winning men to Christ. It does not believe in the social gospel. The United Presbyterian Church places emphasis upon the social gospel and a variety of gospels and has given active support to the sit-in movement in the South, has endorsed the recognition of Red China, and has gone so far as to declare that peaceful coexistence with Communism is not contrary to Christian principles.

● The Bible Presbyterian Church works entirely through independent agencies and in its constitution adopted the principle of states' rights and decentralization, believing that presbyteries and synods should have no power unless it is specifically granted in the constitution. The United Presbyterian Church has developed an elaborate system of implied powers and has established a powerful, bureaucratic system, with the denomina-

tion's highest court owning, directing, and controlling all the agencies.

● The Bible Presbyterian Church places its emphasis upon a spiritual fellowship, co-operation among the churches in accordance with the Word of God. The United Presbyterian Church, because of its powerful system of boards and agencies and the control which these agencies have over the life of the church, has become frankly a powerful, promotional organization to support the agencies.

● The Bible Presbyterian Church is a missionary church and in its activity is seeking to maintain a consistent, separatist position on the mission fields. It co-operates with the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and has joined the issue against the ecumenical missions program of the United Presbyterian Church on mission field after mission field. The United Presbyterian Church is using its "ecumenical missions" to help build the one-world church.

● The Bible Presbyterian Church is in fellowship with the American Council of Christian Churches and was one of the two denominations that helped found it. The United Presbyterian Church is a member of the National Council of Churches and gives heavy financial support to the National Council in all of its activities.

● The Bible Presbyterian Church is in fellowship with the International Council of Christian Churches and has co-operated in the world-wide conflict which the International Council of Christian Churches has led in behalf of the Christian faith. The United Presbyterian Church is a member of the World Council of Churches and its prominent leaders exercise great influence upon the ecumenical movement throughout the world.

● The Bible Presbyterian Church uses the International Evangelical Sunday School Lessons in its Sunday school teachings. The United Presbyterian Church uses what it calls "The New Curriculum," which maintains the position of neo-orthodox and liberalism rather than that known as fundamentalist or conservative.

● The Bible Presbyterian Church provides that local congregations may call their own pastors without interference, that they are free and may withdraw from the church at any time, for reasons sufficient to themselves. The United Presbyterian Church prohibits a congregation's withdrawing. Furthermore, no congregation may call a pastor without first consultation and approval of a committee set up by the presbytery. The denomination has increased its control over local pulpits in the Church. This has taken from the ministers their freedom and from the local congregation their independence of action, but it has been done in order to guarantee a ministry

that will support the program endorsed and approved by the ecumenical leaders.

● The Bible Presbyterian Church is distinct from other groups, including the Orthodox Presbyterian and what is called the Columbus Synod, which have refused to carry on a vigorous, militant battle in behalf of the historic Christian faith and the preservation of a Presbyterian ministry and church in this country which will be in keeping with the Presbyterian heritage. The United Presbyterian Church is finding that an increasing number of people within its boundaries are refusing to support it financially and are looking elsewhere for Christian fellowship.

● The Bible Presbyterian Church is in a definite sense a leader in the historic separatist movement of the 20th century. The United Presbyterian Church is in a definite sense a leader in the ecumenical movement of the 20th century.

Involved in these differences is, of course, the demands of the Word of God.

● The Bible Presbyterians have taken their stand in refusing to have fellowship with that which compromises and which represents unbelief, while the United Presbyterian Church has appealed to what it calls the demands of God against the sin of disunity, and, ignoring the sin of unbelief, and the opening of their churches to those who do not believe or accept such doctrines as the verbal inspiration, the virgin birth, the blood atonement, and the bodily resurrection of Christ, it has created a Laodicean church.

● The Bible Presbyterians believe that their Synod church and churches must preach the Bible to the people and teach them the love of God as presented in the Word of God. The United Presbyterian Church is shifting its emphasis more to include tradition, and in the proposal for a union of four major Protestant bodies made by the present stated clerk, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, has indicated that it would be necessary to give up the historic position of *sola scriptura* and to give a more prominent place to tradition if a union were going to be consummation's highest court owning, directing, and controlling all the agencies.

● The Bible Presbyterian Church places its emphasis upon a spiritual fellowship, co-operation among the churches in accordance with the Word of God. The United Presbyterian Church, because of its powerful system of boards and agen-

THE ABOVE IS A TRACT DISTRIBUTED BY
20TH CENTURY REFORMATION HOUR
COLLINGSWOOD, NEW JERSEY