

# CHRISTIANITY TODAY



||| A PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL DEVOTED TO STATING, DEFENDING  
AND FURTHERING THE GOSPEL IN THE MODERN WORLD |||

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

Published monthly by  
THE PRESBYTERIAN AND  
REFORMED PUBLISHING CO.,  
501 Witherspoon Bldg., Phila., Pa.

MID-JUNE, 1931

Vol. 2

No. 2

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

Entered as second-class matter May 11, 1931, at  
the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the  
Act of March 3, 1879.

## Christianity and the Miraculous

IN our February issue we indicated, as fully as the limits of our space permitted, the kind and measure of that supernaturalism that real Christianity recognizes and demands. In this issue we seek to indicate the place that those particular manifestations of the supernatural we call miracles occupy in Christianity.

It is important that we distinguish between the supernatural and the miraculous. The latter is related to the former as the species to the genus. The recognition of the miraculous necessarily involves the supernatural but there may be a recognition of the supernatural where there is no recognition of the miraculous. A man who believes in God, in other than a pantheistic sense, believes in the supernatural; but such a man does not necessarily believe in the miraculous. Even if we confine our attention to what is specifically Christian, the supernatural includes a great deal more than does the miraculous. Regeneration, the new birth, for instance, is a supernatural event, but, properly speaking, it is not a miraculous event. Regeneration has this in common with the miraculous, namely, it is an event due to the immediate power of God. A miracle, however, is not only an event wrought by the immediate power of God; it is an event in the external world. While then all miracles are supernatural events, all supernatural events are not miracles. A miracle, it may be well to add, is not merely an event in the external world that we are at a loss to explain. If that were the case, the number of events we call miraculous would decrease as the

extent of our knowledge increased. As a matter of fact the number of events we are warranted in calling miracles would be exactly the same even if we possessed knowledge like the Most High. A miracle, in the strict sense of the word, is an event in the external world that the forces ordinarily operating in this world are incapable by themselves of producing, no matter how divinely led—an event that demands the immediate activity of God as its only adequate explanation.

There are those who affirm their faith in those manifestations of the supernatural in the form of the miraculous recorded in the Bible but who class these miracles among the non-essentials of Christianity. These maintain, as a rule, that miracles have only an evidential value. They were "signs" to convince men that Christianity was of God and when they accomplish that end their purpose is fulfilled. The essential thing, therefore, is not that we

believe the miracles but that we believe the things that the miracles evidence as true. Once we have arrived at such faith the miracles have no further significance for us. If we can arrive at such faith without the aid of the miracles or while denying the miracles, well and good. There is some truth in this contention. The miracles do possess evidential value. They are "signs" that are fitted to convince men and that have convinced men that Christianity is of God. NICODEMUS showed sense above that of many modern would-be apologists when he said to JESUS: "We know thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these signs, that thou doest, except God be with him." It is true also that the miracles had greater evidential value, relatively speaking, for the first Christians than they do for us. We have other evidences, such as the historical effects of Christianity, which they did not possess. Moreover all the miracles must have had evidential value for those who first witnessed them. For us, however, the one miracle that has outstanding evidential value is the resurrection of JESUS. But while there is truth in this contention, it comes far short of expressing the whole truth. What it fails to recognize is that miracles enter into the very substance of Christianity. They are not merely "the bell which draws men to God's sermon:" they are an important part of the sermon itself. Apart from them the sermon itself would be radically different from what it actually is. It is true, of course, that all the miracles do not enter into the substance of Christianity in the same degree. We

### IN THIS ISSUE :

Concerning the Work of Evangelism...	4
R. A. Meek	
Is the Pulpit Forgetting God?—II.....	5
Wm. Childs Robinson	
Notes on Biblical Exposition.....	8
J. G. Machen	
Current Views and Voices.....	11
The 143rd General Assembly— A Description and An Interpretation	13
Ministerial Changes.....	19
News of the Church.....	20

might conceivably be ignorant of some of them and still have essentially the same conception of Christianity that we possess. There are miracles, however, that so enter into the very substance of Christianity that apart from them there is and could be no such thing as Christianity in any proper sense of the word. With such miracles as the incarnation and the resurrection in mind every one who has any intelligent understanding of what Christianity is will join in saying that Christianity de-miracalized is Christianity extinct.

That as regards Christianity the choice is between a miraculous Christianity and no Christianity at all appears most clearly when we consider that we cannot eliminate the miraculous without eliminating JESUS Himself. JESUS Himself is the greatest of all miracles; and yet it is He who stands at the center of Christianity and makes it what it is. How is it possible, then, to eliminate the miraculous, or even to treat it as non-essential, and still retain Christianity? We might as well suppose that we could eliminate the sun from the heavens without destroying our solar system as suppose that we can eliminate JESUS CHRIST from Christianity and contend that what is left behind can honestly and intelligently be called Christianity. No doubt we might still call what is left behind after this miracle of miracles is eliminated Christianity, but it would be something *other* than Christianity and hence something that ought to be called by another name. In fact the question whether miracles have occurred is one with the question whether it is indeed true God so loved this world as to give His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him might not perish but have everlasting life. To scoff at the miraculous is therefore to scoff at the reality of redemption. It is the miracles, let us never forget, that give us a Gospel. If the Gospel merely gave us *good advice*, merely told us what we should do to save ourselves, we would not need to be so greatly concerned over the question of miracles; but since it primarily consists of the *good news* of what God has done to save us from the guilt and power of sin, we can deny the miraculous only at the cost of denying that God has intervened in human history to accomplish our redemption.

We are constantly told that great evil results from identifying Christianity with the miraculous. Everywhere there are voices telling us that its miracles are the one great obstacle that keeps the modern world from accepting Christianity, that the Church must preach a non-miraculous Christianity if it would win the men of today. We do not believe that such is the case; but even if we did we would not advise the preaching of a non-miraculous Christianity; and that because it is to us a matter of indifference whether men accept Christianity unless the Christianity they accept be a miraculous Christianity. We readily admit that those who commend to us a non-miraculous Christianity commend to us much that is attractive, much that is worthy of our attention, and yet the Christianity (so-called) which they preach does not differ essentially from what has been preached, or is being preached, under non-Christian auspices. Even if we should succeed in winning the whole world to such a Christianity nothing much would be gained; and yet there is joy among the angels of heaven when one sinner turns from his sins and puts his trust in that miraculous CHRIST who is able to save unto the uttermost. We have, therefore, everything to lose and nothing to gain by preaching a non-miraculous Christianity. If we must evacuate Christianity of all that gives it unique value before we can preach it in a form that will commend it to the modern world, why preach it at all? What is needed is not a Gospel that is easy to preach, or a Gospel that can be preached without giving offense, but a Gospel that is worthwhile. It is a miraculous not a non-miraculous Christianity that provides us with such a Gospel. We hold, therefore, that it is not the part of wisdom to attempt to denude Christianity of its miracles so as to bring it into accord with the prevailing world-view; rather we hold that it becomes us, as best we may, to strive to bring the conceptions of this later, and as it would fain believe itself better instructed age, into harmony with those of CHRIST and His apostles.

Living as we do in an age in which miracles are everywhere spoken against, in which disbelief in miracles is even regarded as one of the hall-marks of culture, we, as Christian men and women, are under constant temptation to weaken if

not to surrender our confession at this point. This temptation, however, must be resisted if we are to witness a good confession, if in fact we are to remain Christians at all. And that because as regards Christianity the choice is not between a miraculous and a non-miraculous Christianity. It is between a miraculous Christianity and no Christianity at all. A non-miraculous CHRIST is neither a proper object of worship nor one who is capable of saving us from the guilt and power of sin. Surely a Christianity that knows nothing of a CHRIST in whose presence we can say "my LORD and my GOD," nothing of a CHRIST who as our substitute bore our sins in His own body on the tree; nothing of a CHRIST who proved conqueror over death and the grave and thus wrought in us a living hope of an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away—is, to put it mildly, a Christianity other than that of CHRIST and His apostles.

The Christianity of CHRIST and His apostles, whatever may be true of much that calls itself Christianity today, is through and through a miraculous Christianity. Christianity, as already intimated, is a miraculous religion because it is a redemptive religion, more particularly because it is that redemptive religion that offers mankind salvation from sin, conceived as guilt as well as pollution, through the expiatory death of the GOD-MAN, JESUS CHRIST. No miracles, no incarnation; no incarnation, no GOD-MAN; no GOD-MAN, no Saviour from the guilt and power of sin; no Saviour from the guilt and power of sin, no Christianity in any distinctive sense of the word. Or again no miracles, no resurrection of CHRIST; no resurrection of CHRIST, no confidence in His claims, His teachings and His promises, no assurance of His power and ability to save, no assurance that He is today LORD of heaven and earth; no confidence and assurance on these points, no Christianity in any proper sense of the word. Surely it should be as clear as day to all that Christianity denuded of its miracles is Christianity extinct. What is left after the miracles are eliminated may be called Christianity but it is not thereby made Christianity. A rose given another name will smell as sweet. But it does not follow that whatever we choose to call a rose will distil a rose's fragrance.

## The 143rd General Assembly

A REPORT of the proceedings of the last General Assembly will be found in the pages that follow. In this connection we content ourselves with certain comments indicative of our reaction to the Assembly as a whole.

The vote for Moderator indicated widespread agreement with the view expressed in our last issue relative to Dr. MUDGE's candidacy. Despite the fact that his sponsors had the temerity to ask that he be elected by acclamation, and thus to forestall even the nomination of another candidate, his rival received the largest vote of any opposition candidate since 1925. So close was the vote that a change of 71 votes would have meant the defeat of Dr. MUDGE. The narrow margin by which Dr. MUDGE was elected finds its explanation, it seems to us, not in any dissatisfaction with Dr. MUDGE personally but in the feeling that he had been put forward by the same group that has been virtually dictating the election of moderators as well as important appointments for a number of years. It seems to us, therefore, that the vote for moderator indicates that there are more in the Church than many had supposed who disapprove of those tendencies that have been most in evidence in the Presbyterian Church in recent years—and that notwithstanding the fact that before the Assembly had ended the opposition candidate was working hand in hand with the group that had nominated Dr. MUDGE. Whatever may be the truth as to the influences that had been at work to secure the nomination and election of Dr. MUDGE, it will hardly be denied that as Moderator he followed in the footsteps of his immediate predecessors. While he only appointed one signer of the Auburn Affirmation as a chairman of a standing committee—and that one of the least important of such committees—yet his appointments as a whole must have been pleasing to the Auburn Affirmationists. Certainly the large group that opposed his election was virtually ignored in his appointments. How complacently Dr. MUDGE looks upon things in the Presbyterian Church as they are appears from the fact that in what may be called his inaugural address he did not hesitate to say: "Brethren, we have no theological problems before this

Assembly; we have no profound ecclesiastical difficulties to solve; we have no ethical difficulties pressing upon us." We are free to confess that we are wholly at a loss to understand how men like Dr. MUDGE can take so complacent a view of the existing situation in the Presbyterian Church. A more obvious case of looking through rose-colored spectacles, it seems to us, it would be difficult to find. To us it seems a case of crying, "Peace, peace; when there is no peace." In our judgment, nothing is gained, except a false sense of security, in concealing from ourselves or in seeking to conceal from others the fact that the Presbyterian Church is in peril by reason of the fact that the forces of modernism are so strong within its gates that it is an open question whether it is to remain an evangelical church.

The report of the Special Commission on Marriage, Divorce, and Re-marriage did not figure largely in the proceedings of the Assembly because the Commission deleted that part of its report that dealt with Birth Control before submitting it to the Assembly. It is regrettable, it seems to us, that the Commission did not have the courage of its convictions and present this part of its report to the Assembly. Certainly the action of the Commission in withdrawing this portion of its report, as far as known without any change of mind on its part as to its wisdom, was not fitted to increase our respect for its members. No doubt strong influence was brought to bear upon the Commission by "the powers that be" to lead it to delete this part of its report, partly to preserve an appearance of harmony and partly out of a fear lest otherwise its report as a whole would be rejected, but a Commission that yields because of such considerations hardly acts in harmony with the best traditions of Presbyterianism. Certainly it will never be possible to say of any of them what MELVILLE said at the grave of JOHN KNOX: "Here lies one who never feared the face of man." While we think that the Assembly dealt too leniently with the Commission for its ill-advised action in giving publicity to its findings concerning birth control, yet it is a source of no small satisfaction to know that pre-Assembly discussion indicated such widespread opposition to this portion of its report that

the Commission lacked even the courage to present it.

The action of the Assembly relative to the Federal Council of Churches, while commendable as far as it went, fell far short of what it seems to us the situation called for. This was not due, however, to a lack of desire on the part of the Commissioners to do the right thing but rather to a skillful handling of the situation on the part of the "platform." Certainly we had the impression that if the matter had been allowed to come to a direct vote, our own Assembly would have followed the good example of the Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church and severed all connection with this organization. That, however, the "powers that be" did not desire with the result that the matter was so presented that while the Federal Council was severely rebuked and admonished to watch its steps in the future official relations together with financial support were continued. Much of the discussion, pro and con, might seem to indicate that the chief count in the indictment of the Federal Council is the pronouncement it sent out concerning birth control. We are sure our readers will not accuse us of having sympathy with that report, and so will not misunderstand us when we say that our main reason for holding that the General Assembly should have severed relations with this organization is that those who dominate its policies are not in sympathy with evangelical Christianity—as we pointed out more fully in our last issue. The President of Princeton Theological Seminary speaking in defense of this organization seemed to us a sight fitted to make the angels weep.

The Assembly approved the recommendation of the Department of Church Cooperation and Union that it be authorized and required to join with Committees on organic union from other Presbyterian and Reformed Churches for holding "a conference sufficiently prolonged to draft a Basis of Organic Union complete in all its details to be presented to the supreme Judicatories in 1932." This action has been emptied of most of its significance, however, by the fact that since its adoption not only the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church but the General Synod of the Reformed Church

(Concluded on page 12)

# Concerning the Work of Evangelism

By the Rev. R. A. Meek, D.D.

[The Editors of Christianity Today count themselves fortunate in being able to print for their readers this exceptional contribution from the able pen of the former editor of the "New Orleans Christian Advocate," and the "Southern Methodist." Dr. Meek is widely and favorably known, especially in the South, as one who loves and believes God's Word.]

CHRISTIAN evangelism is a divinely appointed work that is to be accomplished through human agents, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit. It is not a task for ministers only, though they have a large and important part in the execution of it. St. Paul declares in his First Epistle to the Corinthians that "preaching" is a thing ordained by God "to save them that believe," and that it has been a mighty factor in extending the Divine Kingdom among men is true beyond question. The Churches are wise in regulating by law the licensing of preachers and in seeking to give them adequate equipment, and never were trained and well-furnished ministers more needed to expound and proclaim the inspired Word of God than now. The demand for them is widespread and imperative. But while this is true, it should not be forgotten that it is the duty and privilege of all believers to tell the story of redeeming love that sinners may be won to Christ. Their recital of it no conference, convention, synod, or ecclesiastical dignitary has a right to restrain. It is too precious and too badly needed by the perishing millions of mankind to be withheld by artificial restrictions. The glorious, meaningful news of the Saviour's resurrection from the dead was first announced by women (representative of the laity), and not by any apostle or cleric. In a sense, every disciple should be an evangelist. A fuller recognition of this common obligation to seek the lost, which rests upon all Christians, is one of the great needs of the present time. Larger concert of effort and a more intense and sustained enthusiasm to discharge this responsibility we must have, if we are to meet successfully the perplexing problems of our day and win worthy triumphs for our Lord.

To be most effective, evangelism must be *earnest and aggressive*. There is reason to believe that the spread of the Gospel is fettered and hindered by an excessive

amount of form and ceremony—by improper pride and false notions of propriety. The world will never be saved within church walls; preachers in stately pulpits cannot reach the masses who never enter religious chapels. Less concern for a staid respectability and more anxiety for those going down beneath the black waves of sin, would tend to give to religious denominations new inspiration and to secure for them new power from on high. They need to look upon the spiritually destitute multitudes in this and other lands and feel for them something of the "compassion" that Jesus felt for the sin-cursed and religiously neglected thousands among whom He lived and moved. The tragedy of this age is not that the people are not going to Church, but that the Church is not going to the people.

O! for loving hearts and consecrated tongues to talk of Christ everywhere—by the fireside, on the street, in the marketplace, in the crowded park, along the railroads and highways, or wherever else there are human ears to listen! How utterly lacking in stiff and elegant formality was the Master's ministry when He came "to seek and to save that which was lost." Neither church, nor pulpit, nor choir had He. Wherever opportunity permitted, He opened His mouth and taught. Beside all waters He scattered the precious seeds of truth. None were beneath His notice—He would discourse to a single susceptible soul as readily as He would to an assembled host. Indeed, He was much more of a teacher than a preacher. It was by means of his luminous conversations carried on with one or a few persons, rather than by set and formal sermons, that He seemed to accomplish most. Remarkable upon this fact, a nationally known minister thus spoke in a published article a few years ago:

"Christ's greatest work was done by conversation. There are not in His biographies more than four or

five addresses which by any possibility could be called sermons or lectures. He talked with the people, rather than to the people. We cannot all be preachers or orators; we cannot all be writers or authors; but we can all talk with our fellow beings, and there is no way to the human heart so direct as the way of conversation—no way in which we exert so profound an influence upon others. . . . I write this article, it is printed and goes out, and, save in an occasional letter, get no response from voice or face. The author talks to his audience as one talks through a telephone, and he does not even know whether any one has the receiver at the other end. His personality counts for little. Only his ideas count. The speaker looks into the faces of his audience, gets from those faces an answer to his words, knows, or can know, whether his audience is attending or not attending, whether it welcomes his utterances or is hostile to them. Yet the orator is left largely to surmise or to reading an enigmatical book. The countenances of his audiences are not all tell-tale countenances.

"But in conversation mind meets mind, soul meets soul. You give out your thought; you get back an expression of the understanding or the misunderstanding. If you are understood, you can re-enforce your utterance. If you are misunderstood, you can at least try to correct the misunderstanding. The pastorate is not less important than the pulpit, if the minister is a true pastor—if he knows how to conduct a conversation."

This powerful and fruitful method of evangelism is open to all who know the way of life, and it should be employed by every disciple of the Lord Jesus.

The *message* of evangelism is also a matter of supreme importance. It must

embody the vital truths of the wonderful redemptive scheme. The Gospel alone is the power of God unto salvation. Its basal facts constitute the only teaching that the ascended Christ has promised to re-enforce with divine power and make efficacious. There has never been in the history of the Christian Church a great soul-winner, clerical or lay, who did not reverence, use, and magnify the Holy Scriptures. They are "the sword of the Spirit." The Master venerated them and proclaimed their thorough trustworthiness. Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Edwards, Finney, Spurgeon, and Moody accepted them as authoritative and dependable, and presented them as the veritable Word of God. Liberalism and successful evangelism do not go together. As Mr. Ernest Gordon so impressively points out in his extraordinary book, "The Leaven of the Sadducees," after existence for a century in the United States, the Unitarians, whose teachings constitute the essence of the prevailing Modernism, have in their organization less than a hundred thousand members and are practically without missions. This, though they have had in their possession much wealth and some of the best equipped colleges in the country. American Methodism was formerly distinguishable for its evangelistic spirit and effectiveness, but within its recent decades the Modernists have largely gained control of its institutions and governmental machinery, with the result that for the second year in succession it has had an actual decline in membership, the decrease during 1930, according to figures lately published in *The Christian Herald*, amounting to more than 43,000.

The evangelism needed is a *deep and thorough work of regeneration*. Neither a claptrap, sensational revivalism, nor an outward moral reform, nor a worldly personal campaign to enlist unsaved people as church members, can do for the sinner, the Christian Church, or human society what needs to be done. Sin is too deep-seated in human hearts and the evils to which it has given rise are too strongly rooted and widely extended to be overcome and eradicated by any superficial process. Only the supernatural power of the Holy Ghost can deliver either individuals, the Church or the social order from the moral ills that are preying upon and wrecking them.

Mankind, ecclesiasticisms, and civilization must be saved by the "old-time religion," or they must perish. This truth is writ upon the pages of human history, both sacred and profane.

Furthermore, the present distressing situation calls for an evangelism that *seeks to conserve the fruits of successful Christian effort*. To lead the lost to Christ and then leave them as spiritual babes to have their faith corrupted and undermined by Modernist teachers and influences is to pursue a course that is foolish and futile. Those to whom God gives spiritual progeny are under weighty obligations to see that it is properly nurtured and cared for, no matter what the cost. If new schools and seminaries

are necessary for this, they should be established; or if it is only by setting up new places of worship that this end can be attained, they should be provided. Wesley and the illustrious leaders of the Protestant Reformation did not hesitate to take whatever of such steps were needful to meet the religious exigencies of their times, and if need be we of the twentieth century should not fail to follow their courageous and heroic examples. Loyalty to any denominational name should not be allowed to outweigh loyalty to Christ, His Gospel, and the true interests of the immortal souls for whom He died. To let that come to pass, would be to betray the most momentous and sacred trust ever reposed in human hands.

## Is the Pulpit Forgetting God?

By the Rev. Wm. Childs Robinson, A.M., Th.D.  
Professor of Church History in Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Ga.

### Part II

THE Protestant Reformation was primarily a rediscovery of GOD. LUTHER took seriously the Holy Sovereignty of GOD, and in JESUS CHRIST GOD revealed Himself to Brother MARTIN as gracious Father. The Reformers charged the Mediaeval Church with falsifying the true theme of Christianity, substituting man's Church and man's history, human intermediaries and intercessors, for GOD. With the mighty power of His Word, the Friar of Wittenberg brought Saxon Europe face to face with the living GOD. And every revival since has issued from the preaching of the Almighty GOD. JONATHAN EDWARDS brought New England to grips with GOD, and the Great Awakening ensued. JAMES HENLEY THORNWELL saved South Carolina from Skepticism by his glowing proclamation of the holiness of JEHOVAH. America needs Ministers who will devote their time to CHARNOCK on the *Divine Attributes* rather than to KIRBY PAGE on *War*.

Fellow students, you are called to be ambassadors of GOD; not advocates of labor organizations. Your vocation is theology; not psychology, not economics. Your primary theme is GOD; not the social gospel. Two years ago Dr. WEIR,

venerable secretary of your Board of National Missions, brought us this ringing challenge from a Chicago official: "We cannot live without men who interpret GOD to us."

There are still souls that pant for GOD as the hart panteth for the water brooks. There are trusting hearts in whom are the highways to Zion; men and women whose one desire is to dwell in the house of the LORD, that they may behold the beauty of the LORD. Devotion still lifts her litany:

"Oh, how I fear Thee, living God,  
With deepest, tenderest fears;  
And worship Thee with trembling hope,  
And penitential tears."

And Christian or worlding, it is still true, "Thou hast made us for Thyself and we are restless until we rest in Thee." Do not allow the allurements of the world to seduce you from your high vocation. Christian ministers! your goal is not to be acclaimed District Governors of Rotary; but to be remembered as "men that spake the word of GOD."

The American pulpit is not only forgetting GOD as its primary theme; it is also shifting its central purpose. Too much of our preaching has a wrong teleological orientation. Instead of the glory of GOD we are seeking the conservation of

human values. We are substituting LOTZE and RITSCHL for CALVIN and the Bible. We used to preach that man's chief end was to glorify GOD. Now we make our ideas of GOD according to human value-concepts. A representative example of this way of thinking is found in Professor HORTON's article on the impotence of GOD. With a naivete that is astounding Dr. HORTON proceeds to create a GOD that shall meet the demands of men, and conserve their religious values. He writes:

"It is power that men seek when they seek for GOD; power to stand the gaff in the gruelling struggle of life, power to conquer their baser impulses and develop their nobler potentialities, power to persevere in the effort to create a better human society, against all the fierce opposition which such an effort is bound to elicit. A deity is a power; and the deities that will survive in the struggle for existence are those which have the greatest power to inspire and invigorate their devotees, and raise them to the highest level of triumphant and abundant life.

"The supreme GOD whom all men are blindly seeking is the supreme power which, if one could rightly and reverently ally oneself with it, would make all life a chant of victory."

Is American religion about to revert to magic, that we thus create our own higher powers in conformity with our needs, and in order that they may serve our behests?

Is GOD to be put into the "survival of the fittest" grist mill, and what most glorifies man to be accepted as GOD? That there might be a living GOD Who reveals Himself and Who is concerned for His own glory never seems to occur to the writer. "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the LORD shall have them in derision." These dream-gods of wishful thinkers shall go into discard, and the living GOD Who has revealed Himself in redemption history shall reign alone, resplendent in the glories which He in His Word has ascribed to Himself.

We shall never get a grip upon the present depression until we stop looking at human values and begin to think of the glory of GOD. Though it be an unpalatable doctrine, the only rational explanation of this depression is that the universe is not being run primarily for the glorification of the United States, the enrich-

ment of the American public, the inspiration of god-forgetting humanism. "The heavens declare the glory of GOD," and "the fullness of the whole earth is His glory." We will only secure a rationale for our day when we heed the Psalm call:

"Give unto the LORD, O ye sons of the mighty,  
Give unto the LORD, glory and strength.  
Give unto the LORD the glory due unto His name.  
Worship the LORD in the beauty of holiness,  
And in His temple let everything say Glory." (Ps. 29.)

Especially the Reformed preacher needs to hear MÜLLER's Erlangen message:

"At the very heart of the life of faith must stand the living GOD, who desires to be held in honor for His own sake, and not only as the deliverer of the soul and the supreme means of salvation."

LUTHER's faith is:

"Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost—that is the note struck by the first commandment and by the first petition. Nothing can be dearer to our hearts than the honor of GOD."

This is also CALVIN's religion:

"It is neither true piety nor correct theology to direct men's attention mainly to their own salvation. It is for GOD and not for ourselves mainly that we are born. But in order to make the glorifying of His name more attractive to men and to stimulate their zeal for it, the LORD has so ordained it, that by seeking His glory men always best further their own salvation."

But some of our Presbyterian book reviews read as though the Reformed preachers have less consciousness of the meaning and glory of their own heritage than any people in the world. When SHAILER MATTHEWS exchanges the sovereignty of GOD and the objective Godward meaning of the Atonement for a mere victory of personality over environment, of organism over mechanism, the Northern Presbyterian reviewer (judging from reports) must have surpassed even the flattering review which *The Atonement and the Social Process* received from a Southern theologian. A Southern Presbyterian reviewer commends Union Seminary's (N.Y.) *Ventures in Belief* to "every thinking Christian," without a word of protest against Dr. WEIMAN's rejection of the supernatural. But when

deliverance was not forthcoming from the orthodox Southern Presbyterian, it arose to the LORD from another source. Though he professes a lower doctrine of inspiration, Dr. W. P. PATERSON, of Edinburgh, has the courage of his convictions. He told the Atlanta Presbyterian ministers that "a Church that has lost the supernatural gospel is in the same condition as the salt that has lost its savour."

At the Jerusalem Missionary Council (1928), a group of German theologians felt it necessary to offer a manifesto supporting the absolutely unique acts of GOD for the redemption of men against the syncretism implicit in the papers on the Missionary Message, and one of these papers was written by a Southern Presbyterian. Have we lost the courage of our convictions? Or do we love the glory of men more than the glory of GOD?

Dr. W. M. MCPHEETERS, my honored colleague, seriously questions whether the plan for the union of American Presbyterianism is taking sufficient account of GOD. If we draw up an ordination vow which the unsophisticated will understand as a subscription to the Westminster Confession, but which the initiated will know allows each individual to subscribe only to so much of that Confession as he himself regards as the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, are we honoring the GOD of truth to Whom in the first place we make our profession of faith?

What will our Presbyterian reviews do with the Yale lectures in which Dr. WEIMAN denies the personality of GOD? Will JUDAH again vie with EPHRAIM as to which can be more subservient to this brilliant creator of his own gods? Or, like PAUL, will our spirits be stirred within us when we see ATHENS given to idolatry? If we believe that GOD has revealed Himself and that the Scriptures principally teach that self-revelation, consistency requires us to condemn the making of ideas of GOD contrary to the Biblical revelation.

Or glance at our books. A Northern Presbyterian theologian issues *The Procession of the Gods*, on the cover of which the Crucified appears between a cross-legged BUDDHA and symbols of nature worship. While in *The New Science and the Old Faith*, a Southern Presbyterian university president declares that the GOD of the Old Testament (EL, ELOHIM, JAHVAH) is the same as BAAL, ISHTAR,

ASHTORETH, BRAHMA, etc! (p. 407, cf. p. 128.)

Was ELIJAH right at Mt. Carmel, or was he only an old fogey? Well, evidently the Son of Man bore some of the lineaments of the mighty TISHBITE. When men saw Him consumed with zeal for the LORD (John 2:17), some said He was JOHN the BAPTIST, others ELIJAH (Matthew 16:14). And as His zero hour arrived, the Servant mounted His fire step praying: "Nevertheless for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify Thy name." Oh, that we who bear His name might be anointed with His Spirit—"the spirit of the fear of the LORD" (Isaiah 11:2-3).

In the great premises of his kingdom of ends, THOMAS AQUINAS was right. The soul is higher than the body. Religion cannot be a mere means to society's amelioration. The pulpit must revise her teleology. The primary consideration—the supreme end—is not human values, but the glory of God. The glow of sacred eloquence as well as the radiance of Christian living shines that men may glorify our Father which is in heaven.

Young gentlemen, as you enter your pastorates, I beg you, take the Sermon on the Mount as the model for the true motivation in preaching; take the angels' "Gloria in excelsis, in excelsis Deo!" (Luke 2:14) as the keynote in worship; and take the Apostle's motto as the panacea for congregational factionalism, "He that glorieth, let him glory in the LORD" (I Cor. 1:30).

Finally, religious leadership is taking too lightly the word that the light of the knowledge of the glory of GOD shines from the face of JESUS CHRIST. Too many of us are slurring the Deity of CHRIST; too often we forget the ultimate meaning of our LORD. Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON feels that to give us a true picture of God, JESUS "did not require actually to *be* God." Dr. JOHN BAILLIE thinks it enough for modern Christianity to believe that in CHRIST GOD has been pleased to do something for humanity He had never done before (*The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity*, p. 121). A Briton writes of the human presence of CHRIST in which God was divinely present. Even conservative preachers and professors allow statements of belief to be made which ring the changes, with definiteness

and precision, on the perfect and complete humanity of JESUS; yet, when referring to the Godward side of His being, stop with an adjective and a terminology that is patient of a RITSCHLIAN interpretation. There is a tremendous issue here. Is JESUS ultimate reality to the universe, or is the universe ultimate reality to JESUS? Do we still believe with the church catholic that CHRIST is true and eternal GOD? Do we believe with PAUL and JOHN and Hebrews that all things were created by Him and unto Him? Do we believe that He, personally pre-existing, did supernaturally enter human history by a Virgin birth, and did supernaturally attest His Deity by the resurrection of His body? Then by all that we hold most precious, let us declare our faith today.

If CHRIST is only one, even the best, of mankind's helpers along the way of life, then his Church may well ally itself with the disciples of other helpers in a fellowship of faiths and a fellowship of reconciliation, and a national religious education association, and a world syncretism. The Buddhist and the Mohammendan agree with our stand against alcohol; the Tao and the Buddhist are as pacifist as SHERWOOD EDDY could wish. But, if CHRIST be not a mere product of this planet, but its LORD and GOD and King, then we must take a different attitude toward such entangling alliances. I believe with Dr. B. M. PALMER and the fathers of my Church, that GOD hath given CHRIST to be the whole creation's Head (Eph. 1:22. Cf. Phil. 2:9-11, Dan. 7:13-14, Is. 9:6-7, Matt. 28:18-19, Rev. 5:11-13). I believe that this universal headship is founded on the fact that CHRIST is the eternal GOD and the immediate author, controller and governor of the cosmos (Heb. 1:2; John 1:3; Col. 1:16, 17). It is neither necessary nor becoming for me to take the Body of this Almighty Head and unite it with those who revere Him not. It is not necessary, because in this Headship of JESUS there is safety to the universe, all things are created *unto Him*. "The footsteps of our King are to be seen in all the grand march of history, which begins and ends in a true theocracy." As Head, CHRIST is the sole depository of grace. From the divine-human CHRIST, as a reservoir filled from the fount of Deity, common grace and special grace shall continue to stream until "the kingdoms of this world become

the kingdoms of our LORD and of His CHRIST."

And it is peculiarly improper and unbecoming to take the Body of our Divine Head and make it a mere part of a syncretistic world cult; to be placed in the hands of every reforming enthusiast to be used according to his peculiar whims. No! that Body which is CHRIST's fullness may neither be bound to the chariot in which CAESAR rides, nor yet yoked to the subtler ideologies of evanescent reformers.

In his customary sententious manner, Dr. P. T. FORSYTH has divined and divided our problem (*Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, pp. 27, 28, 29):

"Even with CHRIST in the centre, we must go on and ask a question which divides Christianity into two streams, one of which ends in the eternal kingdom of holy God, and the other in the brief sovereignty of spiritual man. We have to ask, in the Gospel's interest, whether CHRIST is central to a glorified humanity or to a glorious God . . . what we are developing at the moment is an anthropocentric Christianity. God and CHRIST are practically treated as but the means to an end . . . the consummation and perfecting of Humanity.

These two streams may not seem far apart in their origin, but they part widely as they flow on. And one makes glad the City of God and His kingdom, and the other is lost in the desert. The latter makes CHRIST and Christianity to culminate and be exhausted in the service of man, the former makes their first work always to be the honour and worship of God. In that worship man grows to all his destiny, and warms, and even melts, in perpetual brotherly love and service. The one makes the centre of Christianity to be the ideal and spirit of CHRIST, the other the Cross of CHRIST. One makes the Cross the apotheosis of sacrifice with a main effect upon man, the other makes it the Atonement with its first effect on God. The result of the latter is a Church; of the former, a social State more or less spiritualised, and more or less fleeting. The latter postulates the Deity of CHRIST, the other but his relative divinity."

Fellow students, what I have been trying to say to you in many words, ZECHARIAH better says with a few words:

"Thus saith the LORD of hosts: Return unto me, saith the LORD of hosts, and I will return unto you, saith the LORD of hosts."

# Notes on Biblical Exposition

By J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.  
Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary

## VI. THE MESSAGE AND THE MESSENGER

*"But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach to you contrary to the gospel which we preached to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, now also again I say: 'If anyone is preaching to you contrary to what ye received, let him be accursed.' Now am I persuading men—or God? Or am I seeking to please men? If I were still pleasing men, I should be no servant of Christ. For I make known to you, brethren, as to the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not according to man" (Gal. 1:8-11, in a literal translation.)*

### An Inviolable Gospel

IN the verse which we dealt with last month, Paul has stated with the utmost clearness the occasion for the writing of the Epistle: the Galatians are turning away from the gospel of Christ to another teaching. That other teaching purports to be a gospel, but in reality it is no gospel at all. It is a perversion of the one true gospel. The Judaizing teachers who are leading the Galatians astray are laying violent hands upon a gospel which does not belong to them but belongs only to Christ.

But in denying to the Judaizers the right to change the gospel, the Apostle is not denying to them anything that he is attempting to reserve for himself. "Even we who preached the gospel to you," he says, "have no right to change it; it is not our property any more than it is any other man's property; we were the instruments of preaching it to you, but it belongs exclusively to Christ." Indeed, Paul continues, even the angels in heaven have no power over this gospel; it is fixed and sure once for all. "But even if we," says the Apostle, "or an angel from heaven should preach to you contrary to what we preached to you, let him be accursed."

### The Meaning of "Anathema"

The word *anathema*, here translated "accursed," is an interesting word. The

derivation of it is very simple: *ana* means "up"; *the* is a root meaning "to place" or "to put"; *-ma* is a noun ending with a passive significance. Hence an *anathema* is "a thing that is placed up." The word came to refer especially to what is "placed up" in a temple as a votive offering to a god. So the word is used in Lk. 20:5: "And when certain men said concerning the Temple, that it was adorned with beautiful stones and offerings . . ." The spelling is a little different in this passage, a long *e* standing for a short *e* in the *the* of *anathema*; but essentially it is the same word.

How then can a word that means "votive offering" possibly come to have the bad sense, "accursed"? The answer to that question seems fairly clear. The fundamental idea, when a thing is called an *anathema*, is that the thing has been taken from ordinary use and has been handed over to God. If it is a good thing, it has been handed over to Him for His use; if it is a bad thing, it has been handed over to Him for destruction: but in either case men have no more to say about it; it is taken out of ordinary relationships and is "devoted" to God.

So here Paul says—if the original sense of the word is to be regarded as still in view—that the punishment of the man who attempts to lay violent hands upon the gospel of Christ should be in God's hands: that man should be regarded as beyond men's power to help; he should be regarded as having fallen into that state about which the Epistle to the Hebrews says: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."

### The Intolerance of Paul

Upon what sort of error does the Apostle pronounce this tremendous condemnation? It was not an error which the modern Church, according to its present tendency, would be inclined to take very seriously. The Judaizers agreed with

Paul about many things: they believed that Jesus was the Messiah; they seem to have had no quarrel with Paul's lofty view of Jesus' person; they believed in His resurrection from the dead. Moreover, they believed that a man must have faith in Christ if he is to be saved. They differed from the Apostle only in thinking that a man must also contribute something of his own if he is to be saved—namely the keeping of the law of God.

Paul also held that the Christian man must do what the law commands. The Apostle did differ from the Judaizers, it is true, with regard to the meaning of the law; he did hold that certain ceremonial requirements of the Old Testament, though entirely divine and authoritative, were intended by God only for the old dispensation and not for the new dispensation that had been ushered in by the redeeming work of Christ. But that difference is not really the main point in the Epistle to the Galatians. The central point at issue between Paul and the Judaizers concerned merely the logical—not even the temporal—order of three steps. Paul said: (1) "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ; (2) at that moment you are saved; and (3) immediately you proceed to keep the law of God." The Judaizers said: (1) "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and (2) keep the law of God the best you can; and then (3) you are saved."

To the men that dominate the life of the modern Church it would seem to be a subtle, hair-splitting distinction at the most. Surely, they would say, Paul ought to have made common cause with those Judaizers who had such a zeal for righteousness and furthermore exalted the Lord Jesus Christ so high!

As a matter of fact the Apostle did nothing of the kind. What he actually said with respect to the Judaizers was: "Let them be anathema." He seemed to have none of the modern virtue of tolerance at this point.



### Tolerance Right and Wrong

Yet on occasion the Apostle could display tolerance of the broadest possible kind. He displayed it, for example, when he was in prison in Rome, at the time when he wrote the Epistle to the Philippians. At that time, certain men had tried, apparently, to use the Apostle's imprisonment in order to seize the place of preëminence in the Church, which otherwise would have been his. They preached Christ, says Paul, "of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add a fiction to my bonds." It seems to have been about as mean a piece of business as could possibly be imagined. But Paul was very tolerant about it. "What then?" he said, "Notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice."

What was the reason, on the one hand, for the broad tolerance in Rome and, on the other hand, for the vigorous anathemas in Galatia? Why was Paul tolerant in the one case and not in the other? The answer is perfectly plain. He was tolerant in Rome because the message that was being proclaimed by the rival preachers was true; their motives were wrong, but their message was right. And it was with the truth of the message that Paul was chiefly concerned. In Galatia, on the other hand, it was the message that was wrong. No doubt the motives of the Judaizers were by no means all that they should be; these men preached circumcision in order to avoid persecution for the cross of Christ and in order to obtain credit from their non-Christian Jewish countrymen (Gal. 6:12f.). But it was not such faults in their motives that afforded the primary ground for Paul's attack upon them. His opposition to them would have been exactly the same, as he says in our passage, if they had all been angels from heaven!

### Tolerance and Intolerance in the Modern Church

The prime question for Paul in dealing with any message was not the personality of the messengers but the question whether the message was true. In the modern Church, on the other hand, it is exactly the other way around. Paul was intolerant about the content of the mes-

sage but tolerant about the personality of the messengers; the modern Church is tolerant about the message but intolerant about the personality of the messengers and about the methods by which the message is proclaimed.

Thus Paul was just as tolerant as the modern Church; only his tolerance appeared at an entirely different place. It is a mistake to say that the modern Church is really practising tolerance. On the contrary, there is nothing more intolerant than the ecclesiastical machinery that governs, for example, our Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. It seems at first sight to be tolerant in the doctrinal sphere, though even there its tolerance is apparent rather than real, being extended much more to Modernist opponents of the truth than to those who would proclaim in its fulness and in its solemn exclusiveness the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. But even if the ecclesiastical machinery were really tolerant in the doctrinal sphere, its intolerance in the sphere of administration would still be apparent.

### A Recent Example

The difference between the two kinds of tolerance can be made clear if we take as an example the contrast between the methods of the two parties in the recent debate regarding the reorganization of Princeton Theological Seminary.

In that conflict, the gentlemen representing the ecclesiastical machinery, who finally succeeded in bringing about the reorganization of the seminary, certainly displayed intolerance enough, even though the president of the Seminary who agreed with them, advocated an "inclusive" seminary.<sup>(1)</sup> They carried on the conflict, moreover, by the introduction of all sorts of personalities. Such personalities appeared at the beginning, and they also appeared not only throughout the conflict but also at the very end. An official bulletin issued by Princeton Theological Seminary in November, 1929, soon after the reorganization, actually speaks (without any specific citations whatever) of "insinuations," "slanders," "false statements," "defamers," a "disingenuous" attitude on

the part of the opponents.<sup>(2)</sup> It seems almost unbelievable that an official organ of an educational institution should use such language as that; yet such language certainly was used.

We, on the other hand, opposing the reorganization, and opposing the present government of Princeton Seminary, have avoided such personalities. We are strongly opposed to the policy of these gentlemen who brought about the destruction of the old Princeton; but we are not interested in carrying on a guerilla warfare against their character or in analyzing their motives. Their character and their motives are for God to judge; all that we feel obliged to say is that their policy is hostile to the spread of the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. Our objection to them, like Paul's attitude to his opponents in Galatia, would be exactly the same if they were angels from heaven. Not the character of the messengers, but the truth and clearness of the message is our concern in this entire conflict. And in that attitude we have tried very humbly to follow the teaching and example of the Apostle Paul.

### The Cost of Loyalty

There could scarcely be a better guide in controversy than the verse with which we have just dealt: "Even if we or an angel from heaven should preach to you contrary to the gospel which we have preached to you, let him be anathema." That text excludes unworthy personalities in debate; but it also demands the most unswerving loyalty to the gospel of Christ, no matter what personalities may be opposed, and no matter what sacrifices loyalty may involve.

The sacrifices involved in loyalty will, in our Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., in all probability not be small. In the Permanent Judicial Commission just appointed by the General Assembly, four out of eight ministerial members are signers of the "Auburn Affirmation," which declares that a man may be a minister in the Presbyterian Church without believing in one single one of the following verities of the Faith: the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resur-

(1) See *Proceedings of the General Assembly's Special Committee on Princeton Theological Seminary* (on file in the office of the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly), p. 170.

(2) See *Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, xxiii, No. 3, November, 1929, pp. 5-8.

rection, the miracles of our Lord. A leader of the Affirmation movement, Dr. Robert Hastings Nichols of Auburn, is among the four. It seems altogether probable, therefore, that the highest judicial body in the Church, which is charged with the all-important duty of interpreting the creed, is dominated by this point of view so derogatory to the very vitals of the Christian religion.

A consistent Christian man will hold that in any doctrinal issue it will be a disgrace to be acquitted by such a court and an honor to be condemned. But the honor of being condemned will of course involve worldly sacrifices and the revilings of the visible Church, at the same time that it involves the favor of God. Unless all signs of the times fail, Christian men in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. will soon be called upon to decide very definitely which they love more—the Lord Jesus Christ or the favor of men.

### The Law or Grace

Certainly the point of difference between Paul and the Judaizers—to return to our passage in Galatians—was no trifling difference, no matter how trifling it may seem to the modern Church. It was the difference between a religion of merit and a religion of grace. The Judaizers' teaching required a man to earn at least part of his salvation by his own keeping of God's law. Paul saw clearly that to follow such teaching was to do despite to the cross of Christ. If we have to fill up even the slightest gap by our own works, then we are still lost in sin; for the awakened conscience sees clearly that our own works are insufficient to bridge even the smallest gap. We must trust Christ for nothing or for all; to trust Him only for part is the essence of unbelief. There are two ways of being saved, according to the Apostle Paul. One way is to keep the law of God perfectly. That way is closed because of sin. The other way is to accept the gift of salvation which Christ offers us freely by His cross. The two ways cannot both be followed—that is the burden of the Epistle to the Galatians. A man must choose as the way of salvation either the law or grace. In bidding men choose the latter way the Apostle was contending for the very heart of the Christian religion.

So important did the utterance which we have just discussed seem to the Apostle Paul that he repeats it, in slightly different form, in the next verse. "As we have said before," he says, "now also again I say: 'If anyone is preaching to you contrary to what ye received, let him be accursed.'" The reference here is no doubt to a warning which had been given on the last visit by the Apostle to the Galatian churches. "I gave you the warning at that earlier time," he says, "and I am giving you exactly the same warning now."

### Was Paul Inconsistent?

Then he continues, with reference to the uncompromising language which he has just used: "Now am I persuading men—or God? Or am I seeking to please men? If I were still pleasing men, I should be no [true] servant of Christ." Apparently the Apostle had been accused of vacillation and time-serving. When he was among the Gentiles where circumcision was unpopular, it was said, he could preach freedom from the Mosaic law; but when he was among the Jews, where circumcision was popular, he could preach circumcision. Such a charge seems to be implied in Gal. 5:11, where Paul says: "And I, brethren, if I still preach circumcision, why am I still persecuted?"

At first sight, this charge might seem too preposterous ever to have been made even by the bitterest opponents. But closer examination reveals things in Paul's life which might conceivably have given color, though certainly not real justification, to the charge. One may think, for example, of the circumcision of Timothy, the half-Jew (Acts 16:3); or one may remember that Paul himself in his Epistles says that he "became all things to all men" (I Cor. 9:22), and particularly that he became to the Jews as a Jew, to those who were under the law as being himself under the law (I Cor. 9:20). Where no principle, but merely his own convenience, was involved, Paul could be the most concessive of men. Such concessiveness may well have been misunderstood, or wilfully misinterpreted, by the Judaizing opponents. So the Apostle has to defend himself against a charge from which he might at first sight have been thought to be immune.

"You say that I am a time-server," says

the Apostle; "you say that I change my attitude toward circumcision to suit the likes or dislikes of my hearers. Well, the language that I am using now hardly seems to justify such a charge. If any man preaches a different gospel, let him be accursed. I said that some time ago on my last visit. I am saying exactly the same thing now. Does *that* look like persuading or cajoling men? Does that look like vacillation? Surely not. Surely that language is uncompromising enough."

"No," says the Apostle, "if I am 'persuading' anyone, it is God. It is his favor, not men's, that I am seeking to win. Indeed, if I were still seeking men's favor, I should be no true servant of Christ; for the commission that Christ has given me excludes all man-pleasing. The gospel that Christ has entrusted to me is not according to man, and now that I have been entrusted with that gospel I must put all thought of men's favor aside. I must preach that gospel without fear or favor: it is not my gospel, but Christ's; and I have no power to change it to suit the fancies of men."

### Various Interpretations

Such, we venture to think, is the most natural interpretation of a passage that has been much discussed. The commentators dispute, for example, over the meaning of the word "now" at the beginning of verse 10. Does it mean "now since I have become a Christian," or "now since the error has become so serious as to call forth an uncompromising stand"; or does it mean, as we have taken it, "now when I am using such uncompromising language as that which appears in the two preceding verses"?

So also there is dispute over the meaning of the Greek conjunction, usually translated "for", which appears at the beginning of that same verse 10. Does Paul mean (1): "I pronounce this severe judgment upon the Judaizers; for I am no man-pleaser"? Or does he mean (2): "This severe judgment of mine upon the Judaizers is correct; for I am speaking the truth as in the sight of God and am not swayed by my likes or dislikes"? Or, is the "for" best left untranslated in English, as we have left it untranslated, the

(Concluded on page 12)

# Current Views and Voices

## Love and Truth

*Editorial in The Monthly Record of the Free Church of Scotland.*

THE central message of the Second Epistle of John is set forth in a brief exhortation to the followers of Christ to "love one another." That, of course, is the message which in one form or another lies at the heart of all John's writings, but in this Second Epistle we find it in a setting which invests it with a special interest. The exercise of love is unfolded in its relation to other Christian obligations, and in particular to the duty of loyalty to "the doctrine of Christ." By the doctrine of Christ is meant not only, and not even mainly, the doctrine which Christ taught, but the doctrine concerning Christ, which is contained in the entire evangelical record. It is the Apostle's jealousy for the maintenance of a pure Gospel, indeed, that led him to appeal for the exercise of mutual love on the part of Christ's followers—love, that is, which does not consist in mere emotion, but finds its supreme expression in loyalty to the will of God. "For many deceivers," he goes on to declare, "are entered into the world." This menace of erroneous teaching called on the one hand for the exercise of personal watchfulness, and on the other for an emphatic disavowal of every perversion of the doctrine of Christ. So we find that the relation of Love to Truth involves a three-fold attitude on the part of the believer.

### I

First of all, Christian Love must be discerning in its exercise. It is not an indiscriminating charity which opens its arms to every kind of teaching. There are not a few amiable Christian people whose love appears to be of this undiscerning character. They do not exercise their spiritual intelligence on what they hear. For them everything that glitters is gold; everything is truth that is attractively presented or emphatically affirmed. The result is that they unconsciously extend the same hospitality to error as to sound doctrine, and are equally enthusiastic with regard to "gospels" that are wide as the poles apart. To-day they hear a message which they declare to be simply "wonderful"; to-morrow they pronounce a similar verdict on a form of doctrine which is about as different from the other as night is from day. And as one listens to these superficial eulogies one sometimes longs for the utterance of some word of moral reprobation that would be a sign that the senses of these good people were "exercised to discern both good and evil."

Christian love, beyond doubt, must possess a discerning quality. And the reason for that is that "many deceivers are entered into

the world." And John's use of the word "deceivers" implies that error is often so plausibly presented that it bears a close resemblance to truth, and that, unless we keep our eyes open, we shall be imposed upon by false appearances. The special kind of error that he had in view was the denial of the fact that Christ was "come in the flesh," a heresy which embraces all the false doctrines which gather round the Incarnation and redemptive work of the Son of God. There are many deceivers of this kind who have gone forth into the world in our own day, and Christian men and women must be on their guard against their insidious perversions of the evangelical message. Christian charity is no doubt an excellent thing; but it is possible to be too charitable; and we are too charitable when our Love is displayed at the expense of Christian Truth.

### II.

In the second place, Christian Love must ever be watchful over its own well-being. "Look to yourselves . . ." says John; and the exhortation, coming as it does immediately after the reference to the danger arising from "deceivers," sounds forth a salutary note of warning. The deceiver is artful in his approaches—making use, as another Apostle puts it, of "cunning craftiness" as he lies in wait to carry out his ensnaring designs—and error is so blighting and corrupting in its influence, that the believer must exercise unceasing vigilance lest, in the outflow of an unwise charity, his own soul should suffer loss. He must look to his inward defences against the assaults of error, and so guard against its infection. In other words, he must examine the state of his own spiritual health, for, after all, the best protection against the efforts of deceivers lies in that clearness of discernment which springs from purity of heart and integrity of life. It is possible even for believers to be carried away for a time by delusion, and thereby to suffer grievous hurt. "Look to yourselves," is ever a seasonable reminder to the followers of Christ.

### III.

Finally, Christian Love must always be uncompromising in its loyalty. John's words on this point are almost startling in the rigour of their demand. "If there come any unto you," he enjoins, "and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God-speed." This of course does not mean that the Christian is to be neglectful of the ordinary courtesies of life. The admonition gives no encouragement to churlishness. It is not so much individuals that we are forbidden to have fellowship with, as teachers, men who are engaged in propagating views which are in conflict with

the verities of the Christian faith. In their official capacity we must not have anything to do with them. We dare not bid them God-speed on their mission. If we do, we cannot avoid having some complicity in their erroneous teaching and its destructive effects.

It seems a stern prohibition, but it indicates the safe course for every Christian man and woman. On the path of loyalty there must be no ambiguous relationships such as would leave any possibility of doubt as to where we stand. It is certainly a word to severe and inflexible restriction that John here speaks, and yet it is a word that is uttered by the voice of Love. For Christian Love can never be neglectful of the claims of Christian Truth. On the contrary, it is charged with a jealousy for the honour of Christ, for the integrity of the evangel, and for the welfare of immortal souls, that constrains those who are under its influence to face the teacher of error with the attitude of absolute repudiation. That attitude may involve both loneliness and reproach; but when loyalty to Jesus Christ is in question, what course is open to any honest believer but to say, "Stand thou on that side, for on this am I"?

## Discipline in the Church

*By W. R. Stegert  
in "The Ansgar Lutheran"*

DISCIPLINE has almost disappeared from our church life. There was a time in the history of the Christian Church when discipline meant something; church membership also meant something. If a member of a congregation did not live up to his religious profession disciplinary action was taken against him and he was urged and assisted to live a Christian life. And the Church grew under such a concept of its meaning and message.

To-day the tendency is to gather in a large membership, often regardless of their fitness; to raise enormous sums of money, no matter from what source; to build "bigger and better" church edifices, and thus bring to a consummation what some one has called "the Gothic invasion." Church bodies are responsible for much of this because officials are after church membership and the raising of large budgets. Not satisfied with the annual apportionment, appeal after appeal is shot at the pastor through the year until he begins to feel that he is simply a money raiser. And when the pastor makes his annual report it is statistics of gains and losses in membership and finance he must report. No questions are asked regarding the spiritual growth and grace of his flock, and apparently few care about that. A large membership, a large budget and large church plant appear to cover a multitude of spiritual failings.

But is the Church not losing by thus misplacing her emphasis? Her glory has always been the preaching and living of the Christ life; she needs no better advertisement than doing just that. In seeking to inculcate her teaching and the Christ life the Church may lose worldly goods, social prestige and Gothic cathedrals, but she will gain in moral authority, spiritual reality and heavenly power.

Money and worldly power have often threatened to strangle the Church and have again appeared with warnings aplenty. Many pastors have at some time been told to be careful about "so-and-so" because he was a good contributor. Those who contribute much wealth usually desire power and often when analyzed in proportion to the contribution of a poor widow, the wealthy gift isn't so much. But it has now and then happened that the Church has toned down her spiritual message to admit the jingle of gold. We condemn Israel for worshipping the golden calf, but I wonder if sometimes that sin does not beset us in greater measure than we imagine.

Power, wealth and social glory are sins assailing the Temple of Truth. I wonder if the time has not come for the Church to repent of these things, to draw its lines tighter about itself that it may tell the world it stands for something; that it is not seeking glory, or wealth, or power, but that it is seeking to bring the love of God into the hearts of men, and to bring peace and joy into life. Then I wonder if the Church should not re-define its requirements for membership and if it should not make an attempt to adhere to them. Church membership should mean something; it should mean the dedicating of a soul to the Christ, the serious attempt on the part of that soul to live a truly Christian life on week days as well as on Sunday.

Some time ago I was called to a home where a member of the family died. I did not know the family and upon inquiry after I got to the home I learned that the deceased had never made an attempt to live a Christian life, but had consistently opposed it. "But," they explained to me, "that isn't necessary for a Christian funeral. All we have to do is give the minister \$10 and he will say anything we desire." "I'm sorry," I replied, "but you have the wrong minister." And the sad part of such an incident is that I know pastors who would be glad to get \$10 like that, for the money found its way into a clerical pocketbook.

If the Church means anything, if it stands for something, it should exercise enough disciplinary force to maintain those things Jesus committed to it. The Church always loses when it accommodates "its message to the prejudices and interests of the surrounding world." Strait is the gate and narrow is the way . . . What would Jesus find in His churches if He returned to earth?

## Who Can Answer?

Editorial in "The Christian Register"

WE are amazed at the present state of confusion which admits into most approved Christian circles such utterly radical people as the brilliant Abba Hillel Silver and the learnedly ponderous Henry Nelson Wieman. The Rabbi's new book is humanism from beginning to end; he is a liberal whose creed published in these columns a while ago would be accepted by our outmost left-wing brethren. Yet all the evangelical front-line men who get into the book-review pages praise to the point of hysteria the work of this utterly un-Christian prophet, and take him to their bosom much more closely than they do nine-tenths of the orthodox faithful.

We do not understand this uprush of emotion which is without any reason at all. The religious bookclub, we should add, endorses the Silver volume and thus it bears the modernist imprimatur. We are glad of it, for it helps along the liberating business; but still we wonder.

As for Professor Wieman, we are sure the evangelical brethren don't know what he is talking about, for he has changed from one position to another till to-day he is outside the Christian breastworks altogether. As Daniel Evans says of him, his God is in no sense a person; his concept is the thinnest kind of abstraction. Wieman is an "impersonal cosmologist." He does away with "mind and purpose in the universe," and God as a word is for him only a "squawk." Yet this impressive scholastic is so popular in orthodox seminaries and special conferences that he may almost be called a sensation.

These two examples of approval by the curious mind in prevailing religion ought to be a lesson to us, though just what it is we do not know.

## The 143rd Assembly (Editorial)

(Concluded)

in America have voted to discontinue negotiations along this line. It looks as though the United Presbyterian Church would be the only church that is even willing to give further consideration to this matter. It would seem, therefore, as though the labored and long drawn-out effort to unite the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches of the United States had virtually come to naught. As a Department of Church Cooperation the "Department of Church Cooperation and Union" may have considerable to its credit, but as a Department of Church Union it has as yet hardly justified its existence.

Attention is directed to what is said

about the new Judicial Commission on pages 9, 10 and 18.

One of the most significant actions taken by the Assembly was to authorize the General Council to discontinue the Presbyterian Magazine. There will be time enough to discuss the significance of that action, however, after the General Council has availed itself of the authority conferred upon it—if the contingency upon which the exercise of this authority is dependent should become a reality.

Broadly speaking it does not seem to us inaccurate to characterize the 143rd General Assembly as a "Yes and No" Assembly. One can readily find much to commend, but it is equally easy to find much to condemn. As a whole it, perhaps, affords more warrant for encouragement on the part of conservatives than did the Assemblies immediately preceding. That, however, is not saying a great deal.

## Notes on Biblical Exposition

(Concluded)

meaning of it being, if it had to be analyzed, very similar to that which appears in (1).

Then what is the meaning of the word "still" in the clause, "If I were still pleasing men"? Does the word mean, "still after I have become a Christian," or "still after the error has attained such proportions as to call forth an uncompromising stand;" or does it mean, as we have taken it, "still after I have been entrusted with a gospel which by its very nature excludes man-pleasing in the messenger who proclaims it"? It must be said that this last interpretation seems to depend upon the correctness of those manuscripts that read "for" at the beginning of verse 11, as over against other manuscripts that read "but" or "and." We are inclined to hold rather strongly to our interpretation and to the reading that supports it.

Fortunately these questions about the meaning of the passage in detail do not seriously affect the general sense. Paul has been entrusted with a gospel that is not his own and that demands unswerving loyalty in the man who proclaims it. That gospel in its very nature is not "according to man"; it does not conform to any standard which man might set up.

# The 143rd General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

## A Description and An Interpretation

FOR an increasing number of commissioners, the activities of the General Assembly really begin with the Pre-Assembly Conferences. The chief of these is the Pre-Assembly Conference on Evangelism. It is indeed splendid and inspiring to think of gathering the representatives of the Church together to consider how men may be brought into a saving knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ. To bring Christ to men and men to Christ is the fundamental justification for the existence of the Church.

In our times, almost every Protestant Church in Christendom is composed of two elements: those who hold to the Gospel of the Church universal as stated in their historic standards, and those who, in the name of "modern thought" have forsaken that Gospel for another gospel, which is no Gospel at all. The one preach a supernatural Christ who gives to men a supernatural salvation (freely bestowing upon them a blessedness which they could never merit), while the others preach a "Christ" stripped of His New Testament character, to be an example and inspiration to men in their search for God. Here are not two variations of the same great way of salvation, here are utterly opposed messages. One God could not be the God of them both. If the man who holds to historic Christian doctrine is right, the Modernist is leading men to destruction. If the Modernist were right, then the preaching of the blood of the Cross as the only way by which guilty man can be reconciled to God would be blasphemy. For the god of the Modernist is a different god than the God of the Christian, different in nature, and different in his requirements to man. How then, can true Christian men consent to "cooperate" with Modernists when the latter are leading men, not to the light of God, but to endless tragedy and despair? Many good men are confused because the Modernist uses words and phrases dear to the Christian heart, while understanding them in a sense strange to the believing Christian. When the Modernist says "Come to Jesus" he means "Come and see the example of this wonderful character. Receive courage and inspiration to follow him, to be loyal to his teachings and principles." The true Christian means, and thinks the Modernist means "Come to the only One who can save you. He suffered in our place upon the Cross, to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God. You are dead in trespasses and sins, but Christ offers you life. If you come to Him in believing repent-

ance, He offers you a forgiveness you do not merit, and a character as His child to which you could never attain through human effort." So that while the Modernist and the Christian may say the same words, it is obvious that one is calling men to salvation through human effort, while the other is calling men to the everlasting mercy of God in Christ. Both Modernist and Christian are engaging in "evangelism." But no Christian evangelism is possible today that does not preach Christ as the only way in clear distinction from the pseudo-evangelism of Modernism. That is, Christian evangelism includes both a wooing of men to come to Christ, and a warning against the misleading and destructive teachings of Modernism.

To the mind of the present writer, the great weakness, in general, of the Pre-Assembly conferences on evangelism is that the clear distinction between the Christian and other evangelists is not sufficiently presented. The main emphasis is upon the *means* of evangelism. But it will not profit the Church to be expert in means unless she is faithful to the *substance* of the evangel. Yet in the conferences, despite the prevalence of Modernism in the Presbyterian Church, it is rare to hear any reference to it. It seems tacitly assumed that the whole Church is engaged in the same enterprise.

It is also a source of regret that year after year the conference on evangelism must be used by those who are in control of the machinery of the Church as part of the campaign of their selected candidate for Moderator of the Assembly. Last year CHRISTIANITY TODAY protested against this abuse; this year it was repeated. It had been known for some months that the election of Dr. Lewis S. Mudge, Stated Clerk of the Assembly for ten years, was being advocated by those in temporary power in the Church. Considerable campaigning had been quietly done (not, we are sure, at the instigation of Dr. Mudge) in various Presbyteries of the Church. So it was no surprise for many to see the name of Dr. Mudge upon the program, even as the name of Dr. Kerr had appeared last year. And no matter how fine a speech a man may make under such circumstances, the fact that he has been asked to speak while his candidacy is known and avowed is to prostitute the purposes of the conference.

### Dr. Macartney's Great Address

The high light of the Conference on Evangelism was the great address which

closed it. This was delivered by the Rev. Clarence E. Macartney, D.D., Minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, in whose great edifice the conference was meeting. Dr. Macartney spoke from the text, "Watchman, what of the night?" It was an address which thrilled the heart again and again, as he fearlessly called upon the Church to return to its great task of witnessing to the facts of Christ, and to the moral teachings which flow from the Gospel. He spoke of "the inadequacy of half-gospels and near-gospels, the barrenness and impotence of 'psychological' and 'social' gospels, their inability to heal the deep, abysmal fountains of the world's woe and sin." He warned that the witness to Christ must be a corporate witness, that the Church must speak as one concerning Him. "The revival of the eighteenth century came out of a new and strange yearning for the state of the lost, and a desire to bring them to Christ." In concluding he warned that revival would only come through prayer and repentance. Concluding, he told of the man who, while in London, visited the room in Aldersgate Street where John Wesley came into a saving knowledge of Christ. His soul shaken by the memory of all that Wesley's conversion had meant to the world, the visitor, with tears streaming down his face, knelt, raised his arms to heaven and cried, "Lord Jesus, do it again! Lord Jesus, do it again!"

While the Pre-Assembly conferences were held in Churches, the Assembly itself was held in a building called the "Syria Mosque" located near the University of Pittsburgh in the East end of the city. The writer would like to enter his annual objection to the custom of holding the sessions of the highest court of our Church in a secular atmosphere. Doubtless a great auditorium is commodious but whatever may be gained, much more is lost. The Assembly ought to meet in a Presbyterian Church, and if one of sufficient size cannot be secured, then the size of the Assembly ought to be reduced. The name "Syria Mosque" would have made strange reading to our ancestors of the Reformation as a meeting place for a General Assembly of Christ's Church. Of course the building is not a mosque in the strict sense of the term, for it is the property of a masonic order, and not a place of worship for Mohammedans.

As is the custom, the morning of Thursday was taken up with the sermon of the Moderator of the 142nd Assembly, and the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which was jointly

dispensed by the Moderator and the Clerk. Dr. Kerr's sermon, while not generally regarded as up to his usual accomplishments, was listened to attentively.

Thursday afternoon came the formal constituting and organizing of the Assembly. The chief business of the afternoon was, of course, the election of the Moderator.

#### The Election of the Moderator

When the Moderator of the last Assembly announced that it was time for nominations, the first person on his feet was the Rev. Thomas Law Coyle, of Milton, Pa. He called "Mr. Moderator" clearly and loudly an appreciable time before anyone else did so. The Moderator, however, who was not expecting Mr. Coyle to arise, did not recognize him, but recognized Dr. George N. Luccock, D.D., of the Presbytery of Wooster, who was expected to nominate Dr. Mudge. Dr. Luccock nominated Dr. Mudge in an address that lacked any great appeal to the commissioners, if the amount of applause he received is any index of their sentiments.

He said that Dr. Mudge was well groomed sartorially, evidencing the care bestowed upon a properly domesticated husband; he was well groomed temperamentally, abounding in gentlemanliness, culture and courtesy; he was well groomed doctrinally, being fundamentally up to date; he was well groomed ecclesiastically. He was an embodied digest, and his official house was in order so that the Stated Clerk could absent himself on Moderatorial duties, leaving his routine affairs in the hands of a capable and consecrated staff. Dr. Mudge, said Dr. Luccock, was graciousness and wisdom personified. He was learned in ecclesiastical law. In the name of all the presbyteries and all the areas of the Church, Dr. Luccock asked for Dr. Mudge's election as Moderator.

Mr. Coyle then secured the floor, and nominated the Rev. David DeForest Burrell, D.D., of Williamsport, Pa., in a brilliant and impassioned speech. He presented Dr. Burrell not as a candidate for the office whose pictures had appeared in the metropolitan press, nor as one who enjoyed high official position, but as a working pastor who was bearing the heat and the burden of the day. He felt that there was a desire on the part of many of the commissioners for the election of a pastor. Dr. Burrell was a self-made man, a defender of the faith. Dr. Luccock had suggested that Dr. Mudge be named by acclamation, but he felt that the Church was large enough to consider two names. He concluded by again urging that not officialdom, but the pastorate be honored in the selection of the Moderator. Upon the conclusion of his speech he was greeted with such an outburst of applause, that it seemed as if he would prevail with the Assembly.

The nomination of Dr. Burrell was seconded by the Rev. John H. Lamb, D.D., of Lawton, Oklahoma, who also urged that in these troublous times the Church should elect a pastor.

The seconder for Dr. Mudge was the Rev. M. A. Matthews, D. D., of Seattle. Dr. Matthews, as everyone agrees, saved the day for the candidacy of Dr. Mudge. He urged the election of Dr. Mudge on the ground that he was the "drudgery man" of the Church, and that he should be accorded the honor because of his service as stated clerk. Dr. Matthews pleaded with the commissioners to "do their duty" by electing Dr. Mudge.

As usual, the voting was by "electing sections" which are artificial divisions into which commissioners are grouped in order to expedite the voting. The vote for Moderator was distributed as follows, by sections:

1. Synods of New England, New York and Vermont (Welsh), and New York—Presbyteries of Albany, Champlain, Eastern Persia, Hudson, North River, North Siam, St. Lawrence, South Siam, Troy, Utica.

Mudge 21 Burrell 18

2. Synod of New York—Presbyteries of Binghamton, Buffalo, Cayuga, Chemung, Chile, Genesee, Geneva, Lyons, Niagara, Otsego, Rochester, Steuben, Syracuse.

Mudge 24 Burrell 13

3. Synod of New York—Presbyteries of Brooklyn-Nassau, Long Island, New York, Porto Rico, Westchester.

Mudge 23 Burrell 17

4. Synod of New Jersey.

Mudge 31 Burrell 21

5. Synods of Baltimore, Catawba, West Virginia, Atlantic.

Mudge 32 Burrell 8

6. Synod of Pennsylvania—Presbyteries of Chester, Lackawanna, Lehigh, Philadelphia, Philadelphia North.

Mudge 24 Burrell 18

7. Synod of Pennsylvania—Presbyteries of Blairsville, Butler, Carlisle, Clarion, Erie, Huntington, Kittanning, Northumberland, Redstone, Westminster.

Mudge 22 Burrell 15

8. Synods of Pennsylvania (Welsh), Ohio and Western Pennsylvania (Welsh), and Ohio—Presbyteries of Mahoning, Steubenville; Pennsylvania—Presbyteries of Beaver, Pittsburgh, Shenango, Washington, Western Africa.

Mudge 18 Burrell 18

9. Synod of Ohio—Presbyteries of Athens, Chillicothe, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Lima, Marion, Portsmouth, St. Clairsville, Toledo, Wooster, Zanesville.

Mudge 21 Burrell 24

10. Synods of Indiana and Michigan.

Mudge 25 Burrell 17

11. Synod of Illinois—Presbyteries of Bloomington, Chicago, Freeport, Ottawa, Peoria, Rock River, Springfield.

Mudge 29 Burrell 12

12. Synods of Minnesota, Minnesota (Welsh), Wisconsin, Wisconsin (Welsh).

Mudge 21 Burrell 23

13. Synods of Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Mudge 11 Burrell 24

14. Synods of Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming.

Mudge 21 Burrell 17

15. Synods of Iowa and West, German.

Mudge 23 Burrell 15

16. Synods of Kansas and Oklahoma.

Mudge 10 Burrell 26

17. Synods of Missouri, Canadian, East Tennessee, and Illinois—Presbyteries of Alton, Cairo, Ewing, Mattoon, Rushville.

Mudge 31 Burrell 14

18. Synods of Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Mudge 20 Burrell 23

19. Synods of Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas.

Mudge 28 Burrell 13

20. Synods of Oregon and Washington.

Mudge 28 Burrell 17

21. Synods of Utah and California—Presbyteries of Nevada, The Redwoods, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Jose, Santa Barbara.

Mudge 29 Burrell 11

22. Synods of Arizona, New Mexico, and California—Presbyteries of Los Angeles and Riverside.

Mudge 27 Burrell 15

(Total vote, 899. Mudge 519, Burrell 379, Luccock 1 vote from Section 11.)

On analyzing the vote, it is interesting to observe that Dr. Mudge lost electing sections in which were contained the representatives of the following synods: Ohio, Minnesota, Minnesota (Welsh), Wisconsin, Wisconsin (Welsh), Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Oklahoma, Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, and Tennessee. That this vote showed a state of disaffection with the present state of the Church is undeniable. The fact that Dr. Burrell, who was put forward not for personal reasons, but as the representative of those who were dissatisfied with things as they are, should receive such a large vote was accepted as a plain intimation that the rank and file have at last begun to turn and to demand their rightful place in the government of the Church. Indeed William T. Ellis, noted journalist, writing the next morning in the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* said:

"Harmony by prearrangement went glimmering yesterday afternoon when the Presbyterian General Assembly deeply divided into its election of a moderator. The scheduled plan to make moderator the stated clerk of the assembly Rev. Dr. Lewis S. Mudge of Philadelphia, was carried; but there were 379 commissioners, out of the 899 voting, who cast their ballots for another man, Rev. Dr. David DeForest Burrell of Williamsport. . .

"It was not personal opposition to Dr. Mudge that so nearly upset the ecclesiastical applecart, but resentment against politics in

the church, and dominance by a coterie. Dr. Mudge has made an extraordinarily good stated clerk; and he is a man of charm and ability; of distinguished Presbyterian traditions. After the movement to elect the stated clerk to the moderatorship by acclamation had gained some headway in the presbyteries, a certain church leader in the Northwest sent out a letter to 'key men,' proposing that a 'slate' for three years be adopted—Dr. Mudge to be elected in 1931; Rev. Dr. William Hiram Foulkes, of Newark, in 1932, and Rev. Henry B. Master, of the pension board, in 1933. Dr. Mudge and Dr. Foulkes indignantly repudiated this; but the mischief was done. The presbyteries are deeply resentful against dictation by ecclesiastical politicians; and against dictation from the higher circles. Therefore they seized the opportunity to register their feeling by yesterday's surprising vote for Dr. Burrell, whom few of them had ever heard of before his name was eloquently put in nomination.

"One experienced observer called today's election 'the last stand of the Old Guard.' For there can be no mistaking the temper of the presbyters' opposition to ecclesiastical politics. The mood of this assembly is all for democracy."

When the election was over, and the result had been announced, Dr. Burrell, to the surprise of many, moved that the election be made unanimous. Had the candidates been pitted against each other simply because of personal abilities and accomplishments, the case would have been different. But to the minds of many of the commissioners who had voted for Dr. Burrell as the representative of a principle and a protest, his action was hard to understand. The conditions against which they had protested by their votes still remained. Few, if any, had voted for him for personal reasons. Then why, they asked, should the principle be surrendered? It is impossible for one to understand the Pittsburgh Assembly without knowing that a great body of commissioners, controlled by nobody save themselves, were dissatisfied with things as they are, and wanted an opportunity to do something about it. The leaders, quick to sense the pulse of the Assembly, recognized this situation immediately, and took steps to meet it. Yet, it was amusing to watch "prominent leaders" not knowing what the Assembly might bring forth, walking meekly and unobtrusively, in sharp contrast to the pride of other years. The spirit of revolt was in the air. But would it crystallize?

#### Chairmen of Committees

On Friday morning Dr. Mudge announced his selection of chairmen of the various standing committees: They were: *Bills and Overtures*, The Rev. Geo. N. Luccock, Presbytery of Wooster; *National Missions*, the Rev. Herbert Booth Smith, Presbytery of Los Angeles; *Foreign Missions*, the Rev. W.

White, Presbytery of New York; *Christian Education*, the Rev. John E. Wishart, Presbytery of San Francisco; *Pensions*, the Rev. David DeForest Burrell, Presbytery of Northumberland; *Polity*, the Rev. Mark A. Matthews, Presbytery of Seattle; *Theological Seminaries*, the Rev. Robert M. Labaree, Presbytery of Philadelphia North; *Finance*, Ruling Elder Royal R. Watkins, Presbytery of Dallas; *Mileage*, Ruling Elder David Styer, Presbytery of Monmouth; *Leave of Absence*, the Rev. L. Carmon Bell, Presbytery of Huron; *Synodical Records*, the Rev. H. L. McCrorey, Presbytery of Catawba; *Nomination of Members of General Council*, the Rev. Hugh T. Kerr, Presbytery of Pittsburgh; *Nomination of Members of Permanent Judicial Commission*, the Rev. W. Clyde Howard, Presbytery of Chicago; *Resolutions of Thanks*, the Rev. Wm. H. Hopkins, Presbytery of Albany.

A large part of Friday morning—much more than was necessary—was taken up with the presentation of three gavels to the new Moderator. Gavels are, of course, a necessity, and their presentation is a custom. But in an Assembly which it has been estimated costs sixty dollars a minute while in session, they ought to be presented with fewer flourishes.

#### "Spiritual Emphasis" and Repentance

The most important business of Friday morning was the presentation of a paper from the General Council, on the subject of "Spiritual Emphasis." The Council described this as "the supreme issue of this Assembly."

If a nut and bolt manufacturer were to announce that this year he proposed to turn his attention to nuts and bolts, or if a Railroad should declare its intention of paying attention to transportation this year, many would wonder, What have they been doing before? and What else do they exist to do? And yet, when leaders in the Church solemnly assure us that the Church should emphasize spiritual things, there are many who hardly realize the amazing confession involved. If the Church does not exist to bring the spiritual life of God into the spirits of men through Jesus Christ and Him crucified, what does it exist to do? The whole paper of the General Council gives clear evidence of almost boundless ignorance of things as they are, and of the necessary conditions precedent to a great revival. The truth is, that we are living as Churches and as individuals in great sin. We are tolerating unbelief in our midst, even congratulating ourselves on broadmindedness in doing nothing about it. For the honor of the Christ of the New Testament most of us are unwilling to raise a finger. We are living in the sin of prayerlessness. We are living in the sin of conformity to this world, its ambitions and its standards. We are living in the appalling sin of utter carelessness of the fate of our brother men for whom Christ died. We are living in the sin

of being willing to take everything from God, and to render nothing back out of an endlessly rising fountain of gratitude. But the root sin is the sin of unbelief, and in its many forms we are all guilty of it. In God's own name, how can we expect a great revival without repentance and reformation? Without repentance that goes deep? But in all this paper of the General Council, there is nothing about repentance, nothing about our sin. It is shallow. Instead of realizing that no revival has ever come save through such humiliation and agony of spirit as will be satisfied with nothing less than a deep, purifying work of Divine grace, it is satisfied and complacent. It says: "In other periods of history when the Church faced an indifferent and hostile world, the Church was not always aware of its failure. The Church today is wide awake concerning the present urgency. It has rightly appraised the situation. It is not wasting its energies on issues that divide. It is intent upon the central issue . . ." And in answer to the question What is that issue? It drifts off into the "Vague language so dear to religious liberalism" as Dr. Machen calls it, with pious sentences that are susceptible of either a modernist or an evangelical interpretation. But how far they are from true evangelicalism is seen in the fact that there is no mention of the Cross of Christ as the only hope of a perishing world, no reference to the power of His resurrection which He is willing to bestow upon us fully only when we have repented, no recognition of the great facts that lie at the heart of the Gospel. It will probably be heralded as a great spiritual event in a portion of the religious press. Yet such a paper presents not spiritual leadership, but spiritual self-satisfaction and sterility.

Friday also saw the report of the department of Vacancy and Supply, and the submission of a new plan of handling this perennial question. More will appear concerning it later in this report.

#### Fraternal Delegates

On Saturday morning, the Assembly heard the Fraternal delegates. It must be understood by those not familiar with Assembly procedure that the business of the Assembly is so arranged that it normally spends the first half of the week marking time and the last half voting "aye." All business must be considered by committees which report to the Assembly with recommendations. So most of the long addresses usually appear by Monday at the latest. However, the greeting of the Fraternal delegates were, on the whole, interesting. The delegates were: the Rev. Geo. E. Ross, D.D., from the Presbyterian Church in Canada; the Rev. H. A. Kent, D.D., from the "United Church of Canada;" the Rev. James Black, D.D., from the Church of Scotland; the Rev. Vaclav Losa of the Czech Brethren Evangelical Church of Czechoslovakia, the Assembly's

"little sister, older than any other Church, tracing its ancestry direct to John Huss in the 15th century, Calvinistic 100 years before Calvin was born;" the Rev. Guido Miegge, from the Waldensian Church of Italy; the Rev. Ching-yi Cheng, D.D., from "the Church of Christ in China;" and the Rev. S. N. Talib-ud-din from the United Church of North India. Greetings were also exchanged during the week between the Assembly and the General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. and the United Presbyterian Church, both of which were then sitting.

On Saturday morning the budget of the General Council of the General Assembly was presented by J. Willison Smith, Esq., of Philadelphia. It was approved without much comment, except for the item of \$18,500 for the so-called (and in the opinion of this writer the miscalled) "Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America." Upon motion of Dr. Mark Matthews, the item was referred back to the General Council of the Assembly for reconsideration. Such action was likened by some to sending a racketeer to be tried and judged by his faithful henchmen. Every informed person knew that the sentiment in the General Council would be overwhelmingly in favor of the Federal Council. Dr. Matthews could hardly have been ignorant of that fact.

The report of the Board of Pensions was presented to the Assembly at the Saturday morning session. The most interesting feature in connection with this report, at least to the present writer, was the fact that, while the Church finds no difficulty paying large salaries and even larger expense accounts for meandering officials and secretaries, it finds itself unable to give more than a mere pittance to those needy superannuate Ministers or their destitute widows who are on the rolls of the Relief Department. This is not the fault of the Board of Pensions; it is the fault and sin of the whole Church that it forgets so soon and that it estimates the value of service by worldly standards of prominence and fame.

#### Church Union

On Saturday morning the report of the Department of Church Cooperation and Union was partially made by the Rev. J. Ross Stevenson, D.D. He dealt with two proposed unions,—that with the Methodists, which the department considers to be yet a matter for the far far distant future, and the projected union with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., the United Presbyterian Church of North America, the Reformed Church in the U. S. and the Reformed Church in America. He recommended and it was authorized by the Assembly that a conference be held with representatives of the negotiating Churches, which conference should prepare a definite basis of union to be presented to the next Assemblies or General Synods of the Churches. The over-

tures relating to Creed subscription and property rights in the proposed union were referred by the Assembly to the Department for report at the next Assembly. The matter of property involves the relation of congregations that might not concur in the proposed union. According to the tentative plan, such congregations would lose all their property, which is manifestly unjust. The Canadian "union" (more properly a disruption) has taught a lesson to the entire world of the folly of any attempt to coerce Presbyterians into "unions" without their consent, and the intense bitterness in Canada is due in large part to the fact that the so-called United Church attempted, and very nearly succeeded in its attempt, to get all the property of the Presbyterian Church from the great section which would not join the union, preferring to remain Presbyterian. Whether the Department of Church Cooperation and Union will commit the colossal blunder of following in the footsteps of the inept Church unionists of Canada yet remains to be seen. If they do they are going to receive a terrible surprise. It is doubtful, however, if more than a small proportion of the Commissioners knew, when they were voting "aye" on the reference to Dr. Stevenson's department, what the overture was all about. They knew it had something to do with Church union, that the Committee on Bills and Overtures had recommended such reference, and that was about all. Far reaching measures are thus sometimes quietly passed through the Assembly with such smoothness that even commissioners who have voted do not find out what they have actually done until long after.

#### The Federal Council

Saturday morning also saw the bringing in of two reports concerning the Federal Council of Churches, one from the Majority of the Committee on Bills and Overtures, and the other from the Minority. They were as follows:

#### The Majority Report

"The Committee on Bills and Overtures submits the following in answer to Overtures 7 and 14, and Memorials 2 and 3 (not in the White Book):

"(1) The General Assembly disapproves ecclesiastical pronouncements on the subject of birth control.

"(2) The General Assembly deems it important to remind the Church that the Federal Council cannot and does not assume to represent its constituent denominations in this or any deliverance of opinion not specifically authorized by the denominations. The Federal Council has itself recently expressed this view in the following action taken by its Administrative Committee May 20, 1931: 'The publication of such reports (as that on birth control) is authorized by the Administrative Committee not as expressing its own conclusions or the view of the constituent

denominations, but rather as the result of the independent investigations made by specialized committees. Such reports are not to be construed as declarations of the policy or attitude of the Council or of its administrative committee, or of the denominations, but as means of information for helping church members to arrive at their own conclusions.'

"(3) That no further action be taken.

GEORGE N. LUCOCK,

"Chairman,

"Committee on Bills and Overtures."

#### The Minority Report

The Minority report was identical with the Majority report except for the third paragraph. This paragraph, in the Minority report, read as follows:

"3. The General Assembly hereby and herein declares its intention to withdraw from membership in and financial support of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, and that such complete withdrawal be made at the earliest practical date.

(Signed) Jones Earl Corwin,  
Thos. C. Osborne,  
Harrison S. Chapman."

The Assembly set Monday afternoon at four o'clock as the time for taking up these reports, of which more later.

Sunday, as usual, saw many of the Commissioners occupying pulpits in the churches of Pittsburgh and vicinity. Dr. Mudge preached in the Shadyside Church, the host of the Assembly. The pulpit of the First Church was occupied by Dr. Matthews in the morning.

Monday morning was relatively uneventful. The report of the standing committee on Christian education was received, and a number of representatives of the board were heard. The Rev. Harry L. Bowby, General Secretary of the Lord's Day Alliance made a characteristic address. The Assembly was entertained by the Westminster Choir with excellent musical selections.

#### The Presbyterian Magazine

Monday afternoon was eventful. The report of the General Council concerning the *Presbyterian Magazine* was given as follows:

"In facing the problems of publicity for church causes through periodicals, we are confronted by certain divergent and yet related factors.

"First. The pastors are the key men in any well-devised plan of united promotion. They must be informed and quickened if that promotion is effectively to reach the members of our churches. They need and ought to have in their hands specially prepared material, in vital and graphic form, dealing with the enterprises of the Church, with the assurance that such material is for their sole use in sermonic and other pastoral presentation.



"Second. The membership of the Church needs to be reached and stimulated upon a far larger scale and in more effective ways than have yet been devised. The present method of publicity through periodicals is far from the ideal because it introduces competitive elements with our program and sets over against several independent weekly church papers, none of which has a large subscription list, an official publication subsidized by benevolence funds and with an equally unsatisfactory subscription list.

"Third. The ideal solution of the problem in hand would be:

(a) To provide a monthly bulletin, ably edited under the auspices of the General Council, for the pastors and ministers of our Church, the bulletin to contain terse, well edited and up-to-the-minute information concerning what the Church, through its Boards and Agencies, is doing and planning.

(b) To secure the consolidation of weekly church papers so that there should not be more than two in the field, and that such papers should be assisted to become vital and adequate, although not official organs of the work of the entire Church. Such a result to be achieved both by mutual cooperation in the furnishing and publishing of suitable material and also by the furnishing of financial assistance by the General Council and the Boards in the form of paid advertising, the amount and character of such advertising to be determined in the light of the number of subscriptions to such papers, further and active assistance to be afforded by the General Council in the promotion of the circulation and use of such papers.

"Fourth. As a part of such a process, and toward the realization of such ideals, the General Council should be empowered to terminate the publication of the *Presbyterian Magazine*, making due provision for any unfulfilled obligations, when the proposal outlined in (a) and (b) shall have been sufficiently carried out, in the judgment of the General Council, to warrant such termination.

"Fifth. That the General Assembly be advised of the general nature of the proposed plans and be requested to authorize and direct the General Council to devise such plans in detail and to carry them out in the most effective way possible."

#### The Re-election of Dr. Mudge

The most important event of the afternoon was the re-election of Dr. Mudge as Stated Clerk for another term of five years. He was unopposed for the post. After his election as Moderator on the Thursday preceding, it had been freely rumored that other candidates would be mentioned. Many commissioners felt that Dr. Mudge should not hold the two most important offices in the Church simultaneously. Others felt entirely out of sympathy with his general point of

view regarding the maintenance of the doctrinal purity of the Church. It was a surprise and shock to many commissioners to hear Dr. Mudge nominated by Dr. Burrell, who had opposed him for Moderator. It was a further surprise to hear his nomination seconded by Dr. S. P. MacLennan of Hollywood. The action of Dr. Burrell had a marked effect upon the morale of that great body of commissioners who had voted for him, and practically killed the enthusiasm of the anti-bureaucratic movement in the Assembly. It left many commissioners and others puzzled and sick at heart. We need not here sit in judgment upon the motives that impelled Dr. Burrell to desert his conservative friends to go to the aid of the ecclesiastical machine against which his candidacy had been a protest. It is sufficient to record the fact, from which all may draw their own conclusions.

It should here be noted that the objection to Dr. Mudge is not what is usually called "personal." Many who oppose him for conscience sake have felt the influence of his gracious personality, and would be happy to call him a friend. Nor is the objection due to any dissatisfaction with his efficiency as Stated Clerk. The Church has probably never had a more efficient and dependable servant in his office. He has surrounded himself with a highly expert staff. The objection to Dr. Mudge runs deeper,—to the whole drift of the Church in these times, for which many believe Dr. Mudge must assume a large share of responsibility. It is not that Dr. Mudge is not able to keep the ecclesiastical machinery in order—he is—but because many believe he has the machine headed in the wrong direction—straight for the rocks. Nobody accuses Dr. Mudge of being a Modernist. But it seems clear that he favours an inclusive Church. It is just this complacency, this willingness to tolerate all shades of belief (except, of course, militant evangelicalism) that is robbing the Church of her power.

The committee on revision of the Book of Common Worship reported through its chairman, the Rev. Henry Van Dyke, D.D. The revised book was approved by the Assembly. From a rather superficial examination it does not seem to contain anything radically different from its predecessor, and ought to enrich the worship-life of the Church if rightly used.

Shortly before the hour set for discussion of the two reports concerning the Federal Council, the department of Church Cooperation and Union gave, through Dr. Stevenson, its report from the Federal Council. This was a fine bit of strategy, enabling Dr. Stevenson to make a very persuasive plea for the Federal Council before the matter was actually under formal discussion. So much time elapsed, however, that the matter was laid over at four o'clock until the next day at noon.

#### The "Birth Control" Fiasco

It is possible that the least heroic and popular group of men in the Assembly was the Commission on Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage. This Commission, as everyone knows, first made a report to the Assembly, which was included in the "Blue Book," one feature of which was a paragraph endorsing a limited practice of "birth control." This portion of the report immediately became a bone of contention, and so much opposition was aroused that had the report been presented in its original form, the Syria Mosque would doubtless have been the scene of a near massacre. As it was, the Commission held several hurried meetings, and under the guidance of its chairman, the Rev. Ralph Marshall Davis, D.D. of Erie, Pa., took the inglorious course of rewriting the report so as to omit reference to the controverted subject. We would greatly honor the members of the Commission if we could believe that their opinion suddenly changed on the subject, but we suspect the general public is right in believing that the change was due to expediency rather than conviction. If they still believed they were right they should have stood to their guns like men no matter how numerous or vociferous the opposition. And if the first report did not represent their convictions it should never have been submitted.

The Commission did not go entirely without fruit for its labors, however, for its report as approved by the Assembly authorized the appointment of a committee to study the advisability of amending Chapter Twenty-four of the Confession of Faith, entitled "Of Marriage and Divorce" by substituting a new chapter written by the Commission, and more in line with its ideas.

#### Resolution Concerning Publication of Reports

After the conclusion of the consideration of the Commission on Marriage, etc., the following resolution was offered to the Assembly, and was adopted. It is as follows:

"That the General Assembly regards it as unfortunate that certain preliminary findings of its Boards, Commissions, or other Agencies, should have at times been published in the press throughout the country and have been commonly understood by the public as representing the considered and final judgment of the Church; and that, therefore, the General Assembly directs the General Council to devise means whereby the injudicious or premature publication of matters subject to serious difference of opinion or matters subject to sensational or misleading interpretations may be prevented."

On Tuesday morning the Moderator suggested that in order to fulfill the intention of "this very fine resolution," the Stated Clerk be authorized, during the coming year, to modify or interpret the Standing Rule of the Assembly concerning the Blue Book, which reads:

"All reports of Special and other Committees shall be delivered to the Stated Clerk on or before April 1, in each year, shall be printed by him, and copies shall be sent, in bound form, to Commissioners, so far as practicable, immediately upon notification of their election; and copies shall also be delivered to the Assembly on the second day of the sessions.

"All reports included in the above bound form are thereby released for public comment or quotation, but such release does not preclude subsequent changes in any report before its presentation to the General Assembly."

The Moderator suggested that perhaps it might be found desirable to copyright the Blue Book, which would protect the contents from undesirable publicity but might work hardship in relation to legitimate publicity. He desired to consult those concerned, including the editors of the recognized Presbyterian periodicals. The Assembly voted that the Stated Clerk be granted discretion and authority so to interpret the Standing Rule for the coming year.

The purpose of the standing rule which the Stated Clerk is thus authorized to ignore at pleasure, is to make it possible for commissioners to the Assembly to be informed in advance concerning the issues that will be before them for decision. It is to keep anything from being "sprung" upon the Assembly or the Church. No doubt the persons who presented the resolution meant well. But the remedy for such a situation as arose this year is not suppression of the report—for that would have meant that no one could have opposed it for nobody would have known what it recommended. The remedy lies not in the censorship of reports, but in the appointment of commissions composed of men whose character will be a guarantee that their reports will not bring discredit and shame upon the Church. Such matters need not concealment, but cleansing.

On Tuesday morning it was voted to send several overtures down to the Presbyteries. These overtures will be explained in the next issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

#### Affirmationists on the Judicial Commission

The feature of this morning was the report of the Committee to nominate members of the Judicial Commission. The Judicial Commission was appointed *de novo* this year, because of the adoption of the overture changing its constitution. The following were nominated and elected:

Nominations for a period of six years:

Ministers:

Dr. W. P. Lampe, Missouri Synod; Dr. Robert Hastings Nichols, Synod of New York; Dr. Archibald Cardle, Synod of Iowa.

Elders:

The Honorable Clifford L. Hilton, Synod of Minnesota; Mr. C. D. Barr, Synod of Alabama.

Nominations for a period of four years:

Ministers:

Dr. Floyd Poe, Synod of Texas; Dr. W. W. Johnstone, Synod of Illinois; Dr. Herbert Booth Smith, Synod of California.

Elders:

Judge George C. Abernathy, Synod of Oklahoma; Mr. James H. Adams, Synod of Nebraska.

Nomination for a period of two years:

Ministers:

Dr. Herbert K. England, Synod of New Jersey; Dr. Robert Watson, Synod of New England.

Elders:

Mr. Louis M. Stevens, Synod of Pennsylvania; Mr. G. Hall Harris, Synod of Baltimore; Mr. A. A. Reed, Synod of Colorado.

Of the eight Ministers elected to the Commission, four are signers of the Auburn Affirmation! They are Drs. Nichols (one of the moving spirits of the Affirmation), Cardle, Poe and England. None of the other members of the Commission have distinguished themselves as defenders of the Faith. Sometimes the most important business of an Assembly is thus quietly done. Perhaps none of the Commissioners realized that they were aiding in the picking of a "packed jury" for the judicial cases involving doctrine which will doubtless come up for decision in the next few years.

#### The Federal Council

The fate of the Federal Council proposals was settled in comparatively short order. The Rev. Jones Earl Corwin, of Pana, Ill., presented the Minority report. The General Council offered a long paper, which when read by Dr. Kerr sounded more like an oration than a resolution, defending the Federal Council. When another member of the minority of the Bills and Overtures Committee desired to speak he was told by Moderator Mudge that he must wait until some other person had spoken against the minority report, when he would have an opportunity of speaking. After a speaker in favor of the Federal Council was heard, this gentleman tried vainly to secure the recognition he had been promised. Instead, Dr. Mudge recognized a motion to lay the minority report on the table, which was seconded and carried. This impressed many as being unfair, for while a motion to lay on the table is always in order and undebatable, yet the maker of such a motion must have a right to the floor, which he did not have in view of the Moderator's promise. After the minority report was out of the way, the majority report was adopted. Thereupon Dr. Mark A. Matthews arose, and, after the matter was beyond recall, launched into an attack upon the Federal Council, offering a resolution which was adopted as follows:

"That the whole question of the continuance of the Federal Council of Churches and our participation in it be carefully studied by

our General Council, and that through our General Council the Federal Council be now instructed to hereafter hold its peace on all questions relating to morality and delicacy until we have had an opportunity of speaking to them about it."

Whether he so intended it, no man can say, but certainly there were those on both sides of the Federal Council dispute who became firmly convinced from his strategy that Dr. Matthews was really on their side. Certainly his influence could have taken the Church out of the Council, and had he spoken against it before the vote instead of afterward, the result in all probability would have been different.

It was also decided on Tuesday that the Assembly would not proceed with the plans offered by the General Council looking toward the reduction of the Assembly from about 950 to about 560 members.

The Committee on Polity, of which Dr. Matthews was chairman, reported in the matter of an overture from Los Angeles inquiring whether a session could force a member to accept a certificate of dismission while not instituting process that "while a session may earnestly counsel a member to transfer his membership to another church, it has no power to compel him to do so." Back of this case it is said there was an effort by a modernist session to get rid of some conservative members in a church. According to this action of the Assembly, those persons are still very much in.

The old Permanent Judicial Commission gave judgment in a number of cases, none of fundamental importance.

Various members of the Boards were elected on Wednesday morning, and the last items of business were cleared up. The standing committee on Foreign Missions reported, and a celebration of the 100th Anniversary of the Western Foreign Missionary Society, organized in Pittsburgh in 1831 was observed. Speeches were made by the Rev. J. A. K. Kelso, D.D., President of Western Theological Seminary, the Rev. C. E. Macartney, D.D., and Robert E. Speer, D.D.

The Assembly adjourned to meet in Denver, Colorado, in 1932, after a spirited contest between Seattle and Denver for the honor. Los Angeles also ran, but was not a serious competitor.

This report of the 143rd General Assembly is doubtless imperfect in that it omits much that was done. It is believed, however, that the most significant actions of the Assembly have been explained and interpreted. The most forcible conclusion to which one is driven is, that the present ecclesiastical machine is cracking, and that the leaders know it better, perhaps, than do most of those on the outside looking in. As in all dying oligarchies, it seeks, at the end, to fortify itself by frantic and wholesale appointments of its own partisans to key positions—as witness the Affirmationists on the Judicial Commission. Such appointments are a sign,

not of strength, but of weakness. The Church is getting tired of mere well-oiled machinery, it hungers for the great realities of the everlasting Gospel. It is turning from self-important programs, movements and personal ambitions of men, back to the resources of God, those riches in glory in Christ Jesus which He freely bestows through His crucified and risen Son. It is the solemn belief of the present writer that we stand upon the threshold of that time of repentance, expectation and prayer that alone will usher in the great revival. And that revival will sweep everything unworthy before it.

H. McA. G.

### Church Union Defeated in Two Denominations

THE proposed union of the five major Presbyterian and Reformed Churches in the United States received a fatal blow early in June, when both the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. (Southern Presbyterian Church) and the Reformed Church in America (Dutch Reformed Church) voted not to continue negotiations.

The action of the Southern Church was taken by its Assembly, at Montreat, N. C., on June 2. The Dutch Reformed Church voted not to proceed with the plans for Union on June 5, in its General Synod at Asbury Park, N. J. Principal opposition came from the Western section of this Church. Complete accounts of these gatherings, together with reports of other Assemblies, will appear in the next issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

### Ministerial Changes

#### Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

##### Calls

Gordon H. Mattice to Westminster Church, Rochester, N. Y.;  
 Randolph McCluggage to Bethel Church, Wichita, Kans.;  
 William G. Hall, Kingman, Kans. to Sedan, Kans.;  
 C. R. Koons, Stockham, Neb. to Blue Springs, Neb.;  
 G. S. Sutton, Marlborough Heights Church, Kansas City, Mo. to Herington, Kans.;  
 F. W. Gregg, Cody, Wyo. to become Stated Supply Lincoln, Kans.

##### Calls Accepted

B. L. Bergstrom, McBain, Mich. to Westminster Church, Port Huron, Mich.;  
 A. G. Howat, Lake City, Mich. to Second Church, Marlette, Mich.;  
 Walter L. Steiner, Chaplain's office U. S. Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Va. to Chaplain's office, Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N. J.;  
 Gilbert L. Boyd, Battle Creek, Mich. to First Church, Corry, Pa.;  
 Lloyd R. Bream, to Rocky Grove Church, Franklin, Pa.;  
 Robert Findlay, First Church, Cuba, N. Y. to North Church, Rochester, N. Y.;  
 George C. Noetling, Irondequoit Church, Rochester, N. Y. to Mt. Morris, N. Y.;  
 J. W. Boyer, Ph.D., First Church, Vincennes, Ind. to First Church, Saginaw, Mich.;

Will Amis, Monroe City, Ind. to First Church, Newburg, Ind.;  
 Fred S. Piper, Socorro, N. M. to Clovis, N. M.;  
 Lewis M. Lutz, Weyanwega, Wis. to be Stated Supply Community Church, McFadden, Wyo.;  
 Hugh K. Fulton, to Rawlins, Wyo.;  
 J. G. Reinhardt, Vail and Westside, Ia. to Menlo, Ia.;  
 William F. Fulton, to Salida, Colo.;  
 Wallace L. Kennedy, to Glenwood Springs, Colo.;  
 Ward F. Folsom, Community Church, Orondo, Wash. to Calvary Church, Tacoma, Wash.;  
 A. L. Allison, Anamosa, Ia. to Oakville, Ia.;  
 Scott I. Wallace, Wilbur, Wash. to Federated Church, Oakesdale, Wash.

##### Changed Addresses

Leonidas H. Eakes, Vinita, Okla.;  
 Jesse Griffiths, Concrete, Wash.

##### Ordinations

John Ross Hays, Green Ridge Church, Scranton, Pa., April 26;  
 Robert E. Farndon, North Avenue Church, New Rochelle, N. Y.;  
 Arthur C. Waiter, Blairsville, Pa. Presbytery, April 21;  
 Ralph Hartman, Madison, Wis. Presbytery, April 4.

##### Installations

A. J. Preston, Mackinaw City, Mich., May 5;  
 W. M. Bigham, First Church, Paris, Tenn., May 17;  
 Charles Stuckard, Cool Spring, Pa., May 5 and Fredonia, Pa., May 12;  
 Arthur T. Clark, Caledonia, N. Y., May 6;  
 Richard M. Mussen, Honeoye Falls, N. Y., June 8;  
 Charles M. Wyse, Coal Brook Church, Neffs, O., May 19;  
 John H. Lamy, Martins Ferry, O., May 21;  
 George F. Clark, Immanuel Church, Sulphur Springs, Ark.;  
 Byron Baird Evans, Welsh Church, Olyphant, Pa., April 1;  
 V. C. Dety, Wysox and Rome, N. Y., May 6;  
 F. P. Morrison, Wray, Colo., May.  
 A. W. Hollars, Eckley and Waverly, Colo., May;  
 E. J. Larson, Highland Park Church, Denver, Colo., May;  
 David M. Harrison, D.D., First Church, Berwick, Pa., April 28;  
 George Martin, Elysburg and Rush Churches, Pa., April 24 and May 3;  
 John T. Howarth, Licking, Sliga and Calensburg, Pa., April 28;  
 S. M. Morrow, Trenton, Mo.;  
 Luther M. Bicknell, Goshen, N. Y., April 23;  
 Hugh B. Jones, First Church, Sioux Falls, S. D., May 3;  
 C. C. Berryhill, Plum Creek, Pa., May 19 and Poke Run, Pa., May 15;  
 Donald E. West, Bryn Mawr Church, Cottage Grove, Wis., May 10.

##### Resignations

Alexander G. Howat, Lake City, Mich.;  
 E. D. Crawford, Beechwoods Church, Fall Creek, Pa.;  
 Andrew McAllen, Carrollton, Mo.;  
 B. A. Rundus, Miltonvale, Kans.;  
 Hugh Russell Frazer, Monticello, N. Y.;  
 Albert A. Martin, Hopewell Church, Thompson Ridge, N. Y.;  
 John W. Kennedy, D.D., Immanuel Church, Tacoma, Wash.;  
 I. Rothenberger, Lindsey, O.

##### Deaths

James W. Gilland, D.D., New Rochelle, N. Y., April 21;  
 A. F. Ploetz, Omaha, Neb.

### Presbyterian Church U. S.

##### Calls

Stuart Salmon, to Ripley, Tenn.

##### Calls Accepted

George F. Houck, to Beulah and Stony Run, Va.;  
 Archie Brown Williford, to Windy Cove, Va.;  
 T. A. Painter, Swannanoa, N. C. to Craigs-ville, Va.;  
 John MacEachern, Wisacky, S. C. to Whitmore, S. C.;  
 R. C. Long, D.D., to Greenwood, S. C.;  
 S. M. Glasgow, D.D., First Church, Knoxville, Tenn. to Independent Church, Savannah, Ga.;  
 Bernard E. Bain to Ivanhoe, Rio and Wardensville, W. Va.;  
 W. P. Dickey, D.D., to Allen Memorial Church, Edna, Tex.;  
 Paul S. VanDyke, to First Church, Kerrville, Tex.;  
 Henry Poirrier, to First Church, Robstown, Tex.

##### Changed Addresses

J. E. Knight, Thurmond, W. Va.;  
 John Campbell, Lookout Mountain, Tenn.;  
 J. Leighton Scott, 134 S. 44th St., Louisville, Ky.

##### Installations

E. E. Neff, Quicksand Church, Jackson, Ky.;  
 F. B. Estes, Orangeburg, S. C., May 24;  
 D. J. Currie, Edisto Island, S. C., June 7;  
 C. E. Sullivan, D.D., Willington, S. C.;  
 W. E. Powell, Concord and Fruitland, Tenn.;  
 J. A. Warren, Germantown and Eastland, Tenn.;  
 Peter Marshall, Covington, Ga.;  
 Wallace Alston, Rock Spring, Atlanta, Ga.;  
 Harold Smith, Woodlawn, Atlanta, Ga.;  
 Paul C. Morton, Beechmont Church, Louisville, Ky.;  
 J. Leo Hall, Caroline Hunter Memorial Church, Louisville, Ky.;  
 Wm. B. Clemmons, Geneva, Ala., April 16;  
 Clement Ritter, First Church, Dothan, Ala., May 13;  
 David Shepperson, El Dorado, Ark.

##### Resignations

George W. Sheffer, California, Mo.;  
 A. C. Hakim, First Church, La Feria, Tex.

##### Deaths

Prof. J. A. Leonard Jackson.

### United Presbyterian Church

##### Calls Accepted

H. C. Carson, Bulger, Pa. to Piqua, Ohio;  
 J. I. Frederick, Stated Supply United Protestant Community Church, Rockaway, Ore.

##### Changed Addresses

Charles McClung, Kirkland, Ind.

##### Installations

Christian Haupt, Hanover, Ill., May 12;  
 L. W. Lytle, Stamford, Ontario, Canada;  
 R. Francis Hall, D.D., First Church, Portland, Ore., May 13.

##### Resignations

W. T. Warnock, Hopewell, Kans.

### Reformed Church in U. S.

##### Calls

Wm. J. Eckert, Dayton, O. to Fairfield, O.

##### Calls Accepted

F. R. Casselman, Butler, Pa. to Trinity Reformed Church, Tiffin, O.;  
 W. F. Lahr, Waldo, O. to Jeffersonville, Ind.;  
 J. Wade Huffman, Roanoke, Va. to Clear Spring, Md.;

# News of the Church

M. J. Flenner, Hartsville, O. to Heidelberg Church, Dayton, O.

## Changed Addresses

John G. Grimmer, Claysburg, Pa.

## Ordinations

H. Y. Saito, Trinity Church, Tiffin, O., May 17;  
B. M. Werkheiser, Coplay, Pa.;  
C. W. Buffington, Lenhartsville, Pa.

## Installations

Wm. H. Landis, Derry, Pa.;  
J. V. George, St. Paul's Church, Adamstown, Pa.

## Resignations

I. Rothenberger, Lindsey Charge, O.;  
H. F. Weckmueller, First Church, Marion, Ohio.

## Deaths

F. Aigner, Godi, Cal.

## Reformed Church in America

### Calls

Henry L. Korver, American Church, Hull, Ia. to Hopkins, Mich.;  
B. R. Van Zyl, Holland, Neb. to Lynden, Wash.

### Calls Accepted

John Moedt to Racine, Wis.;  
William Rottschaefer, Fremont, Mich. to Carmel Church, Rock Valley, Ia.

### Installations

Martin Hocksema, Grand Rapids, Mich., June 26;  
G. DeMotts, Hope Church, Sheboygan, Wis.

### Deaths

Alfred W. Speer, Philmont, N. Y., May 4.

## Presbyterian Church in Canada

### Calls

William Allan, St. Paul's Church, Peterborough, Ontario, to Dovercourt Church, Toronto, Ont.

### Calls Accepted

John V. Mills to St. Paul's Church, Warton, Ont.;  
R. C. McDermid, St. Paul's Church, Toronto.

### Installations

William Moore, Melville Church, Brussels, Ont., April 21.

### Resignations

A. Shepherd, Burgoyne and Dumblane, Bruce Presbytery;  
G. C. Little, Hanover and Ayton, Bruce Presbytery;  
W. A. MacMillan, Southampton, Bruce Presbytery.

## Christian Reformed Church

### Calls

James Putt, Fourth Church, Chicago, Ill. to Second Church, S. Holland, Ill., (declines);  
B. J. Brohne, Hudsonville, Mich. to Randolph, Wis.;  
William Van Peurse, Zutphen, Mich. to First Church, Grand Haven, Mich.

### Calls Accepted

J. J. Dyk, to Tracy, Ia.

### Installations

William Hendriksen, Allen Avenue Church, Muskegon, Mich.

### Deaths

H. N. Gerdes, Grundy Center, Ia., April 24.

## General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church

THE seventy-third General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America convened in Youngstown, Ohio, on the evening of Wednesday, May 27, 1931. The sessions were held in the South United Presbyterian Church. The sermon was delivered by the Moderator of the seventy-second Assembly, the Rev. Thomas C. Atchison, D.D., of Lawrence, Mass. Following the sermon, the Assembly unanimously elected the Rev. J. Knox Montgomery, D.D., President of Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio, to be Moderator. Dr. O. H. Milligan, of Pittsburgh, was elected Clerk of the Assembly.

Standing Committees were appointed as follows:

Bills and overtures—(Ministers) R. L. Lanning, D.D., D. W. MacLeod, D.D., J. D. Lytle, D.D.; (elders) J. E. Calvert, H. T. McLaughlin, M.D., A. M. Morrow.

Judiciary—(Ministers) J. M. McQuilkin, D.D., J. C. Pinkerton, D.D., James H. Scott, A. A. Thompson; (elders) H. E. Pike, J. W. Miller, Thomas Beatty.

Foreign Missions—(Ministers) H. F. Given, D.D., J. C. McConaughy, A. K. Stewart; (elders) W. E. Moreland, William Smellie.

American Missions—(Ministers) Homer B. Henderson, D.D., L. J. Davidson, D.D., J. Ralph Neale, D.D.; (elders) Owen V. Davis, J. H. Sanford.

Education—(Ministers) J. M. Ross, D.D., S. M. Laing, D.D., G. B. McCreary, D.D.; (elders) Charles C. Russell, Fred Bray.

Ministerial Pensions and Relief—(Ministers) G. M. McKnight, D.D., F. W. Crosbie, D. R. Trumbull; (elders) Thomas E. McDowell, W. M. McCandless.

Publication—(Ministers) H. B. Speer, D.D., A. W. Wilson, J. G. Campbell; (elders) R. S. Cook, James A. Wherry.

Women's Board—(Ministers) J. A. Thompson, D.D., Ernest O. Ralston, Leander Finley; (elders) M. L. McGill, E. B. McCown.

Finance—(elders) J. L. Beatty, W. C. McFadden, T. J. Gillespie, Jr.; (Ministers) Frank H. Wright, D.D., Robert A. Foster.

Statistics—(Ministers) M. J. Calhoun, D.D., A. M. Neale, G. J. Murdock; (elders) Thomas Turner, W. C. Boyle.

Correspondence—(Ministers) W. Charles Wallace, D.D., J. C. Heinrich, John I. Stewart; (elders) Dr. David Lindsay, Charles Wishart.

Revision—(Ministers) Huber Ferguson, D.D., W. O. Chisholm, Thomas McKee; (elders) W. J. Gibb, Edwin Van Saun.

Nominations—(Ministers) W. E. McCulloch, D.D., D. W. McQuiston, D.D., J. C. Foster, S. C. Tharp, T. H. Melville, J. L. Vance, S. A. Livingston, D.D., E. W. Mans-

field, James M. Ferguson, D.D., A. R. Robinson, D.D., James Parker, Ph.D.

Theological Seminaries—(Ministers) Mills J. Taylor, D.D., John E. Simpson, Robert N. Montgomery, D.D.; (elders) J. T. Stewart, D. P. Kennedy.

State of Religion—(Ministers) T. C. Pollock, D.D., Paul Stewart, J. A. McConneelee; (elders) Dr. L. M. Henry, P. H. Matthews.

Councils—(Ministers) Mertz A. Eakin, D.D., R. W. Burnside, D.D., J. E. Bradford, D.D.; (elders) H. D. Frazer, M.D., W. B. Stewart.

Reform—(Ministers) S. Earl DuBois, D.D., W. H. Hubbell, L. K. Peacock, D.D.; (elders) F. G. H. Bayfield, Sherman Lingler.

Administration—(Ministers) William J. Grimes, D.D., William T. Lytle, D.D., W. B. Smiley, D.D.; (elders) John Livingston, C. S. Machwart.

Despite heated opposition, the assembly resolved to continue the committee on church unity.

After hearing vigorous attacks against continuance of the committee by Dr. James Parker, Jersey City, N. J., and Dr. E. M. Milligan, Pittsburgh, other leaders argued in favor of continuing negotiations.

They were Dr. W. J. Reid, Pittsburgh, chairman of the committee; Dr. W. F. McCullough, Los Angeles; Dr. John McNaugher, head of the Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological seminary, and Dr. T. C. Pollock, Philadelphia.

The assembly then resolved by a vote of 154 to 33 to continue the committee.

The committee will prepare a basis of union with the Presbyterian Church, North, Presbyterian Church, South, and the Dutch and German Reformed Churches, to be presented to the annual assembly next year.

Continuance of the committee was opposed by Dr. Milligan because, he said, there is little possibility it will be able to secure an acceptable doctrinal basis of union by 1932.

It was decided by the assembly to continue financial support and representation in the Federal Council of Churches, although there was opposition voiced. C. M. Neeld, commissioner to the assembly, declared officials of the council misrepresent the views and opinions of the great majority of the membership of the church.

"Their assumption and presumption to take the matter of birth control from the hands of the medical profession, where it belongs, and saddle it on the church, where it doesn't belong, shows the dangers of such careless delegation of power," Mr. Neeld maintained.

A resolution was passed by the assembly authorizing each congregation to fix its individual quota for representation at a congregational meeting. The missionary budget of \$850,000 was adopted.

The committee on statistics reported a

present property valuation of \$27,064,440 in church buildings alone. The value of church manses was estimated at \$3,412,900.

The board of ministerial pensions and relief, Dr. R. W. Burnside, secretary, reported the granting of aid during the past year to 41 Ministers, 112 widows, two women missionaries and four orphans at a cost of \$52,145.

Election of Dr. A. H. Baldinger to the chair of Old Testament literature and exegesis at the Pittsburgh-Xenia seminary was approved by the assembly.

A communication from President Hoover was read at the closing session in response to a note sent him by the Assembly praising his stand on prohibition and pledging support. The president's message said:

"The free message of confidence and commendation which your telegram conveys is greatly appreciated. Please extend my thanks to the members of the General Assembly for their pledge of support."

A net gain in membership both at home and abroad last year was 1,742, was reported.

A gain of 540 was reported in the membership of the church in America, which has a total membership of 176,666. The gain abroad was 1,202. The total membership at home and abroad is 242,293. Reports of last year revealed a net loss of 2,005.

Although an increase was reported in membership, a decrease was noted in contributions.

The Assembly was dissolved in the usual manner, and another called to meet in 1932 at Beaver, Pennsylvania.

### World's Christian Fundamentals Convention

**T**HE Fourteenth Annual Convention held in the Bethany Presbyterian Church, 22nd and Bainbridge Streets May 17 to 24, exceeded the Los Angeles Convention in point of attendance, registrations and interest. The morning sessions averaged over 800. The afternoon and evening sessions filled the auditorium each of the eight days. The music was under the leadership of Homer Hammtree assisted by the Bethany Church Choir. The morning and afternoon sessions were led by the exceptionally fine pianist, William Thomas. Mr. Hammtree sang several solos, also duets with the Rev. Merrill T. MacPherson, of Philadelphia, and Dr. Will H. Houghton, of New York. The Bethany Surpliced Choir sang the "Hallelujah Chorus" at the close of one of the inspiring addresses and the audience stood during its rendition. Another feature was the singing of the large student body of the Bible Institute of Pennsylvania under the leadership of the Rev. James Clinton.

Ten of the thirty addresses delivered at this Convention dealt with the various aspects of our Lord's return together with a study of present day conditions in the light of prophecy. The other twenty addresses

covered precious doctrines of the Bible which have been "delivered once for all to the saints" and held by those who believe the Bible to be the uniquely inspired Word of God. The amplifying system used made it easy for everyone to hear distinctly. The broadcasting of each evening session between the hours of 8 to 9 P. M. over station WRAX, carried the messages to thousands who could not attend personally.

The resolutions adopted by the Convention were prepared by a carefully selected committee of Ministers and laymen and were adopted without a dissenting vote. Apart from the usual resolutions regarding the co-operation of the Bethany Presbyterian Church, its officials, its ushers and its choir, the following paragraphs indicate the thought and desire of this group of Christian people; representing all evangelical denominations, and coming from all parts of the United States:

"The Convention takes this opportunity of again mentioning the great necessity of having the truths covered by the theme of this convention "The Lord's Return" permeate the living of God's children. It sincerely hopes that each succeeding convention shall place strong emphasis upon the need of holy and prayerful devotion to the person of our Lord Jesus Christ on the part of those who hold this blessed testimony.

"Whereas, in the light of world wide conditions with their accompaniment of lawlessness and infidelity, Be it Resolved that this convention affirms the need of such a testimony as offered by this Association. We believe it is raised up for such a time as this. Apostasy deepens and abounds. God answers these conditions by offering salvation with its safety and peace and the blessed hope of our Lord's return with its assurance and power for holy living and service.

"Be it further Resolved, that this convention record its sincere conviction that there is a vital need for a positive testimony to God's saving truth expressed in the holy scriptures and that this Association composed of various evangelical denominations or of no denomination, has been raised up of God together with other organizations to give this testimony.

"Whereas there is a need of this testimony growing and having the aid of all true believers, Be it Resolved, that every encouragement be given to the formation of strong state, county and city units of the national and international organizations. That it be the purpose of all interested to stimulate and further such formation by giving their hearty support and cooperation to such efforts. Where individuals are isolated from other believers by distance or other circumstances it is suggested that prayer groups be organized and contact made with the nearest organized group.

"Whereas there is widespread unbelief and disbelief taught in many theological seminaries and other institutions of learn-

ing, in the secular and religious press and other literature, Be it Resolved, that this convention record its hearty endorsement and deep appreciation of the blessed work being done by sound theological seminaries, Bible schools and institutes and other institutions of learning and by all publishers of secular and spiritual literature which are true to the infallible revelation in God's word and the highest standards of Christian living.

"Whereas there is a prevailing tendency in many quarters to belittle rightly constituted law and authority and to aid lawlessness, Be it Resolved, that this convention commend the President of these United States and all governmental agencies and officers for all efforts put forth in law enforcement with particular emphasis upon the retention and enforcement of the eighteenth amendment. We ask the prayers and cooperation of the Christian public that the powers that be that are ordained by God may be constrained to govern in His fear to the end that we may live in peace and have every opportunity to proclaim the glorious gospel of God's grace until our Lord Jesus Christ shall come. We view with grave concern the alarming state of low moral standards, which is further intensified by an increase in birth control, companionate marriage, divorce and similar agitation. The convention stands in these matters where the Bible stands and pleads for Christian people to adhere in these respects to the wholesome standards of conduct that have moulded Christian character, home and nation in days past.

"Whereas there exists a lethargy and indifference on the part of God's people, Be it Resolved, that the World's Christian Fundamentals Association take this opportunity to join hands and hearts with those waiting on God for revival in the body of Christ, further that we record that the task of the Church is to evangelize and to prepare the Church of Christ in true holiness for His coming. May this be our constant endeavor, that this revival and task never became secondary but have whole and warm hearted consecration with the throb and passion that follow the true and abiding service for Christ. The theme of this year's convention accentuates the missionary spirit and in no wise diminishes the incentive to carry out the great commission of our Lord."

### General MacArthur Assails War Questionnaire

**T**HE right of citizens to refuse to bear arms in defending their country has been denied by General Douglass MacArthur, Chief of Staff, in a letter in which he criticized those clergymen who uphold such a right.

The letter was written in response to a request from Kirby Page, editor of *The World Tomorrow*, for the views of the Chief of

Staff on the recent questionnaire conducted by the magazine among clergymen as to their attitude on the question.

"I appreciate very much the courtesy of the suggestion contained in your note of April 20, and am glad, indeed, to avail myself of the privilege of commenting on the general subject of the Church in war.

"My predominant feeling with reference to the majority of the replies received by your paper from 19,372 clergymen is that of surprise. Surprise at the knowledge that so many of the clergymen of our country have placed themselves on record as repudiating in advance the constitutional obligations that will fall upon them equally with all other elements of our citizenship in supporting this country in case of need.

"To exercise privilege without assuming attendant responsibility and obligation is to occupy a position of license, a position apparently sought by men who do not hesitate to avail themselves of the privileges conferred by our democracy upon its citizens, but who, in effect, proclaim their willingness to see this nation perish rather than participate in its defense.

"The question of war and peace is one that rests, under our form of government, in Congress. In exercising this authority, Congress voices the will of the majority, whose right to rule is the cornerstone upon which our governmental edifice is built. Under the Constitution, its pronouncement on such a question is final, and is obligatory upon every citizen of the United States.

"That men who wear the cloth of the church should openly defend repudiation of the laws of the land, with the necessary implications and ramifications arising from such a general attitude toward our statutes, seem almost unbelievable. It will certainly hearten every potential or actual criminal and malefactor who either has or contemplates breaking some other law.

"Anomalous as it seems, it apparently stamps the clergyman as a leading exponent of law violation at individual pleasure.

"I am mindful of the right accorded every American citizen to endeavor by lawful means to secure such changes in the Constitution or statutes as he may desire. But to concede to him the right to defy existing law is to recognize a state of anarchy and the collapse of properly constituted authority.

"May I remark also that, if we acknowledge the prerogative of the individual to disregard the obligations placed upon him by American citizenship, it seems only logical to ask him to forego all rights guaranteed by such citizenship.

"It also surprises me that while apparently entering a plea for freedom of conscience, these clergymen are attempting to dictate to the consciences of those who honestly differ from them over questions of national defense.

"Their sentiments and implied efforts are

injecting the church into the affairs of State and endangering the very principle that they claim to uphold.

"Perhaps the greatest privilege of our country, which indeed was the genius of its foundation, is religious freedom. Religious freedom, however, can exist only so long as government survives. To render our country helpless would invite destruction, not only of our political and economic freedom, but also of our religion.

"Another surprise comes in the revelation that so many seem to be familiar with the struggle of mankind for the free institutions that we enjoy.

"Magna Charta, the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation, the rights of small nations and other birthrights of this generation have been bought with the high price of human suffering and human sacrifice, much of it on the fields of battle.

"I am surprised that men of clear and logical minds confuse defensive warfare with the disease which it alone can cure when all other remedies have failed.

"Do they not know that police systems and armed national defense are the human agencies made necessary by the deep-seated disease of individual depravity, the menace of personal greed and hatred?

"Should not these clergymen turn their attention to the individual sinner and rid the country of crime rather than attack the national keepers of the peace, the most potent governmental agency yet devised for this very purpose?

"It is a distinct disappointment to know that men who are called to wield the sword of the spirit are deluded into believing that the mechanical expedient of disarming men will transform hatred into love and selfishness into altruism.

"May I also express surprise that some have lost sight of the fact that in none of our past wars have clergymen been required to bear arms, and that under the terms of the Geneva Convention, ratified by the United States in 1907 (Sec. 130 and 132), chaplains are non-combatants and not authorized to bear arms.

"And if United States army chaplains are ever guilty of using inflammatory propaganda such activity is without warrant or authority by any statute or order ever promulgated in the history of the country.

"Perhaps I should also remind them that, under the terms of the League of Nations, the United States would be required to maintain a standing army of at least a half million men in order to be able to carry out its mandates.

"I am curious to know how many of the clergymen who voted for the League have read the articles and understand that under them the peace of the world is to be maintained in the last analysis, by armed military forces.

"It is difficult to reconcile the faith of these people in the efficacy of newly organ-

ized international agencies to keep the peace and enforce respect for international covenants with their self-confessed intention to violate the existing laws of their own long-established government.

"A few questions occur to me that could appropriately be asked the clergymen who replied to your questionnaire. In stating that they were in favor of the United States taking the lead in reducing armament, even if compelled to make greater proportionate reductions than other countries might be willing to make, did they know that the existing total of our land forces, including regular army, National Guard and organized reserves, is about one-third of 1 per cent of our population?

"Did they know that in other great countries except Germany, whose army is limited by treaty, this ratio is from three to forty-five times as great?

"Did they know our total forces in actual size are exceeded by those of at least fifteen other nations, although in population we are exceeded only by Russia, China and India?

"Finally, did they consider the words of our Lord as given in the twenty-first verse of the eleventh chapter of St. Luke: 'When a strong man armed, keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace?'

"In all modesty may I not say to the opponents of national defense that our Lord, who preached the Sermon on the Mount, later in his career declared: 'Think not that I am come to send peace on earth. I came not to send peace, but a sword.' (St. Matthew, x, 34.)

"It is my humble belief that the relation which He came to establish is based upon sacrifice, and that men and women who follow in His train are called by it to the defense of certain priceless principles, even at the cost of their own lives.

"And I can think of no principles more high and holy than those for which our national sacrifices have been made in the past. History teaches us that religion and patriotism have always gone hand in hand, while atheism has invariably been accompanied by radicalism, communism, bolshevism, and other enemies of free government.

"Have not those who oppose our modest and reasonable efforts for national defense miscalculated the temper and innate spirit of patriotism in the average American?

"The fact that our Citizens' Military Training Camps are oversubscribed long before the opening of the camps comforts me that patriotism is still a dominant power in our land.

"Any organization which opposes the defense of homeland and the principles hallowed by the blood of our ancestors, which sets up internationalism in the place of patriotism, which teaches the passive submission of right to the forces of the predatory strong, cannot prevail against the demonstrated staunchness of our population.

"I confidently believe that a red-blooded and virile humanity which loves peace devotedly, but is willing to die in the defense of the right, is Christian from centre to circumference, and will continue to be dominant in the future as in the past."

### Religious Freedom Comes to Spain

THE new Government of Spain has taken the first step in its avowed program to separate the Church and the State when the Cabinet on May 22 decreed absolute religious freedom of worship for all creeds in Spain.

Although the measure does not yet actually mean separation, since there is a concordat between Madrid and Vatican City which must be terminated by agreement, the decree provides that the Government no longer professes the Roman Catholic religion as official.

Under the new measure, submitted by the Minister of Justice, all creeds are now equal in the eye of the government. Under the monarchy the Roman Catholic religion was official and the only one permitted to practice its beliefs publicly. All creeds could worship but had to do so within their own edifices. Protestant churches could have no distinguishing marks, and could only have entrances on side streets.

The Cabinet also decided that public schools will hereafter not be required to keep the Roman Catholic religion. Children will receive religious instruction only if their parents so request.

The text of the Cabinet decree for absolute religious freedom of worship for all creeds is as follows:

"The rigidity which was always attached to the religious jurisdiction within Spanish constitutionalism was slightly shaken by royal orders, dated June 10, 1910, but such a brief effort on the part of the then Liberal Government, presided over by Senor Canalejas, was ultimately strangled by underhand work on the part of monarchist institutions.

"When the present provisional Government assumed power and thus became the temporary organ of the supreme foreign function, it declared it would stand for free religious conscience by establishing liberty for all creeds and worships.

"In decreeing the tolerance of creed by this new regime of absolute liberty the present Government is very far from having the slightest intention to injure any religious feelings which hitherto may have enjoyed exclusive privilege in this country.

"Such feelings are worthy of the utmost respect on the part of the public power but the latter also aims, and hereby solemnly declares it to be so, that in the present atmosphere of liberty all inborn feelings of citizens and confessional institutions, which exist or may hereafter exist in the country, should also enjoy the same respect and liberty.

"Nowadays it is one of the bases of inter-

national public law as exemplified in the League of Nations, to fall in line with Eastern European countries in respect to acceptance of the system of freedom of creed.

"There is a graphic example in the case of the system which has been freely adopted by countries of recognized Catholic background, such as Ireland, Poland and Bavaria.

"Even Spain itself, forced by exigencies of reality, carries out in the Spanish possessions of Morocco a religious policy which is far more broadminded than that which has been carried out in Spain proper. But in Spain we had been carrying out a policy utterly repugnant.

"Catholics demand freedom of creed in countries in which there are state churches enjoying privileges wherever the Catholic Church is faced with obstacles to its development.

"Freedom of creed is not only a regulating function in the internal life of a country but it amounts to guarantees of respect in regard to development of civil life.

"For the foregoing reasons the President of the Provisional Government, with the assent of his Cabinet Council and on the proposal of the Ministry of Justice, decrees as follows:

"Article I. No person shall be compelled to declare his religious conviction in any official act in respect to services relating to the state. All military and civil servants will, therefore, abstain from demanding declaration of creed from any person or persons brought before them in any connection whatsoever, or from their subordinates or those working under them.

"Article II. No person, whatever his official status or dependency on the state, shall be compelled to attend any religious ceremony, service or function.

"Article III. All creeds are free to practice worship, either privately or publicly, without any limitations whatever other than those imposed by legal rules and the law of public order."

### The Pope v. Mussolini

LATE last month, the paper *Lavoro Fascista* ("Fascist Labor"), of Rome, charged that the Italian League for Catholic Action (*Azione Cattolica*) was no longer non-political, and had become in fact that mechanism for putting into action a Roman Catholic political plot. This plot, *Il Lavoro* charged, was discussed at a recent conclave of *Azione Cattolica*, addressed by Monsignor Pizzardo, Under Secretary of State of the Papal State. He advocated, according to *Il Lavoro*, action by *Azione Cattolica* to seize the Italian State and set up a "Catholic dictatorship."

Inflamed by the news, a marching column of young Fascists seized a Papal State mail truck, halted by their parade in the square directly in front of Premier Mussolini's

offices. One youth promptly attacked the truck driver with a stick.

The next day an editorial in the Papal daily *Osservatore Romano* complained of "Fascist outrages" in general, but particularly alleged that Fascist students had publicly burned copies of an address by Pope Pius, shouting as they did so "Down with the Pope! Death to the Pope!" *L'Osservatore* also complained that the button-badges worn by members of the Catholic College Men's Association had in some instances been "forcibly torn from their buttonholes" by Fascist bullies. *Il Lavoro* retorted: "Catholic parish priests pray against the Fascist régime! They prevent from entering their churches little boys in the uniforms of the *balilla*" (Fascist Boy Scouts). At the Vatican it was announced that "particulars of 35 recent acts of intimidation" of Catholics by Fascists had come to the attention of the Pope. Thereupon Fascist youths gathered around the Catholic Students Association House, hurled stones, broke windows even as high as the fifth floor.

Other irate Fascists mobbed a Roman Catholic publishing house, hurled from its windows copies of the best-selling book *Il Papa* (The Pope). Wrenching from the wall a portrait of *Il Papa* they dashed it from window to pavement crying: "Here is a traitor to his country!"

Upon the prostrate portrait of the Pope, the Fascist youths stamped and tramped.

*L'Osservatore*, harking back to *Il Lavoro's* original anti-Fascist "Catholic plot," printed a denial by Monsignor Pizzardo that he had ever incited the Italian League for Catholic Action to any action other than religious action. The Bishop of Andria, present at the Catholic Action meeting in question, confirmed Monsignor Pizzardo's denial "before God and in the presence of witnesses."

*Il Lavoro* replied: "Before printing our allegations we checked them point by point. . . . *L'Osservatore Romano* lies, knowing that it lies!"

In an insultingly humorous vein *Il Lavoro* concluded: "Count Dalla Torre (editor of *L'Osservatore Romano*, close lay friend of the Pope) will not find a single priest at the Vatican to give him absolution, since he sinned against the Eighth Commandment: *Thou shalt not bear false witness.*"

Two days later Italian police raided the 390 Catholic clubs in Rome. They took an inventory at each club, gave a copy to the clubmen, and padlocked all clubs "in the interest of public safety." Roman Catholic playgrounds in Rome financed by the U. S. Knights of Columbus were also closed.

In Vatican City, which Italian police were sent to guard last week, Pope Pius resolved with characteristic energy to forestall what he thought might be Mussolini's next act: a decree by the Italian Government dissolving throughout the land all chapters of *Azione Cattolica*. The Pope, observing that this was

"one of the saddest days of our life" (it was his 74th birthday), decreed: "The bishops of the respective dioceses will assume personally and immediately control of the Catholic Action and will guide it in accordance with instructions emanating from the Holy See.

"The directors (of the Catholic Action) to whom the Holy Father desires to address a word of particular eulogy and benediction, will obey their respective bishops in all matters."

Thus the Pope took *Azione Cattolica* under his protection and offered to Dictator Mussolini the maximum defiance which could be offered short of breaking diplomatic relations between the Papal State and the Kingdom of Italy.

The next step by the Italian Government was not the expected decree dissolving all chapters of *Azione Cattolica* but a circular telegram to provincial prefects (all Fascists) granting them "discretionary power" to close Roman Catholic clubs and *Azione Cattolica* headquarters "if the situation warrants." The Fascist prefects at once closed a total of some 15,000 Catholic centres throughout Italy. No Y. M. C. A. or Y. W. C. A. was affected.

The Pope finally called for a secret conclave of twenty-four of his cardinals. The next day the organ of the papacy, *L'Osservatore Romano* adopted a more pacific attitude. This was reflected in the columns of the Government's *Il Lavoro Fascisti*. Both sides issued statements conciliatory in tone. The Church intimated that it had no wish for abrogation of the Lateran treaties. The Government observed pacifically that the Romanists had permitted the closing of their clubs "without incident." Latest advices are that recession of the Vatican and the Government from their somewhat uncompromising attitudes appeared to have brought the settlement of their dispute within sight. The Pope is understood to be willing to accept the State's regrets over attacks on Church property instead of a formal apology and the Government is believed likely to agree to the reopening of Roman Catholic Youth Clubs in another form.

This may be under the title of "confraternities" or like organizations which might later take on many features of the dissolved groups. Such a move would be hastened, it is reported, by the Vatican's willingness to "purify" the clubs by the elimination of certain leaders whose political activities the Government criticises.

The State's efforts to aid the settlement were seen in the arrest of three persons charged with sacking the Priverno Chancery—one of the incidents which the Vatican protested in its recent notes.

The danger of a diplomatic rupture or denunciation of the Lateran Treaty and concordat is now believed to be extremely remote. The speed with which the negotiations have been going forward has surprised

### REGARDING RENEWALS

If the address label on your copy of this issue says "May" or "June" 1931, or any month previous, your renewal is due. A blank is enclosed for your convenience. If your subscription is not yet renewable, please disregard the renewal notice, or better still, use it for a gift subscription, thus extending the ministry of this paper to your friends.

diplomatic circles which had regarded the breach as difficult to mend.

### Western Pennsylvania Bible Conference

THE third annual session of the Western Pennsylvania Bible Conference will be held in the First Presbyterian Church, Slippery Rock, Pa., from June 21 to 28. This conference is conducted by those who hold firmly to the historic Christian Gospel. Its speakers believe in a whole Bible. Although comparatively young, the Conference has begun to attract wide attention among Ministers and Christian people in the area it serves. The Rev. H. H. VanCleve is the President of the Board. Among speakers secured for this year are the Rev. Clarence E. Macartney, D.D., Minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, the Rev. J. R. Loughner, Principal of the Beulah Park Bible School, Allentown, Pa., the Rev. Samuel Dodds, D.D., of Wooster University, the Rev. R. E. Neighbor, D.D., of Cleveland, and the Rev. H. H. VanCleve. The Conference is supported by free will offerings, and accommodations can be reasonably secured. Those interested in this ministry may write to the Rev. C. C. Mohny, 123 Plum St., Oil City, Pa.

### Southern Presbyterians Withdraw from "Federal Council"

BY a vote of 175 to 79, the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. on June 1 voted to sever its connection with the so called "Federal Council of the Church of Christ in America." The decisions came after vigorous debate had clearly shown that the Southern Church is out of sympathy with the point of view of the Council. Conservatives everywhere are rejoicing at the fine action of this great Church.

### Calvin College Commencement

THE Commencement of Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan, was held on June 2, 1931. The President of Calvin College is the Rev. R. B. Kuiper, D.D., who was formerly the Professor of Systematic Theology in Westminster Seminary, Phila-

delphia. The college, which is under the care of the Christian Reformed Church, has just closed an unusually successful year. The commencement oration was delivered by the Rev. Samuel G. Craig, D.D., Editor of *CHRISTIANITY TODAY*. His topic was "Christianity and Culture." Excerpts from Dr. Craig's address follow:

Today they (the advocates of a naturalistic world and life view) reject the moral teachings of Christianity as confidently as they reject its doctrinal teachings.

When the moral ideals of Christianity are attacked, a shot is fired at the very heart of Christian culture and civilization.

We are face to face with a situation in which the question of questions is whether Christian or non-Christian ideals of character and conduct are to shape the culture and civilization of the future.

Despite widespread desertion and open rebellion Christianity will yet make good its right to determine the culture and civilization of the future.

I am confident that, Jesus Christ being what He is, the Saviour of the world and the Lord and Life of humanity, He will make His cause to ultimately triumph so that the kingdoms of this world will become the Kingdom of our God and His Christ.

The mere removal of the intellectual objections to Christianity will not, of course, make a man a Christian, and yet no man ought to be a Christian unless there are adequate reasons for holding that Christianity is true.

In the long run Christianity will move the hearts and guide the hands of men only as it is approved by their heads. Nothing is more needed today than men with sufficient breadth of knowledge and power of thought to make clear to reasonable and reasoning men that the Christian world and life view is the only tenable one.

I am very far from thinking that the thing most needed is the removal of all denominational lines and the formation of one great church organization. In so far as such unity were brought about at the cost of loyalty to the system of doctrine set forth in the Scriptures, I am sure that our last state would be worse than our first.

Abraham Kuyper said: "As truly as every plant has a root, so truly does a principle hide under every manifestation of life."

Christ is our hope as He is our stay, and under His leadership we go forward confident of certain though by no means easy victory.

If Christianity is winning comparatively few adherents from the world, the whole explanation . . . is to be found in the sort of lives that so many professed Christians are living. The most powerful of the arguments for Christianity in its influence on the world has ever been the lives of those men and women who have themselves been redeemed by Jesus Christ.