



"The Only Infallible Rule
of Faith and Practice"

THE CONCERNED PRESBYTERIAN

*Dedicated to Returning the Presbyterian Church U. S.
to its Primary Mission — Winning the Unsaved for
Christ and Nurturing all Believers in the Faith*

234 BISCAYNE BLVD.

MIAMI, FLORIDA 33132

BULLETIN No. 1

MARCH, 1965

Why We Are "Concerned"

*Laymen alarmed over secular
trends in Presbyterian Church U. S.*

Very few laymen are aware of the fact that over the last 15 years there has been a secret organization in our Church working quietly behind the scenes to gain control of the political machinery of our denomination. This group, composed mostly of ministers, called themselves the Fellowship of St. James.

This relatively small but very determined group influences and seeks to control the various agencies of the courts of our Church. In recent years they have succeeded in electing enough men of their choosing to enable them to control many of the important committees of the various Church courts and to have effective majorities on the governing bodies of many of the boards, agencies and other institutions of the Church.

To a greater degree than is generally realized, this group exercises considerable influence in the selection of ministers to fill the pulpits of many of our larger and more important churches.

Last year many of these men joined in a new "out-in-the-open" organization which they called "The Fellowship of Concern." Its professed purpose was to raise money to aid ministers who got into financial difficulties when their congregations refused to let them continue to promote social, political and racial views from their pulpits. Last fall Virginia members who probably comprise the largest segment of the membership of the group held a meeting and proposed that the Fellowship of Concern add the following planks to its platform:

1. Vigorous participation in the NCC and other ecumenical organizations.
2. Support of the critical view of the Bible.
3. Union with UPUSA Church before any other.

These objectives were not *formally* adopted by the Fellowship, but there is reason to believe that these *are* the goals toward which most of the members of the group are working. This group is well organized, highly articulate and zealous in the attainment of their goals.

We are convinced that the Fellowship of St. James and the Fellowship of Concern do not represent the thinking of the vast majority of the laymen and ministers in our Church. *The Presbyterian Outlook* — which for many years has been their mouthpiece — has a paid circulation of less than one-third the circulation of *The Presbyterian Journal* which through the years has represented the evangelical and conservative constituency in our denomination.

The men in these groups have gained control of the machinery of our Church because we conservatives have been largely content to *talk* about these matters without setting up an effective organization through which to make our voices heard in the Church courts. While we have been *talking* they have been doing.

The hour is already late. If we who deplore the

present trends remain silent and inactive much longer, we will never be able to change these trends that many feel are undermining the effectiveness of our Church.

This is the reason for Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. It is our avowed purpose to endeavor to return the control of our Church once more to those who believe that the Bible is the Word of God and the only infallible rule of faith and practice, that unswerving loyalty to the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Catechisms is vital and essential to the work of our Church, and that leading the unsaved to Christ and nurturing believers in the Faith should take precedence even over every other proper activity in the Church's program.

We Are Concerned

- because the primary mission of the Church — winning people to Jesus Christ and nurturing them in the Faith — is being compromised today by over-emphasis on social, economic and political matters, forgetting the basic necessity for regeneration.
- because the integrity and authority of the Word of God are being questioned by dubious theories of revelation in some of the literature of the Church.
- because some presbyteries no longer require complete loyalty to the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Catechisms.
- because continued membership in the National Council of Churches involves us in activities, pronouncements and programs of which we strongly disapprove and repeated protests to that body have been ignored.
- because the plan to establish a Central Treasurer now approved by the General Assembly indicates a determination to regiment the benevolence giving of the Church's members by "equalizing" their gifts — in effect actually thwarting the wishes of many donors.
- because another determined effort has been started to effect a union of the Presbyterian Church U.S. with the United Presbyterian Church U. S. A. which is now engaged in negotiations to unite with denominations that do not adhere to the Reformed Faith.

We urge all who are concerned about these matters to pray daily that God will through His Holy Spirit guide and direct this movement which we sincerely believe is for His honor and glory.

This is NOT the Answer . . .

Concerned Presbyterians, Inc., does NOT recommend that anyone withdraw from our beloved Church. Our goal is to reverse the trends that are causing so many members to consider withdrawal. We should "stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught" —

II Thess: 2:15.

Our Spiritual Objectives

Concerned Presbyterians take seriously the reports given year after year to the General Assembly concerning the failure of our denomination to be effective in evangelism. We do not want to see the first business of the Church placed low on the list of objectives but made the passion of all our congregations. Training in personal witnessing is needed in every particular church; we urge that classes for this purpose be organized all over the Assembly.

Keenly aware that effective presentation of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Saviour men must have if they are not to be eternally lost depends upon an unshakable confidence in the Bible as the very truth of God. We call the Church to realize that theories based upon so-called higher criticism of the Scriptures are essentially subjective and do not really come with full scholarly credit as is so often claimed. Every negative approach to the Bible has had its full and adequate answer from conservative scholarship. There is not the slightest reason for any of us to give ground at this point, but we may stand with implicit confidence upon the whole truthfulness of Scripture.

Concerned Presbyterians refuse to be alarmed at the numerous voices that would characterize the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Catechisms as the sterile voice of the 17th Century. We regard these noble creedal documents as the glorious fruit of deep and expert study of the Bible and as the best expression of Biblical teaching ever produced. We insist that men who are to take the vows of the Church Office in our denomination sincerely accept the system of doctrine set forth in the Westminster Standards. Personal integrity requires no less and denominational health cannot be maintained without this.

Concerned Presbyterians understand that organization, protest, controversy, necessary as these often are in the life of the denomination, cannot by themselves achieve revival. We remember that it was said by an Old Testament prophet and has been emphasized and re-emphasized in the New Testament that it is not by the might or power of man but by the working of the Spirit of God that His kingdom is preserved and advanced.

We rely therefore upon prayer and earnestly inter-

cede and call our whole denomination to intercede for a new moving of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of our ministers and our members. We would in the midst of the years ask our God to remember mercy and to restore what the locust and the worm have eaten and to give wholeness and soundness and continued growth to our great Church.

Be "Concerned" — But Also Be Informed

Every "Concerned Presbyterian" should read the *Presbyterian Journal* — the weekly paper that has been the "voice" of the conservative and evangelical forces in the Presbyterian Church U.S. for more than 23 years. If you are not already reading this fine paper send \$3. to *Presbyterian Journal*, Weaverville, North Carolina, for a one-year subscription. If you are already a subscriber and want to make an excellent "investment" in the Lord's work, select 10 or more key people in your church — elders, deacons, Sunday School teachers, leaders in adult or youth work and send them a subscription (only \$2.50 in lots of 10 or more).

All Concerned Presbyterians who contribute \$10 or more toward the support of our movement will receive a year's subscription to the *Journal* free of charge. If you are already a subscriber you can have your gift subscription sent to a friend.

Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. will be glad to send all members copies of the following informative booklets **FREE OF CHARGE.**

The National Council of Churches—A Menace to Church and State — 36-page booklet of articles appearing in the *Presbyterian Journal*.

The Fifth NCC Assembly: A Report — 8-page booklet by Dr. G. Aiken Taylor.

The National Council of Churches —A Power Bloc in Protestantism — 12-page booklet by Dr. G. Aiken Taylor

Confessions of a Liberal Turned Conservative — The testimony of a Presbyterian minister who was weaned away from his belief in an inerrant Bible at seminary but has returned to preaching Christ and Him crucified.

St. Mark's Vestry Committee Report on the National Council of Churches — 48-page booklet giving documented facts obtained in a 10-months study of the NCC by the Vestry of St. Mark's Episcopal Church of Shreveport, Louisiana — largest Episcopal Church in the Diocese.

These and other informative booklets have been assembled in our Information Packet. It's yours for the asking. If you care to make a contribution to defray printing and mailing costs it will be welcome. Write for your packet today!

Make Your Copy Do "Double Duty"

This Bulletin No. 1 is being mailed to all members who have enrolled in Concerned Presbyterians, to all Presbyterian U.S. ministers and missionaries, to Clerks of Sessions and to a large list of church officers and others who have indicated their concern. 50,000 copies have been printed but there are 950,000 members in the Presbyterian Church U.S. that should be concerned. When you have read your copy pass it along to others. Better still send us the names and addresses of the elders and deacons in your church and we will mail them a copy.

Our Officers - Trustees

The officers of Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. elected by the Board of Trustees in Atlanta, Georgia, February 9th are:

President Kenneth S. Keyes, Miami, Florida
 Vice President ... Col. Roy LeCraw, Atlanta, Georgia
 Secretary—W. J. (Jack) Williamson, Greenville, Ala.
 Treasurer J. M. Vroon, Miami, Florida

Trustees elected to date include:

Peter R. Branton Chattanooga, Tenn.
 Henry Burns, Jr. Macon, Ga.
 David P. Dean Ft. Worth, Texas
 R. K. Gregory Deland, Florida
 Horace H. Hull Memphis, Tennessee
 Roy LeCraw Atlanta, Georgia
 Tom C. Martin South Charleston, W. Va.
 Dan H. McEachern Florence, South Carolina
 T. Howard McKey, Jr. Atlanta, Georgia
 James Francis Miller Lexington, Kentucky
 J. J. Norton, Jr. Gaffney, South Carolina
 Arthur L. Rogers, Jr. Osceola, Arkansas
 J. B. Stovall, Jr. Lynchburg, Virginia
 Oscar Tedford Knoxville, Tennessee
 W. J. (Jack) Williamson Greenville, Alabama
 H. S. Williford Jackson, Mississippi

The Truth About The National Council of Churches

Under this promising title, *Presbyterian Survey*, official publication of the Presbyterian Church, U.S., devoted fifteen pages of its December, 1964, issue to a one-sided defense of the National Council of Churches (hereafter identified as NCC). Five of these pages bore the title, "The Charges and the Answers." The questions and answers were prepared by the Sub-committee on the National Council of the General Assembly's Committee on Inter-Church Relations — a committee dominated by those who favor our continued involvement with the NCC. It is apparent that many of the questions were adroitly phrased in a way that would enable them to be answered with a minimum of harm to the NCC. We have been informed that our Committee on Inter-Church Relations paid the *Survey* \$2,400. for publishing this "report."

The 1964 General Assembly adopted the recommendation of the Standing Committee on *Presbyterian Survey* — "that the Board of Directors of *Presbyterian Survey* be requested, in case of controversial subjects, to give opportunity for the presentation of both sides, as is done in our church courts." (Page 69 Assembly Minutes.) In line with this action we asked Dr. Felix B. Gear, Chairman of the *Survey* Board, to grant space for articles presenting our views. This request was denied! It is apparent that the *Survey* Board intends to ignore the expressed wish of the General Assembly and plans to use this official church publication to promote only their point of view — which we sincerely believe does not reflect the opinion of the vast majority of the members of our Church.

Therefore it becomes necessary for us to answer the questions raised, presenting the true facts as we see them. We quote each question, summarize briefly the answer given in the *Survey* "Special Report," followed by our answer. To avoid any feeling that we are quoting out of context we recommend that you send 10¢ to *Presbyterian Survey*, 341 Ponce de Leon Avenue, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia, for the reprint of their complete report.

Here Are The Questions:

QUESTION: "What is the actual monetary support provided the National Council by the Presbyterian Church U.S.?"

SURVEY ANSWER: "In 1963 . . . only \$8,361 . . . In addition, six of our major boards 'invested' in 1963 the sum of \$90,345. in departmental programs of the National Council, including \$55,895. through the Board of World Missions . . ."

OUR CONTENTION: The *Survey* obviously made a mistake in reporting only ". . . \$55,895 through the Board of World Missions . . ."

Page 180, Board of World Missions Annual Report for 1963 section "F — Overseas Relief and Inter-Church Aid-Projects" gives a total of \$287,000. listed for various Church World Service (an agency of NCC) causes, plus \$66,375. for World Council of Churches causes. Section "G — Cooperative Work in Connection with other Boards" reports additional disbursements of \$70,968. to National Council and World Council causes.

We realize that a large part of the disbursements by the Board of World Missions to NCC and WCC are used in overseas relief or other world mission related projects, often in cooperation with the efforts of our own missionaries, but the NCC's own report states that \$38,853. was used for direct administrative report.

QUESTION: "Is the National Council of Churches 'soft' on Communism?"

SURVEY ANSWER: "No. It is not and never has been."

OUR CONTENTION: The *Survey* report attempted to prove its point by quoting a pronouncement of the NCC's General Board stating that the NCC "is and always has been unalterably opposed to Communism," by quoting a letter from J. Edgar Hoover saying that he had never *made any statement* criticizing the NCC, and by quoting a report of the Joint Committee on Ecumenical Relations of the Episcopal Church stating that they were not able to discover any fact or record that would support the charge that the NCC harbors Communist sympathizers.

The Subcommittee failed to report that Mr. Richard Arens, Staff Director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, during a hearing on evidence of Communist activity in the religious field, testified as follows: "Thus far, of the leadership of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America we have found over 100 persons in leadership capacity with either Communist-front records or records of service to Communist causes."

Many of the pronouncements of the NCC in recent years, placed side by side with the announced objectives of the Communist Party in the U.S., leave little doubt in the minds of thinking persons that *some* NCC leaders who shape its policies and programs are sympathetic to the causes which the Communists advocate — recognition of Red China, unilateral disarmament, abolishment of universal military training, suspending atomic testing, abandoning of military alliances, repeal of the McCarran Act restricting immigrants, replacing the capitalistic system with Socialism, agitation on behalf of convicted spies such as Morton Sobell, opposition to anti-communist efforts such as the film "Operation Abolition" — to mention only a few.

Rev. Edwin T. Dahlberg, president of NCC in 1958, was identified with the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges (a Communist front) which sought to prevent Bridges' deportation and his name was linked with "National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act" (cited as a Communist front by both the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Sub-Committee on Internal Security. He signed the infamous "Pacifist Pledge").

The NCC, unintentionally or not, has associated itself with persons who have not been above suspicion as far as Communist influence is concerned. If having its President identified with subversive organizations, and engaging in activities and making utterances that closely parallel those of the Communist conspiracy can be termed "being soft on Communism," then there is ample evidence to support the belief that Communist sympathizers have infiltrated the NCC.

QUESTION: "Does the National Council of Churches maintain a 'lobbying' office in Washington, D. C.?"

SURVEY ANSWER: (No "Yes" or "No" answer is given. The reply does state that 1. A Washington Office of NCC does exist. 2. The purpose of that office being to "keep churches informed of pending legislation, etc.")

OUR CONTENTION: It has been repeatedly denied that the Washington office of NCC engages in lobbying to influence legislation. Apparently our Subcommittee which "answered" these charges does not believe this denial, for they "answered" this question by defending the right of the NCC to support or oppose legislation, and states "In their own interest the most

conservative church bodies should defend the right of the National Council of Churches to support or oppose legislation . . .”

Webster defines “lobby” as “To address or solicit members of a legislative body in the lobby or elsewhere, with intent to influence legislation.” The lobby bulletin published by the NCC is entitled *Memo* and can be ordered from NCC, 110 Maryland Ave., N.E., Washington, D.C.

We see nothing wrong in such lobbying if it is limited to legislation involving moral and spiritual issues. On such issues we think church organizations should make their voices heard. But we think it is wrong for the NCC to lobby for or against legislation which deals with national defense, disarmament, right-to-work laws and other purely political and economic matters. This the NCC persists in doing.

QUESTION: “Does the National Council of Churches claim to speak for forty million Christians?”

SURVEY ANSWER: “It does not and it never has.”

OUR CONTENTION: This answer is a true answer to the question as it was phrased — the NCC has always denied that it speaks for its membership. If the question had been asked, “Does the NCC give the impression that it speaks for forty million Christians?” an honest answer would be an unqualified “Yes, its pronouncements do lead the reader to believe that they represent the thinking of the members of its constituency!” When spokesmen of the NCC appear before Congressional committees in support of or opposition against legislation, they appear in their capacity as officials of a body representing a large segment of the Protestant community of America.

The Vestry Committee of St Mark’s Episcopal Church of Shreveport, Louisiana, which devoted ten months to a careful study of the NCC, says: “We have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that it (the NCC) has made a practice of speaking on behalf of all members of the 34 denominations comprising the NCC, when it is in fact not specifically authorized to do so. In this regard it has been deceitful in that it actually did desire the impression to be made on the public that it spoke officially for the ‘39 million’.”

The pronouncements of the General Board of the NCC are presented to the churches and the public in a manner that often gives the impression that they represent the thinking of the 34 constituent communions and their 39 million members. Examples of this are so numerous and obvious that it seems superfluous to repeat even a few. However, —

NCC News Release No. 22 GA 3/14/61. “New York, March 14, 1961. The National Council of Churches today released the full text of an official policy statement on the question of Federal aid to education; issued as a pronouncement adopted by the Council’s General Board, representative of the 34 Protestant and Eastern Orthodox Communions in the Council, . . .”

We find it interesting that the official Presbyterian U.S. representation to the General Board of the NCC (the very people who “answered” these “charges” and say “It does not and it never has”) felt called upon to request the NCC to “make clear its public statements.” We refer to page 171, Minutes of the General Assembly, April 1964:

“The official representatives also recommended that the General Board, insofar as possible, make clear in its public statements that the General Board was not speaking or acting in behalf of all Protestant denominations unless the denominations gave specific authorization.”

This is an inconsistency that is difficult to understand. On one hand our representatives to the NCC felt called upon to report to our General Assembly its recommendation that the NCC “make clear its public

statements.” But in this “Special Report” they deny that the NCC “is or ever has been” guilty of such actions.

QUESTION: “Did the National Council of Churches sponsor an ‘invasion’ of Mississippi last summer by northern student volunteers?”

SURVEY ANSWER: “It did not.”

OUR CONTENTION: The *Survey* report says, “The NCC did not sponsor COFO’s Mississippi Summer Project, did not recruit the student volunteers and had no control over COFO’s policy, strategy, rationale, or personnel.” Then in the next paragraph it is stated, “The NCC undertook to provide training and counselling for the volunteers in an effort to safeguard their lives, prepare them for their dangerous tasks, offer spiritual guidance and provide legal assistance when needed.”

The NCC sponsored two-week-long orientation courses at Western College for Women, Oxford, Ohio, last June and recruited minister counsellors and lawyers to be with the students in Mississippi. The fact that the NCC may not have *initiated* the project seems beside the point. The NCC certainly aided and abetted the project. Moreover, the NCC continued its support of COFO after Martin Luther King’s Southern Christian Leadership Conference and NAACP had withdrawn their support of some of COFO’s local activities.

The question was, “Did the NCC sponsor an ‘invasion’ of Mississippi?” The word “sponsor” is defined to mean “one who is responsible for a person or thing.” It seems that the NCC took considerable responsibility when it recruited volunteers, conducted voter registration projects, provided training for volunteers, etc. It also seems a strange policy for the NCC to become so involved in a project which it “had no authority to encourage or restrain” and when it had “no control over COFO’s policy, strategy, rationale, or personnel.”

As we read the *Survey* answer we wondered if the Sub-Committee raised and answered this question about the “summer project” to divert attention from the far more important “Mississippi Delta Project” that they dismissed with a brief statement in the last paragraph. This Delta Project for which the NCC and World Council seek to raise \$400,000. per year is a *continuing* project. It has the potential of causing far more trouble than last summer’s limited effort. We have in our files a letter from the NCC which says, “The idea of a Mississippi Delta Project originated with the Division of Home Missions of the NCC.” There is no question therefore that the NCC did originate this project, that the NCC board approved it and that the NCC staff is doing its utmost to promote it.

An interesting sidelight to this question is that one of the instructors at the NCC “sponsored two-week-long orientation courses for Summer Project volunteers at Western College for Women in Oxford, Ohio, June 13-27, 1964” was Mr. Myles Horton, head of the notorious Highlander Folk School formerly of Monteagle, Tennessee.

QUESTION: “Does the NCC advocate recognition of Red China?”

SURVEY ANSWER: “No. . . . In its finding this conference spoke for itself only, not for the council.”

OUR CONTENTION: An official body of the NCC, the “Fifth World Order Study Conference” held in Cleveland, Ohio, November 18-21, 1958, was called by the General Board of NCC; work papers for the conference were prepared by the NCC’s Department of International Affairs; and the results of the conference were published by the NCC. Page 13 of this report states, “The Fifth World Order Study Conference was *planned* by the National Council of Churches with the understanding that it was to be followed by a nationwide educational effort.” This conference approved and issued a document which stated:

"With reference to China, Christians should urge reconsideration by our government of its policy in regard to the People's Republic of China. While the rights of the people of Taiwan and Korea should be safeguarded, steps should be taken toward the inclusion of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and for its recognition by our government."

The Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations headed by Congressman Walter H. Judd, a former medical missionary to China, conducted a poll to determine whether the findings of the conference met with the approval of the ministers in the United States. Of the 8,000 ministers who responded to the poll, 87% opposed both admission of Red China to the United Nations and recognition by the United States.

It is disappointing to note that those who supplied the "answers" to these "charges" have, in stating "this conference spoke for itself only, not for the Council" followed the "escape clause" so often used by the NCC as it has failed to accept responsibility for actions and statements of its official bodies and personnel.

QUESTION: "Did the National Council of Churches copyright the Revised Standard Version of the Bible?"

SURVEY ANSWER: "Yes, it did . . ."

OUR CONTENTION: This answer requires no comment.

QUESTION: "Is it true that the National Council is a clergy and church-agency dominated organization?"

SURVEY ANSWER: "So in terms of actual numbers of people involved, there are more clergymen and church-agency people than laymen."

OUR CONTENTION: A study of the composition of the General Board of the NCC revealed that in 1960, 74.4% of the members of the General Board were ordained persons. The action of June 30, 1955, of the General Board of the NCC disbanding the National Lay Committee laid the foundation for the feeling that the General Board was determined to shut off the "lay voice."

QUESTION: "Has the National Council advocated 'free love' for young people?"

SURVEY ANSWER: "Emphatically, it has not."

OUR CONTENTION: This question was very adroitly phrased. If the question had been put "Has the National Council of Churches published a booklet in which young people were told that there is nothing actually wrong about extramarital sex relations" the answer would be "Emphatically it has."

Among the materials prepared by the NCC's Department of Youth Work for Youth Week in 1962 was a booklet entitled "Called to Responsible Freedom: The Meaning of Sex in the Christian Life." Its text was in the form of a heart-to-heart talk between a church leader and a teen-ager. At one point the church leader says to the youth,

"Our culture declares that all sexual activity within marriage is legal, proper and good while any such activity outside marriage is illicit, sinful and wrong. This is to ignore the personal dimension of life, to seek to force everyone under one massive legal umbrella. You and I know perfectly well that there are many marriages that are simply matters of convenience, that such sex as goes on in them is selfish, exploitative and evil. We know further that there is sexual contact between unmarried couples that is motivated by love and *which is pure and on occasions beautiful.*" (The italics are ours.)

In another paragraph the youth is told:

"The crucial question to be asked about any sexual contact — from holding hands to complete intercourse

— is not so much what is done as what is meant."

Again we read:

"In the personal individual sense, then, what justifies and sanctifies sexuality is not the external marital status of the people before the law but rather what they feel toward each other in their hearts. Measured in such a way, holding hands can be very wrong indeed while intimate sex-play can be right and good."

It seems inconceivable that any responsible church organization should condone this booklet encouraging young people to disobey the Commandment "Thou shalt not commit adultery," but the pamphlet bore on its cover the statement that it was published for the United Christian Youth Movement, National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA and it was copyrighted by the NCC. It caused such a furor that it was withdrawn from circulation but the harm had been done.

We feel that the NCC must accept full responsibility for any publication that it (1) has written; (2) publishes; (3) holds the copyright; and (4) sells. We find it almost unbelievable that this Sub-Committee in answering these "charges" could defend this publication.

QUESTION: "Did the National Council publish a reading list which recommended obscene books?"

SURVEY ANSWER: "No. This false charge is frequently made with regard to a bibliography on 'The Negro American' prepared in 1957 by the council's Department of Racial and Cultural Relations. It was intended solely for the information of church leaders and students of Negro history. The list was a cross-section of available reading on the subject, *presented without comment.*" (The underscoring is ours.)

Apparently, the person who wrote that answer has never seen the list. The list was classified — Books for Primary Children (pre-school and grades 1-3), Intermediates (grades 4-6), Juniors (grades 7-9), Seniors (grades 10-12) and Adults. The introduction to the list urges:

"Read for enjoyment and information. Read aloud to your children or put the books where they will be picked up. Make recommendations to your children's teachers and to librarians. Share your copy of this list with friends. Urge church, PTA and other organizations to circulate copies."

The "answer" also states that there are "no books on this list that have been declared obscene by any duly constituted and competent agency," and points out that the book *Without Magnolias* by Bucklin Moon was not banned from the mail. This is a poor defense in that many publications that have not been banned from the mail or officially "declared obscene" are in fact, by most standards of common decency, obscene! The book that is defended in this "answer" contains some of the vilest language ever put in print and depicts an act of adultery between a Negro woman and a white man in such a manner that the act was actually condoned.

Alfred S. Kramer, associate executive director of the Department of Racial and Cultural Relations of the NCC, states in the foreword that its compilers "have done an admirable piece of work." It says the list contains the names of books "about Negroes which are safe to recommend for children — safe because they qualify as literature."

Thirty-four books on this recommended list were written by Communists or authors identified with Communist-front organizations. Nine books were written by Langston Hughes, identified as an active Communist — a member of approximately 50 Communist-front organizations. He is the author of the poem "Goodbye Christ" which states in part:

Goodbye, Christ Jesus, Lord God Jehova
 Beat it on away from here now.
 Make way for a new guy with no religion
 at all —
 A real guy named
 Marx, Communist, Lenin, Peasant, Stalin,
 Worker, Me —
 I said, ME.

The "answer" in the *Survey* defends this poem by stating, "Moreover, Mr. Hughes himself contends that the poem is not intended to be sacrilegious." We would consider this a normal reaction for Langston Hughes and won't attempt to argue the point.

Another author was Victor Perlo. His Book "The Negro in Southern Agriculture" was published by the Communist Party's major printing firm. The Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee described Perlo as "an open propagandist for Soviet World conspiracy." Perlo has been identified as a member of the first Communist cell established within the U.S. Government.

Herbert Aptheker who wrote one of the recommended books admits that he is a Communist. He has 13 citations for Communist activity. He was editor of "Political Affairs" — the Communist Party's official theoretical organ.

W. E. B. DuBois, who authored several books on the list, was cited in 1949 for 29 Communist affiliations, and his name made news as recently as January 4, 1965, as Mr. J. Edgar Hoover identified the "W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America" as a "new national Marxist youth organization" initiated by the Communist Party with recently organized chapters on several of our college campuses. DuBois had repeatedly attacked churches and clergymen and defamed the United States.

QUESTION: "If charges levelled against the National Council in None Dare Call It Treason are false, why have they not been refuted?"

SURVEY ANSWER: ". . . they have been refuted — and soundly, by responsible, impartial agencies and individuals . . ."

OUR CONTENTION. The refutation quoted was by Dr. Henry M. Bullock, editor of Church School Publications for the Methodist Publishing House. Since Stormer devoted much space to criticisms of Methodist literature, we would hardly say that Dr. Bullock's approach would be "impartial." We have read Dr. Bullock's lengthy "refutation" published in the South Carolina *Christian Advocate*, practically all of which deals with the criticisms of literature prepared by his department. Since we have not read the literature, we are not in position to comment.

The question as to why the NCC has not refuted these charges remains unanswered.

QUESTION: "Did the National Council of Churches in Nashville, Tennessee, Consultation on Youth and Race advocate 'subversion' on parental authority?"

SURVEY ANSWER: "There were several resourceful persons from various civil rights organizations — invited on the basis of their professional experience in the race struggle rather than religious affiliation. These persons provided expert background information and gave consultants a critical and objective 'outside view' of church activity in the field of civil rights. The consultation has no power to formulate policy for the National Council of Churches . . . One reporter apparently came forearmed with strong pro-segregation sentiments. From his garbled and biased report of what was said sprang the tempest that quickly filled the teapot."

OUR CONTENTION: *The Nashville Banner* of

January 10, 1964, reported that Dr. Colin Williams, NCC director of Evangelism, told the group that he thought the United Christian Youth Movement, an NCC organization, should organize pickets and "if this involved conflict with local law, all the better."

The same report stated that Jay Moore, a director of NCC's Commission on Religion and Race suggested using experienced racial agitators as leaders in summer camps for high school youth. It reported that the associate editor of Youth Magazine of the United Church of Christ suggested that instead of bringing demonstrators to the camps, the camps themselves should be "blooded" — that they should participate in demonstrations. She was quoted as saying, "All over the nation parents have restrictive influence. Summer camp is the time for the youth to get away, free to do as they like."

Another leader was quoted as suggesting that there should be more conflict in the church and he wanted the young people to be involved in it. He was quoted as saying, "Parents in the north would get as mad at seeing their kids in a labor picket line as in a civil rights line — we need to get the kids politically involved."

This consultation was held in Nashville, Tennessee, January 7-9, 1964, and was sponsored by the NCC with the following NCC leaders present:

John Wood — NCC Youth Dept.

Dr. Colin Williams — Director, NCC. Dept. of Evangelism

Jay Moore — Asst. Director of NCC, Commission on Religion and Race.

The Ad Interim Committee Report to Red River Presbytery, April 7-8, 1964, concerning the National Council of Churches stated on page 6:

"From personal interviews with persons present at this meeting in Nashville the committee finds as fact:

"a. *Subversive Teaching Concerning Parental Authority* — These NCC leaders at this meeting advocated plans for the holding of camps and conferences for youth where workshops on 'sit-ins' and racial demonstrations could be conducted, and where actual sit-ins and demonstrations could be staged in an atmosphere and environment where youths were 'free' from 'harmful' parental restraint.

"b. *Subversive Teaching Concerning Law and Order* — These NCC leaders advocated activities which would bring young people into conflict with local law and bring about brushes with what was termed 'the system.' Jail was held forth not as a calculated risk, but as a goal to be desired — an excellent way to 'wake them (the young people) up' to what is going on in the world."

QUESTION: "Are any steps being taken by the National Council to respond to and profit by the constructive suggestions and criticisms being made of its program?"

SURVEY ANSWER: "The answer is a definite Yes."

OUR CONTENTION: We would say "Amen." It is high time that the leaders in the NCC realized that their programs and pronouncements have carried the churches far away from their basic mission of winning the unsaved to Christ and nurturing all Christians in the Faith. But in the light of the record it is difficult to believe that this will be done.

Peter R. Branton

Elder: First Presbyterian Church of Chattanooga, Tennessee, and a member of the Board of World Missions.

The St. Mark's Vestry Report

The most painstaking and thorough study of the NCC that has come to our attention was made by the Vestry of St. Mark's Episcopal Church of Shreveport — the largest Episcopal church in the Diocese of Louisiana (2,100 members). Ten months were spent in the study and preparation of the report. They held a tape recorded interview with Dr. J. Quinter Miller, Assistant General Secretary of the NCC. They obtained and carefully analyzed the official texts of approximately 40 political pronouncements by the NCC's General Board.

In its approach to this task the Committee was neither prejudiced nor provincial. Its work was done in a careful, unhurried, dispassionate and analytical manner. The Committee had but one objective in mind: to determine the facts and to draw its own independent conclusions, using as its sole standard what it conceived to be the long-term best interest of the Church. Here is the summary of their findings:

"Theoretically, and perhaps practically, the NCCCA does many things which are good. It conducts foreign missionary work; it distributes food and clothing to many who need it overseas. It prepares and distributes church literature.

"But we have not discovered any so-called evangelistic activity of the NCCCA which is not also a function of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Our church also conducts foreign missionary work and publishes literature.

"Our investigation leads us to the following conclusions:

"The NCCCA has done and is doing a great number of things that we feel are not in the

best interest of the Church. We have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that it has made a practice of speaking on behalf of all members of the 34 denominations comprising the NCCCA, when it is in fact not specifically authorized to do so. In this regard, it has been deceitful, in that it actually did desire the impression to be made on the public that it spoke officially for 'the 39 million.'

"The NCCCA has far exceeded its rightful role in speaking out, as the official voice of Protestantism in America, on such controversial issues as federal aid to education, the right-to-work laws, the ethical considerations of the steel dispute, the seating of Red China in the United Nations, etc.

"The NCCCA, although not communistic, has been an aid to the communist conspiracy.

"It has been hypocritical in assailing 'guilt by association' and 'name calling' in one breath and employing it in the next.

"It was deceitful in the manner in which it handled the Fifth World Order Study Conference in Cleveland. It is deceitful in refusing to repudiate mistakes or to correct misinterpretations in the press, except when such mistakes or misrepresentations are harmful to what they (the professional core of the NCCCA) believe and profess.

"We believe that such deceit is not a proper Christian attitude.

"The NCCCA is in fact, if not in theory, dominated by a hard core of professionals, some of whom have never done pastoral work. We believe they may consider themselves leaders of what they would like to consider
(Continued on Back Page)

IF YOU ARE "CONCERNED" ABOUT THE TRENDS IN OUR CHURCH USE THIS ENROLLMENT BLANK TO ENLIST TODAY!

I believe the following would be interested in hearing about Concerned Presbyterians. Send them your literature.

Name

Address

Date

CONCERNED PRESBYTERIANS, INC.
234 Biscayne Blvd., Miami 32, Florida

I AM CONCERNED about present trends in the Presbyterian Church U. S. and desire to become a member of your organization.

I covenant —

- To pray for a spiritual awakening in the Church.
- To actively support your program to the best of my ability.

For the undergirding of the program during the coming year

I will contribute (check which)

.....\$5\$10\$25\$50\$100\$250\$500\$

Payable

Name

Street

City State Church

Office Held (if any) ... Elder ... Deacon ... S. S. Teacher ... Other

*Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. is a non-profit organization.
It is anticipated that all gifts will be tax deductible.*

Please list additional names
on a separate sheet

Why We Are "Concerned"
Our Spiritual Objectives
The Truth about the National Council
of Churches — Our Reply to the 15-page
"Report" in Presbyterian Survey
Be "Concerned," But also be Informed
The St. Mark's Vestry Report

— C O N T E N T S —

RETURN REQUESTED

Dedicated to Returning the Presbyterian Church U. S.
to its Primary Mission — Winning the Unsaved for
Christ and Nurturing all Believers in the Faith
MIAMI, FLORIDA 33132
234 BISCAYNE BLVD.

THE CONCERNED PRESBYTERIAN

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
MIAMI, FLORIDA
PERMIT No. 1244

(From Page 7)

as a super church. They deliberately destroyed the Lay Committee of the NCCCA because the NCCCA could not effectively spread its propaganda with such a loud dissonant voice from within. We are of the opinion that there is something basically wrong with a religious organization which cannot bear to have within its framework a highly responsible group of the laity simply because it disagrees with the dominating clergy.

"It is wrong for the NCCCA to carry out lobbying activities with the federal government at all, and it is particularly erroneous for it to do so as the professed voice of Protestantism.

"There are only two choices available in reaching a conclusion in regard to the reading list, 'The Negro American,' which it published. Either the NCCCA displayed incompetence in allowing it to be distributed, or else it was distributed deliberately as a corrosive. In all charity we must conclude that it was a display of incompetence, which conclusion strengthens our conviction that the NCCCA should refrain from taking stands on highly controversial issues in politics and economics: besides not being so authorized, it is not competent to judge upon all of these matters.

"The most important point of all is this: far from being the great cohesive power it was intended to be, the NCCCA by its actions is splitting the churches wide open. We believe that it is doing much more harm than good; that its actions will restrict the attracting of

new members to the Church; that it will alienate and is now alienating many of the now faithful parishoners; that it is creating disastrous dissension in all Protestant Churches. We know for a fact that it is wreaking such havoc in individual churches that meeting of budgets is being impaired, and that lifelong friendships between laity and clergy, and between laity and laity, are being strained.

"In summation, we conclude with firm conviction and only after long study and prayer, that the National Council of Churches as it is presently constituted and operated, is a harmful and highly dangerous institution."

The complete 50-page report is included in a packet of materials on the NCC that will be sent on request to members of Concerned Presbyterians. Others can obtain it by sending 50¢ to Vestry Committee, St. Mark's Episcopal Church, Shreveport, Louisiana. Every Presbyterian regardless of his present views on the NCC should read this illuminating analysis of the NCC and its operations. We urge you to obtain a copy, read it and then pass it along to your friends.

**If A Reply To Your
Letter Is Delayed . . .**

A flood of inquiries, letters and enrollments has swamped the office of Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. If a reply is not forthcoming promptly, please attribute the delay to this deluge of mail. We are replying to all mail. Your patience is appreciated.