



*"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*

100 BISCAYNE BLVD.

MIAMI, FLORIDA 33132

BULLETIN No. 14

OCTOBER, 1969

A Dangerous Amendment Which Must Be Defeated

THE determination of those in control to force their program upon an unwilling Church is clearly revealed in their newest plan to reduce the number of synods and presbyteries.

The Ad Interim Committee on Restructuring Synods and Presbyteries will be making its report to the Memphis Assembly. We learned recently that the Committee plans to recommend that our present 16 synods be enlarged and reduced in number to 7 and that these synods then proceed promptly to enlarge the presbyteries, reducing their number to about half the 74 which we have today.

The Book of Church Order — Sec. 18-6 (9) — gives the Assembly power "to establish new synods" but it does not give the Assembly authority to reduce the number of synods by enlarging them. Realizing this, the liberal-controlled Mobile Assembly approved an amendment (see #7, page 92, Assembly Minutes) which would give the Assembly the additional right to "unite and divide synods previously organized."

When this particular amendment reached the floor at Mobile, the commissioners were told that its purpose was simply to *clarify* the Book of Church Order — that the Assembly already had this power. Our conservative commissioners accepted this statement as being true. They voted to approve the amendment only to discover later that they had been misled.

The Synods already have authority to "establish new Presbyteries and unite or divide those which were before established." If we now give to the Assembly the power to unite and divide Synods, those in control will be able to restructure the Church, nullifying the votes of conservative Presbyteries by combining them with liberal ones. If this amendment is adopted the liberals could muster the votes required to put through programs which face almost certain defeat under our present set-up.

The amendment has been sent to the Presbyteries for their approval and consent. *It will be voted on in your Presbytery during this church year.* Your Presbyters will probably be told, as were the Commissioners, that the amendment is a "routine matter." This tactic has already succeeded in several conservative Presbyteries which have already voted. The true purpose of the amendment must be made crystal-clear. Our liberal

brethren can be expected to wage a strong fight because the success or failure of their entire program could well be riding on this one amendment.

Among the arguments which can be used to oppose the amendment are:

1. The amendment would enable the minority in control to combine liberal Presbyteries with conservative ones in a way that would make it easier for the liberals to out-vote conservatives on changing our Confession of Faith and effecting union with the U.P.U.S.A. and C.O.C.U.

2. Ruling elders would have to travel double the distances they now have to travel and be away from their jobs, businesses and professions for much longer periods. This would make it much more difficult to attend presbytery and synod meetings. These leaders probably had this in mind, for many of them are beginning to realize that an aroused and informed eldership is going to strenuously resist what they are devising and planning to do to the Church.

3. Women of the Church would be forced to travel twice as far to attend presbyterial and synodical meetings.

4. Men of the Church would have to travel far longer distances to attend conferences and retreats. This is certain to reduce attendance at these meetings.

5. Our young people would likewise find it more difficult to attend camps and conferences if the distances they have to travel are doubled.

6. The amendment seems to be specifically designed to enable a liberal-dominated Assembly to take the voting control of the Church from the smaller "grass roots" Presbyteries where it is vested today.

It is imperative — we repeat, IMPERATIVE — that the amendment be defeated in a majority of the Presbyteries. Every "concerned" ruling elder and every "concerned" minister must know in advance when this amendment will be voted on in his Presbytery and work diligently to defeat it by as large a vote as possible. We must meet this new challenge "head-on." The vote on this crucial issue could well decide the future course of our beloved Church.

Our Church's Reply To the Black Manifesto

THE Black Manifesto, with which James Forman interrupted a Sunday morning service at the Riverside Church, New York, and which was injected in services in other churches (including some in the Presbyterian Church U.S.), demanded that the white churches and synagogues of America pay \$500,000,000. in reparations which Forman claimed is due the black people who have been "exploited, degraded, brutalized, killed — persecuted."

James Forman — a 40-year-old negro — was graduated from Roosevelt University, Chicago, a training ground for radical leftist leaders. An Allen-Scott report stated that Forman was a power in the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and quoted him as stating in the Berkeley Barb —

"Will you fight and die for your black brothers? Will you kill a white cop? We have confronted the war makers. Now let us confront the money makers. We are not going to be shorted. We are the vanguard of the revolution."

These three statements from the Foreword of the Manifesto indicate the vicious tone of the document:

"We live inside the U. S. which is THE MOST BARBARIC COUNTRY IN THE WORLD and we have a chance to help bring this government down . . . It is time we stop mincing words. Caution is fine, but no oppressed people ever gained their liberation until they were ready to fight, to use whatever means necessary, including the use of force and power of the gun to bring down the colonizer."

"But while we talk of revolution which will be an armed confrontation and long years of sustained guerilla warfare inside this country, we must also talk of the type of world we want to live in. We must commit ourselves to a society where the total means of production are taken from the rich and placed into the hands of the state for the welfare of all the people. This is what we mean when we say total control. And we mean that black people who have suffered the most from exploitation and racism must move to protect their black interest by assuming leadership inside of the United States of everything that exists."

"Our fight is against racism, capitalism and imperialism and we are dedicated to building a socialist society inside the United States where the total means of production and distribution are in the hands of the State and that must be led by black people, by revolutionary blacks who are concerned about the total humanity of this world."

The Manifesto itself contains such threats as these:

"We are therefore demanding of the white Christian churches and Jewish synagogues which are part and parcel of the system of capitalism, that they begin to pay reparations to black people in this country. We are demanding \$500,000,000. from the Christian white churches and the Jewish synagogues . . . We are also not unaware that the exploitation of colored peoples around the world is aided and abetted by the white Christian churches and synagogues. This demand for \$500,000,000. is not an idle resolution or empty words."

"We call for the total disruption of selected church sponsored agencies operating anywhere in

the U.S. and the world. Black workers, black women, black students and the black unemployed are encouraged to seize the offices, telephones, and printing apparatus of all church sponsored agencies and to hold these in trusteeship until our demands are met."

"To win our demands we will have to declare war on the white Christian churches and synagogues and this means we may have to fight the total government structure of this country. If the white Christians and Jews are not willing to meet our demands through peace and good will, then we declare war and we are prepared to fight by whatever means necessary."

Response to the Manifesto by some large Protestant groups indicates how far radical leftist churchmen are prepared to go to help Forman destroy the Christian churches of America and our government itself. The United Presbyterian Church allowed Forman to use the platform of its recent General Assembly to make his vicious threats. It gave Forman an ovation at the conclusion of his demands. A Methodist church in New York voted \$30,000. for the National Black Economic Development Conference, the International Foundation for Community Organization and the Black Panthers. The General Board of the National Council of Churches on May 2, 1969, approved the "programmatic aspects" of the Manifesto by a vote of 68 to 14.

It is significant that the only large Protestant denomination whose leaders have voiced opposition to the Black Manifesto is the National Baptist Convention — a 6,500,000-member black denomination — led by the courageous Rev. James H. Jackson.

The Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization (IFCO) paid the expenses of 600 militant negroes to the National Black Economic Development Congress in Detroit from which the Black Manifesto came. IFCO is the channel through which hundreds of thousands of dollars of church funds are turned over to black militant organizations. Last year our Committee on Church and Society allotted funds to IFCO. The 1969 Assembly not only approved these contributions but authorized that the allotments be increased during the coming year. As late as August the Board of National Ministries of our Church refused to sever its ties with IFCO.

OUR CHURCH'S REPLY

In 1968 our Council on Church and Society asked the General Assembly to grant it the power to issue pronouncements without first clearing them with the Assembly. They were given this authority by a vote of 111 to 108 — a 3-vote margin. The Council used this power to issue "A Message to the Presbyterian Church U.S. Concerning the Black Manifesto." Although the "message" says "we speak only for ourselves and not for the Presbyterian Church in the United States," the Council saw to it that this reply was given widespread publicity throughout the length and breadth of the

OFFICERS of

Concerned Presbyterians, Inc.

Kenneth S. Keyes
President
Col. Roy LeCraw
Vice President

W. J. Williamson
Secretary
J. M. Vroom
Treasurer

Church. Their pronouncement has been accepted generally, not as the views of a few committee members and the Moderator, but as the answer of the Presbyterian Church U.S. to the Manifesto.

That the Council on Church and Society used the Black Manifesto as another opportunity to promote its radical liberal philosophy is understandable. It was the predecessor of this group which brought Martin Luther King to the Montreat Conference platform several years ago. The Mobile Assembly approved the holding of a special memorial service for King when the Assembly meets in Memphis next year.

To issue any reply at all to a blackmailing document which threatened to destroy the white churches of America if they failed to pay the reparations demanded showed lack of judgment on the part of the members of the Council. That the Manifesto brazenly threatened to destroy our nation itself unless total control of resources and means of production is placed in black hands makes it even worse. And for the Council to employ the submissive language it used in its reply showed not only poor judgment but complete lack of wisdom.

Under the heading "Truths We Cannot Deny" the reply says:

"We are at a critical moment in our national history. The very fact that there exists within our midst fellow citizens who are 'burning with anger and despair,' and who believe that this is 'the most barbaric country in the world,' is sufficient evidence of this. The gravity of our crisis is demonstrated not so much in these inflammatory words as in the fact that within this most prosperous nation in the world there are citizens who feel, rightly or wrongly, that they must utter them."

Are the members of the Council so naive that they think any person in his right mind actually believes that the United States is "the most barbaric country in the world"? For the Council to affirm that there are citizens who believe this lie and to predicate their reply on such a premise was beyond the realm of sound reasoning.

Another "truth" which the Council says white Christians must affirm states, "the crisis is both racial and institutional: racial in that blacks and other minority groups suffer disproportionately from the ills of our common life, institutional in that our nation has not yet been able or willing to develop new social structures to overcome this injustice."

A recent (August, 1969) Census Bureau report revealed that the percentage of our negro population classified as poor (incomes of less than \$3,553. for a non-farm family of 4) has dropped from 56% in 1961 to 33% in 1968. Would this not indicate that our nation is making substantial progress in this regard?

Businessmen everywhere today are having difficulties in finding people who are willing to work. Every housewife knows that it is well-nigh impossible to obtain domestic help in most urban areas. Millions of strong-bodied Americans are on relief today because they would rather loaf and draw welfare benefits than earn an honest living from jobs which are available. Sympathy for the sick and the helpless is a commendable Christian trait but our Council's sympathy for the lazy and shiftless is an evidence of unsound thinking.

The reply also says that Christians must affirm that "white Christian churches have participated in, benefited from, and given their blessing to the white racism which permeates American society — that we have often provided the moral cement for the structure of racism in our nation." To try to make this point, the reply

quoted at length from a pronouncement on the slavery question issued more than 100 years ago by our first General Assembly. The situation which prevailed in 1861 has little if any application to the situation which exists today.

Another "truth" which the reply says we all must affirm is: "Justice — not charity, but justice — demands that compensatory consideration be given to black Americans and members of other minority groups." In another paragraph it suggests that "no amount of money can make amends for the wrongs blacks (and other minority groups) have suffered in this nation . . . to assume that we could fulfill our obligations through the mere payment of reparations would be a mistake. What is critically needed in this moment is not a lump-sum payment for past or present injustices, but a more equitable distribution of our nation's resources." This is pure and unadulterated socialism—an evil which should be avoided at all costs. Finally, the reply suggests: "As part of our response to the demands of justice, the white church should make significant funds and other resources available for the use of black leaders selected by black people and accountable to black people, not to us." For the white church to do what the Council suggests, turning over funds to black leaders of the type which sponsored the Manifesto — militants who have clearly indicated that they seek to overthrow our government itself — would be the height of folly.

The liberals continue to stress the point that we must strive to follow in the footsteps of Jesus Christ. Nowhere in the Gospels, the Book of Acts or the letters to the Churches is there any intimation that Jesus or his disciples ever attempted to reform the social ills of their day. Their mission was to reform *individuals*. We must never forget that the primary mission of the Church is to evangelize — to lead the lost to accept Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. When the Church places its major emphasis on correcting social ills it is disobeying the Great Commission given it by our Lord.

Note: A complete copy of the Black Manifesto can be obtained by writing our Miami office, Concerned Presbyterians, Inc., 100 Biscayne Blvd., Miami, Florida 33132. A copy of our Committee on Church and Society's reply can be obtained by writing Presbyterian Book Stores, Box 1176, Richmond, Va. 23209, or it can be picked up at any of our Presbyterian Book Stores. Concerned Presbyterians are urged to obtain these items, read them and then circulate them among their friends.

Donors Reserve Right To Designate Gifts

IN supporting Project Equality — a program urging Church institutions to boycott private businesses which (in the Church's opinion) have not fully integrated their work forces — the 1968 General Assembly issued this pronouncement:

"The church has not only the right but the responsibility to be selective in the use of its funds. It is the responsibility of the church . . . to put the power of its dollar on the side of the right."

Since our Church has officially taken the position that it is right for the Church to bring financial pressure to bear upon private business, then surely the Church and its institutions must agree that it is right for individual donors, church sessions and presbyteries to designate their gifts to causes which they can wholeheartedly

continued on page 4

Donors . . .

continued from page 3

support, refusing to allow their benevolence funds to be turned over to boards and agencies that are promoting projects which many Presbyterians cannot in good conscience approve.

We are approaching the season when sessions will be preparing their 1970 budgets and asking the members of their churches to pledge their support for the coming year. We suggest that every church member and every session earnestly seek the leading of the Holy Spirit in deciding where their benevolence gifts will best serve the Lord and that they *specifically designate* where their gifts are to go.

In 1848 London was in the throes of a serious cholera epidemic. One Dr. John Snow observed that most of the victims had used water from the Broad Street pump. When he removed the handle of the pump, the epidemic subsided. The program boards and agencies of our Church today are controlled by radical liberals who are working to liquidate the Church and to destroy its historic evangelical testimony. The time has surely come for those who cannot conscientiously support the programs these agencies are promoting to "take the handle off the pump."

Conservative PCUS Ministers Organize

MORE than 500 faithful ministers have recently formed an organization of their own to help preserve our Church's evangelical testimony and keep the liberal minority from carrying out their plans to liquidate the Church. The organization is known as Presbyterian Churchmen United. These men mean business.

Large advertisements outlining their Declaration of Commitment and giving the names of the ministers who signed it were published in leading newspapers throughout the Church on October 4th.

The advertisements also announced a giant Rally to be held at the Marriott Motor Hotel, Atlanta, December 5th and 6th.

Hundreds of ministers, church officers and members are expected to attend this meeting.

Concerned Presbyterians are urged to mark the date on their calendars and start praying now that God will use the Rally in a mighty way for His honor and glory. Plan to attend if at all possible.

Will PCUS Majority Approve These Issues?

THE National Council of Churches recently employed the National Opinion Research Center to poll adults in all religious persuasions, asking this question:

"In general, do you approve or disapprove of the churches becoming involved in social and political issues such as the urban crisis, Vietnam and civil rights?"

58.6% said that they disapproved; 36.7% said that they approved; 4.8% were indifferent or undecided.

The radical liberal leaders who dictate the pronouncements and programs of the National Council of Churches can be expected to ignore the implications of this poll of public opinion just as they ignored the poll which revealed that 87% of the ministers of America were opposed to U. S. recognition of Red

China and the admission of this bloody Red regime to the United Nations.

If the membership of the Presbyterian Church U.S. were to be polled on this question of church involvement in social and political matters, we believe at least 75% would vote against such involvement. But the small but well organized group of radical liberal ministers in our Church continue to ignore the wishes of the majority. They are determined to force their minority views upon the Church by fair means or foul, but the tide is turning against them. We believe they face certain defeat when the crucial issues of changing our Confession of Faith and union with the UPUSA and the super-church being planned by the Consultation on Church Union come up for a vote in the presbyteries.

The Voice of the Laity Echo or Trumpet

— This article appeared in a recent issue of THE PRESBYTERIAN LAYMAN; reprinted by permission.

IF laymen will only stand up and voice their convictions about the direction their Church should take, then they won't have to settle for the kind of Church someone else thinks is best for them.

The United Presbyterian Church offers laymen an equal voice and vote on all issues. Our constitution, in fact, provides for this true parity of laity with clergy throughout the church government structure.

This year our General Assembly further reiterated the importance of maintaining this parity when they took initial steps to correct the preponderance of non-pastoral but voting ministers that has prevailed in many presbyteries. This includes ministers who are not active pastors as well as all those from the multitudinous boards and agencies of the Church.

This historic concept of parity offers laymen a rare opportunity for serving their Church. It provides the Church with a vast reservoir of lay representation that should help insure a strong, balanced church government at all judicatory levels.

But this is not the way it actually works, as we have pointed out (See "Elders at the Centers of Power" in April *Concerned Presbyterian*.)

Although the number of *ruling* elders (laymen) far exceeds *teaching* elders (ministers) in the Presbyterian form of government, the voice of the ruling elders is not properly represented either in presbytery or synod and does not balance the power of the ministers as it should.

Why is this so? Primarily because ruling elders usually are reluctant to give up the time to attend judicatory meetings. As a result, "whoever can go" goes and probably never goes again.

Such a commissioner, who usually is a neophyte in ecclesiastical matters, is handed a stack of mimeographed matter about which he knows little or nothing. He hardly has a chance to read, study or discuss these numerous committee reports and recommendations before he is asked to vote on them. And, unless he has deep convictions on all the issues involved and uncommon courage, he wouldn't think of standing up to voice his opinion on the floor of presbytery. What generally happens is that he looks to his minister for advice on which way to vote and keeps quiet, lest he expose his ignorance. Why shouldn't he lean on his minister? Ministers are usually well informed on all church matters, and bear equal constitutional responsibility.

Thus the voice of the laity becomes a mere echo in the local presbytery.

Instead of an echo, the layman should become a trumpet who can sound out loud and clear in presbytery, in synod and, once a year, in General Assembly; a trumpet that reflects the convictions, the beliefs, the recommendations, the opinions of those who support the activities of the Church with their time, their talent, and their pocketbooks.

One suggestion for providing such a trumpet comes from a minister who has tried it successfully: The session appoints an elder as commissioner to presbytery for his or her entire term of service on the session. If the right person were available, he or she could be appointed for an indefinite period and asked to report to the session after each presbytery meeting. Also, an alternate could be appointed from the session to attend presbytery as an observer and, more important, as an understudy. Or a commissioner might be appointed for one year, as is done in other churches.

In any event, such *regular* commissioners become more familiar with the complicated procedures of our church government, are more knowledgeable about the continuing programs of the presbytery, are able to help their ministers tremendously by sharing the presbytery administrative loads, become more articulate and effective spokesmen in presbytery for their session and congregation and more accurate in reporting back to their session. They also qualify as outstanding candidates for commissioner appointments to synod and General Assembly.

This more certain sound of the trumpet is desperately needed today as our church leadership struggles with the many conflicting points of view over just which direction the Church should take.

Liberal Action by Board of World Missions

EARLIER this year our Board of World Missions brought to the United States and placed on its staff a Brazilian minister to handle international student relations. This minister was defrocked by the Presbyterian Church in Brazil because of his liberal leanings. To place such a man in a responsible position on our Board was an insult to the Brazilian Presbyterian Church.

Region I of our Brazil Mission adopted the following resolution protesting this appointment. Here's what they said:

"The Equatorial Region notes that to a very great extent the success of our missionary calling of evangelizing and helping to develop a strong and independent Presb. Church in Brazil depends upon the continuance of a spirit of cooperation and mutual respect between the 'receiving' and the 'sending' churches. Unfortunately, the recent action of the BOWM in appointing Mr. Lemuel Nascimento to the staff in Nashville has done much to undermine this relationship in the eyes of many national pastors in this area who are aware of the circumstances of Mr. Nascimento's dismissal from the Belo Horizonte Presbytery.

"This committee was informed by the member of the Executive Committee of the General Assembly who presided over the reviewal of the Presbytery of Belo Horizonte's action in 'deposing the Rev. Lemuel Cunha do Nascimento from his office of minister and separating him ecclesiastically from the Presb. of Belo H.,' that the action was upheld by the committee of the Brazilian Church's highest court after very careful consideration.

The Church cannot and should not decide its course on the basis of a Gallup Poll or a popular vote, for the voice of the people is not the voice of God. Yet the Church must and will listen to the voice of the laity — the LAOS, the whole people of God responding to the whole Word of God — when this voice is spoken with knowledge and authority in the proper channels that our democratic system of government provides.

This is something for laymen to get excited about — we hope and pray.

Reds Affecting Pulpit

by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover

THE Communists are spraying the world today with ideological and propaganda missiles designed to create a deadly radioactive cloud of Marxism-Leninism. From bases behind the Iron Curtain and in the non-Communist world, this cloud of Communist propaganda is drenching many lands with a particularly heavy fallout in this Nation.

The deadliest of these Communist missiles — whose warheads are exceptionally heavy — are being directed against the Christian pulpit. Communist gunners, with special ideological training and schooled in atheistic perversity, are "sighting in" the clergy, hoping to shatter, immobilize, and confuse this powerful forum of idealism, morality, and civic virtue.

No assignment is more strategic in the Communist world today than the disruption of the church of God, both within and outside the Iron Curtain.

Why does the church, which has no military forces, merit the most explosive of Communist rockets, the most venomous of Communist hate, the most vituperative of

continued on page 6

It is not our intention here to uphold or dispute the propriety of the decision, but the fact that shortly after this action, the disciplined person was hired as a staff member of our BOWM, has led to widespread feeling among Brazilian pastors that the action was an official slap in the face to the Brazilian Church. This has made the fulfilling of our missionary task in this Region more difficult." (Minutes of the Executive Committee of Region I — January 7-8, 1969)

Region III adopted a similar resolution.

In a recent letter one of our dedicated Brazilian missionaries wrote:

"But by far the biggest area of concern for all of us down here is the program promoted and touted by the Board. We become sick at heart, soul, and stomach every time we have to go to Montreat as we come home on furlough. The Montreat 'Message' is *not* the message we preach here on the field — and it is not the message that meets the need of the people to whom we must minister. We are sick because we feel that the home church must think that as they hear the 'program' of Nashville, that is the 'program' of their missionaries. Nothing could be further from the truth as far as the Brazil Mission is concerned. Oh, how we do pray that our people could know that this is *not* what we are doing here. We also pray that we can *keep on* preaching and teaching the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ here in Brazil. She needs it so much."

It is indeed tragic that this Board, supported over the years by the sacrificial gifts of dedicated Presbyterians, should turn a deaf ear to the appeals of its own faithful missionaries.

Reds Affecting Pulpit . . .

continued from page 5

Communist scorn?

The Communists realize that unless the Christian pulpit, that mighty fortress of God, is liquidated pitilessly, mercilessly, finally, the very existence of Communism itself stands in jeopardy.

The spiritual firepower of the Christian Church, based on the love of God, is sufficient to destroy all the Soviet man-made missiles and rockets and extirpate this 20th century aberration.

And the Communists know it, and fear it.

The basic Communist weapon is the materialism of the Communist dialectic. Communism is atheistic, utterly denying God. This has been a fundamental premise of Communism since the days of Marx and remains so today under the mendacious huckstering of Communist dictators.

Just why, we may ask, does the party rely so greatly on these missiles of atheism? Just why do other phases of Communist strategy alter, but never the dependence on this weapon?

The answer is simple and fundamental to any progress which Communism hopes to achieve. Atheism is an all-out weapon of highly destructive and devastating power.

If properly launched, atheistic missiles can mangle, cut and obliterate the spiritual tendons of life — belief in God, faith in Christian values, love of the church.

However, we note that, in launching these missiles of atheism toward America, the Communists are experiencing considerable trouble. These mighty missiles seem to burn up as they approach the atmosphere of America, a proud Christian land.

In simple language, here is the problem of party strategists: How can an atheistic Communist Party operate in the United States where the vast majority of people believe in God?

The Communist answer: Employ a strategy of deceit — a technique designed to hoodwink non-Communists. This is today one of the party's most potent attacks against the Christian pulpit.

The strategy means primarily three things:

A false claim that the Communists stand for tolerance of religion.

The party's tactic in the Christian world is to de-emphasize the importance of religion, to talk and write little about it, and emphasize other topics, such as social, economic and political issues.

If questions are asked, Communists pose as being tolerant, and say that religion is a private matter for the individual.

Actually, however, religion is not a private affair for the Communists. As a Marxist, he must be an atheist. He has absolutely no personal choice. Their aim is to achieve a mutuality of agreement with the Christian pulpit on common issues as defined by the Communists.

This tactic is being actively pursued by the Communist Party, U.S.A., today.

"Look," the Communists are saying, "we are tolerant of religion, we do not want to attack your faith. Rather, let's work together on issues in which we are both interested — peace, civil liberties, economic justice, and the brotherhood of man. We, too, want a world of peace and good will. Let's not fight but work together."

Here is the deadly come-along of Communism directed today at the Christian pulpit. This enables the party to move close to unsuspecting ministers and lay-

men who see only the exterior verbiage and not the concealed danger.

At the same time the party, through infiltration tactics, is attempting to reach inside the churches.

Most important, of course, is the youth field. A national party leader recently commented that Communist youth must find common ground with church youth groups, not only for ideological reasons but also for the use of their facilities. They then exploit the church for their own Communist ends.

This brotherliness of Communists is most purposive: The Communists want to hitch as much of the influence of the Christian church as they can capture to the party's cause.

This means that if clergymen or laymen participate (knowingly or unknowingly) in fronts, sign Communist-sponsored petitions, speak favorably of Communist objectives — these points must be exploited to strengthen the party's position.

To the Communists any support gained from church circles enables them to break down the antipathy of the community and gives them a desperately desired respectability.

Hence, this strategy of Communist deceit is aimed to undermine, hoodwink, and exploit the Christian pulpit.

The Christian pulpit is today one of America's most formidable barriers against Communism. The spiritual dedication of thousands of clergymen, in large and small churches across the nation, is a powerful antidote to the danger. America owes a great debt of gratitude to the stalwart example of our religious leadership.

Yet in our nation one of Communism's most potent allies is apathy toward and lack of knowledge of Communism.

Very strangely, many citizens will be highly conversant about the diseases of azaleas, the weathering qualities of automobile paints, the latest ways to play a new card game — yet know nothing about Communism, that deadly plague which threatens to extinguish our way of life. That is one of the anomalies — and tragedies — of modern-day America.

Communism is not a monstrosity to be hidden from sight, never spoken about publicly, or shunted into a side closet.

Like an epidemic of polio, the solution lies not in minimizing the danger or overlooking the problem — but rapidly, positively, and courageously finding an anti-polio serum.

We in America have this anti-Communism serum, the answer to the Communist challenge. It lies in the strength of Christian tradition, the power of the Holy Spirit working in men.

Too frequently, both clergy and laymen do not realize the full resources at their command in the Christian tradition — the tremendous power of God to turn men toward God, to make personalities bloom with the living courage of sainted men.

The job of you as clergymen is to help channel this divine power into the hearts, minds, and souls of men.

No greater challenge has ever faced the Christian church. As spokesmen for God, your task is to enable men to know the truth, so the truth will set them free.

— from the *Congressional Record*

IN a recent bulletin to the members of his congregation one dedicated pastor had this to say about Concerned Presbyterians, Inc.:

"Several of you have asked me concerning the 'Concerned Presbyterian' organization you have been reading

and hearing so much about. I must say that I find myself in agreement with the evaluations, purposes, and aims of this organization. If you find yourself in agreement with its statement of belief, you would do well to join. *I believe it to be the last real hope of the Presbyterian Church U.S. humanly speaking.*"

Political Action

THE Rev. Malcolm Nygren, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Champaign, Illinois, wrote recently:

When the Church becomes a political force it inevitably divides Christians from one another, for it labels as unChristian whoever will not espouse its particular cause . . . It is unfortunate when a man is unable to accept a church's creed and must be cut off from the company of Christians. It is tragic when the creed he can't accept is not a religious statement but a political one.

The combination of Church and politics always makes bad politics and bad religion. Bad politics because it gives the force of "thus saith the Lord" to judgments no better than anyone else's. Bad religion because it appeals to men's pride and hostility, because it undermines the credibility of the Word, because it fails to understand our need to be treated as real people.

A Christian bricklayer may find his attitude toward his work changed by the Church, but he shouldn't expect it to tell him how to lay bricks. The Church shouldn't tell him how to vote, either, nor present political programs to him as though they were the will of God.

— Copyright 1969 by CHRISTIANITY TODAY; reprinted by permission

Breaking Ordination Vows

EVERY minister in the Presbyterian Church U.S. has taken a solemn vow when ordained that he sincerely receives and adopts the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures. He has further vowed that if at any time he finds himself out of accord with any of the fundamentals of our system of doctrine he will of his own initiative make the change known to his presbytery.

We have yet to hear of any minister who has confessed to his presbytery that his views have changed, although there are many, especially among the younger men who have been graduated from our P.C.U.S. seminaries in the last 15 years, that are today working to rewrite our Confession of Faith and to have our Church violate its Constitution and merge with denominations which are not conformed to the order and doctrine of our Church.

These radical ministers who today control the General Assembly and many of our Church courts are accusing dedicated ruling elders and ministers who are working to preserve the Confession of Faith and to uphold the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church U.S. of violating their ordination vows. What a travesty! Is it not those ministers and ruling elders who, seeking to change the Confession of Faith and to violate our Constitution by merger in the liberal super-church now being planned by the Consultation on Church Union, who are violating their ordination vows?

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

Please send information about Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. to the following members of the Presbyterian Church U.S.:

Name

Date

Address

CONCERNED PRESBYTERIANS, INC.
100 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

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

Please list additional names on a separate sheet

Office: Minister Elder Deacon

All contributions to Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. are tax deductible

Personal Evangelism 1970 Model

THE real reason for the *concern* of the "Concerned Presbyterians" is that we see the leaders of our Church taking the Church away into devious paths of humanism instead of personal evangelism; of political and secular activities instead of Gospel preaching; and of ecumenism with all kinds of people who have beliefs entirely foreign to our Reformed, Calvinist, Confessional faith. We see COCU as beginning a move toward a World Church composed of many strange and pseudo-religions which will surely become a frankenstein and a wordly octopus. All of this the liberals-radicals-and-leftwingers in the Presbyterian Church U.S. will do unless we return to our Bible as the "infallible" Word of God and retain, without dilution, our Westminster Confession of Faith.

As a part of our positive program, Concerned Presbyterians, Inc. and the Presbyterian Evangelistic Fellowship are now co-sponsoring "Laymen's Evangelism Training Institutes" in many of our churches. These institutes are producing wondrous results in new "Decisions for Christ," rededicated lives, and renewed true Christian spirit, thus confounding the devil who has been sowing discouragement, worldliness and disbelief.

Here is how the Institutes work:

Pastors or church sessions contact Mr. W. A. L. Sibley or the Rev. William E. Hill, Jr. (address below) for the purpose of arranging a Training Institute. A date is agreed upon. The church then publicizes the coming evangelistic effort and invites nearby conservative churches to participate. Committees are formed and prayer groups are organized. Prospect cards are assembled. These cards list unsaved persons together

with church members who have become cold and disinterested. The Training Institute starts Wednesday evening and continues Thursday and Friday evenings. The literature and training material has been brought in by the Director who is also an ordained minister on the staff of the P. E. F.. The Director gives the three nights of instruction in evangelistic visitation and presentation of the Gospel. A definite, proven plan is taught, and the workers are provided with a presentation procedure to follow. Much prayer accompanies the Course.

Then on Saturday the workers are divided into teams, usually composed of both laymen and lay women who actually go out to visit on both Saturday and Sunday afternoons. Each team has a leader who is experienced in evangelism along with two interested and dedicated "learners." Each team has about five "prospect cards" for each afternoon. Reports are turned in on each card each day. Results have been truly wonderful. The first five Institutes produced 48 "Decisions for Christ" as well as many rededications. Churches sponsoring a Laymen's Evangelism Training Course become spiritually refreshed, renewed, and strengthened by the new Christians and rededicated people. They have learned that personal evangelism is still effective and modern. A follow-up program is encouraged.

The Rev. Arnie Maves, who conducted the 10 Institutes held during July, August and September, will be available for Institutes during the first quarter of 1970. Pastors or sessions desiring to have an Institute in their church or city should write W. A. L. Sibley, 110 Fant Lane, Union, S. C. 29379, or the Rev. William E. Hill, Jr., Presbyterian Evangelistic Fellowship, 2401 City Point Road, Hopewell, Va. 23860.

Thank God, the Bible and its marvelous plan of salvation does not need to be revised to be made relevant. IT ONLY NEEDS TO BE PRESENTED!

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*

100 BISCAYNE BLVD. MIAMI, FLORIDA 33132

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

NON-PROFIT ORG.

PAID

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

— CONTENTS —

A Dangerous Amendment
Church's Reply to Black Manifesto
Conservative Ministers Organize
Breaking Ordination Vows
Donors Reserve Right