



"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. 5

JUNE, 1966

The 1966 General Assembly!

ACTIONS of the 1966 General Assembly in Montreat April 21-25 clearly demonstrated the need for an active and effective organization of Concerned Presbyterians if the Presbyterian Church U.S. is to resist the organized attempt which has greatly accelerated to, 1) commit the Church to new forms of "mission" which no longer will include leading the unsaved to Christ and nurturing believers in the Faith; 2) destroy the Reformed faith and substitute modern versions of "belief" which are hostile to the Gospel of sin and salvation; 3) destroy the Presbyterian representative order and commit the Church to an episcopal order within a monster Protestant organization in excess of 24 million members.

It was evident from opening night at the Assembly that the "liberal" machine had worked diligently to insure that the "right" commissioners were sent from most of the presbyteries; that they had been contacted by the "right" people and pledged in advance to vote the "right" way.

Here are some of the actions taken on controversial issues:

Capital Punishment. Overriding fervent pleas from a criminal court judge and state parole board member, a captain in the Georgia State Patrol, an attorney who had prosecuted and defended capital cases, and a minister who has worked in prisons, the Assembly voted 243 to 188 to stand for the abolition of capital punishment.

Civil Disobedience. The Assembly went beyond the 1965 Assembly, which supported those persons who feel they must practice civil disobedience, to a position in which the Assembly itself condoned civil disobedience in certain cases.

Viet Nam. The Assembly adopted as its own the December, 1965, pronouncement of the National Council of Churches criticizing U.S. policy in Viet Nam.

Church Union. Probably the most far-reaching and potentially dangerous of all the actions taken was the decision to have the Church actively participate in the Consultation on Church Union (the so-called Blake-Pike merger talks). By joining the Consultation (COCU) this Church pledged itself to accept all "progress" made in the talks to the moment of joining. An outline of principles on which a monster Church may be constructed has now been adopted (with no negative votes cast by our delegation) and sent down to the denominations for acceptance.

It seems certain that the action of the Assembly which took the Church into COCU will bring to an abrupt end the current negotiations with the Reformed Church in America. These had reached the point where it was generally believed that the merger of the two bodies could be consummated in due time.

We do not believe that the Southern Presbyterian

Church is prepared to surrender its distinctive testimony and be swallowed up in a great super-Church which would have as its primary goal social, economic and political action, with no thought of the traditional and basic Christian mission of leading the unsaved to Jesus Christ. But a very determined, well organized and largely successful effort is under way to take the Church into this "liberal" way.

New Confession. The Assembly approved in principle a new confession of faith to supplement the present Confession of Faith.

Concerned Presbyterians need to be aware that the General Assembly voted, in effect, to 1) re-state the Church's faith; 2) join in union conversations with Churches that are neither Reformed nor evangelical, which means that it was willing to, 3) abandon the Presbyterian order.

It is vitally important to acquaint our fellow church members with what is happening and enlist their prayers and active support in preserving the Presbyterian Church.

Question: Have you made it a point to find out who shares your concern, and enlist their aid and support of Concerned Presbyterians?

Savannah Churches Vote to Withdraw

DURING April two Presbyterian churches in Savannah, Georgia, voted overwhelmingly to withdraw from the Presbyterian Church in the United States. The vote at Eastern Heights Presbyterian Church was 122 to 0; the vote at Hull Memorial was 184 to 22.

While we sympathize with the reasons which prompted these two churches to withdraw, we regret that they decided to take this drastic action. The trustees of Concerned Presbyterians feel that the solution to the serious situation facing our denomination today is not to be found by withdrawal, either individually from the local church or collectively as a congregation from the presbytery.

We therefore urge — indeed, we plead — with everyone who is unhappy and concerned about the present trends in our Church to remain in the Church and work with us to reverse them. Leaders of Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. sincerely believe that these trends *can* be changed — not this year or next year — but certainly in the foreseeable future if those, who want to see the historic witness of our Church continued, remain in the fold and work diligently and pray fervently to that end.

Are We “Divisive and Destructive”?

LAST January a Texas minister speaking on the floor of his presbytery accused Concerned Presbyterians of attempting to “divide and destroy the witness and ministry of the Presbyterian Church U.S.” In subsequent correspondence with us, this gentleman listed 12 reasons for making this statement. Because many of these same charges are being levelled at us by those who would have our Church depart from its primary mission, it seems advisable to acquaint our members with the reasons this minister gave for calling our organization “divisive and destructive” and the reply which seems obvious to each charge.

Charge 1: Year after year, our General Assembly has declared its intention, by an overwhelming majority, to stay in the National Council of Churches. Yet “Concerned Presbyterians, Inc.” has spent a great amount of money and time propagandizing against the National Council of Churches, being unwilling to accept the will of the General Assembly.

Our Reply: It is true that year after year the General Assembly has voted to stay in the National Council of Churches and that one of the objectives of Concerned Presbyterians is to have us withdraw. But is it divisive and destructive to question the wisdom of the General Assembly position?

May we point out that the Church clearly expressed its opposition to union with the USA Church some years ago and has continued year after year to answer in the negative overtures seeking to reopen the negotiation. Yet proponents of organic union have continued to send up overtures and continue to agitate for union. The overture from the Synod of Virginia last year asking that we reopen negotiations was defeated by a 3 to 1 vote — about the same ratio as the vote which answered in the negative the overtures seeking withdrawal from the NCC.

This year your own Synod of Texas is overturning the Assembly asking that it be permitted to unite with the Texas synod of the USA Church. A similar overture has been voted by the Synod of Kentucky.

We find it hard to understand why so many of those who oppose our objectives seem to take the position that it is right and proper for them to agitate for goals to which they believe the Church should be committed but deny to conservatives the privilege of doing the same thing. If it is all right for the Fellowship of Concern (which was organized long before Concerned Presbyterians, Inc., came into being) to publish objectives and to work assiduously for their accomplishment, is it fair to charge that Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. is “divisive and destructive” for announcing its goals and working to achieve them?

Charge 2: In much of its program on this and other items, “Concerned Presbyterians, Inc.” has created suspicion of, if not destructive distrust in, the duly elected officers and leaders of our General Assembly.

Leading Church Away

Our Reply: You say that we have created suspicion of and distrust in duly elected officers and leaders of our General Assembly. Some of these men seem to be trying to lead our Church away from the Reformed Faith which has long been our heritage. There are others who would substitute social programs for what we believe to be the primary mission of the Church — leading the unsaved to accept Christ as Savior and

Lord. We differ decidedly with these two points of view.

Many of these men think we are in error and a few of them have been very outspoken in impugning our motives and condemning our organization and its program. We have never to my knowledge questioned the motives or impugned the character of any leader in our Church. We feel that they have every right to hold their opinions and to express them freely. We claim this same right for ourselves and expect to be vocal in expressing our convictions when we sincerely feel that the programs of any of our leaders are hurting the cause of Christ and are detrimental to the work of our Church.

Charge 3: “Concerned Presbyterians, Inc.” has instigated agitation, if not pressure, in Sessions and Presbyteries, of which the instigators are not members, to initiate overtures against the National Council of Churches.

Our Reply: To the extent that we have through our literature and in our meetings sought to inform the duly elected officers and members of the churches of our denomination regarding the dangers we feel are inherent in our membership in the National Council of Churches we have undoubtedly encouraged many Sessions and some Presbyteries to initiate overtures against the NCC. I am not aware of any instance, however, where “pressure” has been brought to bear in Sessions or Presbyteries by those who were not members of the Church courts involved.

Charge 4: The members of “Concerned Presbyterians, Inc.” as members of the Presbyterian Church, U.S., are violating their vow to “submit yourselves to the government and discipline of the Church, and promise to further its purity and peace.”

Our Reply: By and large the leadership of Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. is in the hands of dedicated laymen whose love and loyalty to our Church is a matter of record. We would vigorously deny that we have either in spirit or letter violated any of our ordination vows. We have promised to study the *purity* and *peace* of the Church. Purity has ever been the solid foundation for peace.

We are fully committed without mental reservation or equivocation to a strict construction of the Constitution of our Church. We are opposed to the “loose constructionists” who feel that they can with impunity and with no violation of their ordination vows take our Church along paths which we, in good conscience and in loyalty to our ordination vows, cannot possibly travel. We would stoutly deny that we are divisive. We are the result of a division which has been growing in our Church for a long time but we are certainly not the cause of this division.

Charge 5: “Concerned Presbyterians, Inc.” or at least individual members, have initiated movements to persuade particular churches to give up their “Every Family Subscription” to *The Presbyterian Survey*, the official publication of our Church.

Our Reply: You say that “Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. or at least its individual members” have sought to persuade individual churches to give up the “Every Family Plan” for subscriptions to *The Presbyterian Survey*. I have no doubt that individual members have urged their Sessions to discontinue sending the *Survey* to their members. Many of our members feel very keenly that the *Survey* which is supported by the benevolence gifts of all of our people should present fairly and objectively both sides of controversial issues being debated by the Church. The *Survey* was requested to do this by the 1964 Assembly but has consistently refused to conform to this request.

Charge 6: Leaders in "Concerned Presbyterians, Inc." have used their influence to persuade particular churches, of which they were not members, and even in presbyteries of which they are not members, to call ministers who are not Presbyterians, U.S., and who are not in sympathy with the approved policies and program of our General Assembly.

Our Reply: As long as I have been a member of the Presbyterian Church US — almost 40 years — ministers who are not members of the churches seeking pastors or the presbytery involved have sought at times to use their influence to have particular ministers called by pulpit committees. I am very sure that you will readily agree that such activities have not been limited to those who hold the conservative position. If anything, those who hold the liberal view have been far more active in this field than have the conservatives. Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. has never advocated the calling of any man who was not completely committed to the Standards of our Church.

Central Treasurer System

Charge 7: "Concerned Presbyterians, Inc." or at least some of its leaders have, after our General Assembly has approved a central benevolent treasurer, worked to destroy the effectiveness of this office, or at least make the work more difficult.

Our Reply: We freely admit that Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. as an organization and most of our members are opposed to the Central Treasurer system to "equalize" all benevolence gifts to Assembly's causes in accordance with the percentages set by the Assembly. We feel very keenly that this plan which proposes to regiment the giving of the Church is fundamentally unsound and that it will hurt and not help the stewardship program of the Church.

During the last 30 years I have travelled very extensively throughout the Church at my own expense, encouraging our people to give more liberally to the work of the Kingdom. My message "In Partnership with God" has been given more than 650 times and several million copies have been printed and distributed without cost to the church.

It disturbs me greatly, therefore, to see our Church now setting up a system which will in effect distribute the gifts of donors the way the Assembly decides they should be distributed rather than the way the donor wishes the money to be used. Any such system is certain in the long run to discourage people from giving.

Let me illustrate: Some years ago Mrs. Keyes and I felt led to take on the partial support of at least one missionary in each of the foreign fields served by our Church. Our gift for this purpose was over and above our contributions to Current Expenses and Benevolences. The Board of World Missions was required to deduct 5% of this gift and put it in the Equalization Fund for redistribution to other agencies of the Church which were already benefiting from our gifts to Benevolences. We felt that it was basically wrong for the Church to take 5% of our designated gift and use it for causes for which it was not intended. But that 5% was just a "drop in the bucket" compared with what the Church is now doing under the Central Treasurer plan.

The 1965 Assembly set the 1966 Askings at \$8,406,136. It designated \$4,432,689. for World Missions — 52.73% of the total. The other causes receive 47.27%. This year our special gift for the support of missionaries will be designated for World Missions and will be sent to that Board. But Assembly's Central Treasurer will withhold from the Board of World Missions its share of the undesignated gifts until our gift has been "equal-

ized." The net result of this plan is that only 52.73% of our gift designated entirely for World Missions will actually benefit this cause. 47.27% will in effect be redistributed to other Assembly causes.

May Discourage Giving

We believe that any plan which in effect distributes the gifts of our people the way the Assembly orders them distributed rather than the way the donors intended their money to be used will discourage our people from making over-and-above gifts to causes in which they are especially interested. When our people realize what is really happening to their gifts under the Central Treasurer "equalization" we believe they will resent this "manipulation" of their funds. We think the plan will discourage liberality rather than encourage our people to give more generously to the causes of the Church.

Charge 8: "Concerned Presbyterians, Inc." or at least one leader, had advocated that relief aid not be given to our approved agency, Church World Service, but to an independent agency.

Our Reply: We do not deny that Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. is opposed to having our Church's gifts for relief channelled through Church World Service. This organization is closely affiliated with the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches. Since many of our churches are opposed to the programs and pronouncements of these two organizations and are insisting that none of their benevolence contributions be sent to them, we believe it would be far better for our Board of World Missions to distribute its relief funds through recognized independent organizations which have facilities for providing relief.

Charge 9: You, the president of "Concerned Presbyterians, Inc." have spoken at meetings of Presbyterian laymen held in secret so that no clergymen could hear of or be present, attacking the approved program of our General Assembly.

Our Reply: You charge that as president of Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. I have spoken at secret meetings at which no ministers were permitted to be present. Most of the meetings at which I have spoken have been public meetings to which ministers and laymen alike have been invited. I have met from time to time with small groups which have shown an interest in organizing Concerned Presbyterians in their areas. The decision as to who would be invited to these meetings has been made by the person or persons who arranged the meeting. Very frequently ministers have attended these meetings but quite obviously ministers known to be opposed to the objectives of Concerned Presbyterians would not be invited to attend a planning session of this kind.

Charge 10: Meetings of laymen held in secret, the purpose of which is not always made clear to those invited, is most un- Presbyterian, and a divisive wedge within our Church.

Our Reply: I cannot agree with you that meetings of laymen to discuss the trends in our Church and what should be done to reverse them are "un- Presbyterian and a divisive wedge within our Church." If there ever was a secret organization in our Church it was the Fellowship of St. James which held unpublicized meetings for more than 15 years without mention of the organization in our Church papers or in the courts of our Church. Ministers known to be conservative in their position on controversial issues were not invited to belong to this secret group.

Liberal Zeal

I am sure the members of the Fellowship of Concern have held many meetings to which those holding oppos-

(continued on page 4)

Are We Divisive?

(continued from page 3)

ing views were not invited. Their January 31st bulletin states clearly that they are concerned about (and I quote) "the whole stance of the Church in the face of social witness, Church union and the relevance of the Reformed Faith" and that they plan to "broaden their witness" in these areas. Should they be labelled un-Presbyterian and divisive because they are working to achieve goals in which they (we think, wrongly) believe? Again let me emphasize that we do not feel it is fair to castigate conservatives for no other reason than the fact that they are presenting a program differing from the program which the liberal organizations are promoting with such evident zeal.

Charge 11: When "Concerned Presbyterians, Inc." organizes a pressure group to "get control of" our General Assembly, it is either saying that "God is dead, the Holy Spirit is not in control," or "The Holy Spirit is in control but we know a better leadership."

Our Reply: For you to imply that the Holy Spirit at all times controls and directs all the decisions of our General Assembly and that therefore our movement is either saying that "God is dead, the Holy Spirit is not in control" or that "The Holy Spirit is in control but we know a better leadership" is unwarranted almost to the point of being ridiculous. Our Confession of Faith (Chapter XXXIII par. 3) makes it quite clear that our Church courts "may err and many have erred."

Charge 12: Several of the Trustees of "Concerned Presbyterians, Inc." are also Trustees of and active in the organization of a theological school in competition with theological seminaries owned and controlled by the Synods of the Presbyterian Church, U.S..

Our Reply: It is true that several Trustees of Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. are also Trustees of the Reformed Theological Seminary. There are many individual members of our organization who sincerely believe that the four seminaries controlled by our Church or operated jointly by our Church and the USA Church are no longer providing our young men with education and training in full conformity to our Reformed Faith and that a new conservative seminary is needed if our historic faith is to be preserved.

There are other members who are equally concerned about some of the teaching in our present seminaries but who believe we should work at this time to have our existing seminaries take a more forthright stand on the doctrines of our Church. It is only natural that in an organization as large as ours dedicated laymen should differ as ministers often do, on the strategy best designed to meet the situation.

Our letter to this Texas minister closed with these remarks:

"I have taken time to answer your 12 points in this rather lengthy fashion because I believe you want to be fair in your evaluation of us even if we do not agree on what is after all the crux of this controversy — the nature and mission of the Church.

"We have very deep convictions on this point. We believe the historic position of our Church is the Scriptural one and we hope and pray that those who today seek to change this position will be thwarted in their efforts. We will be working toward the accomplishment of this purpose in love and through proper channels of Presbyterian procedure.

"We have been criticized because we are an organization of laymen and not ministers and laymen together.

From its inception Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. was planned as a laymen's movement. There are certain angles to this job which we feel that informed laymen are best qualified to handle and for which they should assume the responsibility. Laymen are not as vulnerable to the ridicule and the unjust reprisals which have been visited upon some of our conservative ministers by certain elements within the liberal establishment of the Church.

"But it should be clearly understood that we are not working at cross purposes with the conservative ministers who, we believe, constitute the vast majority at the present time. We seek their advice and have been largely guided by their wise counsel.

—KENNETH S. KEYES, *President*
Concerned Presbyterians, Inc."

The Commission on the Minister and His Work

THERE is considerable confusion over the responsibility and authority of the Commission on the Minister and His Work when a pulpit becomes vacant. Some commissions seem to regard themselves as vested with veto power, refusing to permit nominating committees to consider names of ministers that have not received the approval of presbytery's commission. Such procedure is unconstitutional. The Book of Church Order confers only *advisory* power on the commission.

Nominating committees should carefully study the Book of Church Order and the Manual prepared by the General Assembly's Commission on the Minister and His Work. They should refuse to be dictated to by the commission of Presbytery. While it is true that the good will of the commission is important to gain, inasmuch as opposition expressed by the commission to a call that is being processed before the presbytery could very well prejudice the chances of presbytery's approving the call, nominating committees should make it clear to the Commission on the Minister and His Work with which they have to deal that the Book of Church Order must prevail.

One of the presbyteries that are carefully seeking to follow the Book of Church Order has formulated a summary of its requirements on this matter. It seems worth reproducing here:

Rules for Nominating Committees

Rules for Nominating Committees of Vacant Churches (See BCO, 21-2, 26-1):

1. Immediately after being elected, a Nominating Committee shall arrange to meet jointly with the Commission on the Minister and His Work, to

- A. Plan procedure for finding a new pastor;
- B. Consider names of men suggested for the vacant pulpit, including those offered by the Commission on the Minister and His Work.
- C. Discuss the church's own data form, which it is the duty of the Session to prepare immediately on the church's becoming vacant.

2. The Nominating Committee shall submit all names under consideration to the Commission together with the source from which they were received, so that the Commission may give advice concerning such names.

3. The Nominating Committee shall ask the Commission for data forms on men it may desire to investigate.

4. If the church is a home missions church, the Nominating Committee should consult the Church Extension Committee of Presbytery regarding that portion

of the salary to be paid him by the Church Extension Committee.

Seek Commission Advice

5. When the Nominating Committee has settled upon the man whose name they desire to present to the congregation, they shall before asking the Session to call a congregational meeting, ask for and consider the advice of the Commission concerning their choice.

Appendix I: The above procedures also apply in general to the calling of an associate pastor or an assistant pastor, it being recognized that in the latter case the Session nominates and calls.

Appendix II: When a church is vacant, the Session shall counsel with the Commission regarding Stated Supplies, Interim Supplies, and Occasional Supplies.

Most important for all pulpit nominating committees: Know where recommendations come from and the persons making the recommendations. Accept no recommendations except from persons you know to be sympathetic to your own particular objectives. And remember, the Commission on the Minister and His Work may offer suggestions, may try to insist, may convey the impression that they will decide whom you will call, but the decision is yours to make, not theirs, and they do not render the final verdict, presbytery does.

World Council of Churches Acts on Vietnam and Red China

THE ECUMENICAL COURIER is a bi-monthly bulletin published by the United States Conference of the World Council of Churches. The following is reprinted verbatim from its January-February, 1966, issue:

A strong appeal to stop the fighting in Vietnam was made by the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches in Geneva.

All sides were urged to take actions toward peace in a ten-point program calling for the following measures:

“ — That the United States and South Vietnam stop the bombing of the North, and North Vietnam stop military infiltration of the South.

“ — That the United States now announce its commitment to a withdrawal of its troops phased in accordance with provisions for peace-keeping machinery under international auspices and deemed adequate in the judgment of an international authority.

“ — That all parties recognize the necessity of according a place in negotiations both to the government of South Vietnam and to the National Liberation Front (Viet-Cong), in proportions to be determined, and that arrangements be encouraged for negotiation between the government of South Vietnam and the National Liberation Front in the hope that there may be found a negotiating authority representative of all South Vietnam.

“ — That North and South Vietnam develop greater flexibility in the initiation of and response to negotiation proposals.

“ — That all parties give every possible protection to non-combatants and relieve the plight of those suffering from the fighting.

“ — That all parties recognize the extent to which what is happening in Vietnam is part of a social revolution and that, freed from foreign intervention, Vietnam, both North and South, ought to be in a position to determine its own future, with due consideration of the

demands of peace and security in South-east Asia.

“ — That all parties recognize the extent to military action for the solution of the underlying political, social and economic problems of Vietnam and the necessity of massive and generous development programs.

“ — That in order to relieve present international tension the United States review and modify its policy of ‘containment’ of communism, and communist countries supporting ‘wars of liberation’ review and modify their policy.

“ — That every effort be made to bring the 700 million people of China through the government in power, the People’s Republic of China, into the world community of nations in order that they may assume their reasonable responsibility and avail themselves of legitimate opportunity — to provide an essential ingredient for peace and security not only in South-east Asia, but throughout the entire world.

“ — That another cease-fire be mutually and promptly agreed upon, of sufficient duration to serve as a cooling-off period and as an opportunity for testing possibilities of negotiation — with a considerably enlarged unit of the International Control Commission (India, Canada and Poland) to ensure that cease-fire commitments are honored.”

Pronouncements such as these by national and international church organizations give “aid and comfort” to the enemy. They weaken the will of many people to resist the inroads of atheistic Communism which is bent on destroying Christianity and the freedoms we enjoy.

But those in control of our Church today continue year after year to put the World Council of Churches in the annual budget, in effect, forcing all of us to support financially this world organization whose programs and pronouncements are deplored by so many of the rank and file members of our churches.

Christ’s Way of Fighting Sin

“HALF the world was in slavery to the other half when the Lord was here, but never once did He lift up His voice to speak against slavery as an institution. The tramp of Roman legions was always in the ears of the Saviour while He was here on earth, but never once did He speak against war. He went to the cross and died and thereby set in motion a doctrine and a set of principles based on that atoning death that would make peace possible in the hearts that believed in Him and would make peace impossible where those principles were not accepted. Christ’s hatred of sin was manifested in dying on the cross in order to furnish life to those who would believe His word. His life, freely given, would enable the believer to partake of the Lord’s nature and furnish the base from which sin could be overcome. Thus, only, would the Lord fight sin. And we are to fight it by lifting up the cross and proclaiming the gospel which takes men out of death into life.”

Excerpt from Donald Grey Barnhouse’s
Romans, Vol. III, page 222.

The Truly Wise Man

DR. REUBEN A. TORREY wrote: “The truly wise man is he who always believes the Bible against the opinion of any man, any scientist, any scholar, any council of theologians, any congress of philosophers, or savants. If the Bible says one thing and any body of men say another, the truly wise man will say, ‘This Book is the Word of Him who cannot lie.’”

On Church Union

THE EVANGELICAL PRESBYTERIAN is published bi-monthly by the Westminster Fellowship within the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand formed in 1950 "to conserve the distinctive reformed testimony of the Presbyterian Church in that country."

A recent editorial by the Rev. Arthur G. Gunn, B. A. gives five potent reasons that many dedicated believers are opposed to the efforts being made to merge many of the leading Protestant denominations into one great super-church:

"Why should not the church be one? Are not denominational differences due to historical causes which are best forgotten today? In the face of a rising antagonism to religion in any form should not all who love Christ come together to present a united front to the world? Do we not need to forgive and forget the past in the spirit of our Savior, and bury once and for all prejudices about other churches?

"These are the questions which exercise many minds today. They appeal to something very deep in the heart of every Christian. He knows that Jesus said: 'I command you, that ye love one another' (John 15:17).

"Why then is it that so very many Christians are against the church union movement when the arguments for it seem to be so much after the mind of Christ?

"We would answer as follows:

"1. They are against the Church Union movement as it is at present because it does not stress the fact that unity already exists. It speaks of 'our sinful divisions' whereas there are no ultimate divisions at all between those who are 'all one in Christ Jesus.' Men and women in all denominations who are 'born again from above' are already one. They have been made one by God Himself. Their spiritual unity already exists quite apart from a visible uniformity. Being members of different regiments does not mean that they are not members of the one army of the Lord Jesus Christ. And what is so thrilling is that they recognize their real unity and rejoice in it.

"2. They are against the Church Union movement as it is at present because it wrongly interprets our Lord's prayer in John 17:21. A careful reading of John 17 shows that our Lord prayed that His followers would, by a sovereign work of God, be made one. And this actually happened, at the Cross. Since then all believers have formed one church mystical, the Body of Christ, the people of the one Lord, one faith, one baptism (Ephesians 4:3-6).

"It is simply not true to say that our Lord was praying that a great world church would emerge. The church in the world of our day is only a tiny part of the company of the redeemed. The greater part is 'with Christ,' which is 'far better.'

"3. They are against the Church Union movement as it is at present because it makes constant use of emotive terms such as 'the Holy Spirit wills,' 'the scandal of denominationalism,' 'Jesus prayed that we might be one.' These terms are sometimes incorporated in prayers, with congregations made to repeat them. Such use of psychological methods for indoctrination is repugnant, especially where there is the suggestion that one cannot be a Christian and be against organic union.

"4. They are against the Church Union movement as it is at present because the historical episcopacy is being accepted as an essential requirement if we are to leave the door open for future talks with the Orthodox churches and with Rome. They do not believe

that the three-fold order of bishop, priest and deacon is found in the New Testament (where the order is always elder and deacon), and they do not believe that the episcopal system of church government is as effective as the presbyterian system. And they do not want union with Rome.

"5. They are against the Church Union movement as it is at present because the declaration of faith being accepted in uniting churches today is usually stated to be merely an expression of a faith which will be liable to constant change according as philosophical and theological insights change. According to present trends this will lead to an increasing 'liberalization' of the theology of the union church.

"These arguments, taken together, have persuaded many people that although it might not be ideal to have separate denominations worshipping separately in one town it would be a hundred times worse to have only one monolithic Anglican type church. And with no option for the hungry evangelical soul."

Field Director's Office Open

DURING the last six months our Field Director, George T. Peters, has spent most of his time travelling throughout the Church in the interest of Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. From now on he will be dividing his time between the field and his newly opened office at 4535 Lyons View Pike, Knoxville, Tennessee. His phone number is Area Code 615 — 584-1772. Future correspondence relating to organization matters and chapter activities should be addressed to Knoxville instead of to our Miami office.

Concerned Presbyterians in Church Budgets

WE are much encouraged by the fact that several churches have put Concerned Presbyterians, Inc., in their budgets for 1966. One church has already sent us a check for \$500.; another is sending \$300. for our program; and others are planning to send lesser amounts. We are grateful for this fine support and the vote of confidence it implies.

Speakers Available For Meetings

THE list of speakers available for meetings has been enlarged by Concerned Presbyterians, Inc., to serve practically every area of the Church. Through our Speakers Bureau, many sessions interested in setting up such meetings have been put in touch with men zealous in the service of the Lord, capable speakers concerned for the faithful witness of the Presbyterian Church US. With many of these speakers it is necessary to plan schedules months in advance; so it would be advisable, in planning meetings, to provide a good latitude of time.

Keep in mind also that Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. is in position to suggest qualified men to hold evangelistic meetings in local churches.

Biblical evangelistic preaching revitalizes congregations, revives interest in the Scriptures, plants the seeds for new candidates for the ministry and for the mission field, and stimulates and renews a sense of stewardship of time, talent and possessions. It ignites enthusiasm in every area of church life.

Is NCC Qualified to Speak On Foreign Policy?

THE General Board of the National Council of Churches, at its recent meeting in Madison, Wisconsin, adopted a policy statement in regard to the war in Vietnam. Space will not permit the printing of the complete statement but we believe it is summarized in the following passages taken from the "Message to the Churches" which was a part of the pronouncement:

"As Christian members of a worldwide Christian family we must remind ourselves and our Government of these convictions:

"I. We believe that war in this nuclear age settles hardly anything and may destroy everything.

"II. We believe that unilateral action by the United States in Southeast Asia will not lead to peace. We must seek with new determination to unite our efforts through the United Nations and its concerned members.

"III. We believe that if the United States follows a unilateral policy in Vietnam, no conceivable victory there can compensate for the distrust and hatred of the United States that is being generated each day throughout much of the world because we are seen as a predominantly white nation using our overwhelming military strength to kill more and more Asians.

"IV. We believe that the loss of life and the indescribable sufferings of the civilian population of South Vietnam over a period of more than 20 years of conflict and the increasing number of casualties in the armed forces, together with the suffering accompanying this increasing loss of life, should be such a matter of Chris-

tian conscience and concern that church members should give strong support to efforts to care for the people involved and to end the war as quickly as possible."

Comfort to the Enemy

We could debate at some length the wisdom of the NCC's issuing and giving widespread publicity to a policy statement which could be interpreted as a criticism of the course our Government is following in its effort to prevent further Communist encroachment upon the countries of the free world. We believe such a statement coming from a national religious organization which purports to reflect the thinking of the majority of the Protestant churchmen of America has given aid and comfort to the enemy and is discouraging to our fighting forces in Vietnam. But that is not the point we would raise here.

The question we would ask is: "Does the previous record of the National Council of Churches in issuing pronouncements on matters of foreign policy justify us in feeling that this body is qualified to speak on these matters?" It is our belief that the NCC's past record clearly proves that the leaders of the NCC have shown themselves to be extremely inept in this particular field. Here is what the Division of Foreign Missions had to say about Cuba in its report to the General Assembly of the NCC at its 1960 meeting:

"A very real revolution, shaking the very foundations of all social and economic standards and accepted norms is in process now . . .

"The Agrarian Reform program has been designed to distribute land to thousands of landless 'campesinos' to plan and manage the economy of the country. The government-owned general store was introduced to compete
(continued on next page)

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

Name

Date

Address

CONCERNED PRESBYTERIANS, INC.
234 Biscayne Blvd., Miami, Florida 33132

Name

I AM CONCERNED about present trends in the Presbyterian Church, U.S. Please enroll me as a member of Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. and send me your Bulletins and other literature.

Address

Name

Address

Name

Address

Name

Address

Name

Address

Name
(please print)

Street Address

City & State Zip

Member Church

Please list additional names
on a separate sheet

Office: Minister Elder Deacon

<p>Are you a subscriber to PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>

All contributions to Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. are tax deductible

Qualified to Speak?

(continued from page 7)

and in most cases eliminate the privately owned country store . . . It is a small wonder that many Cubans have been loyal to the revolutionary government and not critical even when the ideals of state ownership of property have been proclaimed, and new relationships with Russia and Red China have been introduced into the revolutionary scene . . .

"Many saw in the Castro movement even prior to the deterioration in relationships with the United States, definite Communist influence, systematically planned and carried out. But it is easy to pin the label 'Communist' on every social reform. The fact that Castro took land without paying for it, that he is hostile to American capital, does not necessarily make him a Communist. It is assumed by many that 'Fidelismo' and Communism are the same thing."

One year after this NCC division applauded the Castro takeover in Cuba, Castro announced to the world that he had been a Communist since his student days. The NCC was 100% wrong in their analysis of the Cuban situation. We believe most red-blooded Americans also believe they are wrong in their thinking in regard to our policy in Vietnam.

Another case in point is the National Council of

Churches' position on the admission of Red China to the United Nations. After the NCC-sponsored Fifth World Order Study Conference recommended the admission of Communist China to the U.N., the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China polled 45,000 ministers to obtain their views. We have been informed that 87% of the ministers who replied to the poll were *against* the admission of Red China.

The last three national platforms of the Democrat and Republican parties have opposed their admission; Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson have publicly voiced their opposition; Congress has gone on record time after time against concessions to Red China, and most of the major labor, veterans, civic and fraternal organizations have gone on record opposing their admission to the United Nations or diplomatic recognition by the United States.

In the face of all this opposition the NCC-sponsored Sixth World Order Study Conference held in St. Louis last October again recommended the admission of Red China to the U.N. and in February of this year the General Board of the NCC voted 90 to 3 urging the United States to permit the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

We believe that the vast majority of the members of Protestant churches in America are opposed to the admission of Red China to the United Nations. We believe that the National Council of Churches is just as mistaken in its position on this as it was in its position on Castro's conquest of Cuba.

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

RETURN REQUESTED

NON-PROFIT ORG.

PAID

U. S. POSTAGE
MIAMI, FLORIDA
PERMIT No. 1244

— C O N T E N T S —

The 1966 General Assembly!
Are We "Divisive and Destructive"?
The Commission on the Minister and His Work
Is the N.C.C. Qualified to Speak
on Foreign Policy?
Two Churches Withdraw