

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-NOVEMBER, 1931
Vol. 2 No. 7

\$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 as a Way of Life: Its Supernaturalism

IN a previous issue we sought to indicate the kind and measure of that supernaturalism that Christianity recognizes and demands. On that occasion (February, 1931) we dealt with the place that the supernatural occupies in Christianity as a mode of thought rather than with the place that it occupies in Christianity as a mode of behaviour. On this occasion we propose to reverse the emphasis and to show that the supernatural is as inextricably implicated in Christianity considered as a way of life as it is in Christianity considered as a creed. In proportion as we succeed in doing this it will become evident that in the struggle for and against supernaturalism it is not merely the Christian creed that is at stake. It will be seen that the Christian ethic, the mode of life that it commands, is equally at stake. Doubtless there have been, and still are, those who have rejected the Christian creed and yet have commended the Christian ethic. But, unless we are altogether mistaken, that is only because they have not realized the extent to which Christianity even as a way of life is through and through supernatural. It is our contention that neither the reasonableness nor the practicability of the Christian way of life can be maintained except as the supernatural as a factor in human life is frankly recognized. We hold, therefore, that if the present attempt to uproot belief in the supernatural should succeed, it would mean the ultimate dis-

appearance of Christianity as a way of living as well as a way of thinking. Some considerations that indicate the part the supernatural plays in Christianity as a way of life follow:

(1) We cannot get into the Christian way of life apart from the supernatural. When we first discover our whereabouts we find ourselves in the broad way that leads to death, not in the narrow way that leads to life. Moreover we find that of ourselves we are unable to forsake the broad way and plant ourselves in the narrow way, not because the way is barred, as it were, by stone walls and iron gates but because of our sheer inability. We might as well suppose that an evil tree

can produce good fruit as suppose that those dead in trespass and sin can by their own will and power set themselves in the path that leads to eternal life. Only as a supernatural power energizes within us does this become possible for us. In other words regeneration, a rebirth through the operation of the Holy Spirit is necessary before we can get into the Christian way of life.

We are aware that a different representation is widely current. We are told rather: "The gates along the way of life stand open; whosoever will may enter in." Moreover such language is employed not merely to express the universality of the gospel offer; it is employed to express belief in man's plenary ability to work out his own salvation. Are we not constantly told that the parable of the Prodigal Son is all the gospel men need? We would be the last to minimize the value of this parable, but we are not blind to the fact that it says nothing of atonement, nothing of the Holy Spirit, not even anything of CHRIST Himself. If this parable contains the whole, or even the core of the gospel, then, we can get up of ourselves and go back to God and assume the position of a child in His household whenever we choose—no questions asked and a warm reception assured. Such a conception is pleasing to many but it is not the Christian conception. It is CHRIST Himself who says: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot

IN THIS ISSUE:

Editorial Notes and Comments.....	3
The Truth About the Presbyterian Church.....	5
J. G. Machen	
Questions from the General Council....	6
W. V. Watson	
Notes on Biblical Exposition.....	9
J. G. Machen	
Books of Religious Significance.....	12
Letters to the Editor.....	14
Questions and Answers.....	15
Current Views and Voices.....	17
Ministerial Changes.....	19
News of the Church.....	20

enter into the Kingdom of God." We are dependent on the Holy Spirit at every stage of the Christian life but our immediate concern is merely to point out that apart from the supernatural operation of the Holy Spirit in our hearts we cannot even get started in the Christian way of living.

(2) We cannot make progress along the Christian way of life apart from the supernatural. As travelers along the way of life we need directions. Such directions have been supplied us. These directions, however, are of supernatural origin. Christianity does not represent its moral code, its ethical ideals, whether as expressed in words or embodied in the life of its founder, as naturalistic in origin. It maintains that if sinful man had been left to work out his destiny on the plane of nature he would be as ignorant of the Christian standard of conduct as he would be of the Christian dogmas.

As travelers along the way of life we also need motives or incentives. Such motives and incentives are provided but the main ones are drawn from the supernatural. Christian ethics does not disdain motives drawn from purely earthly consideration, but it places its chief reliance on motives that according to naturalism have no existence. The central and controlling motive in the life of the Christian is represented as grateful love to the redeeming God who mercifully set His love upon us and sent His Son to die for us. PAUL put it thus: "The love of CHRIST constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them, and rose again." No doubt we all act from mixed motives, but if this motive has no place in our lives it is quite certain that we are not living a Christian life. And yet only as we frankly recognize the supernatural CHRIST as a living reality is there any such motive with which to reckon. Even the motive drawn from the thought of rewards and punishment in a future life which Christianity employs is deceptive and misleading apart from the reality of a supernatural world. Reject the supernatural and the main motives which have hitherto induced men to walk in

the Christian way will have to be thrown into the discard.

It is not enough, however, that we know the Christian way of life and that incentives be brought to bear upon us to lead us to walk in that way. These will prove unprofitable unless we receive power to walk in newness of life. We may have the latest model of an automobile; we may have studied our Blue Book and be certain of our route; we may be under strong inducement to follow the route chosen; but if there is no gasoline in the tank or our ignition system is not working, we cannot advance a single mile. And so it is because and only because we can do all things through Him that strengthens us that it is possible for us to advance along the Christian way of life. Apart from this element of power JESUS would still possess significance as a moral and spiritual teacher; but in that case He would not differ in kind from SOCRATES, BUDDHA, CONFUCIUS and others. The power that enables us to walk along the Christian way fairly shouts to us concerning the indispensableness of the supernatural to Christianity considered as a way of life. Even if we could show the reasonableness of the Christian standard of conduct, we would not be able to show its practicability apart from the supernatural—and that for the very good reason that it requires the supernatural to make it operative in a world of sinful men. As well expect an automobile to run without gasoline or an electric spark as expect men to make progress along the Christian way of life apart from the supernatural CHRIST and the equally supernatural Holy Spirit.

(3) When we speak of Christianity as a way of life we imply not only that it prescribes the path along which we should walk but that this path leads somewhere. If now we consider the end of the Christian way, we will have impressed upon us anew the futility of supposing that we can retain the Christian ethic while rejecting the supernatural. The naturalist may feel that he has no need of an eschatology, but the Christian necessarily has one—and that because his goal lies in the world beyond. It is indeed true that Christianity is not an ascetic, world-shunning religion. Its shibboleth is not separation

from the world but only from that which is evil in the world. And yet unquestionably it finds its center of gravity in the world of the supernatural. Hence it is impossible to vindicate its reasonableness, save as we recognize that supernaturalism in which alone it finds its proper setting. If there be no such supernatural fact as the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST or if the present economy be but a short span of life between two eternities of death, how can it be maintained that the Christian ethic indicates the best type of life or the lines along which our activities may most profitably proceed? A superstructure whose center of gravity lies in the supernatural world cannot be built on a naturalistic foundation.

We do not profess to have enumerated all the points at which the supernatural enters into Christianity considered as a way of life. It seems to us, however, that we have said enough to make clear that it is impossible to vindicate either the reasonableness or the practicability of the Christian way of life apart from a frank and generous recognition of the supernatural as a factor in human life.

There was a time when the enemies of Christianity were accustomed to maintain that they were opposed not to its moral ideals but to the puerilities of its supernatural creed. MILL and HUXLEY and ARNOLD, for instance, rejected the supernaturalism of the Christian creed but had only praise for Christianity as a way of life—apparently unaware that the supernatural is as essential to Christianity as a way of life as it is to Christianity as a creed. NIETZSCHE saw more clearly. He perceived that the Christian ethic is organically connected with the Christian creed—as roots and fruit are alike part of the same tree—and having rejected the Christian creed he saw that the logic of the situation demanded that he be equally outspoken in rejecting the Christian ideal of life. Today it is increasingly recognized that NIETZSCHE was right and that on the outcome of the struggle for and against the supernatural depends the future of Christianity as a way of life as well as its future as a believable creed. We simply deceive ourselves if we suppose that Christian ideals of conduct will survive even if belief in the super-

naturalism of Christianity becomes extinct. We hold with L. S. THORNTON that "the whole strength of the Christian position lies, not in repudiating those features in it which are most unlike the temper of the world, but in emphasizing them. If the Christian ethic were of this world and like unto it, there

would be nothing more to be said. Its distinctive character is its other-worldliness. For Christianity, so far from being a system or code, is the manifestation in the world of a life which draws all its power from a supernatural experience—an experience which in its turn is based upon a supernatural creed."

Editorial Notes and Comments

The Failure of Attempts to Unite the Northern and Southern Presbyterian Churches: An Explanation

DR. WILLIAM CROWE, Minister of the Westminster Presbyterian Church (South), of St. Louis, Mo., has written and the *Presbyterian* has published one of the most illuminating articles dealing with this matter that it has been our good fortune to see for many a day. Dr. CROWE's contention is that fifty years of negotiations have led to nothing because when these two churches talk of unity they are talking of two entirely different things. "In the North emphasis is laid upon church administration; in the South, it is laid upon doctrine. Therefore, when Southern Presbyterians speak of organic union, they are talking about a unity in belief; whereas, in the North, in discussing the same subject, the thought in mind is community in government." In support of this contention Dr. CROWE maintains that the basis of union both between the Old and New School Presbyterians in 1869 and the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in 1906 was a basis of common administration that ignored doctrinal differences. The gist of Dr. CROWE's article is expressed in the passage which follows his historical summary, to wit:

"It may be asked, why not then let all Presbyterian Churches unite in accord with the idea expressed above. The answer is, that while we might have consolidation in such a project as that, consolidation is in no sense union. Christianity is a doctrine; it is an interpretation of the Christian story; it is the method by which an unsaved man discovers the meaning of CHRIST's death. Therefore, the essential business of Christianity is to proclaim a message of salvation. In other words, the atonement of JESUS CHRIST is the throbbing heart of the Church and a removal of that doctrine from the center of the life of the Church is destructive to the mission of Christianity. While in large measure the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. promotes Christianity through that message, yet by the carelessness of its actions for fifty years it has permitted many voices, hostile to this heart message, to be raised within its body. Therefore, the Presbyterian Church is not at one

on a basis of belief. The situation, as it is today within that body, justifies the answer that there is no organic union within the Presbyterian Church itself. Because of these variant voices there are various parties within the Church as divergent as theological poles can separate them. These divisions, running through the whole Church, affect the harmony of belief and action. It is true that the Presbyterian form of government is seen presiding over these various schools of thought, but even that effective administrative agency has never yet been able to coerce all the factions into a semblance of unity."

In our judgment Dr. CROWE does not speak without knowledge when he maintains that doctrinal indifferentism is rampant in the Northern Presbyterian Church and warns his brethren against union with said Church except on the basis of a doctrinal unity. It seems to us that a like doctrinal indifferentism is on the increase in the Southern Church but we hope that it will never become strong enough to bring about union with the Northern Church upon a governmental basis that sits loosely to doctrinal purity. Our hope and prayer is that our own Church may be led to put first things first and that upon the basis of these first things all Presbyterian Churches will unite. At the same time we hold with Dr. CROWE that the churches are already one, "in so far as they love a common LORD and strive together for bringing the message of His salvation to all people."

"Fundamentalism and Premillennialism"

THE September issue of *The Christian Fundamentalist* (edited by W. B. RILEY) contains a vigorous assertion of belief in pre-millennialism as a prerequisite to membership in the "World's Christian Fundamentals Association," the occasion of this assertion being the formation by a group of Philadelphians of a Fundamentalist organization in which belief in the pre-millennial view of our LORD's return is not a condition of membership, as was reported in our July issue.

We are free to confess that our views at this point coincide with the "Philadelphia Fundamentalists" rather than with those of

the national body. It has always seemed regrettable to us that the "World's Christian Fundamentals Association" should insist on belief in the "pre-millennial and imminent return of our LORD and SAVIOUR" as a condition of membership, inasmuch as this necessarily excludes a vast number of "Fundamentalists." For instance, this means that such giants of orthodoxy as the late Drs. B. B. WARFIELD, ABRAHAM KUYPER and HERMAN BAVINCK were not eligible to membership in this organization, not to mention many of the leading living exponents of orthodoxy.

The occasion of our comments, however, is not the unqualified stand that Dr. RILEY takes against any change in the basis of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association. It is to be found rather in some of the things that he says (or implies) in the course of his reaffirmation of the pre-millennial position. Dr. RILEY writes throughout as though all believers in the personal and visible return of CHRIST were either pre-millennialists or post-millennialists completely ignoring the fact that many of them are a-millennialists. It is this assumption that all believers in the "blessed hope" are either pre or post-millennialists that explains, if we mistake not, the otherwise inexplicable list of scholars that are cited as advocates of pre-millennialism. Apparently he assumes that all intelligent Christians who are not post-millennialists are pre-millennialists. Otherwise how explain the fact that CALVIN, ZWINGLI, MELANCTHON, LUTHER, KNOX and the WESLEYS, not to mention others, are cited as pre-millennialists? Be that as it may, we are confident that the list he cites must be rather radically revised before it can be accepted as authentic.

What is more, we do not believe that Dr. RILEY can sustain the allegation that "post-millennialism has been the breeding-ground of modernism." Such an allegation seems to us similar in kind to the representation that pre-millennialism has been the breeding-ground of say Millennial Dawnism, Seventh-Day Adventism and other similar heresies. Equally irrelevant in this connection is the following: "You can't deny the Word at one point and hold it at another. It is either all inspired or none." A-millennialists and post-millennialists may or may not be mistaken, but at any rate they do not admit (at least the ones of which we are thinking) that pre-millennialism has Scriptural sanction. It is hardly fair to imply that the pre-millennialists are the only ones who have "always and everywhere stood for the authority, integrity and verbal inspiration of the Bible."

While we think it regrettable that the differences between pre-millennialists, post-millennialists and a-millennialists should be made a divisive issue, yet we fully approve when our contemporary writes: "Our advice to the brethren is: stay by the Book first; let loyalty to the LORD and His Divine

revelation rise above all personal friendship, and even all fraternal cravings." We would add, however, that we do not think that the following of this advice precludes fellowship between pre-millennialists, post-millennialists and a-millennialists.

Overtures A, C and E

THE last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. sent down five overtures to be voted upon by the Presbyteries. A majority of Presbyteries must answer each overture affirmatively, before the next Assembly, if it is to become a part of the constitution, law, of the church.

Overture "A," which is understood to have originated in the General Council of the General Assembly, is a revision of the Form of Government, Chapter XIV, "of Licensing Candidates or Probationers to Preach the Gospel." Much of the language is the same as that of the present chapter, but certain differences are striking. One is the provision that a candidate may be excused from examination in Greek and Hebrew if he presents a "certificate of creditable work" from his seminary, or upon being excused by a three-fourths vote of Presbytery. It is feared by many that this provision will weaken the emphasis of the Church upon an educated ministry. Another proposal of the overture suggests that in cases where the Presbytery believes a candidate should be licensed although he does not meet the educational requirements laid down, the Presbytery consult the synod or a synodical committee empowered to issue, giving the reasons why it is believed an exception should be made. If synod or its committee consents to licensure, it may be conferred. If synod disapproves, it must send its reasons back to Presbytery, which may, then, by a vote of three-fourths, solemnly decided to proceed to licensure anyway! Exactly the same result would be obtained if Presbyteries were allowed to proceed originally by a three-fourths vote. The cumbersome machinery of the overture seems merely to provide something for synod to discuss. The average synod does very little real business, being usually of a quasi-"inspirational" character, but even this suggestion does not materially add to its powers, though it does take away from the powers of the Presbyteries.

In our opinion, however, the really objectionable feature of Overture "A" is found in Section V; where it provides that a prospective licentiate "shall also give evidence of having successfully pursued two years of study in a recognized Presbyterian theological seminary, or shall offer an educational equivalent, judged satisfactory by the Presbytery." Just what is "a recognized Presbyterian theological seminary"? Recognized by whom? So far as is known, nobody has explained what this phrase means. Nobody seems to know. There are those who

feel that the phrase is possibly intended to mean "a seminary under the control of the General Assembly," and that an attempt may soon be made to classify Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia as no "recognized" Presbyterian seminary. And this, in face of the fact that, judged by the history of Presbyterianism and by its Confessional statements, Westminster Seminary is more really Presbyterian than any other seminary serving the northern church! There are some who believe it to be the *only* seminary in that church that is completely Presbyterian in more than name. Those who are familiar with the history of the Presbyterian Church from the days of KNOX and WISHART down, will rub their eyes at any definition which "recognizes" an institution as Presbyterian solely because of its administrative dependence upon the then dominating ecclesiastical organization.

It has been argued that the phrase "or shall offer an educational equivalent, judged satisfactory by the Presbytery" offers an exception so far as Westminster Seminary is concerned. This may be true in theory, but no one can deny that if the impression were falsely spread that Westminster Seminary is not a truly Presbyterian seminary many Presbyteries might hesitate in making such an exception for its graduates. This would be grossly unfair. Because, therefore, there are no particular advantages to be gained by passing this overture, and since much confusion, misunderstanding and harm would almost surely be bound to result, the Editors of CHRISTIANITY TODAY urge those who are loyal to Presbyterian doctrine and polity to vote to defeat the overture.

Overture "C" can be dismissed with fewer words. It is a rewriting of Chapter XV of the Form of Government, "of the Election and Ordination of Bishops or Pastors." The changes here are few. This fact should make for caution, rather than the opposite, for if the "powers that be" go to the trouble of writing a whole new chapter in order to introduce a few new words, we may safely assume those words to be pretty important. Aside from the fact that a reference to the Synod is provided in certain cases of ordination and reception of Ministers from other denominations, the principal change is the insertion of those now-familiar words "a recognized Presbyterian theological seminary."

Since this overture has little to commend it, and much to render its value doubtful, the Editors believe that it also should be rejected by the Presbyteries. Indeed, it may be remarked that these overtures—and the two which accompany them—have not been promoted because of any interest in the church, but because of the desire of the small, official group who control the General Council. These overtures were not discussed nor were their principles approved by the last General Assembly. The Editors hope to write more in the near future regarding the wisdom and legality of this procedure.

Overture "E" makes a change in the composition of the General Council of the General Assembly. The only noteworthy change is the insertion of a provision that, in the election of the five members of the Council chosen annually by the General Assembly, "of the five, two shall be Ministers, two shall be men who are ruling elders, and one shall be a woman in full communion of the Church, who may be a ruling elder." This sentence legalizes the presence of women on the council, following the adoption in 1930 of the amendment to the constitution allowing them to be ordained as ruling elders. Curiously enough, however, this new overture does not *require* that the women on the Council be ruling elders. The effect of this is, that if the overture be adopted, women communicants of the church, not elders, will be eligible to positions to which male communicants, not elders, will not be eligible. Then we shall probably have a new agitation, asking equal rights for men! The clause might just as well read: "one shall be a woman in full communion of the church, who need not be a ruling elder." Certainly that is the clear purport of the overture. Its wording, we repeat, is curious, almost calculated to give the impression to a hasty reader that it means the exact opposite of what it says.

Overtures "B" and "D," which are extremely important, will receive Editorial discussion in the next issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

A Fact and An Appeal

CHRISTIANITY TODAY does not profess to be a self-supporting business enterprise, still less one that yields a profit to its owners. It was established as a venture of faith to provide an instrument for expounding and defending the Gospel of the grace of God in the face of encroaching modernism in the knowledge that it would be dependent, for a number of years at least, on the gifts of those who share its aim and purpose not only for its well-being but for its very existence. Thus far this faith has been justified by the event. The paper has no debts and has funds in hand to meet all obligations that are expected in the immediate future. This does not mean, however, that our future is assured. Because of the depression some of those who supported us most generously during our first year are not in a position to continue their aid. This means that we can go forward in the work we have undertaken only as others assume the obligations these have been forced to lay down. We appeal to those who are in sympathy with our efforts, who are able to do so, to come to our help. In so doing, if we mistake not, they will be coming to "the help of the Lord against the mighty." Those who are not in a position to do more than pay the yearly subscription can help us greatly by commending the paper to their friends and acquaintances.

The Truth About The Presbyterian Church

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

I. MODERNISM IN THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION

IN 1923 and 1924 the battle between Christianity and Modernism entered upon its last and most acute phase in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. The Christian position was represented by the evangelical pronouncement of the 1923 General Assembly; the Modernist position was represented by the "Auburn Affirmation."

The General Assembly's pronouncement declared that the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection, and the miracles of our Lord are essential doctrines of the Word of God and our Standards; the Auburn Affirmation attacked that pronouncement, and declared that not a single one of these great verities is essential even for the ministry.

The issue cannot be evaded by any plea that the Affirmation attacked the General Assembly's pronouncement merely on technical grounds. The Affirmation does, indeed, raise the technical point that the General Assembly had no right to issue such a pronouncement. But it proceeds at once to something far more fundamental. It attacks the *content* of the pronouncement. It declares that not a single one of the great verities mentioned by the General Assembly is essential; and it declares that all of the five verities are merely "theories" (among other possible theories) which some may and some may not hold to be satisfactory explanations of something else. Thus it excludes all of these verities from the essential message of the Church, and in so doing it strikes a blow against the very inmost heart of the Christian religion.

In the battle between the General Assembly's pronouncement and the Auburn Affirmation, between Christianity and Modernism, the Modernist contention has in the main won the victory, and now dominates the machinery of the Presbyterian Church.

There are many indications of that fact; but one indication is so unmistakable that it might almost suffice if it stood alone. It is found in the composition of the "Permanent Judicial Commission," which was entirely reconstituted in 1931 with largely increased powers, and is now practically the supreme doctrinal as well as disciplinary authority in the Church. In the composition of such a court, we may discover, if anywhere, what the true temper of the Church is. Who, then, are members of this all-important court?

The Commission consists of fifteen members, chosen by the General Assembly, eight being ministers and seven being elders. Whatever may be said about the elders, it is perfectly easy to tell where the ministers stand in the great issue of the day.

The plain fact is that of the eight ministerial members four are actually signers of the Auburn Affirmation, and one of the four is Rev. Robert Hastings Nichols, Ph.D., D.D., of Auburn, Secretary of the committee that issued the document. Elders were not invited to sign the Affirmation, so that the signers have been given exactly one half of the total number of places available to them in the Commission. That is, one half of the ministerial members of a commission which is practically the supreme guardian of doctrine in the Presbyterian Church are signers of a public and formal document which, beside being directly polemic against the doctrine of the full truthfulness of Scripture, declares that that doctrine and the virgin birth and three other great verities of the Faith are non-essential even for the ministry.

The point is not merely that these four gentlemen have shown by their signing of the Affirmation that they are incompetent persons to sit upon the supreme judicial body of an evangelical Christian church. That point would certainly be

well taken. But the real point is far more definite than that. It is that by their signing of the Affirmation these gentlemen have already expressed themselves upon the most important question that has come or is likely to come before the Judicial Commission upon which they sit, and expressed themselves in a way derogatory to the central verities of the Christian Faith.

In the presence of that fact, it will at once be seen that all the optimistic talk about the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. as being "essentially sound" must surely cease.

But how about the other eleven members of the Commission? May there not be found among them such representation of the evangelical position as shall offset the Modernism of the Affirmation which the four members have signed?

Unfortunately, that possibility is, to say the least, very slight. There have been other tests beside the Auburn Affirmation to determine whether a man does or does not stand for the Bible and the Christian Faith in the councils of the Presbyterian Church.

In 1928, for example, there was presented to the General Assembly a petition of which the ultimate purpose was defence of the doctrine of the virgin birth—defence, that is, of one of the five doctrines attacked as non-essential by the Auburn Affirmation.

The "Virgin Birth Petition" was signed by about seventeen hundred ministers as over against the thirteen hundred who signed the Auburn Affirmation. Not a single one of these seventeen hundred was placed upon the Permanent Judicial Commission, though no less than four of the thirteen hundred signers of the Auburn Affirmation were placed there.

The Virgin Birth Petition was also signed by over four thousand elders.

Not a single one of these was given a place on the Commission.

In the same year, moreover, another evangelical memorial was presented to the General Assembly. It was the "Princeton Petition" directed against the reorganization of Princeton Theological Seminary. We shall not stop here to ask whether the signers of the Princeton Petition were or were not justified in thinking that the proposed reorganization of the Seminary was inimical to the evangelical cause. As a matter of fact, we think that they were fully justified, and that a very early official pronouncement of the new Board of control about its own membership demonstrated the fact beyond peradventure. But whether they were justified or not in the specific request that they made of the General Assembly, it is perfectly evident that they were animated in making that request by an evangelical motive and that they represented the evangelical party in the Presbyterian Church.

We do not mean that all the signers of the Princeton Petition represented the evangelical party in any very consistent or vigorous way. The Petition was a very mild document, and many of its signers have been anything but thoroughgoing in their championing of the evangelical cause. But though some of the signers of the Petition may not have been very consistent or vigorous in their evangelicalism, we do deliberately make bold to say, conversely, that a very great block of the evangelical ministers and elders in the Church—perhaps the great majority of them—were among the signers.

Yet not a single one of the twenty-five hundred or three thousand ministers, and apparently only one of the seven thousand or so elders, who signed the Princeton Petition has been given a place on the Permanent Judicial Commission.

Could there possibly be a clearer example of a partisan court? Half of the available ministerial positions have been given to signers of a radical Modernist document that attacks the message of the Church at its very root; and not a single ministerial position has been given to the far greater number who signed the mildest possible petitions looking to

the defence of God's Word. At most the Commission seems to include only one man (an elder) who by signing one of these two petitions has given public indication of zeal for the historic witness of the Church.

The ecclesiastical machinery seems to have done its work well. There may, indeed, be gentlemen on the Commission, in addition to the one signer of the Princeton Petition, who are opposed to the Auburn Affirmation and in favor of maintaining the Church's historic message; but if there are such they seem to have given as yet no very clear public indication of their stand.⁽¹⁾ So far as public utterances could lead the General Assembly to judge, the composition of the Commission, as the Assembly constituted it in May, 1931, is such as to give assurance not merely that a real believer in the Bible and in the Confession of Faith shall have no sympathetic hearing from a majority of the

⁽¹⁾ One of the ministers on the Commission, not counted here among the four signers of the Auburn Affirmation, first signed the Affirmation, but then—we cannot now say for what reason— withdrew his name before the Affirmation was printed in its final form.

Court, but also that he shall not "disturb the peace of the Church" by receiving even any considerable minority opinion in his favor or in favor of the Bible in which he believes.

It is evident that any consistent Christian man will count it a disgrace to be acquitted, on any doctrinal issue, by such a court, and an honor to be condemned. But the composition of the Court shows that the corporate life of the Presbyterian Church is corrupt at the very core; and that until the sin of the Church is honestly faced and removed, all the great swelling words about the Church's work, and all the bustle of its organizational activities, can avail but little in the sight of God.

NOTE:—In the next number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, the present writer hopes to deal with the centralization of power and the attack upon Christian liberty which is involved in measures now before the presbyteries (particularly the dangerous Overture D), and with the secrecy and discouragement of free discussion by means of which the undermining of the Church's witness has been carried on.

Questions from the General Council

By the Rev. Walter Vail Watson
Number Nine Church, Stanley, N. Y.

JUST before last Easter the General Council addressed a letter to the pastors and churches of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. that deserved more consideration than it received. Though it should have had the careful attention of each and every Presbyterian, probably not one in fifty so much as knew that the General Council had spoken—a fact that is eloquent of widespread indifference to existing denominational leadership on the part of the rank and file of the Church. In that letter the General Council asked four trenchant questions which will live until answered. As yet they have received practically no attention. Our efficient denominational press scarcely noticed them! Despite the lapse of months these questions are

as insistent as when stated in the Council's letter. Let us look at them.

The first question is about money. Quoting, "Our people do not lack money. We have more money at our command than ever before. *Why do we withhold our money from Christ and the Church?*" In this connection we are reminded that money selfishly gained and selfishly spent turns to dust in our hands. But there are reasons other than selfishness for our failure to support the denominational budget.

Our national poverty is at the most but a contributing reason, even within the last two years. The last available figures show that as a nation we have a gain in purchasing power of 59.2% since 1913. Presbyterians have doubtless

shared to the full this increase. But strange to say our benevolent giving while taking a sharp rise since that early date has fallen off very sharply since 1926. It is the evident lack of denominational support, of the budget benevolences that is at the bottom of the General Council's question. Here are the comparative figures:

	(a) Budget benevolences (living givers)*	(b) Local expenses
1926	\$44,731,062	\$10,007,762
1931	45,217,335	8,911,605
change	1.1% plus	10.95% minus

These benevolent losses can be laid at the door of hard times, of selfish absorption, but not alone there. Indifference to the causes of the budget, or suspicion, or both equally, are to blame as well. Indifference to our denominational board leaders, suspicion of their sincerity; surely these cut no small figure. Why not all face the facts frankly?

Not only is money being withheld by many of us because we lack confidence in our secretaries themselves; we don't believe in their aims and their program. Recently at a foreign missions conference it became at once evident that in our board are those who believe in catering to all elements of conviction within the church. And so we are treated to the spectacle of our leaders trying to ride in two directions at the same time. The time has come to raise the question of the feasibility of trying to send out missionaries who believe that foreign missions is primarily a business of personal salvation from sin on the one hand, and sending out on the other men and women whose missionary conviction is comprehended in the idea that our business in the last analysis is the welding of our culture with the culture of paganism. Or to put it more accurately these last believe that the missionary end is the blending of American and oriental paganism. They do not apparently realize that this is their view. But we see that their message is a message of give and take, we see that their "Christianity" is merely our western culture, our civilization, and not our per-

sonal Saviour. In the judgment of many of us the time has come to separate these two opposing views of the primary objective of foreign missions. Some of us are holding back on the Budget because it is evidently supporting both groups. We are waiting until a way can be found to support only those who represent our personal viewpoint on missions, surely a legitimate attitude!

It looks as if the time had come for the "old fashioned" group, the supernaturalists if you will, to form their own Central Receiving Agency and Board machinery for the proper propagation of its viewpoint and the handling of its money. This will have to begin in a small way; it may well become a project of the new League of Faith, composed of Ministers holding the conservative view. People of like minds must work together to support benevolent projects with which they are entirely in sympathy. There is no question that the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. is full of conflicting opinion and policy. Therefore anything like full support of its denominational budget by all the denomination is in consequence absolutely impossible. After separation into mutually exclusive groups the work can be enlarged and deepened, and will certainly be more adequately supported.

The second question has to do with the failure of the Gospel to spread with the rapidity it should. Quoting, "Our people do not lack intellectual leadership. Among our members are multitudes of men and women of high attainments. *Why do we not consecrate our talents to the defence of the Gospel and the spread of the Kingdom?*" In this connection we are reminded that knowledge leaving out God cannot satisfy the deepest needs of life.

Why is it that this is so? Have we gone over to "intellectual leadership?" Can it be that the Presbyterian Church has forgotten that "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are chosen: but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and the base things of the world, and the things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not,

to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence."

There are plenty of reasons why our denomination is not "talent conscious." In the first place the Gospel has been so insidiously misrepresented, often from within, that we are with difficulty able truly to determine it. There is no clearly defined and universally accepted statement which can now unite us as a denomination. Much of the Bible instruction in denominational colleges leads our youth to conclude that the Christian Faith is based upon ignorance, prejudice, inaccuracies, over-dogmatic interpretations by lop-sided apostles. Our Bible is claimed to be merely early Jewish and Christian literature, containing the Truth, relatively inspired, not thoroughly reliable in a superior scientific age, out-grown in much of its ethic, decidedly passe. Men are not going to dedicate their talents to an out-moded Message. A return to the supernaturalistic emphasis is indicated as the next immediate step.

What is this "new truth coming to us from physical science, political science, philosophy and theological scholarship" that the Message urges us to welcome? Frankly, many of us are suspicious of much of it. For instance, are we to understand that among its revelations are the new views of Presbyterian leaders on birth control? Is it modern philosophical truth which lets us understand that our social customs are to have the sanction of a leadership which makes expediency the ultimate basis of our standards? Are we to let lust wear the guise of respectability, and give it our blessing? Are we going to accept the assured results of a science which makes our blessed Christian Faith an emergence from the dust? Are we going to go over to the supremacy of the "inner light" in place of the "thus saith the Lord" of the Bible? It would seem that, in spite of all assurances to the contrary, many Presbyterians are becoming disciples of these heresies because of the example of their leaders.

Let us return to the view that the Gospel is a blessing to be personally received, and for the self, but only in order that it may lead us into perfect sacrificial service, into loving witness to

*Note: The figures of

(a) for 1929 were \$10,298,215

(b) for 1929 were \$50,450,686

others not yet saved. Our leadership is not urging with confidence daily taking up of the cross of self-denial and sacrifice.

The third question concerns the avoidance of Christian work by Christians. Quoting, "Our people do not lack time. We have more leisure than any previous age has had. *Why do we hold back from personal Christian service?*" In this connection we are reminded that leisure that leaves little time for Christian work or worship misses its true purpose and intent.

Here the Message tells us that there are five things Christians must do. The first is the necessity of living a life of personal righteousness. But this is not Christian work. Men are not won to discipleship of Christ solely or often by example. Ultimately men are won by the power of the Word of God proclaimed by those who themselves are redeemed sinners.

A second thing the Message says we Christians must do is faithfully to attend church and work for the proper maintenance of the organization to which we belong. Particular stress is laid upon church worship in this connection. But worship and church attendance is not the end of our Christian service. Neither did our Lord say, "Go ye into all the world and form men's brotherhoods, organize effective every-member canvasses, conduct efficient guilds and missionary societies." He did not say anything categorical about any of the organizations which occupy so much of the work time of God's people. Aside from the care of the poor, instruction of the youth, attendance upon the assembles, there is no explicit Scripture instruction for supporting the modern church organizations; but there is plenty of emphasis upon personal soul winning. All church organizations which can stand the test of definitely aiding in the evangelization of the community or the world at large should be maintained in the Church's life; the rest should go. Everything else is subordinate to the proclamation of personal salvation from sin. What redeemed men will do in their social contacts is aside from the main point. The gospel of personal salvation comes first. After individuals are saved

they will transform society where they are. Nothing is more pitiful than the sad spectacle of the organized Church in many places, largely composed of members who apparently have never been born again, desperately trying to revive the social order by human effort alone.

All of which inevitably leads us to believe that many church members utterly lack a conception of what personal Christian service really is. A recent seminary publication refers to a now famous statement of one of our leaders that what the Presbyterian Church needs is fewer and larger, more efficient churches. We can only hope to impress the world by large units with superior preaching, music, buildings and equipment. Pray, when did we receive the commission to go into all the world and impress it? Pray, when did we get the command to go into all the world and do all good things? At present we flounder about in our denominational testimony, concentrating efficiently upon no clear testimony and presenting ourselves a laughing stock to an unsympathetic world which makes us out imbecilic if not utterly insincere.

A third thing the Message says we must do as Christians is to train our youth. But how, and in what kind of doctrine? We are persuaded that nothing will enlist the loyalty of thousands of youth today, and hold it, based upon a less foundation than the Sure Word of Prophecy. The "new expression of loyalty to Christ" must necessarily gather its inspiration from a confidence in the trustworthiness of the Bible which alone speaks of Him. It is well to remember that those movements initiated with such success a generation and more ago among youth were started by men who had no doubts as to the value of the old Gospel or the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. The heart of the Student Volunteer Movement was a conviction that the world was lost in sin and going to hell. The Christian Endeavor movement was born in a love for the study of the Word itself. Where are these organizations today—not to mention others—without the old emphasis?

A fourth service activity indicated for

the Church is our leadership in all moral and intellectual issues of the day. Some of us are afraid of the almost certain result in too great intimacy between Church and state if the implications of the Message are followed. Christian people should be vitally interested in all good things; it is a real question whether the church organization should lead them. The question is whether this active interest in human affairs cannot be effected better through organizations of Christian people working without the immediate pale of the Church. History would seem to support this contention.

The Message says, fifthly, that we must be busy in the proclamation of the Gospel, and to that we heartily agree. But let us beware lest it is "another gospel," and not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The Council's fourth question is, "Our people do not lack organization or equipment. We are better equipped and more efficiently organized than at any period in history. *Why does our activity result in so much restlessness and powerlessness?*" In this connection we are reminded that if activity is not ceaselessly fed from the fountain of life it is soon exhausted.

Already it has been shown why there is so much restlessness and powerlessness. The basis of our faith has been seriously weakened through the assent of many of our church leaders to modern rationalistic and humanistic teachings: We are not being "taught of God." One wishes that the Message had stressed these facts as it should.

The study of God's Word will surely show us that as a Church we have been far too busy doing a multitude of good things instead of the big thing to which we have been committed. It will teach us that a source of present day restlessness is in our lack of the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have obscured our Saviour in the study of the "historical Jesus." When the Book of the Law is again found in the House of the Lord individual members of the Church will obtain and regain spiritual power. The cause of the Church will cease to appear a lost cause, because, like Paul, we can truly say, "I know him

whom I have believed." And how many will begin to pour in, even in times of financial depression!

The problems before the Church today are principally those which affect its heart. We are members of this Church. Let each of us pray for the illumination of the Holy Spirit, the larger entrance of God's Word, a truer and more absorbing vision of the true need of ourselves and the world as a whole. Let us start again in a new spirit of humility and expect-

ancy. Let us now rejoice that in these days the Church is again to be revived, and let us expect from God that which is impossible with man. Indeed let each one of us pray:

Awake, O Lord, as in the blessed days of old!

Come Holy Spirit, in Thy power and might;

Through grieving Thee our hearts are strangely hard and cold,

Our minds but blindly groping towards the light. . . .

Make us now on to be what we profess to be;

Let prayer be prayer, and praise be heartfelt praise.

From unreality, Oh! set us wholly free, And let our words be echoed in our ways.

Turn us, good Lord, and then shall we be truly turned.

Let every passion grieving Thee be stilled:

Then shall our race be won, our promised guerdon earned,

Our Master looked-on, and our every joy fulfilled.

Notes on Biblical Exposition

By J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.,

Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary

XI. HARMONY OF ACTS AND GALATIANS

"Then after fourteen years again I went up to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking along also Titus; and I went up according to revelation; and I laid before them the gospel which I am preaching among the Gentiles, and privately before those who were of repute, lest perchance I should run in vain or should prove to have run in vain" (Gal. 2:1-2, in a literal translation).

Identification of the Second Visit

IN last month's number we finished the discussion of Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion. It did not take place immediately after the conversion, but three years after, and in connection with it he saw no others of the pillars of the Jerusalem Church except the Apostle Peter and James the brother of the Lord, while with the Judæan churches outside of Jerusalem he had no contact at all. He was with Peter, moreover, only fifteen days.

Then he went away into the regions of Syria and of Cilicia. The Book of Acts tells us, more specifically, that he went to Tarsus, his birthplace, the chief city of Cilicia, and then was brought by Barnabas to Antioch, the chief city of Syria, to engage in the important work which was going on in that city after the gospel had been preached by certain Jewish Christians of Cyprus and Cyrene to the Gentile population.

"Then," says Paul, "after fourteen

years again I went up to Jerusalem."

What does he mean by "after fourteen years"? Does he mean fourteen years after the visit to Jerusalem which has just been mentioned, which visit in turn was three years after the conversion (Gal. 1:18), so that the total period between the conversion and this visit now to be narrated would be seventeen years; or does he mean fourteen years after the conversion—that is, eleven years (fourteen minus three) after the first visit? It is very difficult to answer this question; but the former view is perhaps slightly more probable.

With what visit mentioned in the Book of Acts is this visit narrated in Gal. 2:1-10 to be identified? Our first impulse might be to say that since it is the second visit mentioned in Galatians it is to be identified with the second visit mentioned in Acts.

The second visit mentioned in Acts was the "famine visit" of Acts 11:30; 12:25. Agabus came from Jerusalem to Antioch and prophesied a famine. To relieve the distress which this famine brought or would bring to the brethren in Judæa, Barnabas and Paul were sent up to Jerusalem with the gifts of the Antioch Church; and after the fulfillment of their commission they returned to Antioch (Acts 11:30; 12:25). Was this the visit which is to be identified with the one narrated in Gal. 2:1-10?

Chronological Considerations

Chronology does not quite interpose a decisive objection to the identification. The famine visit, it is true, is mentioned in the Book of Acts in close connection with the death of Herod Agrippa I, which occurred, as can be established from Josephus, the Jewish historian, in A.D. 44; and since Paul says (according to what we have just held to be the more probable interpretation of Gal. 2:1) that the visit narrated in Gal. 2:1-10 took place seventeen (three plus fourteen) years after the conversion, identification of this Gal. 2:1-10 visit with the famine visit would seem to put Paul's conversion in A.D. 27 (forty-four minus seventeen), which is clearly too early, since it would be earlier than the crucifixion of Jesus.

But, in the first place, it is not clear that the famine visit took place just in A.D. 44. It is true, the Book of Acts does mention the death of Herod Agrippa I, which took place in A.D. 44, between the mention of the journey of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem (Acts 11:30) and the mention of their return from Jerusalem to Antioch (Acts 12:25). But that may be merely because at the point where the author (by the mention of the journey of Paul and Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem) brings the Antioch thread of his narrative into connection with the Jerusalem thread, he

feels the need of bringing the Jerusalem thread up to date by the mention of events like the imprisonment of Peter and the death of Herod Agrippa I, which may have taken place some time before the point where the two threads of narrative are brought together. Thus it is possible that the famine visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem may have taken place not just in A.D. 44, but as late as A.D. 46.

Even so, however, it might seem as though that famine visit can hardly be identified with the visit of Gal. 2:1-10, since this visit of Gal. 2:1-10 took place seventeen years after the conversion and if we subtract seventeen from forty-six we shall get a date (A.D. 29) which is clearly too early for the conversion of Paul.

Inclusive Method of Reckoning?

This argument is not, however, quite decisive. In New Testament times an inclusive method of designating periods of time was often used. By this inclusive method, which counts both the year in which a period begins and the year in which it ends, 1933 would be "three years" after 1931. Thus "three years" in such designations would sometimes mean what we should call two years or even less; it would mean one full year and parts of two other years.

If Paul is using this method, then the "fourteen years" of Gal. 2:1 may be what we should call thirteen years, and the "three years" of Gal. 1:18 may be what we should call two years; so that if the visit of Gal. 2:1-10 be identified with the famine visit, and the famine visit be put not in A.D. 44 but in A.D. 46, we should obtain as the date of the conversion forty-six minus thirteen minus two, or A.D. 31—which, although uncomfortably early, is not quite impossible.

Moreover, it is by no means certain that Paul is reckoning the "fourteen years" of Gal. 2:1 from the first visit rather than from the conversion. Quite possibly what he means to do is to contrast the first visit, which occurred only three years after the conversion, with the Gal. 2:1-10 visit, which occurred fourteen years after that same event. If so, we should be obliged (on the assumption that the visit narrated in Gal.

2:1-10 is to be identified with the famine visit, and that the famine visit occurred in A.D. 46), to subtract only fourteen (or, with the inclusive method of reckoning, thirteen) from forty-six to get the date of the conversion, which would thus be A.D. 32 or 33—both quite possible dates. Indeed, we might even put the famine visit as early as A.D. 44, the actual year of the death of Herod Agrippa I, and still not obtain a prohibitively early date for the conversion.

It remains true that chronological considerations do on the whole favor the identification of the visit narrated in Gal. 2:1-10 with some visit later than the famine visit; but what we have just maintained is that they do not actually preclude identification with the famine visit, if other considerations make that identification natural.

Identification with the Apostolic Council

Perhaps the chief argument against the identification with the famine visit is to be found in the marked similarity between what is recorded in Gal. 2:1-10 and what is recorded in Acts about a visit other than the famine visit—namely, the visit at the time of the "Apostolic Council" of Acts 15:1-39. One of the similarities holds also, indeed, with reference to the famine visit as well as with reference to the Apostolic Council—Barnabas is represented in both places as being present with Paul. But other features are found only in Acts 15:1-39 and not in Acts 11:30; 12:25. In both Acts 15:1-39 and Gal. 2:1-10, the circumcision of Gentile converts is under discussion, and in both the result is the same—namely, approval of the position taken by Paul.

This argument for the identification of the event of Gal. 2:1-10 with that of Acts 15:1-39 and against the identification with the event of Acts 11:30; 12:25 is not, indeed, quite decisive. Even if Paul had discussed the matter of Gentile freedom privately with the pillars of the Jerusalem Church (as Gal. 2:1-10 may be interpreted to mean that he did discuss it), there would still be room, some years later, for a public pronouncement against the Judaizers like that which is recorded in Acts 15:1-39. Nevertheless, as we read Gal. 2:1-10 in comparison with Acts 15:1-39, it cannot be denied

that our first impression is that they refer to the same event. That is at least the *prima facie* view of the matter.

In the following discussion, this *prima facie* view will be adopted provisionally in order that we may see how it works in detail. We shall endeavor to see how Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts 15:1-39 fit in together on the assumption that they refer to the same event. The momentous implications of this whole comparison will appear more clearly in the sequel.

The Famine Visit Not Mentioned?

Just at the beginning, we encounter what is often regarded as a serious difficulty. Paul says, after he has narrated his first post-conversion visit to Jerusalem, "Then after fourteen years again I went up to Jerusalem." Could he have passed over unmentioned a visit to Jerusalem that took place in that interval, as we are compelled to hold that he has done if we identify the visit narrated in Gal. 2:1-10 with the Apostolic Council and hold that the famine visit had taken place in between?

This question is often answered in the negative, and either one of two conclusions is drawn from that answer. Some of those who hold that Paul could not have passed over the famine visit here without mention draw the conclusion that this visit of Gal. 2:1-10 is itself the famine visit, and that the identification of it with the Apostolic Council of Acts 15:1-39, which we have adopted provisionally, must be given up after all. Others, insisting still on the identification of this visit with the Apostolic Council, draw the conclusion that the famine visit never occurred at all, and that therefore the information in Acts 11:30; 12:25 is incorrect.

But is the assumption upon which these two conclusions are based so well grounded as the advocates of it suppose? Is it true that Paul would have been obliged to mention the famine visit if it had really occurred between the first visit and the one narrated in Gal. 2:1-10?

At first sight, it might seem as though that were the case. In this passage, it might be said, the Apostle Paul is tracing in the most careful way his relations with the Jerusalem Church, by way of answer to bitter opponents who would

have been quick to seize upon the slightest weakness in his argument. He has just narrated his first visit to Jerusalem with careful attention to detail and with asseveration of his complete accuracy. He has dealt with all possibilities of contact with the original apostles, in order that the Judaizers might not be able to say that he has left anything out. In Jerusalem, he is careful to tell us, he saw only Peter and James, and he did not visit the Judæan churches at all. Could he possibly lapse so soon from this completeness and carefulness of statement as actually to omit mention of a second visit to Jerusalem? Would not the Judaizers have been quick to seize upon so significant an omission? Would they not have said that there, at that second visit, which Paul (as they would have charged) was afraid to mention, was to be put the meeting with the Jerusalem leaders which showed Paul to be no independent apostle but a mere disciple of those whom Jesus had originally chosen?

The Transition in Paul's Argument

This argument, plausible though it may seem at first sight, is not decisive. It ignores the fact that there is a transition in Paul's argument between the first chapter and the second chapter of Galatians.

In the first chapter, Paul is arguing that at the beginning of his Christian life there was not even such *contact* with the original apostles as could have made him a mere disciple of theirs. To how late a period in Paul's life would this exhibition of lack of contact with the apostles have to be continued? Only, it seems natural to say, to the point where Paul was already well launched upon the preaching of his gospel. But that point was surely reached some time before the time of the famine visit, supposing the famine visit to have taken place as the Book of Acts says it took place.

What did Paul do when he was in or near Tarsus between the time when he left Jerusalem three years after his conversion and the time when Barnabas brought him to Antioch? Surely he preached there; and in all probability both the Galatians and the Judaizing opponents knew that that was the case, so

that all the original readers of the Epistle to the Galatians would understand that when Paul says in Gal. 1:21 that he went to the regions of Syria and of Cilicia that meant that at that time he was launched very definitely upon the preaching of his gospel.

But if he preached his gospel before he had the kind of contact with the original apostles which could have made him a disciple of theirs, he could not have derived his gospel from them. Therefore, when in the Epistle he has traced his life up to the point where he was fairly launched upon the preaching of his gospel, the first part of his argument is over, and it no longer remains necessary for him to trace in any such detail the subsequent history of his relations with the Jerusalem leaders.

Conference With the Apostles

He proceeds, therefore, in the second chapter, to an entirely different argument. The point of this new argument is that when the original apostles, the very men to whom the Judaizers appealed, finally did have a conference with Paul about the content of his gospel, they took completely Paul's view of the matter, admitted gladly that Paul needed no endorsement from them and his gospel needed no addition, gave him the right hand of fellowship, and recognized the fact that his gospel had already been given him, without any mediation of theirs, by God Himself.

It is true, Paul is careful to say when this important conference took place. It took place, he says, fourteen years after the first visit (or, by another interpretation of his words, fourteen years after the conversion). But the point of this mention of the time of the conference visit is not to show that it was after an interval of so many years during which Paul had made no visits to Jerusalem, but rather to show that the first real conference with the original apostles, at which the content of Paul's gospel was discussed with them, did not take place at the first visit after the conversion, as apparently the Judaizers said that it did, but at a visit many years later.

The "after fourteen years" of Gal. 2:1 stands, therefore, in relation to the "after three years" of Gal. 1:18. "The first contact of any kind that I had with

the original apostles," says Paul, "took place three years after the conversion; and the first real conference with them at which they expressed themselves about my gospel took place fourteen years later still."

The Apostles and the Famine Visit

Rightly regarded, therefore, Paul's argument does not demand that the famine visit should be mentioned, supposing it took place prior to the visit recorded in Gal. 2:1-10, unless it involved the important event of a real conference between the original apostles and Paul regarding the content of Paul's gospel and an expression of opinion by the original apostles about that gospel and about Paul's right to preach it.

But it is very improbable, from the account of the famine visit in Acts, that that visit, if it did really take place, involved anything of the kind. It is said in Acts 11:30 that the gifts were sent to the "elders" at Jerusalem; no mention is made of apostles as being there: and, indeed, it is quite possible that at the time of the persecution by Herod Agrippa I and for a time after his death the apostles were all out of the city. James the brother of the Lord was, indeed, no doubt there; but still, if the apostles were away, there would be no real opportunity at that time for the kind of pronouncement upon Paul's gospel which Paul would have been obliged to mention at this point in his argument in Galatians.

We must remember, moreover, that in the first two chapters of Galatians Paul is not constructing an argument which would hold against all possible objections, but rather is meeting specific objections of the Judaizers. Apparently it was that first visit to Jerusalem which they had seized upon for their purposes. Paul was obliged, therefore, to set them right in detail about that visit. But if the famine visit gave them so little color of support that they had not even tried to bring it forward, then Paul was not obliged to mention it in his argument, and his omission of mention of it before Gal. 2:1 does not prove either that the visit narrated in Gal. 2:1-10 is to be identified with it or that the Book of Acts is in error in representing it as having occurred.

Books of Religious Significance

SCIENCE AND RELIGION, a Symposium by twelve British scientists and clergymen. Scribners, 1931. Price, \$1.75.

IN the case of a number of the writers of this work there is an evident propriety in their placing "science" first in the title. As Principal Jacks points out, "some of the writers, lay and clerical, give science the leading part in laying down the terms of reconciliation between science and religion. Science is master of the situation. She has won all the engagements that have been fought so far, and, though religion has not been annihilated, she has been taught a sharp lesson. Therefore it is for science to dictate the terms of surrender and for religion to accept them. In case religion refuses a bad time is in store for her. The passports of religion are not valid until they have been stamped and visa'd by the scientific consulate."

In particular Professor Julian Huxley demands that religion become the pliant handmaiden of science and content herself with such menial tasks as the mistress of the situation allows her—i.e., the setting up of a scale of values on the basis of the data furnished by science. Huxley insists that the nature of religion be determined by the science of comparative religion. Accordingly the root elements of religion are declared to be a sense of sacredness, a sense of dependence, and a desire for explanation and comprehension—which last is to be gratified by natural science. God and immortality are "not essential to the nature of religion." Further it is the duty of religion to assimilate the new facts and the possible generalizations offered by science to account for these facts. Religion must modify herself according to Darwin. For, while God and man are treated as relative, evolution is regarded as absolute on this planet. "Nature works according to universal automatic law," preserving her unity and continuity apart from any guidance of matter from without. The energy which moves the tides, drives a motor car, and in man consciously feels, reasons and plans, "is only one world-stuff, only one flow of energy." Again it is the business of religion to mold itself to conform to the sex-psychology of Freud, and the behaviorism of Pavlov.

Without stopping to criticise Huxley in detail, it is important to recognize the service he has rendered in clearing the atmosphere, and in revealing the irrepressible conflict which must continue to exist between historic Christianity and science as he has presented it. Christianity can never accept the terms of reconciliation which the eminent zoologist offers—for when she does she ceases to be Christianity. Anyone who

reads this lecture with an ounce of discrimination must see that Professor Huxley has branded as a particular theology which science is determined to destroy the religion of the sovereign God and of His great and "absolutely unique acts for the redemption of mankind, particularly the sending of His only begotten Son, His death on the cross for the atonement of the world, His resurrection as the beginning of a new God-given life for the redeemed race"—the religion commonly and historically known as the Christian religion. Huxley has also clearly limned a form of the doctrine of evolution—an all too common form of that doctrine—with which supernatural religion can have only war from generation to generation.

Other addresses offer more positive contributions, although too many of the speakers have allowed Huxley to sound the keynote. Eddington finds that the most fundamental postulate derived from scientific inquiry is that in us there is something to which truth matters. Rev. H. R. L. Shepard forcibly reminds us that in their profound crises men turn to religion rather than to science; and from religion derive their new vitality. Dean Inge points out defects in the Victorian doctrine of universal and automatic progress; Principal Jacks is thought provocative. A Protestant naturally differs from Father O'Hara in his doctrine of Baptism; but in spite of this difference the reviewer regards the Jesuit's article as the most distinctively Christian of any in the series.

WILLIAM CHILDS ROBINSON,
Columbia Theological Seminary,
Columbia, S. C.

THE BONDAGE OF THE WILL. By Martin Luther. Translated by Henry Cole, M.A., with slight alteration from Edward T. Vaughan, M.A. Corrected by Henry Atherton. Great Britain: The Sovereign Grace Union, 98 Camberwell Grove, London, S. E. 5, 10/6. United States: W. B. Eerdman's Pub. Co., 234 Pearl St., N.W., Grand Rapids, Mich., \$3.50.

THE Sovereign Grace Union is doing a valuable service to orthodox Christians by reprinting books of the type now under consideration. Luther's book will remain a classic on the subject of man's free will. It should be remembered that Luther deals with the subject chiefly from an ethical point of view. Accordingly he brings out very forcibly the Scripture doctrine of the "natural man's" total inability to do anything that is good in the sight of God. And what could be more useful for the church today than a reemphasis of this very point? The "wisdom of the world" rebels against this

doctrine constantly. This wisdom seeks to insinuate itself into the church again and again. It is such a hard doctrine to believe that we can do nothing meritorious in the sight of God unless He by His grace operates in our hearts.

The method employed by Luther is that of detailed Scripture explanation. For this reason the book should be very useful for those who are troubled with certain Scripture passages which they think seems to allow some power to the "natural man." Moreover the book is very readable. The fact that it was written long ago should not keep any one from reading it.

Incidentally one may gather many interesting bits of information about the ways and methods of Modernism in this book of Luther. Luther was writing against the famous Modernist of his day, the great Erasmus. Luther shows how Erasmus counseled men from the investigation of deep doctrines. Such investigations could lead to nothing but disharmony and strife according to Erasmus. At the same time the real result of such a policy and the real intent of Erasmus who advised its adoption was that men should turn to an agnostic position. "You call us off, and forbid our endeavouring to know the prescience of God—and counsel us to leave such things, and to avoid and disregard them; and in so doing you at the same time teach us your rash sentiments; that we should seek after an ignorance of God—" p. 45. We may well ask, "Shall a leopard change his spots?" Modernism in the Reformation period sought to insinuate a far-reaching agnosticism into the church in the name of peace and harmony. Is Modernism today doing anything different?

Luther takes pains to call attention to this policy of Erasmus again and again. Nothing seems to him to be so dangerous as the systematic cultivation of ignorance in the name of peace as Modernism engages in it without let or hindrance. Accordingly he wrote his catechisms with which to instruct the youth of the church in the essentials of the Christian faith. Would not the church do well to follow Luther's example in this respect? Orthodox Christians have themselves to blame most of all for the rapid inroads of Modernism in the Church. Modernism thrives wherever ignorance of the church's teachings prevails.

Another point of interest is the confidence with which Luther meets his opponent. He gives Erasmus credit for great learning and culture but does not in the least fear to meet him in the arena of religious debate. In this respect too, it would seem, we can well afford to follow Luther's example. All too often we crouch like "a belaboured

hound beneath his master's lash" when Modernism hurls the dread name of science rather than produce argument. We need to be humbly bold in our fight with Modernism because we have the fullest confidence that truth is on our side.

Many other matters might be mentioned which would prove that the book of Luther makes very profitable reading for any one interested in the progress of the old gospel. We have mentioned only two or three items in order to give an illustration of the great value of the book.

CORNELIUS VAN TIL.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF KARL BARTH by the Rev. John McConnachie. Hodder and Stoughton, London. pp. 228.

KARL BARTH: PROPHET OF A NEW CHRISTIANITY? by William Pauck. Harper & Brothers, New York. pp. 228.

THESE two books witness to the growing interest in Barthianism in English speaking circles. The first is from the pen of the Minister of St. John's Church, Dundee, Scotland (see our August issue, p. 16) and is more appreciative than critical. In fact we will hardly do its author an injustice if we speak of him as a disciple of Barth. The second is from the pen of the professor of Church History and Historical Theology at the Chicago Theological Seminary (Congregational) and is more critical than appreciative. For while Professor Pauck finds much of value in Barth he holds that he is the "preacher in the wilderness" not the prophet of the new Christianity. Both these writers have studied under Barth and speak out of a first-hand knowledge of his writings. Their books admirably supplement each other and together constitute a valuable contribution to the literature of Barthianism.

In the first of these books we see Barth through the eyes of one whose theological background is that of a present-day Scottish Presbyterian while in the second we see him through the eyes of one whose theological background is the modernism that derives from Schleiermacker by way of Ritschl, Harnack and Troeltsch. The thoroughly naturalistic viewpoint from which Professor Pauck approaches Barth is indicated not only by his statement that "supernaturalistic metaphysics are offensive to our minds and consciences" (p. 202) but more in detail by such a passage as the following: "No intelligent person will deny the validity of the demand that the church recognize the modern world-view as it has been shaped by the results of scientific research. A defense of the story of the creation as it is told in the first chapters of the Bible against the theory of evolution is an act of blind stubbornness. A denial of the human origin of the Bible and a refusal to investigate the

history of the Church according to the best scholarly methods is dishonest. To retain a theology of yesterday, which does not do justice to modern astronomy, geology, biology and psychology is impossible" (p. 22). We cannot stay to question Professor Pauck's assumptions that scientific research has disproved the Bible story of creation or that the use of the best scholarly methods leads to belief in the purely human origin of the Bible; but we pause to remark that the fact that a man like Professor Pauck finds so much in Barth to praise is fitted to raise the question whether there is as much of good in him as Mr. McConnachie discovers.

In trying to appraise Barth it is imperative that we keep in mind that he attacks both modernism and fundamentalism. Our satisfaction over the vigor and cogency of his attack on modernism is greatly lessened by the fact that he is scarcely less vigorous (we do not say scarcely less cogent) in his attack on fundamentalism—true as it is that his sympathies are with fundamentalism rather than with modernism as shown by the fact that he says that if he had to choose between them he would choose the former. Moreover it is significant in this connection that Barth began as a modernist. This means that he has travelled in the direction of fundamentalism (using the term in its broad sense) and inasmuch as he is still travelling it is by no means impossible that he will yet reach a position more in accord with that of the fundamentalist. Our regret that Barth's own position is as yet so far removed from orthodoxy should, however, not be allowed to conceal from ourselves the fact that the theological movement now most in favor in Germany is strongly anti-modernistic. A few years ago it seemed that the whole theological world insofar as it was not fundamentalist had gone over to the modernist position. Certainly that is not the case today. Today Barth and his friends look upon liberalism as represented by men like Fosdick as belonging to yesterday to a much larger extent than fundamentalism.

Mr. McConnachie maintains that Barth is a reformed theologian and that Barthianism is a revival of Calvinism. It seems to us, however, that Professor Pauck is nearer the facts when he maintains that there is only a small measure of truth in this contention. It is true that Barth holds that Calvinism understood Christianity much better than have the modernists but Calvinism will have to be largely re-defined before we can call Barth a Calvinist.

We hope at some future date to give our readers something like an adequate appraisal of Barthianism but at present we content ourselves with indicating some of the points at which it seems to us fatally defective. In the first place it seems to us that its doctrine of the transcendence of

God is so one-sided as practically to deny that man is made in the image of God. If modernism errs by a too exclusive emphasis on the immanence of God, Barthianism errs by a too one-sided emphasis on the transcendence of God. In the second place its doctrine of the Bible seems to us far removed from the true doctrine. We agree that the Bible cannot rightly claim exemption from historico-critical treatment but we cannot agree that its value as revelation is independent of the results of such criticism. According to Barth the Word of God is in the words of the Bible, but the Word of God is in no real sense to be identified with the words of the Bible. While Barth has repeatedly said that the doctrine of the literal inspiration of the Bible is not easily pushed aside yet he does not hold that position and many of his followers at least accept the conclusions of the most radical critics of the Bible. In the third place its view that faith cannot be built on historical facts seems to us fatally defective inasmuch as it seems to sit loosely to the very things that make Christianity the gospel of salvation. Mr. McConnachie in the name of Barth takes exception to Dr. Machen's statement (*What is Faith* p. 242) that "Christianity is founded squarely . . . upon facts." Barth's desire of course is to secure a basis for Christianity that is independent not only of the psychologism of modernism but of the historicism of fundamentalism. He is attempting the impossible. Christianity is grounded in facts and is neither credible nor possessed of saving significance apart from those facts.

The following passages from Professor Pauck seem to us significant. After stating his own conviction that "our only authority is our venturesome faith as we have been led by a sincere open-minded consideration of the facts of life. God has revealed Himself to us in the present life we are living. We believe in Him because the realities of life compel us to. In these realities He finds us. In this sense faith comes to us; we do not create it" he adds: "our impression is that the ultimate authority on which Barth depends is no other than this, and we cannot avoid the conclusion that he is guilty of a strange self-deception, when he insists on pointing to the immediate revelation of God which is concealed in the Biblical testimony on Jesus Christ. He operates with a conception of revelation which is antiquated, outlived, unreal. It is the old supernaturalism, the old belief in the miraculous intervention of an otherworldly, superhuman, anthropomorphic God which haunts him" (p. 165). We call this passage significant because it indicates to us what seems to us to be an important truth about Barth, viz., that within him two life and world views are struggling for the mastery. Broadly speaking these life and world views are the ones known as naturalism and su-

pernaturalism. Professor Pauck holds that it is the former that fundamentally determines his thinking but admits that the latter still supplies much of the content of his thought. It seems to us, therefore, that the question whether the Barthian movement ultimately furthers the cause of true religion depends on which of these elements in its thought secures the ascendancy. If its

naturalistic elements triumph it may be different but it will be as much the enemy of Christianity as is modernism; but if its supernaturalistic elements triumph it may be instrumental to a revival of Christianity in all its ancient power. The supernaturalism of Christianity is not its weakness but its strength.

S. G. C.

minority up to 1890. But every year their number increased. Look at the following list:

Immigrants from Northern Europe:	
1870-1880	91.6%
1880-1890	80.2%
1890-1900	48.4%

Immigrants from Southern Europe:	
1870-1880	8.4%
1880-1890	19.8%
1890-1900	51.6%

Since 1890 the Southerners (Roman Catholics) have outnumbered the Protestant immigrants and the ratio in their favor has increased.

Look at these statistics: Number of immigrants from Northern Europe during 1900-1910 was 23.3%. In the same time from Southern Europe it was 76.7%. From 1910-1920 the Northerners came down to 22.8% and the Southerners climbed up to 77.2%. What do these figures tell us? A great deal. They tell us that Protestant America is on the brink of ceasing to be a Protestant people. These figures tell us that we are drifting to Rome if not to Leningrad (Moscow) for many of the aliens from Latin and Slavonic countries have communistic and anarchistic if not atheistic tendencies. If the latter pernicious tendencies should get the upperhand in our beloved country not only Wittenberg and Geneva (Luther and Calvin: Protestantism) but also Rome itself would be in danger and doomed to destruction.

If our present-day Protestant churches would only be "Valiant-For-Truth"; if they had only maintained "The Faith of our Fathers"; if they only had stuck to the fundamentals of our Apostolic Catholic Christian Faith and Creed there would be at least some hope for a vigorous Protestantism, able and powerful enough to overcome Roman Catholic errors superstition and also unbelief and atheism, etc.

Alas! nowadays Modernism has rejected many truths which Rome upholds, such cardinal doctrines as: Creation and Providence, the Holy Trinity, the Godhead of Christ, the Virgin Birth, the substitutionary character of Christ's death, His resurrection, the Godhead of the Holy Spirit, the plenary inspiration of Holy Scriptures, etc., etc.

There is more. The committee of the Federation of Churches reported favorably on Neo-Malthusianism, (birth-control, rather birth-denial).

While negroes, orthodox Jews and Roman Catholics as a rule believe in large families, so called *Protestants* protest against them! They cannot afford them.

Indeed there are reasons to be heavy of heart as to the future of Protestantism in our country.

J. KEIZER.

Kalamazoo, Mich.

Letters to the Editor

[The letters printed here express the convictions of the writers, and publication in these columns does not necessarily imply either approval or disapproval on the part of the Editors. If correspondents do not wish their names printed, they will please so request, but all are asked kindly to sign their names as an evidence of good faith. We do not print letters that come to us anonymously.]

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Your excellent and informing report of the 143rd General Assembly deserves appreciation, even though belated. If it had not been for CHRISTIANITY TODAY and the daily press, Presbyterians in general would have had little knowledge of what actually took place. The church papers which are under the domination of the ecclesiastical machine either do not care to inform their readers of what is going on, or they are not permitted to tell the readers what they should know. Some day, perhaps sooner than those now in the saddle are thinking, the rank and file of Presbyterians will awake to the folly of supposing that a church divided against itself can fulfill the mission God intended. The sooner Presbyterians do get possession of the facts, the sooner some of the "distinguished" leaders, who are running things now with a high hand, will stop some of their Modernistic tomfoolery.

The triumph of Modernism, with its "every man his own saviour," and "Christianity a way of life" teachings, seems to have had something of a jolt by the way the General Assembly voted on Moderator, by the "progress" of Church Union, and by the outcome of the Federal Council matter. Church Union is coming by leaps and bounds through various well known undenominational agencies too numerous to mention, but the Union which is coming with such certainty is in no sense such a machine affair as Presbyterian politicians are endeavoring to bring about. All who are true to the faith can rejoice in that fact. The average member of the Presbyterian Church is led to wonder why certain of the "statesmanlike" leaders should be so zealous in behalf of the Federal Council, in view of the unsavory notoriety that organization has acquired. Certainly the Presbyterian Church has nothing desirable to gain from connection with such an outfit. There may be some "big leaders" of the Church who have not as yet been elected to the presidency of the Federal Council, but this is hardly a

worthy reason for the Presbyterian Church to retain membership in such an organization. Since many of the interests of the Federal Council are more or less anti-Christian—indeed it is interested in about everything except redemptive Christianity—it is passing strange that the President of a Presbyterian Theological Seminary should feel called upon to go out of his way to keep the Church in the Federal Council. It is no wonder the Seminary finds it necessary to issue protestations in defense of its orthodoxy! They are needed. This is carrying the "inclusive policy" to the bitter extreme.

Has the General Assembly ceased to seek the glory of God and become merely an agency for the glorification and flattery of a few selected or self-appointed "leaders"? It is no wonder the question is being asked in all seriousness. Let us confess that it is because the Presbyterian Church is forgetting the glory of God and giving a sadly divided testimony, that she is so impotent in the presence of infidelity, worldliness and heathenism. It must be so until the Church is purged and can give a clear witness to the Christ.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL T. BARR.

Germantown, Phila., Pa.

"Protect Us by Thy Might, Great God Our King."

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: We Americans have been from the beginning a Protestant people. The immigrants from England, Germany, Holland and Scandinavia were as a rule, of Protestant persuasion. But since the year 1890, there has come a change. During the decade from 1860-1870 there came to our ports from Northern (Protestant) Europe 98.4% immigrants in comparison with 1.6% only from Southern Europe: Italians, French, Spaniards, Slavonians, etc. These were as a rule, nominally at least, Roman Catholics. These Southern immigrants were far in the

Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice

Baptism and Salvation

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

I am enclosing a marked clipping from *The Westminster Intermediate-Senior Quarterly*. As a Bible teacher, I would like to have you tell me where I can find any authority in the Bible for such a statement. Christ said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." When the Ethiopian eunuch asked Philip "What doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." Peter did not baptize Cornelius and his household until they believed on Jesus, Christ, and had received the witness of the Holy Spirit.

To a Presbyterian Minister, the answer to Q. 95 in our *Shorter Catechism* should have some weight. "Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of the visible Church, till they profess their faith in Christ, and obedience to Him; but the infants of such as are members of the visible Church, are to be baptized."

J. T.

The citation referred to above is to be found in the lesson of October 4th in connection with the comment on Acts 16:13-15 where Luke relates the conversion of Lydia and reads as follows: "Then God's whisper came to her. God opened her heart so that she believed the Christian message. She asked for baptism, and Paul baptized her and all her household, which included all those employed in her business, perhaps many slaves and freedwomen" (italics ours). In our opinion that part of the comment expressed by the italicized words is fitted to convey a thought out of harmony with the teachings of the Bible. Believing as we do that the Bible authorizes infant baptism we think it altogether likely that the statement "she was baptized and her household" means that her children were baptized as well as herself. It is also quite possible that those of "her household" included others beside her immediate family. Inasfar as these others were adults, however, we may be sure that they were baptized only in case they had a faith like unto that of their mistress. It is regrettable, it seems to us, that an official Presbyterian publication should convey the impression that there is Biblical authority for the notion that Paul baptized adults who were lacking in personal faith in the Christian message.

God of Both Testaments

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

Is it correct to say that the God of the Old Testament is quite different from the God of the New Testament? Is there factual evidence to prove that the Bible portrays man's evolution from a concept of God as a sovereign God of justice to be feared to a democratic God of love?

C. K.

IN our judgment there is no warrant for saying that the God of the Old Testament is different from the God of the New Testament. It is true of course that the New Testament contains a fuller revelation of God than does the Old Testament, but it is the same God of whom we learn in each. The representation to the contrary that constantly emanates from "liberal" circles rests on no solid basis as Dr. A. C. McGiffert in his radical book, *The God of the Early Christians*, has rather recently shown afresh. According to Dr. McGiffert, who certainly cannot be accused of sympathy with "conservative" views, Jesus did not teach a new view of God. More especially he maintains that it is a mistake to suppose that Jesus stressed in any revolutionary manner the love or the Fatherhood of God. He says in fact that the love and the Fatherhood of God were more prominent in the teachings of Jesus' contemporaries than in His own, and that if any element in His teaching was more distinctive than any other it was what He had to say about the awful severity of God. Jesus as he points out had much to say about punishment as well as bliss in the future world and presented a picture of God that accords not at all with the common "liberal" representation. While we regard Dr. McGiffert's picture itself as one-sided yet it provides a wholesome check on a picture that is even more one-sided, viz., the picture of God presented by modern religious liberalism in which no place is found for the element of sovereign justice. In both the Old and the New Testaments God is revealed as a God of love, but in both it is a love that can be apprehended in any adequate way only as it is understood against the background of those other conceptions of His character expressed in the phrases, "God is Righteousness," "God is Holiness," "God is a consuming fire." The Scriptures never teach that God is love and therefore there is no need of an atonement for sin. They ever teach that God is love and therefore He, at unspeakable cost to Himself, provided an atonement. As John

wrote in words that all the New Testament would have approved: "Herein was the love of God manifested in us, that God sent His only-begotten Son into the world that we might live through Him. Herein in love, not that we loved God, but that God loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (I John 4:9, 10.); "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him might not perish but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). It may be added that if the God of the Old Testament were "quite different" from the God of the New Testament, it is passing strange that writers like Paul and Peter and John—all of whom were steeped in Old Testament teaching—exhibit no consciousness of the fact. Their unawareness of the difference evidences that no such difference exists.

Our answer to the second question given above has been indicated in what has been said. If the same God meets us in both Testaments, it is obvious that the Bible does not portray such an evolution in men's concept of God. It is true, as indicated above, that God's revelation of Himself has been progressive, "by divers portions and in divers manners," but it is ever the same God who does the revealing and that is revealed. No doubt it is possible to so reconstruct the Old Testament as to make it appear that it supports a different thesis, but, in our judgment, such reconstruction is itself unwarranted. Everywhere in the Bible we meet a God who is sovereign both in the sphere of justice and love. In the nature of the case there can be no such thing as a "democratic" God. A god who is less than sovereign is no god at all. Whoever conceives of God as less than sovereign misconceives and profanes His holy name. The fear of God is a characteristic of New Testament saints as well as of Old Testament saints.

Divine Healing

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

Why do not the disciples of Christ today have the same power to heal as did the apostles to whom Christ gave this power just before He commissioned them to go forth?

Very sincerely,

C. C.

IN our judgment the answer to this question is to be found in the fact—for fact we esteem it to be—that miraculous gifts were bestowed upon the Apostles as the authoritative agents of God in founding the church and hence ceased with the passing of the Apostles together with those upon whom the Apostles had conferred this power. This question of miraculous gifts in the church (including the gift of healing) has

been dealt with adequately and satisfactorily in our opinion by the late Dr. B. B. Warfield in his book "Counterfeit Miracles" (Charles Scribner's Sons). "The Apostolic Church," he wrote, "was characteristically a miracle-working church. How long did this state of things continue? It was the characterizing peculiarity of specifically the Apostolic Church and it belonged therefore exclusively to the Apostolic age—although no doubt this designation may be taken with some latitude. These gifts were not the possession of the primitive Christian as such; nor for that matter of the Apostolic Church or the Apostolic age for themselves; they were distinctively the authentication of the Apostles. They were part of the credentials of the Apostles as the authoritative agents of God in founding the church. Their function thus confined them to distinctively the Apostolic Church and they necessarily passed away with it. Of this we may be sure on the ground of both principle and fact; that is to say both under the guidance of the New Testament as to their origin and nature, and on the credit of the testimony of the later ages as to their cessation. . . . This does not mean, of course, that only the Apostles appear in the New Testament as working miracles, or that they alone are represented as recipients of the charismata. But it does mean that the charismata belonged, in a true sense, to the Apostles and constituted one of the signs of an Apostle. Only in the two great initial instances of the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost and the reception of Cornelius are charismata recorded as conferred without the laying on of the hands of the Apostles. There is no instance on record of their conference by the laying on of the hands of any one else than an Apostle." In our judgment Christian disciples in general never did have the power to heal miraculously, that being a gift that was possessed only by those upon whom Christ or His apostles conferred it. That power passed away with the Apostles and the last of those upon whom the Apostles conferred such power. Hence there is nothing surprising in the fact that disciples today do not possess such power. That is only what is to be expected. What would be surprising would be their possession of such a power.

Bible Inspiration

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

I liked the tone of your reply to a question in the April issue relative to the authenticity of the last twelve verses in the Gospel according to Mark, though I had never before known that this passage was of doubtful authenticity and probably an interpolation. You say you consider it "spurious" and why you do. I like your frankness in this and in all your answers to

correspondents. But it seems to me you are doing, to a limited degree, only what reverent higher critics in general are doing and what I think they should not be censured for doing, even though their researches force them to throw out other portions. There is no real difference, in principle, between throwing out twelve verses or ten times that number. In either case the admission that portions are probably spurious, is an admission that the Bible, as we have it, is not "infallible." The statement that the original manuscripts were infallible does not seem to alter the case, since those originals are not now in existence. I should greatly appreciate your discussing this point, for it is of very deep interest to me.

B. G. W.

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

Your paper is filling a great need in the readers of religious magazines, and I thank God for the large helpfulness which you are extending to many. I would be both glad and grateful if you would let me know your views on the inspiration of the Scriptures. I have always believed in verbal inspiration and that therefore there is no error of either thought or words in the original documents, but I have been asked what would be the value of such inspiration if the copies now extant and our various translations are not themselves exact in word. I have not found an answer entirely satisfactory to myself, but still feel that verbal inspiration and equal inspiration of every part of the Word are essential to the authority of the Word as the message of God. If you can answer my question through the columns of your paper I shall greatly appreciate it.

Yours in the service of Christ,

A. M. M.

We greatly appreciate the kind words of our correspondents and would at least like to believe that we are in some degree deserving of them. We do not cherish the notion, however, that we are superior to our fellow-conservatives in the matter of frankness. The true evangelical has nothing to conceal and so is under no temptation to use double-faced language when speaking of the Scriptures. To a fuller degree than some he can say with Paul: "For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God; but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ." This finds its ultimate explanation, if we mistake not, in the fact that the Bible is through and through an evangelical book, as is freely acknowledged by radical scholars of various schools. What is more, frankness is a characteristic of the evangelical because he is fully convinced of the truthfulness of the religion of the Bible. He welcomes "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the

truth" because he is persuaded that in proportion as this is done his view of life and the world will be recognized as the only valid one. Since in his judgment the Christian life and world view rests not on human wisdom but on divine revelation, he is not fearful lest human wisdom will show it to be false.

The questions of our correspondents have to do with two matters. They have to do (1) with the legitimacy of textual criticism and (2) the propriety and value of appealing to original manuscripts which are no longer extant. The first of these can be disposed of in a few words by saying that we fully recognize the legitimacy of both textual and historical criticism. We agree that there is no difference in principle between deleting one verse or twelve verses or many times that number. Whether any particular deletion is warranted is simply a matter of weighing the evidence for and against its genuineness. The choice here is not between criticism and no criticism but between a sound and an unsound criticism. In as far as we censure others for eliminating portions of the Bible which we accept we do so on the ground that they have done so in the face of the weight of the evidence.

The second of these matters calls for much fuller consideration, much fuller in fact than we are able to give it in this connection. We are not without hope that at some future date we will be able to give our readers a somewhat extended discussion of the whole problem of inspiration. At present, however, we confine our attention to certain considerations which seem to us to justify the appeal to the original manuscripts as our final authority despite the fact that all existing copies (including of course all translations) are admittedly not infallible. In the first place we should remember that while all admit that we do not have the autograph copies of the Biblical books yet what we have approximates to that. Dr. Hort has estimated that in .999 per cent of the New Testament we have the exact words of the original authors. There is no reasonable doubt but that many exaggerated statements are current as to the extent to which the Bible we have departs from the original. In the second place, we should not overlook the testimony of the Scriptures to their own trustworthiness. While written by men they claim to be the Word of God and as such completely trustworthy in all their representations. If we reject this basic claim it goes without saying that the Bible errs at a central point. In fact if we cannot trust the Bible in what it tells us about itself, how can we trust it in what it tells us about other things? On the other hand if we admit this basic claim, it is evident that there were no errors in the original manuscripts. We can understand how men can differ as to the validity of this claim, but we cannot understand how they

can differ over the question of its importance. In the third place the question whether the original manuscripts were infallible is of great importance because on that question hangs the binding authority of the Bible. A Bible that always contained errors could not rightly be spoken of as the "Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice." Only on the assumption that the original manuscripts were free of error can we be certain that the Bible even when its text is rightly ascertained and rightly interpreted is authoritative. Surely it is a matter of no small importance whether from the beginning the Bible has been a mixture of truth and error. If the Bible has always contained errors we cannot be certain that even those passages concerning whose authenticity there is no doubt will yield us the sure word of God.

We believe, therefore, that the appeal to the original manuscripts is a justifiable one.

No doubt this consideration may be abused. We have no right to say that an alleged error was not in the original manuscript in defiance of all sound textual criticism. But while this consideration does not provide an ever-ready refuge to which to flee when confronted with alleged Biblical errors, it should be firmly maintained that it is a perfectly legitimate one and that no one has any right to say that there are proved errors in the Bible unless he can show that there is good reason to think that they were in the original manuscripts. This consideration is no subterfuge, as is often said, but rather an eminently reasonable demand. The whole science of textual criticism is worthless, or at most has only an academic value, unless the original manuscripts are the final court of appeal. In the nature of the case the Biblical writers can be held responsible only for what they themselves wrote.

of the Virgin Birth, the physical resurrection of our Lord, His second coming to judge the quick and the dead, and the doctrine of the resurrection which will take place when the Lord comes again. Moreover, the Bishop of Gloucester says that the "whole series of Articles IX.-XVII." are such that "an educated person at the present-day is quite out of sympathy" with them. Presumably then these Articles must be revised or removed. Yet they set forth some of the great foundation truths of the Gospel. They treat of the doctrines of sin, good works, free-will, justification, Christ's sacrifice for sin, and Election. The doctrine of justification by faith only through the blood and righteousness of Christ is the great doctrine for which Luther stood out, and it is the doctrine which differentiates the Church of England from the Church of Rome. Abandon this doctrine and it matters little what else we abandon. After all, the great question is, How can a sinner be justified before God? Rome in effect says by our own merits. The Church of England says "only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings."

Current Views and Voices

The Growing Revolt Against Sound Doctrine

Editorial in "The English Churchman and St. James' Chronicle"

SOUND doctrine and Bible truth have never been palatable to the carnal mind. Our Lord Jesus Christ was the very embodiment of truth. He was "full of grace and truth." "I am the way," He said, "the truth, and the life." He came into the world to "bear witness unto the truth." Yet He and His testimony were rejected. The very truthfulness of His testimony caused Him to be rejected. "Now ye seek to kill Me, a Man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God." "Because I tell you the truth, ye believe Me not." His testimony was infallible, His character was blameless, and His life was absolutely sinless. His hearers could not convict Him of anything blameworthy, either in the matter of His testimony, or in the manner in which it was given, yet He was rejected. They said "Away with Him, let Him be crucified."

The Apostles met with similar treatment. The word of truth which they preached was for the most part rejected. It is the same to-day, and the predictions of Scripture lead us to conclude that the truth of God will be more and more rejected as the end of the dispensation draws to a close. The Apostle Paul speaks of those who are "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." He speaks of those who "resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith." He says, "The time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts

shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables."

We are living at a time when this prophecy is being fulfilled. There is a growing revolt against sound doctrine. It is manifest on all sides, and in all the countries of Christendom, and it is also manifest in heathen countries where missionaries to the heathen are promulgating Modernist teaching. Recent utterances show that Presbyterians are revolting against the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the attack on our own XXXIX. Articles as well as on the ancient creeds of Christendom is growing in volume. This attack comes from two quarters. The Anglo-Catholics "account the XXXIX. Articles of Religion as a document of secondary importance concerned with local controversies of the sixteenth century, and to be interpreted in accordance with the faith of the Universal Church of which the English Church is but a part." Naturally those who have imbibed Romish doctrine, and who desire reunion with the Roman and Orthodox Churches, reject the Articles, because they so clearly condemn the errors of these two Churches. On the other hand, Modernists attack the Articles because they set forth the great foundation truths of the Gospel. The acceptance of the unscriptural doctrine of Evolution has led to the rejection of the Biblical teaching on the Fall of Man, and of his need of atonement by blood; and along with this the full inspiration of Scripture is regarded as an exploded doctrine. Recent letters in *The Times* have shown that leading men reject the doctrines

How is this revolt against sound doctrine to be met? Briefly, we answer in the language of the inspired Apostle. "Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of." Continue to believe that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and that it is wholly sufficient for the man of God. Continue to preach the Word in season and out of season, fully assured that God's infallible Word will not return unto Him void.

The Need for Better Church Music

OWEN W. MORAN in "Western Recorder"

NEVER before in the history of evangelical church worship has there been greater need for improved church music than there is to-day. And when I say this, I do not refer to the country church—I refer to the city church. At our last Southern Baptist Convention a move was made to have workers go out into the country and educate the churches in better music.

Why should we go to the country first when the city church is so sadly in need? If you want to know what I am talking about, just visit almost any city church and listen to the music. Those who know anything about it, will admit that most of our Baptist churches have struck rock-bottom when it comes to music. And there is no better time to correct this condition than the present. . . .

I

Music of the Church. You say, "Aren't

we singing the music of the church?" My answer is, "A few churches are, but not many." What would our great spiritual leaders, who have gone on to their reward, have to say about this so-called modern music our churches are using? These fast, snappy, jazzy songs that people sing to-day have no vital religion in them, and no results are secured after they are sung. The words convey no spiritual thought, and the melody does not carry the reverential feeling so necessary to true worship. This music is for the feet and not for the heart.

When I say, "Music of the church," I do not mean the music of other religious bodies; I mean music in local Baptist churches. Our denomination is old enough to have its traditions; surely our Baptist forefathers handed down a musical tradition that is worthy of our guardianship. Out of their persecutions and tribulations and triumphs, songs sprang up into their hearts. Our democratic organizations make for a freer and less stilted form of worship, and what would suit a high ecclesiastical organization would not suit us.

II

The next thing I want to say is that we must have MUSIC BY THE CHURCH. Will you please notice the word "by"? Go into a large number of Baptist churches in the South and what do you find? A quartette choir composed of four people who belong to churches of other denominations or none at all. These are professional musicians, and when I say professional, I mean they sing only for money. How many of them would come to two services or even one, on Sunday if they were not being paid for it?

I have yet to go into a Baptist church where every member of the paid quartette was a member of the church and working in the church. One church I knew had a Jew for a choir director, another had a Catholic soprano, and still another had a Jewess contralto who was a Unitarian. Is it possible for such combinations to be thoroughly in sympathy with the music of a Baptist church? I say no.

When I say *music by the church*, I mean a choir composed of singers who are members of that church. But you say, "We don't have any singers in our church." I doubt seriously if such a church ever existed. The trouble is, while the talent has been there all the while, the church has never given it a chance to be developed.

Surely the organist, pianist, or some singer in the church knows enough about music to train a chorus choir. Many times we have the director, but do not use him.

Most of our churches go to one of two extremes. They either gather a large number of people into the choir and fail to pro-

vide competent leadership for the training of this choir, or they hire a quartette to do the singing for the church.

III

My last point is—MUSIC FOR THE CHURCH. Music for the church is music that will create a worshipful atmosphere so that the worshipper will feel that he is in the very presence of God. Too much of our music is of the entertainment type. I do not always blame the singer for this, for the people in the pews demand it.

Many things could be said about the right kind of church music, but I have not space to mention all of them. I will say that church music should be born of the Holy Spirit, and should be sung by regenerated singers in such a way that the message may be understood. I don't care how well a person sings, if he is not trying to live a Christian life, he has no business in the choir. Too many singers are chosen for their voices and not for the kind of life they live. Organists are usually chosen the same way. I cannot be convinced that a drunkard can sing, "The Lord is my Shepherd"; nor a Jewess sing "Jesus, Saviour, Pilot Me." This is mere mockery and cannot be sanctioned by God.

Paid church organists have been known to play while they are under the influence of liquor. Some of our churches right here in our Southland employ such singers and organists. The pastor has as much right to call on a person of questionable character to lead in prayer, or an unbeliever, who chances to have a free flow of language, to preach, as we have to ask people who are not leading consistent Christian lives, to sing in our choirs. As long as such conditions exist, we shall never have the spirit of revival that some faithful people of God are praying for.

I have here merely touched upon conditions as they exist in many of our churches.

A Message to Christians Whose Church Membership is Elsewhere

"The Presbyterian of the South"

THERE are many people in High Point—including some Presbyterians—who hold their church membership elsewhere. When they are visited by leaders of local churches, they give various reasons why they will not unite with a church in the city where they live. Here are some of these reasons:

1. They cling to the "Old Church" because father and mother belonged there. Exactly so! Father and mother belonged there because they lived there. Why not be as sensible as father and mother were, and belong to the church in your neighbor-

hood. We honor father and mother by doing as they did in this respect.

2. They say: "The Old Church needs me." Perhaps it does; but it does not get you. In spite of your spasmodic efforts to go back to the old church for special services and a few other times during the church year, you are not giving the old church an honest support. Pulling a church is like pulling a wagon: the farther you get away from the load, the less you pull. Some are so far away from the pole that their traces have been on the ground for years. . . .

3. They say: "We have a burial lot there." It is good for you to think of the resting place of your dead. Earth holds no more sacred spots for any of us than the places where our beloved ones lie, but these departed saints will be even more sacred to those of us who enter whole-heartedly into the work of the church of Jesus Christ in the city where you live.

4. They say: "It costs too much in the city." It will never cost you a penny more than you are willing to give. Your pledge to your church here or elsewhere is a matter between your own conscience and your Lord. Nobody sets any amount for you to give. If some churches of equal means give more per capita than others, it is because they love God and God's work more. Enter the church of your choice, and give what you can. This church is seeking your good, not your goods.

5. They say: "I am not ready yet." When you moved to High Point, how long did it take you to connect with a new grocery store, a new meat market, a new school, a new bank, a new doctor, and a new filling station? I suspect you found all of these at once, and began to make use of them immediately. Your spiritual interests are vastly more important than your interests physical, material and intellectual. Do not neglect the weightier matters of life.

6. They say: "I am not sure that I shall make this city my home. I may not be here very long." True! But a certain Minister in North Carolina tells his members they ought to take their church membership with them if they are to be in a place just one month. Some people come to a city for a lifetime and remain only six months; others come for a few months, and stay thirty years. The only sane thing is to change your church affiliation immediately, just as you change your grocer, your school, and your auto repair shop. It will never be home in reality, until you have your church home in High Point.

Meet with the session in the study after the benediction, and be welcomed into the membership of this church. The pastor will attend to the transfer of your membership, without any effort on your part. High Point (N. C.) Church Bulletin.

A False Tongue

From the *Baptist Standard*

IT is wicked and foolish to tell a deliberate and thorough-going lie, but in the end it is quite often harmless. It can be exposed at once, and it is never believed. It hits the man against whom it was told and remains on the head of the man who told it. Nothing is so coarse and vulgar as a brazen lie, and no respectable person would condescend to such an act. Half truths are ten times more dangerous than untruths, but they are tolerated by a certain kind of conscience. Given a little skill, a little malice, and no scruples, and anything can be done with facts. If you would allow me to select from among the words and actions of the best of men just what I choose, and let me use what I have selected in any way I please, I could make the man's character look like that of Judas Iscariot. I could poison the minds of his friends against him, and I could convict him before a jury of honest men. Just a sentence without the whole letter, just a saying without the circumstances, just an action without the reason, just a text without the context, just some judicious selection and some judicious omission—and out of the man's innocence I could create the plausible evidence of his wickedness. There is nothing on earth quite so mean or so clever as the evil tongue working deceitfully, decently, politely. What course a single slander may wreck! And who is safe from the arrows of a tongue set on fire by hell? Neither position nor service nor even character can afford to bid it defiance. Its influence runs through church and state. Life and death are in its power. Joseph is flung into prison on the false charge of an abandoned woman. Paul is followed through all his life by the envenomed accusations of Jewish bigots. We are all in one another's hands. A congregation's character hangs on the testimony of its Minister, and he in turn must trust to the congregation's charity. One merchant may ruin another by a skillful word of depreciation. One man may damage his friend for years by a single sentence. One woman's tongue may break up the peace of a family. A habitual talebearer and willful slanderer should receive no more mercy at the hands of society than an assassin. Indeed, he is worse than a common murderer who only wrongs the body, for this person is apt to break the heart.

Blessed and honorable is that person whose tongue is obedient to the law of Christ, and whose words are as a spring of wholesome water, who never uses scorn except to scourge sin, or satire except to prune folly, who never puts the simple to confusion nor flatters the great, who says no ill of any man except under the last compulsion of truth and justice, who delights to speak well of every man, and who bids the cast down to be of good cheer.—W. P. White, President, Bible Institute, Los Angeles.

Ministerial Changes

Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

Calls

Frederick S. Crane, Atglen, Pa. to Gettysburg, Pa.;
H. B. Gebbard, to Smith Center, Kans.;
Thomas L. Kiernan, Salem, O. to Solon, O.;
Ira H. McClymonds, Oregon Church, Belleville, Wis. to Urich Church, Creighton, Mo.;
Joseph H. Miller, Knoxville, Tenn. to Rogers, Ark.;
R. R. Williams, Colwyn Bay, Wales, to Moriah Church, Utica, N. Y.

Calls Accepted

Theron Alexander, Rogers, Ark. to Park City Church, Knoxville, Tenn.;
H. R. Austin, Genoa, N. Y. to Fairhaven, N. Y.;
Jesse H. Baird, D.D., First Church, Salt Lake City, Utah, to Oakland, Cal.;
Richard E. Baker, to Brooklyn, Mich.;
Thomas J. Buckton, Red Wing, Minn. to Osakis, Minn.;
Geo. A. Chatfield, Anadarko, Okla. to Cleveland, Okla.;
B. H. Conley, Adena, O. to W. Rushville, O.;
Louis H. Evans, D.D., Pomona, Cal. to Third Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.;
Noble C. Griffin, Bement, Ill. to Winstanley Park, E. St. Louis, Mo.;
John N. McGurley, D.D., Baxter Springs, Kans. to Neoga, Ill.;
Frank F. Ogle, Stated Supply, Monroe City, Ind.;
P. E. Radford, Erin, Tenn. to Matatuck, N. Y.;
Edward R. Rein, Pitts Creek Church, Pocumoke City, Md. to Wallingford, Pa.;
Garth B. Solmon, West Union, O. to Columbus Grove, O.;
Charles M. Smith, to Forest City and Uniondale, Pa.;
Robert Steel, Herron Avenue Church, Pittsburgh, Pa. as Assistant Shadyside Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.;
Lyle D. Stone, to Kampsville and Summit Grove, Ill.;
Charles D. Todd, Fredonia, Kans. to Sapulpa, Okla.;
O. Hoyt Tribble, Ellicott City, Md. to Congregational Church, Higganum, Conn.

Resignations

A. H. Ackley, Memorial Church, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.;
Robert C. Dunn, Chaumont, N. Y.;
George T. Eddy, Cape Vincent, N. Y.;
James Ferguson, Bosworth Road Church, Cleveland, O.;
Emil Holzhauser, Steamboat Rock, Ia.;
John Orr, Ph.D., Stated Supply, Hopewell, Pa.;
William K. Sherwin, Grandin and Elm River, S. D.;
Thomas W. Swan, West Pittston, Pa.;
Herbert Ure, Athens, Pa.;
Wilbur A. Wagar, Adams, N. Y.;
Caradoc P. Williams, Bethel Church, Rome, N. Y.

Ordinations

W. T. Swain, Jr., Union Presbytery, Tennessee, Aug. 31;
William C. Thompson, Pittsburgh, Pa., Sept. 18.

Installations

H. Warren Allen, First Church, Minneapolis, Minn., Oct. 16;
Robert H. Blackshear, Peekskill, N. Y., Oct. 14;
Merchant S. Bush, Second Church, Lincoln, Neb.;
Howard Vernon Comin, D.D., Third Church, Salt Lake City, Utah, Oct. 25;
E. A. Dowey, Dunmore, Pa., Oct. 7;
R. J. Fredericks, Calvary Church, New Castle, Pa., Oct. 16;
Paul Gilbert, Bourbon, Ind., Oct. 22;
L. K. Grimes, D.D., North Church, N. Tonawanda, N. Y., Oct. 29;
A. C. Hill, Poynette, Wis., Oct. 25;
Samuel A. Jackson, Thompson Memorial Church, New Hope, Pa., Oct. 8;
Floyd E. Kline, Plymouth, Ind., Oct. 13;
Orville R. Lamber, Wabash and Pisgah Churches, Allendale, Ill.;
Harry M. Markley, D.D., Nebraska City, Neb., Nov. 4;
Alfred E. Nelson, St. Paul's Church, Emery, S. D., June 26;
Morris C. Robinson, Grace Church, Minneapolis, Minn., Oct. 9;

Walter Theodore Riemann, Evangel Church, Philadelphia, Pa., Oct. 2;
Percy L. Smith, Madison, S. D., Sept. 10;
Paul P. Thrower, Vicco, Ky.;
Harold Turpin, Rochester, Ind., Oct. 2;
Henry G. Weibon, Head of Christiana, Del., Oct. 11;
Thomas A. Williams, Salisbury, Md., Oct. 13;
John M. Wilson, Spicer, Minn., Oct. 9;
W. L. Wishart, First Church, Sharon, Pa., Oct. 1.

Changed Addresses

F. C. Hullhorst, 5418 Walker Ave., Lincoln, Neb.;
Geo. R. Jackman, Caney, Kans.;
James H. MacArthur, New Orleans, La.;
William J. Spire, Van Buren, Ark.;
A. S. Stearns, Canastota, N. Y.

Deaths

W. M. Paden, D.D., Salt Lake City, Utah, Sept. 16;
A. V. Bryan, Monroeton, Pa., Sept. 27;
Willis Edwards Parsons, D.D., Tryon, N. C., Oct. 27;
W. O. Garrett, D.D., Miami, Fla.;
Louis D. Grafton, Waxahachie, Tex., Nov. 1;
Jesse G. House, Newburg, Ind., Aug. 19;
A. B. Marshall, D.D., Creston, Ia., Oct. 29;
John E. Pritchard, Liberty, N. Y., Oct. 20;
John W. Rosenau, Hastings, Neb., Sept. 1;
James E. Weir, San Leandro, Cal., July 17;
Thomas W. Young, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pa., Oct. 20;
W. S. Young, Santa Ana, Cal., May 25.

Presbyterian Church, U. S.

Calls

R. Roy Brown, Sardinia and Alcoln, S. C., to Midway, S. C.;
T. M. Stephenson, Kershaw, S. C. to Craigs-ville, Va.

Calls Accepted

C. C. Anderson, to Mulberry Street Church, Montgomery, Ala.;
I. M. Bagnal, Honea Path and Broadway, S. C.;
E. G. Beckman, Wewoka, Okla. to First Church, Paris, Texas;
I. D. Borders, First Church, Lexington, Mo. to Boonville, Mo.;
M. C. Denny, Aveleigh Church, Newberry, S. C. to First Church, Gainesville, Ga.;
Warner DuBose, D.D., Johnson City, Tenn. to Goot Street Church, Mobile, Ala.;
J. C. Frist, to Moorefield, W. Va.;
J. E. Hobson, to Eufaula, Ala.;
M. H. Knox, Hugo, Okla. to Wharton, Tex.;
J. C. Lechemy, Panama City, Fla. to Pittsfield, Maine;
Frank H. McElroy, to Lafayette, Lebanon and Roanoke, Ala.;
R. G. Newsome, Oakdale, La. to Opelousas, La.;
W. R. Pritchett, Olanta, Kingstree and New Zion, S. C. to Mouzon, S. C.;
T. J. Ray, Jr., Garyville, La. to DeQuincy, La.;
J. McD. Richards, Clarksville, Ga. to Thomasville, Ga.;
Geo. F. Robertson, D.D., Mt. Holly, N. C. to Clover, S. C.;
John W. Rowe, D.D., Eastminster Church, Kansas City, Mo. to Norton, Va.;
A. H. Sargent, to Lee's Summit, Md.;
W. S. Scott, Branchville, S. C. to Williston, S. C.;
B. O. Shannon, Spring Hill Church, Staunton, Va. to Broadway, Va.;
M. O. Sommers, Gravis Memorial-Holly Grove, to Clinton, N. C.;
T. M. Stevenson, Kershaw, S. C. to Craigsville, Va.;
John D. Thomas, Pensacola, Fla. to Milton and Bagdad, Fla.;
Parks W. Wilson, Assistant Second Church, Memphis, Tenn. to Harrisonburg, Va.

Resignations

J. B. Bittinger, D.D., Gerrardstown, Bunker Hill and Clearbrook, W. Va.;
W. R. Buhler, Mulberry Street Church, Montgomery, Ala.;
J. S. Crowley, Westminster and Richland, S. C.;
J. D. Gillespie, Quitman, Ga.;
B. F. Wilson, D.D., Harrisonburg, Va.

Ordinations

William L. McColgan, First Church, St. Charles, Mo., Sept. 16;
Thomas H. Grafton, Decatur, Ga.;
F. E. Lothery, Florida Street Church, Baton Rouge, La.

Installations

George Belk, Evergreen Church, Memphis, Tenn.;
 J. A. Christian, D.D., First Church, Baton Rouge, La.;
 W. N. Holley, Hammond, La., Nov. 3;
 R. C. Long, Greenwood, S. C.;
 William Lewis McColgan, First Church, St. Louis, Mo., Nov. 15;
 John McEachern, Whitmire, S. C.

Changed Address

Stephen B. Williams, Monroe, La.

Deaths

Bothwell Graham, Charlotte, N. C.;
 Alexander Martin, Rock Hill, S. C.

United Presbyterian Church**Calls**

John T. Meloy, Bloomington, Kans. to Sterling, Kans.

Calls Accepted

R. G. Clark, Stated Supply, Topham, Vt.;
 A. C. Douglas, Sterling, Kans. to Fresno, Cal.;
 A. T. Moore, Saxman, Kans. to Hutchinson, Kans.;
 W. A. Stevensen, Hutchinson, Kans. to Kansas City, Mo.;
 W. Charles Wallace, D.D., New Wilmington, Pa., Stated Supply, E. Craftsbury, Vt.;
 W. L. Wishart, Washington, Pa. to Presbyterian Church, Sharon, Pa.

Resignations

J. F. McKnight, United Churches of Harmony and Eden, Ill.

Installations

Harry L. Hood, Ph.D., Cabin Hill, N. Y., Oct. 23;
 Geo. W. Hutton, Stronghurst, Ill., Oct. 13.

Changed Address

W. T. Warwick, 915 E. 8th St., Wellington, Kans.

Presbyterian Church in Canada**Calls**

Melford G. Court, Wyoming, Ont. to Knollwood Park Church, London, Ont.;
 Robert Coyle, Vancouver, B. C. to Port Dover, Ont.;
 A. D. Hamilton, Edinburgh, to Dundalk and Wentry, Ont.;
 R. J. Hay, Minneapolis, Minn. to St. Andrew's Church, Perolia, Ont.;
 T. G. Marshall, Madoc, to Hespeler, Ont.;
 John McTurk, Nanaimo, B. C. to Cook's Church, Chilliwack, B. C.

Calls Accepted

S. B. Carey, St. Andrew's Church, Guelph, Ont. to Baddeck, Nova Scotia;
 Thomas McAfee, Qu'Appelle, Sask. to St. Andrew's Church, Arnprior, Ont.

Resignations

Girard Graham, Holstein and Fairbairn, Ont.;
 D. C. Hill, Port Elgin, Ont.;
 W. B. Macodrun, Cobden, Ont.;
 W. A. Mitchell, St. Andrew's, Lachine, Que.;
 F. G. Furnell, Allenford and Elsmore, Ont.;
 T. Miller Revie, Knox Church, Red Deer, Alta.

Inductions

William Allan, Dovercourt Rd., Toronto, Ont., Sept. 3;
 D. J. Lance, Knox Church, Goderick, Ont.;
 R. B. Ledingham, Old Church, Weston, Ont.;
 Arthur Leggett, Molesworth and Gorrie, Ont., Oct. 25;
 W. A. MacWilliam, Burgoyne and Dunblane, Ont., July 14;
 H. R. Pickup, Renfrew, Ont.;
 Hugh R. Williams, Centreville and Millbrook, Ont., Sept. 11.

Deaths

D. O. MacArthur, Toronto, Ont., July 17;
 Ephraim Scott, D.D., Montreal, Que., Aug. 7.

Reformed Church, U. S.**Calls Accepted**

Ellis Hay, D.D., Saegerstown, Pa. to Roanoke, Va.;
 B. M. Herbst, Corinth Blvd. Church, Dayton, O. to Zion Church, Norwood, O.;
 R. W. Hucke, Nanticoke, Pa. to First Church, Marion, O.;
 O. B. Moor, Milwaukee, Wis. to Salem Church, Cincinnati, O.;
 Max C. Rost, St. Luke Church, Phila., Pa. to Emmanuel Presbyterian Church, Newark, N. J.

Resignations

C. Edward Holyoke, Lone Tree, Ia.;
 Edward L. Mohr, Zwingle, Ia.

Installations

E. K. Augstadt, Kutztown, Pa., Sept. 20;
 R. S. Beaver, Loyal Oak-Manchester Charge, Manchester, O.;
 C. A. Lang, Austintown Church, Youngstown, O.;
 James E. Wagner, St. Peter's Church, Lancaster, Pa.

Changed Addresses

Paul Grooshuesch, D.D., R.F.D. No. 5, Plymouth, Wis.;
 Arthur Lemming, 3911 N. 17th St., Phila., Pa.;
 Edward H. Wessler, D.D., 612 Erie Ave., Sheboygan, Wis.

Deaths

Thomas H. Krick, Sinking Spring, Pa.

Reformed Church in America**Calls Accepted**

H. Beltman, Grand Haven, Mich. to Hope Church, Los Angeles, Cal.;
 Geo. Haukamp, Pella, Ia. to Lynden, Wash.

Resignations

John Engelsman, Randolph, Wis.
 A. V. S. Wallace, D.D., Flatbush-Saugerties, N. Y., effective Dec. 1.

Installations

Milton B. Eastwick, Philmont, N. Y., Oct. 15;
 LeRoy Nattress, Saratoga, N. Y., Sept. 9;
 Nelson Van Raalte, Wynantskill, N. Y., Sept. 24.

Christian Reformed Church**Calls**

William Van Peurseem, Zutphen, Mich. to Lagrave Avenue Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Calls Accepted

Nicolas Beute, to Sullivan, Mich.;
 Raymond H. Haan, to Aetna, Mich.;
 J. J. Holwerda, Highland, Mich. to Randolph, Wis.;
 John Kenbeek, to Cincinnati, O.;
 J. G. Van Dyke, Bigelow, Minn. to First Church, Grand Haven, Mich.;
 M. J. Van Dyke, Sherman Street Church, Grand Rapids, Mich. to Highland, Ind.

Ordinations

Cornelius Van Schouwen, Archer Avenue Church, Chicago, Ill.

Installations

J. Bouwsma, Second Church, S. Holland, Ill.;
 Albert Jabaay, Third Church, Zeeland, Mich.;
 D. Mellema, Hamshire, Texas, Sept. 11.

News of the Church

League of Students Holds New England Conference

THE League of Evangelical Students held its First Regional Conference of New England, in Boston, Massachusetts, November 13th-15th. The Gordon College Chapter was the Convention host.

Dr. Robert H. Glover was heard in a message on "Student Responsibility to Missions." Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, of Wheaton College, and Dr. J. Gresham Machen of Westminster Theological Seminary each brought forceful messages. Beside these great guest speakers, President Nathan E. Wood, Dr. E. P. Drew, and Professor Merrill C. Tenney, all of the Gordon College faculty were on the program. Two of the League Regional Secretaries were present to represent the League and bring short messages. Miss Margaret Hunt represented women's colleges, and the Rev. W. Harlee Bordeaux is New England Secretary. The Conference sessions closed Sunday evening with a public service at the Park Street Congregational Church, when Dr. A. Z. Conrad, staunch conservative leader in the East, brought the closing message.

The League believes that an unparalleled opportunity for a winning and a powerful

gospel witness in the scholastic life of New England will follow this gathering.

The enrolment of two new Chapters and the increased territory to serve have made it imperative that new Secretaries serve the League. God's abundant blessing has been shown in the securing of three actively engaged Regional Secretaries in the East: Miss Margaret W. Haines, Miss Margaret Hunt, and the Rev. W. Harlee Bordeaux. Schools or churches desiring to arrange meetings for these representatives, may communicate with the League Headquarters. Prayer is requested for the general work of the League, and the particular objects mentioned. Information or literature concerning any part of its work may be secured from the General Secretary of the League, Box 455, Wheaton, Illinois.

Presbytery of Milwaukee Investigates Foreign Mission Board Policy

AN unexpected question was raised at a recent fall meeting of the Presbytery of Milwaukee by the Rev. John Clover Monsma, a member of that presbytery, relative to certain alleged actions by the Board of Foreign Missions with reference to candidates for the foreign field.

The matter was broached in the form of a question to the Foreign Missions Committee of presbytery, whether the committee could furnish definite information about news that had come from the East to the effect that two young men, the one a graduate of Princeton and the other of Westminster Seminary, had been refused admission to the foreign field because of their strict adherence to orthodox principles and their refusal to follow modernistic methods of mission work.

After some discussion back and forth presbytery decided unanimously to direct its Foreign Missions Committee to investigate the matter and to report on the same at the mid-winter meeting. Mr. Monsma was appointed a special member of the committee for this particular purpose. Rev. Irwin E. Bradfield, pastor of the First Church of Racine, Wis., is chairman of the committee.

Philadelphia Presbytery Against Four Overtures

THE Presbytery of Philadelphia, at its regular meeting on November 2, expressed itself overwhelmingly in opposition to Overtures A, B, C and D. Overture E was answered in the affirmative.

At a previous meeting of Presbytery a committee had been appointed to consider the overtures. Its report was given through its chairman, the Rev. M. J. Hyndman, D.D. The recommendation in the case of overture "A" was that the answer be negative. After some discussion this was made the answer of Presbytery. Overture "B," which would establish a minor order of the ministry in the church, was next considered. While it had its defenders, it was opposed principally by the Rev. Geo. B. Bell. Those opposing the overture contended that its adoption would be a direct contradiction of the Presbyterian doctrine that there is but one order of the ministry. It would also be in conflict with the provisions of the Confession of Faith requiring that the Sacraments be dispensed by Ministers lawfully ordained only. The attempt of the overture to say that unordained missionaries should "be deemed" to meet these confessional requirements was branded as an unethical subterfuge, in order to make the confession appear to mean the exact opposite of what it says. Although the recommendation of the committee was that this overture be answered in the affirmative, the Presbytery overwhelmingly voted to say "no," holding that no emergency could justify such a fundamental surrender of Presbyterian convictions.

Overture "C" was also reported out favorably by the committee. Several speakers urged the Presbytery to caution, saying that they did not understand the necessity of incorporating a few changes in the law into a whole new chapter. It was suggested that the phrase "recognized Presbyterian theo-

logical seminary" might be aimed at Westminster Seminary. After full discussion the Presbytery, with hardly any dissenting votes, answered the overture in the negative.

Overture "D" received favorable consideration from the committee. At first it seemed that Presbytery would agree to it, but when the true nature of the overture was pointed out, it was buried under a chorus of "nos." Those who opposed it contended that it involved the creation of an "inside, super-government" in every Presbytery and Synod, and in the General Assembly, placing the whole control of vacancy and supply, with the vast power thus accruing, in the hands of a small, potent committee in each judicatory. This, it was held, would mean that those not in sympathy with the ecclesiastical leaders would soon be flattened out by a new, legalized form of the old steam roller known as "control of vacant pulpits."

Overture E, reported favorably by the committee, was answered in the affirmative, with no one apparently willing to speak either for or against its merits.

Rights of Conscience Re-affirmed in Protest

THE cases of Prof. D. C. Macintosh of Yale Divinity School, and Miss Marie Averill Bland, who were recently denied the right to citizenship by the Supreme Court, are still exciting interest, and may result in remedial legislation. Five judges of the United States Supreme Court denied them the right to citizenship on the basis of their refusal to carry arms in a war which they deemed unrighteous. In other words, if their conscience forbade their fighting they wished to reserve the right of not going to war. Five judges took the position that this was disloyalty to the Constitution. Four of the nine judges, however, favored giving them citizenship. Among these four was Chief Justice Hughes. Since the rendering of this decision, which seems destined to become famous, the press of the country, especially the religious section, has kept the issue alive. Most of the religious weeklies are in accord with the minority of the Supreme Court, namely, that in matters of conscience a man owes his highest allegiance to God. "In the forum of conscience," so reads a line from the minority decision, "duty to a moral power higher than the state has always been maintained."

A large group of Ministers, Religionists, Professors and Religious Journalists is now circulating a protest to President Hoover and to the Congress, with a view to securing additional signatures. The Protest, together with the names of the original signers, is as follows:

To the President and Congress of the United States:

The recent decision of the Supreme Court, which denies the right of citizenship to persons who refuse to abdicate their con-

science on the question of participation in armed conflict, forces us, the undersigned citizens, to notify the constituted authorities of our nation that we share the convictions of those who have been denied citizenship.

Some of the undersigned find it impossible, because of religious and moral scruples, to render any kind of combatant service in time of war. Others share the conviction of one of the persons denied citizenship in the recent Supreme Court decision and cannot promise support to the Government until we have had the opportunity of weighing the moral issues involved in an international struggle.

We concur in the minority opinion of the Supreme Court that "in the forum of conscience, duty to a moral power higher than the State has always been maintained. The reservation of that supreme obligation, as a matter of principle, would undoubtedly be made by many of our conscientious citizens. The essence of religion is belief in a relation to God involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation."

W. S. Abernethy, minister, Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C.
 Peter Ainslie, minister, Christian Temple, Baltimore.
 William F. Anderson, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Boston.
 Robert A. Ashworth, editor, "The Baptist," Chicago.
 William H. Boddy, minister, First Presbyterian Church, Chicago.
 W. Russell Bowie, rector, Christ Church, New York City.
 Benjamin Brewster, Bishop of Maine, Protestant Episcopal Church.
 Dan B. Bruhmitt, editor, "Northwestern Christian Advocate," Chicago.
 Hugh L. Burleson, Bishop of South Dakota, Protestant Episcopal Church.
 S. Parkes Cadman, radio minister, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, Samuel McCrea Cavert, general secretary, The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
 Henry Sloane Coffin, president, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.
 Abraham Cronbach, professor, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati.
 A. C. Dieffenbach, editor, "The Christian Register," Boston.
 Sherwood Eddy, publicist and author, New York City.
 Fred B. Fisher, minister, Methodist Episcopal Church, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Albert Parker Fitch, minister, Park Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City.
 Harry Emerson Fosdick, minister, Riverside Church, New York City.
 Charles W. Gilkey, dean of the Chapel, University of Chicago.
 William E. Gilroy, editor, "The Congregationalist," Boston.
 A. O. Hartman, editor, "Zion's Herald," Boston.

Hubert C. Herring, Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America, New York City.

John Haynes Holmes, minister, Community Church, New York City.

S. Arthur Huston, Bishop of Olympia, Protestant Episcopal Church, Seattle.

Paul Hutchinson, managing editor, "The Christian Century," Chicago.

Edward L. Israel, chairman, Central Conference of American Rabbis, Baltimore.

Burriss Jenkins, minister, Linwood Boulevard Christian Church, Kansas City.

John Howland Lathrop, minister, Church of the Saviour, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Paul S. Leinbach, editor, "The Reformed Church Messenger," Philadelphia.

Halford E. Luccock, professor, Yale University Divinity School, New Haven.

Louis L. Mann, rabbi, Sinai Temple, Chicago.

Francis J. McConnell, president, The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Harold Marshall, manager, "The Christian Leader," Boston.

C. C. Morrison, editor, "The Christian Century," Chicago.

Mrs. Thomas Nicholson, president, Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Detroit.

Reinhold Niebuhr, professor, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Kirby Page, editor, "The World Tomorrow," New York City.

Albert W. Palmer, president, The Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago.

Edward L. Parsons, Bishop of California, Protestant Episcopal Church, San Francisco.

Carl S. Patton, moderator, Congregational General Council, Los Angeles.

William Scarlett, Bishop Coadjutor of Missouri, Protestant Episcopal Church, St. Louis.

Guy Emery Shipler, editor, "The Churchman," New York City.

Ralph W. Sockman, minister, Madison Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, New York City.

Wilson R. Stearly, Bishop of Newark, Protestant Episcopal Church.

Ernest Fremont Tittle, minister, First Methodist Episcopal Church, Evanston, Illinois.

Luther A. Weigle, dean, Yale University Divinity School, New Haven.

Stephen S. Wise, rabbi, Free Synagogue, New York City.

Mary E. Woolley, president, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.

While most of the names attached to the protest are of those holding "liberal" views in religion, many conservatives have also expressed themselves as being unable to concur in the reasoning of the majority of the Supreme Court, that a man's duty to the state takes precedence of his duty to God.

An Unusual Degree for Dr. Munhall

DR. L. W. MUNHALL, of Philadelphia, militant Methodist Fundamentalist, who had been speaking to the student body of the Bob Jones College, College Point, Florida, for three weeks, closed his work there late in October with an address on the subject, "Evolution Unscientific, Unchristian, and Unreasonable." At the close of Dr. Munhall's address, the Bob Jones College through its president, conferred upon him possibly the most unusual degree which has ever been given in the educational world.

Dr. Bob Jones, founder and president of the college, in conferring the degree, said, "Dr. Munhall, you are almost ninety years old. You have been a Minister of the gospel of Jesus Christ for nearly seventy years. You have traveled more than one million three hundred thousand miles. You have preached forty-two thousand times and have preached to more people than any living man. You are the author of a number of religious books. You have delivered one lecture on the Bible to almost a thousand audiences throughout the world. You are the editor of 'The Methodist,' published in Philadelphia.

"In all your sermons and writings you have stood without apology for the old time religion and for the absolute authority of the Bible. What you stand for the Bob Jones College stands for, and this day we are conferring upon you the honorary degree of Contender for the Faith.

"We could confer upon you the same degrees which are usually conferred by colleges upon distinguished men, but you have received these degrees from a number of institutions, and besides, these other degrees would not convey the honor it is our desire to give.

"We pray that God may spare you many years yet, but we, the Bob Jones College, pledge you our word that if you go home to Heaven first we will keep the fires burning and continue the glorious fight for orthodoxy and evangelism which you have been carrying on for three score years and ten."

Dr. Munhall, in accepting the degree, said that the only solution for the problems of the perplexed world is old time Bible preaching and a revival of the old time religion.

Reformation Fellowship to be Organized

SOME time ago an article appeared in CHRISTIANITY TODAY, written by the Rev. John Clover Monsma, of Oostburg, Wis., in which he suggested organization of a "Reformation Fellowship" for the purpose of consolidating the orthodox forces in the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches of America and preparing them for aggressive action along definite lines. According to reports the response to that suggestion has

been gratifying and concrete plans for the organization of the Fellowship are gradually taking shape. Organization work will be started next Spring. Philadelphia will be the headquarters, and Mr. Monsma himself contemplates settling there to help in the launching and directing of the movement.

The Reformation Fellowship will be chiefly a laymen's organization. While the Presbyterian League of Faith, organized some months ago in New York, seeks to band the faithful Ministers of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. together for a study of their common problems as well as for joint testimony and action, the Fellowship will seek to enlist primarily (though not exclusively) the general membership. It will call to its ranks the thousands of faithful men and women in the pews who at the present time are weak and inarticulate because they lack organization.

The Wisconsin pastor is not a stranger in the Middle West. He has had considerable experience in organization work, yet is still a young man, is of Holland-American stock, and combines the three functions of Minister, journalist, and author.

Dr. Diehl Cleared of Charges

THE Rev. Chas. E. Diehl, D.D., President of Southwestern College, Memphis, Tenn., has been cleared by a unanimous vote of the Presbytery of Nashville, (Presbyterian Church in the U. S.) of charges of unorthodoxy. Last spring, when rumors concerning Dr. Diehl were being circulated, he appeared before the Presbytery, spoke concerning his convictions, and placed himself in their hands. At the same meeting charges were preferred against Dr. Diehl. A committee of five was appointed to investigate, and to report at the autumn meeting. The committee gathered information concerning Dr. Diehl, and submitted a questionnaire to him regarding his beliefs. When its report was given to the Presbytery, it made no recommendation, but simply submitted the material it had gathered. In the discussion that ensued, the charges against Dr. Diehl were formally withdrawn, and Presbytery passed a motion that he be exonerated. It is also reported, however, that a motion to endorse his administration of Southwestern College was lost.

Effects of the Revolution in Spain

THE well known Spanish Protestant clergyman, Theodor Fliedner, writing in the Dutch periodical "Zeitwende" concerning the revolution in Spain, says: "Many Spaniards have assured me that the king would still be on his throne if his policy had not been so clerical. Spain has for long not been the faithful daughter of the church, to the extent foreign Roman Catholics and Prot-

estants generally considered it. The revolution was against the monarchy but still more against the church. Everywhere in Spain, for example, one finds Protestant mayors and judges. The Spanish Ministers are openly sympathetic towards Protestantism. Naturally, Protestant Spaniards who suffered most under the former intolerance, are now the firmest adherents of the Republic."

The North Kiangsu Mission of the Southern Presbyterian Church and Registered Schools

FOR several years the North Kiangsu Mission, in China, has refused to register its schools. This summer the Kiangpei Presbytery, which works in the field with this mission, asked that the appropriations, the missionary teachers and two of the largest buildings be given to the Presbytery to administer for a period of three years, and said that it proposed to register the schools and intended to maintain their Christian character. Since some mission schools were registered under more favorable regulations the supporters of the Christian work in China, will wish to know why this seemingly simple request of the Presbytery was denied.

According to information sent to CHRISTIANITY TODAY by B. C. Patterson, Tenghsien, Shantung, China, in dealing with the question there was nothing dictatorial or supercilious in the attitude of the mission toward its Chinese fellow workers. On the contrary the matter received the most sympathetic, prolonged and earnest consideration.

Further the mission was not unwilling to turn over funds to the Chinese church to use for purposes that the mission thinks is right.

The mission does not object to registering its schools but objects to registration while the present restrictions are in force and other missions, such as the Great China Inland, the American Episcopal, Dutch Reformed, have taken similar action.

Some of the chief reasons for the mission's vote were—(1) It is the declared purpose of those in authority in the Chinese National Board of Education to "definitely ("drastically") abolish Christian schools." This is published in the Board's orders. This and the following quotations are from the April, 1930 edition of "The Important Educational Regulations now in Force." Thus to put Christian schools under their control is to invite trouble. (2) Christianity may be studied as an *elective* course by students in the last three years of the senior high school but may not be required. This is a sop thrown to Christians but the real animus of the matter appears in the other regulations.

The school may no longer be called "Christian." "No student may be *forced, induced* or *encouraged* to study Christianity (except last three years of senior high school) and Christianity may not be taught to the stu-

dents." No teacher in the class room is "permitted to speak a good word for Christ or His cause." "No place for Christian worship may be tolerated on the school premises."

A deadly parallel is given in order 291 which says—"Every student *must* perform the Sun Yat Sen memorial service and must study the national party principles under a teacher approved by the Board." This weekly memorial service consists in standing before a tablet or photograph of Sun Yat Sen in quiet meditation and then bowing before it. This is considered by many Chinese Christians as idolatry, though it is called "respect." Some ignorant Christians are even now praying to Jesus and Sun! And as to the party principles they are intensely and in places acrimoniously patriotic. Thus a weapon is forged absolutely to nullify any Christian work attempted out of school. To register is to put the school in this danger.

Some Christian schools have registered and established Christian services and teaching in near-by houses, and this has been allowed by friendly executives. But, if registered, the pupils cannot be limited to Christian families, the school spirit is destroyed and no student may be "induced" or "encouraged" to study Christianity. When it suits the powers that control, all Christian plans and ideals must go.

(3) The order to register or close was made several years ago but its execution has again been deferred a year. The mission is encouraged to hope that by prayer and wise effort these anti-Christian restrictions may be modified in a way that will not injure the work of the church.

(4) The mission appointed a committee to meet the Presbytery and to try to propose a solution of the difficulty. The committee was instructed to say that it cannot make proposals that look towards registration under the present restrictions.

The difficulty is a very real one to Chinese brethren and the home church should join in earnest prayer for them.

A recent issue of the "China Fundamentalist" further describes the effect of registration as follows:

"The Shantung Christian University, located in Tsinanfu . . . has had to drop the word 'Christian' from its name, the name in English now being 'Cheeloo University.' One fears from the recent commencement exercises that not only the name but the reality are sadly missing. The following is a translation of the brief programme:

"(1) The assembled body respectfully stand. (2) Singing of the Party Song. (3) Three bows to the Party flag and to the picture of Dr. Sun, the late leader. (4) Respectful reading of Dr. Sun's will. (5) Bowing of the head in three minutes of silence before the picture of Dr. Sun. (6) Opening remarks by the Vice-President. (7) Address by Mr. Chu Ching Nung. (8) Presentation of diplomas. (9) Conferring of

degrees. (10) Words of instruction by Mr. Ho, the President of the Shantung Provincial Bureau of Education. (11) Awarding of prizes. (12) Dismission.'

"Many Christians present were astounded and grieved. For opening prayer, hymns, Scripture reading, and closing benediction were all conspicuously absent. A Christian Chinese present said that the name of Christ was not even mentioned! Mr. Ho, the President of the Provincial Bureau of Education, who delivered the 'Words of Instruction,' is an avowed atheist and one of the most relentless persecutors of Christianity in all China. Such commencement exercises in a Christian institution is little less than high treason to the Lord Jesus Christ. Fortunately this travesty was not performed in the University Chapel."

A veteran missionary in China, writing to the Editors of CHRISTIANITY TODAY says: "It should make those in America who favor the registration of Christian schools in China rub their eyes and those who do not favor a Nicolaitan policy to raise their voice in protest against the use of Mission funds in such educational work.

"As to the Tsinan school (Cheloo), a secretary of our Foreign Mission Board once announced that he proposed to 'stand by it until the cows came home.' It would seem that they have arrived."

Presbyterian Church in Canada

THE Church has recently lost another of its stalwarts in the death of the Rev. D. R. Drummond, D.D., pastor of St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, Hamilton, Ontario. Born in Ontario in 1868, a kinsman of the famous Professor Henry Drummond, he graduated from Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, in arts in 1889 and in theology in 1892. In 1893 he presented studies in the theological halls of Edinburgh. He was Minister at Russelltown, Quebec and at St. Thomas, Ontario, before going to Hamilton in 1905. A man of great evangelical and missionary zeal, he was one of the leaders in the battle against the abortive "Church-union" of 1925.

* * *

Among the invitations sent out by the United Church of Canada to the opening of their new Emanuel College, Toronto, was one to Glasgow University, asking that it send a delegate. In response to this invitation, the University commissioned as its representative the Rev. Stuart C. Parker, D.D., of New St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Toronto.

Though Canada is a young country the Presbyterian Church has had a place early in its history. St. Andrew's Church, Niagara-on-the-Lake, celebrated recently the 137th anniversary of its founding and the 100th anniversary of the erection of the present building. The celebration consisted of special services on Sunday and a congre-

gational rally on the Monday evening. On Sunday several tablets were unveiled in honor of faithful members of the congregation. The Church's history is blended with the story of the war of 1812 when the congregation suffered the loss of its building by fire. Located on the Niagara Peninsula it was in the very heart of the conflict.

In the far east, Charlottetown, P.E.I., the congregation of St. James during the summer, entered upon an extensive remodeling of the interior. The result has been a transformation of the building in a manner that brings great satisfaction to the congregation. On the day of re-opening a beautiful chancel was dedicated to the memory of Rev. John Goodwill and his wife, missionaries of The Church of Scotland in the Island of Espiritu Santo in the New Hebrides. Rev. R. Moorehead Legate is the Minister. Dr. Leatham of St. Andrew's Church, Ottawa, was the preacher at the re-opening services.

An incident in the Home Mission work among the Indians of the West that affords great encouragement was the baptism and reception into membership of the church of thirty-three boys and girls from the Cecilia Jeffrey Indian School at Kenora, Ont. This is a tribute to the good work done by the principal, Mr. E. W. Byers, and his efficient staff. This school which was founded over thirty years ago and was established in the heart of the reserve on the Lake of the Woods was recently removed to within three miles of the town of Kenora where a very fine and commodious building was erected by the Dominion Government.

Relative Per Capita Giving

THE United Stewardship Council has reported its estimates of the sum contributed to various church purposes in Protestant denominations, with the average per member. A total communicant membership of 23,367,360 in the United States and Canada gave \$514,992,105. Of this amount \$406,069,808 was used for congregational expenses; \$79,857,761 for benevolences and included in budgets; and in addition, large amounts for non-denominational and interdenominational activities. The Southern Presbyterian Church holds first rank, giving an average of \$9.01 per member. The United Presbyterian Church stands second, with an average of \$8.49. The United Church of Canada holds third place, its average being \$6.35; the Reformed Church of America (Dutch Reformed), fourth, with \$5.68 per member; and fifth, the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., with \$5.26. This is for budget contributions only. In per capita gifts for all purposes the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec show the highest average, \$40.10 per member. Next in order is the Protestant Episcopal Church with \$39.72; the Northern Presbyterian with \$34.89; Reformed Church in America with \$34.42;

WHAT CHRISTMAS GIFT

shall I give this year? Expensive presents are not in 1931 style. Why not present your friends with a yearly subscription to Christianity Today? It will bring more than a dollar's worth of pleasure and profit for twelve months. You will be saving money, informing your friends, and helping the cause of the Gospel. If you wish to subscribe for your friends we will send them a Christmas Card bringing your greetings and our best wishes. Take advantage of this opportunity! A blank is enclosed.

United Presbyterian with \$33.81, and Southern Presbyterian with \$31.91.

Von Hindenburg a Regular Worshipper

VISITORS to Berlin, it is reported, desirous of seeing Von Hindenburg, will find that the best opportunity of doing so is in church. He is very rarely absent from the Divine Service held on Sunday mornings in the church-Wilhelmsplatz in Berlin. Just as the service begins, the congregation rises to its feet as Hindenburg, with military punctuality, enters the church, accompanied by his daughter-in-law and takes his place at the end of one of the back pews. That the congregation, it is said, sees nothing remarkable in the presence of Hindenburg. The service proceeds as usual. Like the other members, he deposits his contribution in the collection bag and at the end of the service leaves the church, politely acknowledging the greetings of his fellow worshippers.

"Criticism" Gone Wild in Germany

THE wife of the well known German generalissimo, Marshal Ludendorff, whose anti-Jewish propensities are notorious, has published a book entitled "Redemption of Jesus Christ," which has now reached a third edition. In this book, Mrs. Ludendorff says that the religion of Christ and also that of Moses, originated in India and that misinformed versions were made by the Jews. She attempts to "purge the Scriptures of everything Jewish" and to retain the "original." In a recent issue of the German "Pfarrerblatt" Professor Schomerus, the theological expert has demonstrated that the wife of the German general has taken all her material from an obscure, romantic French work. Although "good German literature" might have shown her, he says, all the so-called "proof" she brings forward is pure imagination. Notwithstanding this, the book is already in a third edition. The German church-press has expressed its sur-

prise and regrets at this action which in a very suggestive manner combats Jews and Christian alike, in the name of the "old Germanism."

The Tallest Church in the World

A SKYSCRAPER church is to rise in John Street, New York City, in the heart of the financial section, when the old John Street Methodist Church is torn down and a nineteen story building to cost more than two million dollars is erected in its place. This structure will be the tallest church in the world. The John Street Church is the oldest Methodist church in the United States, having been built ninety years ago. Many priceless Methodist relics have been preserved in it and provision will be made for these in the new building. At its top will be a tiny modern chapel which is to be named the Barbara Heck Chapel, in memory of the first Methodist woman in the world. Barbara Heck was a cousin of Philip Embury, the first Methodist preacher in America, and she was one of a group that came with him to America from County Limerick, Ireland, arriving here in 1760. They helped to organize the present John Street Church.

Soviet Sunday Schools in America

IT is reported that within fifty miles of Boston, Mass., thirty-two Soviet Sunday Schools function where children are instructed in atheism. In Pittsburgh a "Soviet" Sunday School, with an average attendance of 700, is said to meet every Sunday. In these gatherings, the children are taught to hate God, Christ and the Bible—openly.

Missouri Lutherans Show Increase

RECENT statistics for the Lutheran Synod of Missouri list 3,843 congregations in the United States and elsewhere with 1,163,666 baptized members and 731,119 communicant members. Congregations increased 75 during one year, baptized members 25,000, and communicant members 16,000. There were, however, but 133,324 "voting members" an increase of 2,000. Parochial schools decreased 32 to 1,339. Sunday schools increased 115 to 2,849. Adult confirmations during the year numbered 6,346; children confirmed 26,090; adult baptisms 2,179 and child baptisms 33,689.

Fruits of Christian Missions

OVER three hundred Christian women in the Metet field, West Africa, have pledged themselves to do Christian work, and, seventy-five of the local Metet women have given their promise to try to lead, at least, one other woman to Christ before the close of the year.