

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-MARCH, 1932
Vol. 2 No. 11

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE
Entered as second-class matter May 11, 1931, at
the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the
Act of March 3, 1879.

Christianity and the Living Christ

THE object of our faith as Christians is JESUS CHRIST as He exists today. Christians are not worshippers of a CHRIST of yesterday whose body moulded under the Syrian skies and who for nineteen hundred years has been lifeless and inert; they are the worshippers of a CHRIST whom the grave could not hold and who, clothed with unlimited power, is at the right hand of God, accessible to all. All instructed Christians approve the answer which the Shorter Catechism gives to the question, "Who is the Redeemer of God's elect?"—to wit, "The only Redeemer of God's elect is the LORD JESUS CHRIST, who, being the eternal Son of God, became man, and so was, and *continueth to be*, God and man, in two distinct natures, and one person, *for ever*." What JESUS was yesterday, He is today—and will continue to be forever.

It should not be supposed, however, that the fact that the object of our faith as Christians is CHRIST as He exists today affords any warrant for any degree of unconcern about Him as He existed in the days of His flesh. There are those who seem to think that because the object of their faith is the living CHRIST they need not be greatly concerned about His earthly, historical life. Such a notion not only overlooks the fact that we are indebted to the historic records of the earthly CHRIST for all the real knowledge (factual or doctrinal) that we possess of CHRIST as He exists today but the equally important fact that CHRIST as He exists today would have little or no value for us were

it not for what He experienced while He dwelt among men as a definite historic person. This means that CHRIST would have little or no value for us today were it not for the fact that the virtues of His earthly experiences are perpetuated in the life He lives today. So far from saying that the earthly life of JESUS has no interest for us because the object of our faith is JESUS as He exists today, we say rather that JESUS as He exists today would have no interest for us were it not for the life He lived on earth. The earthly life was indeed but a stage in the career of the Son of God, but it was a necessary stage if sinners were to be saved, and hence one that can never lose for us its significance. The life that He lived on earth, the death that He died were prerequisites to the functions He now performs. Hence we must never allow the fact that the object of our

faith is the risen and glorified CHRIST to lead us to underestimate what He experienced in the days of His flesh. The net results (as it were) of His earthly life were carried over into and made the permanent possession of His risen and glorified life. Apart from that fact He would not be qualified to bestow upon us the forgiveness of our sins or to grant us an inheritance among the saints in light.

But while we should permit nothing to lead us to minimize the earthly historical life of JESUS as recorded in the Gospels, we should never lose sight of the fact that He is consciously alive today. Some have denied that such a person as JESUS ever existed. Such denial is absurd and has been repeated by but few. But fatal as is such denial to the Christian's hope, it is no more fatal than is the denial that JESUS lives today as one Who is able to save to the uttermost those who put their trust in Him. That JESUS is everywhere represented in the New Testament as infinitely more than an historical character is obvious to the most casual reader. LUKE, for instance, tells us in the preface to the book of *Acts* that in his former treatise (his Gospel) he had dealt with the things that "JESUS began to do and teach, until the day in which He was received up," thus implying that in what he was about to write he was to deal with the things that JESUS continued to do and teach after His ascension. In harmony with this we find that this book deals with *The Acts of the Risen CHRIST* rather than with *The Acts of the Apostles*, the

IN THIS ISSUE:

Editorial Notes and Comments.....	2
Is Atheism Scientific?.....	5
G. P. Pierson	
Notes on Biblical Exposition.....	6
J. G. Machen	
Why I Am a Fundamentalist.....	9
J. A. Schofield, Jr.	
The Virgin Birth and Saving Faith.....	11
Current Views and Voices.....	12
Letters to the Editor.....	16
Ministerial Changes.....	17
News of the Church.....	18

Apostles being regarded as but the instruments through whom the risen CHRIST continued to carry on His work in this world. It is hardly necessary to add that all the writers of the New Testament share LUKE's viewpoint. Not only did all these men write subsequent to CHRIST's death but all were firmly convinced that He was a living, ever present reality. PETER is the mouth-piece of the primitive Church as a whole when he wrote: "Blessed be the God and FATHER of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, who according to His great mercy begat us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of JESUS CHRIST from the dead, . . . whom having not seen ye love; on whom though now ye see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice greatly with joy unspeakable and full of glory: receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls." Apart from the resurrection and ascension as the transition points between the time when the object of the Christian's faith was the earthly, historic JESUS and the time when it became the risen and glorified JESUS, the subsequent significance of Christianity as a factor in the life of humanity is inconceivable.

Suppose that when JESUS was put to death He had stayed dead! Then Christians in as far as they worshipped Jesus would be guilty of an exaggerated form of hero worship. Then we might have some knowledge of a Jesus that was but nothing of a Jesus that is. Then there would be such a thing as a Jesus of history, but not a Jesus of experience. What a cold and lifeless and inert thing the Christian religion would be were it not for the fact that CHRIST not only lived and worked in the past but lives and works at present as prophet, priest and king and so one from whom men can obtain satisfaction for their needs as truly as when He trod the earth. The secret of Christianity's power lies in the fact that it proclaims a living CHRIST—in whom men can justifiably put their trust, from whom they can receive power to overcome sin, with whom they can walk hand in hand through this dark world up to and through the very gates of death itself.

The stress which Christianity places on the living CHRIST is motivated by a

practical interest. Hebrews 13:8 is a typical not an exceptional statement. The writer's object in introducing this great statement into his epistle was to incite his readers to lead genuinely Christian lives. In the verse immediately preceding he had reminded them of their former teachers and exhorted them to imitate them; and then lest they should think he was asking too much of them he goes on to remind them that "JESUS CHRIST is the same yesterday and today, yea and forever." It was, he said in effect, the living CHRIST who had made possible the lives of their predecessors and what he wanted his readers to realize was that they too could live such lives because this same JESUS CHRIST stood ready and willing to do for them all He had done for their predecessors. It is as though we should remind our readers of those who since the Gospel was first proclaimed have most adorned it by their characters and deeds, and then urge them to imitate them, to walk in their footsteps, to do as they did. And then lest some of them should think we were asking too much of them we should bid them recollect that JESUS CHRIST is all He ever was, that there is nothing He has been to any past generation that He is not to this generation—the generation of which we are a part. It was

JESUS CHRIST who made their lives possible; and since He abides the same through every change and chance of time we need only repeat their faith in order to repeat their victory.

To maintain that through faith in the living CHRIST we can imitate those who in ages past have most adorned the Gospel by their lives is not to maintain that we can or should do exactly the same things they did. That would be the case only if the age in which we lived were an exact replica of the age in which they lived. Whether we will or no we live in the twentieth century and so must necessarily face its problems and adjust ourselves to its conditions. But while it is not to be supposed that we should attempt to imitate the saintly men and women of former generations in the sense of doing exactly the same things they did, we should and can imitate them in the only sense in which imitation is possible—namely, by staying our souls on the same great Christian verities, by manifesting the same loyalty to truth and conscience, and by serving our age and generation as faithfully as they served theirs. This we can do—because through all the world's changes JESUS CHRIST remains the same and so stands ready and willing to be unto us all that He was unto them.

Editorial Notes and Comments

Where is the Trouble?

THE *Presbyterian*, in its issue of February 25th, contains the following editorial pronouncement: "We are convinced that the differences which trouble us as a denomination are more ecclesiastical than theological." This pronouncement does not deny that as a denomination we have theological differences and that these are a source of trouble; but obviously it does imply that these theological differences are relatively unimportant as a source of trouble compared with our ecclesiastical differences, and that if the latter were remedied the former would give us small concern.

Such a pronouncement, it seems to us, rests on a diagnosis of the situation in the Presbyterian Church that attaches primary importance to what is really quite secondary. The emphasis should be reversed. What is more, our ecclesiastical troubles as a denomination are rooted in our theologi-

cal differences to such an extent that if the latter were remedied the former would largely disappear of themselves. Whereas orthodox Presbyterianism stresses not only the parity of the ministry but the parity of the ministry and eldership in the government of the church, Modernism in all its forms tends to the development of a form of clericalism that is worse in many respects than the clericalism of Rome since it rests on human ability and learning instead of alleged divine illumination.

This pronouncement adopts in principle the slogan of those who advocated the reorganization of Princeton Seminary, viz., that the differences there were personal and administrative not doctrinal. Misled by that slogan many voted for that reorganization who otherwise would have opposed it. What has been the outcome? Today Princeton Seminary is under the control of a Board of Trustees, two of whom are signers of the heretical Auburn "Affirmation" and

all of whom (of those originally elected at least) are on record as commending these Auburn Affirmationists to the confidence of the Church. Just as it should be clear to all that the trouble at Princeton was due to doctrinal rather than personal and administrative differences so it ought to be clear to all that our troubles as a denomination are due to theological rather than ecclesiastical differences. And just as we would not have been particularly interested in the Princeton controversy had it not been for the doctrinal issues involved, so we would not be particularly interested in the ecclesiastical differences in the church at large were it not for the theological interests involved. After all it makes little real difference who are Moderator and Stated clerk and who are the members of the Boards of the Church apart from their bearing on the theological or doctrinal differences that exist within the Church.

And yet there are apparently those who still think of "The Presbyterian" as a defender of the faith in the present crisis!

The Proposed Union of Churches

IT may be safely assumed that as requested numerous comments have been transmitted to the Joint Committee on Organic Union of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. and the United Presbyterian Church. In harmony with that request we have formally transmitted copies of the last two issues of CHRISTIANITY TODAY to said Committee as expressive of our judgment of the proposed union and no doubt the contents of these two issues (in as far as they bear on this particular issue) are receiving the consideration of the Committee along with others submitted. The presentation of the "complete Plan of Union" will be awaited with interest.

We trust it is abundantly clear to our readers that our objection to this particular union is based on its terms and conditions. If it was proposed to unite these two churches on the basis of the existing standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. the proposal would have our hearty approval. What has been proposed thus far, however, is something very different. In effect it has been proposed to unite these churches on the doctrinal basis of the existing creed of the United Presbyterian Church—a creed that at the best contains a weak and inadequate statement of the Reformed Faith along with much that is of more than doubtful validity. What is even worse than the doctrinal basis itself are the terms of subscription to the subordinate standards of the Church now in vogue in the United Presbyterian Church which it is proposed to extend to the combined churches. What is equally bad are many of the provisions of the proposed Form of Government, Book of Discipline and Directory of Worship.

We do not indeed think that there is any

good reason for thinking that the United Presbyterians as a group are more orthodox than are ordinary Presbyterians and so for supposing that union with them would strengthen conservatism; but at the same time we have no reason to suppose they are any worse in this respect. Hence we would be quite willing to see the two churches united on a basis of union fitted to conserve the best elements, doctrinal and ecclesiastical, in the existing churches—something that the proposed union, in our judgment, is not calculated to do.

"The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination"

ONE of the most encouraging signs of the times is the revived interest that is being taken in Calvinism—that system of thought and life that as yet has found its best confessional statement in the Westminster Confession of Faith. In our January issue we reviewed two recent books dealing with this subject, one by a masterly Calvinist and the other by an anti-Calvinist. From time to time we have also dealt with books having to do with the movement known as Barthianism, so much in vogue in Continental Europe. This movement is frequently spoken of as a resurgence of Calvinism—a mode of speech which though faulty is warranted to the extent that such elements of power as it possesses are due to the stress it places on certain Calvinistic elements. In our judgment the great need of the times is a renaissance of genuine Calvinism as it seems to us not only that Calvinism alone supplies us with a life and world view in which all the elements of Bible Christianity find a natural and logical place but that it alone offers us a vantage point from which we can successfully defend even what we call common Christianity in the forum of the world's thought.

One can readily imagine, therefore, the satisfaction with which we have read Professor LORAIN BOETTNER's book *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination* as just published by the WM. B. EERDMAN'S Publishing Co. of Grand Rapids, Michigan (pp. 430, \$3.00). In a later issue we hope to publish a review commensurate with the importance of the book. We do not feel justified in awaiting that time, however, before advising our readers to secure it without delay. The title is hardly fitted to indicate the full scope of the work. It contains in fact not only a clear and cogent presentation of the Reformed doctrine of predestination but of all the great distinctive doctrines of the Reformed Faith. What is more the objections commonly urged against Calvinism are not only fairly stated but adequately answered. Much attention is given to Scripture proof in order to show that Calvinism and Bible Christianity are one and the same. The practical importance of Calvinism is stressed. The chapter on Calvin-

ism in History will prove illuminating to many. Not the least of its merits is its clear and readable style. It is safe to say that for the layman as well as for the average minister this is the best book available.

Appropos the proposed union of churches on the basis of the Confessional Statement of the United Presbyterian Church, Professor BOETTNER's comment on page 105 is significant: "Mild Calvinism' is synonymous with sickly Calvinism, and sickness, if not cured, is the beginning of the end."

"The Federal Council: A Protest and a Reply"

THE *Sunday School Times*, under date of December 12, 1931, printed a lengthy "protest" from the Federal Council of the Churches of CHRIST in America against its action in advertising a book entitled, "Pastors, Politicians, Pacifists" (Constructive Educational Pub. Co., 111 West Washington St., Chicago, \$1.00), that is highly critical of the Federal Council, together with an editorial reply.

While *The Sunday School Times* says that it "is quite ready to believe" that "some of the deductions or generalizations in the book under discussion are not warranted," it none the less stoutly maintains that "broadly speaking the book is a needed effort to warn the Churches of tendencies in the Federal Council toward committing the Churches to pronouncements upon political and economic questions, including opposition to certain measures for national defense, as though the opinions of the management or 'controlling group' of the Council really represented the conclusions of a body of twenty millions or more church members; and also to point to the very objectionable affiliations of influential leaders in the Council with radical movements." Its Reply includes the following:

"A main contention of the book is that the principle of the separation of Church and State is seriously threatened by the Council. The book presents an abundant and convincing array of documentary material in support of its contentions. . . . So long as the Federal Council retains men in its official family and committee service who hold and express convictions, and who have affiliations, of which conservative Churches could not possibly approve, it is inevitable that the active management of the Federal Council will receive, and will thoroughly deserve, severe criticism such as has already been brought to bear on the Council by agencies entirely apart from the book in question.

"There are at least four main points at issue with regard to the whole movement, and there is nothing new in the attitude of conservative Churches on these points, except perhaps a new concern because of the extended activities of the Federal Council: (1) the transgression of the great

principle of separation between Church and State, and the question as to what is the rightful mission of the Church as such; (2) the prominence of the religious radical in the councils of the movement; (3) the affiliations of prominent members of the management, or of committees, with socially and politically radical groups that are a menace to our nation itself; and (4) pronouncements that do not necessarily represent the opinion of the churches."

In the course of its Reply *The Sunday School Times* refers to a new book, written by Colonel E. N. SANCTUARY, as "one of the many reflections of the profound concern that many earnest Christians have as to the Federal Council movement." This book is entitled, "Tainted Contacts," and may be secured by addressing American Christian Defenders, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York City (Cloth \$1.00; paper 50 cents).

The Next Move Belongs To Dr. Mudge

THE attention of the Editors of CHRISTIANITY TODAY has been called to the fact that, at a recent meeting of the Presbytery of San Francisco, Dr. LEWIS S. MUDGE, Moderator and Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, apparently questioned the accuracy of a news-item in the January issue of this journal regarding the licensure of Mr. LUCIAN HARPER KEARNS. Mr. KEARNS, who is a non-affirmer of the Virgin Birth of CHRIST, was licensed by the Presbytery of Washington City (D. C.) on December 14, after he had been tentatively accepted for service by the Board of Foreign Missions. The report of Dr. MUDGE's reference to this matter has come to CHRISTIANITY TODAY through trustworthy and unimpeachable sources. Our informants agree that Dr. MUDGE did not, in so many words, accuse CHRISTIANITY TODAY of not telling the truth. Yet in replying to a public query regarding the affair, during a period when questions had been invited from the floor, Dr. MUDGE is said to have stated that he was not in the confidence of the Foreign Board and did not know it had been done. Then he inquired the source of the information. His questioner replied, "CHRISTIANITY TODAY." Certain persons present were moved to laugh audibly. Whereupon Dr. MUDGE is said to have smiled, waved his finger, and replied "Ah! just as I thought. Well, I'd look further if I were you." The questioner is said to have replied: "But the name of the young man, a Mr. LUCIAN HARPER KEARNS, was given. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Washington, D. C. and designated as a missionary to South America." Whereupon Dr. MUDGE is said to have rejoined, "Well, I know nothing about it, but I repeat, I'd look further." This conversation moved one of those present to declare "The impression Dr. MUDGE meant to convey was that CHRISTIANITY TODAY was absolutely undependable

and a huge joke to quote it as a source of authority."

The Editors of this paper could hardly expect Dr. MUDGE to be in sympathy with their editorial position concerning the state of the Church. They have, however, always tried to be scrupulously fair to him while remaining opposed to many of his policies. But the Editors are very sensitive about the reputation of this journal for honesty and truth. And when a man of Dr. MUDGE's prominence publicly questions the veracity of a reputable news journal, whether by implication or directly, its Editors are under an obligation to record the fact, then either confess error and apologize, or else establish the statement as true and ask the accuser to make a public retraction. We are taking the latter course.

The item in question was published in good faith and on good authority. Without ever doubting its accuracy, the Editors, upon being advised of Dr. MUDGE's statement, set about to secure additional information. It is now at hand. The account in the item was true. It might have been much stronger, and still have been true. Of our informants seven are members of the Presbytery who were present at the meeting. Some of them voted for the licensure of Mr. KEARNS. They have written in confidence, which will be respected. But, from their several accounts, the four following facts are agreed upon by all:

(1) That Mr. KEARNS could not affirm belief in the Virgin Birth of CHRIST.

(2) That Dr. A. J. MCCARTNEY read a statement of Mr. KEARNS' doctrinal beliefs to the Presbytery.

(3) That it was stated in Presbytery that the Board of Foreign Missions had approved Mr. KEARNS, and were merely awaiting his licensure by the Presbytery, and that this approval was used as an argument why he should be licensed.

(4) That, after debate in which much was said, Mr. KEARNS was licensed, with a considerable minority voting "no."

Our correspondents have sent us much other information about the case which sheds considerable light upon it. There is some slight disagreement among them as to who made certain statements. Some of them understood that the Board had approved Mr. KEARNS' doctrinal statement. The fact that it was stated that the Board, with four ex-moderators of the General Assembly as members, would not pass a man not entirely satisfactory in every way, is undeniable. There is no doubt that some members of Presbytery, having heard Mr. KEARNS' statement, his reported approval by the Board, and the other arguments advanced, voted for his licensure hoping that in the future his views might be clarified. And there is also, unfortunately, no doubt whatsoever of the fact

of Mr. KEARNS' tentative appointment by the Board of Foreign Missions.

The facts in the case are clear and incontrovertible. The next move belongs to Dr. MUDGE.

Banishing "Religious Bigotry"

ACCORDING to press dispatches from Washington, D. C., a "seminar" composed of "Protestants, Catholics and Jews" was held in that city from March seventh to ninth, for the purpose of discussing religious prejudice in America.

It is always easy in this day to raise an outcry against "intolerance" and "bigotry." The temper of the age in which we live is clearly averse to uncompromising and positive statements of belief. The world, in its effort to commend "open-mindedness" and "tolerance," both of which rightly understood are salutary and good, has gone to the extreme of "tentativitis." Unless a man or a church is willing to ascribe only tentative validity to beliefs and doctrines, and is willing to concede that "we may not be right" the world looks upon him as an obscurantist, as an enemy of progress.

We have nothing but commendation for the Washington gathering or for any other movement insofar as it attempts to do away with hatred of persons as persons, or with hatred of races as races. But experience has shown that it is difficult for some attending such meetings to remember the great and wide distinction between tolerance and compromise. And we feel no hesitation in saying that in such conferences, it is the Protestant, rather than the Roman Catholic or the Jew, who is called upon to make sacrifices of conviction. The spokesmen of the Church of Rome uniformly address these gatherings with felicity and charm. They wear the velvet glove, but beneath it is the gauntlet of steel. Rome will not compromise, nor can she be blamed for it. The Jew also, remembering his racial dignity and history, speaks courteously, but avoids abandonment of his own position. It is the Protestant who usually, in gatherings of this kind, feels himself in the grip of an "inferiority complex." He feels caught between two extremes, and it would be more than one could expect from human nature to find that men are not swayed somewhat thereby. Hence, expressions which would reduce all religions to a common level in order to banish "religious prejudice" are usually uttered by Protestants. Nor is the reason far to seek. The Protestants who are found in these conferences are likely to be Modernists. They have cast away the great, certain foundation upon which Protestantism was reared, and on which alone it can stand: an infallible Bible. For it they have nothing fixed to substitute. They find common ground with the Reformed Jew, so far as authority is concerned, more than with the true Protes-

(Concluded on Page 21)

Is Atheism Scientific?

By the Rev. George P. Pierson, D.D.

IT is hard to prove the existence of God, we are told: it would seem harder to prove His non-existence. To prove His non-existence one must account for the universal capacity in man to believe in God and the universal instinct to search after God that have manifested themselves through the millennia of human history.

To demonstrate atheism we should have to be super-men with super-celestial knowledge. We should have to be able to say, "We have searched the universe from centre to circumference and by searching we have not been able to find out God." Moreover, to conduct our search in any thorough-going manner we must needs be super-infinite and super-eternal; for beyond our visible universe lie the heights and depths and lengths and breadths of illimitable space, the dimensions of which alone must measure the extent of our doubt whether perchance God might not be found somewhere out there in the uttermost.

A strictly logical atheist would have to be able to comprehend God, since an uncomprehended area must ever remain an area of doubt. To comprehend God one would have to be mentally greater than God and hence, so to say, a super-God himself; and so no longer an atheist.

Now, there is a way of investigating the existence and nature of God. It is the scientific method. Just as I would do in the case of any other science—botany, grammar, music—I naturally expect in approaching the study of this super-science (a) to conform my method to the nature of the field of investigation, (b) to assemble all possible data, (c) to set up an hypothesis and test it out by all the facts available, and (d) to avail myself exhaustively of any instruction I can secure. I do not abandon my reasoning faculty, I shall use it to its highest power. Nor shall I discard logic. I shall maintain an open mind. I shall not begin my thinking with a denial, any more than I would

attempt to study light blindfolded, or life without allowing it free course through every avenue of my body and soul. This attitude I take to be both rational and scientific.

To illustrate, I am told that there is a newly discovered planet on the rim of the solar system. I am told of other marvels of the stellar sphere. I had thought the stars were lamp lights along celestial highways or openings in the floor of Heaven. The explanation of science excites my wonder and tests my credulity. Astronomy had always seemed weird and impossible to me. I had laughed to scorn the astronomer with his lenses, formulae and astounding figures; they were all so remote from my experience. But perhaps there was method in his madness; anyway, I will try him out; so just provisionally I accept his telescope, his text-book and his teaching. I soon discover that my eyes are in bad condition, that I have incipient cataracts. Immediately I have them "melted off" by the family oculist. Then to the observatory! If you have never observed the heavens through a large telescope, don't miss the next chance. You will never forget the absolutely novel thrill in gazing at a universe of hitherto unknown worlds—and incidentally you will be awed at the quiet depths of the pure, luminous ether containing them. The big earth will never seem big any more. If you have not actually seen Heaven itself you have seen at least the portals thereof. I am humbled now. I listen eagerly to what my instructor has to tell me, and I go on thence from vision to vision, from glory to glory,—all because in undertaking the study of my new science I had submitted myself to the method of investigation the science demanded, I had actually observed a new world of data—from such data discovering the principles of my science, and I had accepted the superior knowledge of a perfect teacher. In all these particulars I have never condemned myself as having been unscientific.

In studying the existence and nature of God, we are not concerned with visible, tangible things that may be observed with physical instruments. Our spirits are seeking to become acquainted with the Great Spirit we call God. The promise is that God will commune directly with my spirit. No proof could be more intimate or convincing. It is actually possible for me to talk with God and to be assured that He is listening to what I say. I have come to that point in my life when I find myself face to face with God. Shall I venture to address Him, or through awe or apathy turn away from Him? A great crisis this! My destiny hangs in the balance. The only attitude for me to take is that of deepest humility, confession, petition, adoration, thanksgiving—in a word, prayer. Am I willing to make this test of humble, importunate, prevailing prayer? Another audience may not be granted me save perhaps after I have sought it with strong crying and tears. Surely no serious student of Theism will leave untested this direct proof of persistent prayer—a transaction taking place in the very innermost shrine of the temple of my soul.

Most of us have found the shrine disordered, dark, befouled. The promise is that God will send His Holy Spirit to enlighten, restore, quicken my fallen soul. It is true that our spiritual vision is impaired. It is true that the natural man cannot know the things of God, because they are spiritually discerned, but God is more willing to give His Spirit to them that ask Him than earthly parents are to give good gifts to their children. Shall I decline this second proof, so essential, so convincing, so attainable? "Well, then," our friend inquires, "is there anything further I can do except maintain this receptive attitude toward God?" Yes. Set your affections on God. "He that loveth not knoweth not God." Commit your will to His will—the only way to gain real liberty, by the way—"he that doeth His will shall know of the doctrine." These are searching

tests, but what you get is worth infinitely more than the price you pay.

Now I can imagine an atheist objecting, "What you say is all very well from a subjective standpoint, but what have you objective for the man on the street who is concrete in his thinking? Men are not satisfied with an unseen, invisible, unheard, inaudible, untouched, intangible God. Their cry has been, 'Oh, if only He would show Himself, speak to us, come to us!'" Now that is precisely what He has done. Two thousand years ago, in the centre of the then known world, at the focal point of history, God appeared, manifesting Himself in the very thing that men know

best—the human body and spirit. The way to see God is to look at Him—in Christ. Nothing is so convincing as direct vision. Ours is a privilege of a heavenly order, to be able to study the thoughts, words and deeds of God exhibited in a Being like unto ourselves.

"But that is a miracle!" you say. Truly, the incarnation was a supreme miracle. Shall we not in our study of the supernatural welcome every evidence of the supernatural? Or shall we join the Jews of Jesus' time in demanding a miracle and, when He showed them many,—conspicuously the miracle of the resurrection—retort, "Impossible, we never heard, saw, experienced any-

thing of the sort. We deny angels, spirit and resurrection." This surely is not the constructive attitude of a serious scientist. The scientific road to assured knowledge leads upward over three ascending levels,—"I have believed:" I will accept the statements about God's existence and nature provisionally, hypothetically; "I know:" having placed my soul in this new environment, I find all its demands—supremely the demand for new life—just as fully satisfied as are the demands of my body in its present physical environment of air, light, food and sound; "I am persuaded:" "I know whom I have believed and am persuaded."

Notes on Biblical Exposition

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

XV. "THE APOSTOLIC DECREE"

"But from those who were reputed to be something—of whatever sort they were, it makes no difference to me; God does not accept the countenance of a man; for to me those who were of repute added nothing, but, on the contrary, when they saw that I had been entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision just as Peter with that of the circumcision (for He who had worked for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision had worked also for me unto the Gentiles), and when they recognized the grace that had been given me, James and Cephas and John, those who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision—only, that we should remember the poor, which very thing also I was zealous to do" (Gal. 2:6-10, in a literal translation).

No Addition to Paul's Gospel

LAST month we treated the beginning of this momentous sentence in which Paul tells of the result of the Jerusalem conference, and we showed what the structure of the sentence is.

Paul began the sentence as though it were to be in the form, "From those who were reputed to be something I received nothing;" but then, after the intervention of several very weighty parenthetical clauses, he concludes it in the form, "To me those who were of repute added nothing."

We must now consider this latter utterance, which, in the course of modern criticism, has been one of the most discussed utterances in the whole of the New Testament.

The meaning of the word which we have translated "added" is fixed by the preceding context. Paul says in verse 2; "I laid before them the gospel which I am preaching among the Gentiles." The word translated "added" here in verse 6 is in the Greek exactly the same word as the word translated "laid before" in verse 2, except that here in verse 6 it has prefixed to it a preposition meaning "in addition." What Paul is saying, then, is this: "I laid my gospel before them; and they laid nothing before me in addition. They had nothing to add to my gospel, but recognized it as true and complete and as having been given to me by God."

Thus what Paul is denying in verse 6 is that the pillars of the Jerusalem church made any additions to his gospel; and that is all that he is denying. A clear recognition of that fact would have saved a vast amount of error in the modern study of the New Testament.

Acts and Galatians

Failing to recognize that fact, or failing to understand its implications, many modern critics of the New Testament have found in Paul's words, "They added nothing to me," in Gal. 2:6, a contradiction between the Pauline Epistles and the Book of Acts.

The Book of Acts, these critics insist, in the account which it gives of this meeting between Paul and the Jerusalem Church, says that the Jerusalem leaders did "add" something very important—namely, "the Apostolic Decree" of Acts 15:20, 23-29; 21:25. The Book of Acts, according to these critics, says that the Jerusalem Church, while not requiring the Gentile converts to be circumcised and to keep the whole of the ceremonial law, did require them to keep a part of the ceremonial law; it did require them not only to refrain

from the sin of fornication, but also to refrain from "things offered to idols and from blood and from things strangled" (Acts 15:29). Thus, according to the Book of Acts, say these critics, a compromise was effected at the Jerusalem conference; circumcision was not required—in that Paul's position was endorsed—but, on the other hand, Paul's teaching was modified to the extent that certain portions, at least, of the ceremonial law were imposed upon the Gentile converts. Could there be, these critics ask, any clearer example of an addition to Paul's teaching? Paul said, "Believe in Christ and you do not need to keep the ceremonial law;" the Jerusalem Church said, "Believe in Christ and, while you do not need to keep all of the ceremonial law, you do need to keep certain particularly necessary parts of it."

A Critical Lever

In Galatians, say these critics, any such compromise is entirely excluded; in Galatians, Paul says of the Jerusalem leaders, "They added nothing to me." In Acts, on the other hand, say these critics, Paul is represented as submitting tamely to a compromise, which certainly does involve a modification of, or addition to, his gospel. Thus Acts is found by these critics to be in conflict with Galatians. But if so, Acts must be wrong; since scholars of all shades of opinion recognize Galatians as being a genuine epistle written by an eyewitness and therefore true. But if Acts is wrong at this point, where it can be tested by comparison with a recognized authority, then—so the argument runs—it is presumably wrong elsewhere as well, and the whole account which it gives of the apostolic Church is discredited. But the Third Gospel evidently was written by the same author as the author of Acts; therefore, if Acts is discredited, so is the Third Gospel; and since the Third Gospel gives essentially the same account of the life of Christ as do the First and Second Gospels, their account also is discredited; and thus the entire New Testament account of the events at the basis of the Christian Church is shown to be unhistorical.

Such is the reasoning when it is reduced to its simplest terms. Of course, many other considerations are adduced against the New Testament books; but such is the importance of these words, "They added nothing," in the whole discussion that it may be said with a rather high degree of truth that it was at this point that modern negative criticism of the New Testament applied its lever to throw the entire edifice of historic Christianity to the ground.

But is the lever rightly applied? Is the Book of Acts really in contradiction with the Epistle to the Galatians at this point?

There are three ways in which that question may be answered in the negative—three ways in which Acts and Galatians may be shown to be in harmony with respect to the Apostolic Decree.

Galatians Before the Council?

In the first place, it may be held that the Epistle to the Galatians was written before the Apostolic Council, according to the hypothesis which was discussed in the November, 1931, number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, and that the meeting with the Jerusalem leaders which Paul describes in Gal. 2:1-10 was entirely different from, and earlier than, the "Apostolic-Council" meeting of Acts 15:1-29. Obviously if the Epistle to the Galatians was written before the Apostolic Council, Paul could not in Galatians mention a decree which the Council afterwards passed; and the silence of Galatians about the Decree would show only that when Galatians was written the Decree had not yet been passed; it would not show that the Decree was not afterwards passed, and passed exactly in the way which the Book of Acts describes.

Something is to be said for this way out of the difficulty; it is followed by certain noteworthy modern scholars, and it may possibly be correct. If it were the only way to avoid admitting a contradiction between Acts and Galatians, then we should be thoroughly justified, in accordance with scientific historical method, in adopting it, because there is a great weight of independent evidence

to show that Acts was written by a companion of Paul who could not have been mistaken about so central a matter as the Apostolic Council. To treat that weight of independent evidence as though it did not exist, just because, on the basis of one of several possible ways of interpreting Gal. 2:1-10, Acts is in contradiction with Paul is not merely contrary to the Christian Faith, but is contrary to the sound scientific methods of study which are constantly employed in other fields of historical research.

The Text of the Decree

The second possible way of showing Gal. 2:6 to be in harmony with Acts 15:29 is to adopt the reading of the so-called "Western text" at Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25. The text or wording of the Book of Acts can be shown to have been handed down in the Church at an early time—say, in the second century—in two different forms. One was the form, called by modern scholars the "Neutral text," which has been preserved for us in our two earliest and best New Testament manuscripts, the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus, together with a number of other less important documents. The other was the form, called by modern scholars the "Western text," which has been preserved for us especially in one Greek manuscript, the Codex Bezae, and, with varying degrees of clearness, in certain remnants of the "Old Latin" translation of the Book of Acts and in certain quotations from the Book of Acts in early Christian writers.

Now the Western text at Acts 15: 20, 29; 21:25 omits the word meaning "what is strangled" or (as it appears in 15:29) "things strangled." If the Western text is right in this omission, then what the Gentile converts were told to refrain from, according to the Book of Acts, was "things offered to idols [or "pollutions of idols," as it is in Acts 15:20], blood and fornication." If this short text, without "what is strangled" is correct, what is the meaning of the Decree? The answer to that question depends largely upon the meaning of the word "blood." "Blood," as a thing to be refrained from, may mean one of two things: (1) it may mean the *shedding* of blood, or murder;

or (2) it may mean the *eating* of blood, or disobedience to the Mosaic food-law which forbids the eating of meat with the blood in it.

This second meaning seems to be fixed for the word "blood" if the word meaning "what is strangled" is included in the Decree as it is included by the Neutral text; or, at least, if "what is strangled" is included in the text, then, whatever be the meaning of "blood," the Decree does contain a direction about foods, since a prohibition of "what is strangled" can only mean a prohibition of the eating of what is strangled.

If, however, the word translated "what is strangled" be omitted, then "blood" may mean the shedding of blood or murder, and the three things prohibited in the Decree may be simply the three deadly sins; idolatry ("things offered to idols" or "pollutions of idols"), murder ("blood") and fornication. But if the ceremonial element was thus absent from the Decree, the Decree did not constitute any addition to Paul's gospel, since Paul of course had told his converts as clearly as anyone else had done that they must refrain from these three deadly sins. Indeed, the negative part of the Decree, like the positive part, would be a way of rebuking the Judaizers and of agreeing with Paul. "You have been told by the Judaizers," the Jerusalem Church would be saying to the Gentile converts, "that you must be circumcised and must keep the ceremonial law; but, as a matter of fact, all the things that you need to refrain from are sins like idolatry, murder and fornication." According to this view, the prohibition of idolatry, murder and fornication would be only a particularly forcible way of saying that the abstinence from other things which was insisted upon by the Judaizers was *not* required.

But the Western text of the Book of Acts, upon which this solution of the problem is based, is usually incorrect, and in all probability it is incorrect here. A few noteworthy modern scholars have, indeed, adopted the Western text of the Decree, and the decision with regard to it is not perfectly easy; but on the

whole the solution which it provides for the problem of Acts and Galatians is to be regarded as inferior to either of the other two.

The Best Solution

On the whole, the best solution is the one which we must now consider—namely, the one which admits that Gal. 2:1-10 and Acts 15:1-29 refer to the same visit of Paul to Jerusalem and that the Neutral text of the Decree is correct, but insists that the Decree, rightly interpreted, did not constitute an addition to Paul's gospel and so did not need to be mentioned by Paul at Gal. 2:6.

What was the real meaning of the Apostolic Decree according to the Book of Acts? Was it a part of the gospel, or was it something entirely different; were its prohibitions something to be added to faith in Christ as among the conditions of salvation, or was their purpose of entirely different kind?

The answer to this question, and the key to the whole problem, is probably to be found in Acts 15:21. In that verse, James the brother of the Lord, immediately after advocating the Decree with its four prohibitions, goes on to say: "For Moses from ancient generations has in the several cities those who proclaim him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath."

Various interpretations, indeed, have been proposed for this much discussed verse. But surely the most natural interpretation is that which makes James here give a reason for the four prohibitions in the Decree by pointing to the fact that there are many Jews in the cities to which the Decree is to be sent. "There are many Jews in those cities," says James; "they hear the law of Moses read in the synagogues every Sabbath; from the reading of the law they come to abhor especially certain things in Gentile life; and in order to win them the Gentile disciples of Jesus ought to refrain from those things."

So interpreted, the observance of the four prohibitions in the Decree was to be regarded not as necessary to salvation but only as a means of avoiding offence in certain mixed communities

where there were many Jews. Not being necessary to salvation, it was not an addition to Paul's gospel; and not being an addition to Paul's gospel, it is not excluded by Paul's words in Gal. 2:6. "I laid my gospel before them," says Paul, "and they made no addition to it." These words of Paul remain true even if the Apostolic Decree was issued by the Jerusalem Church.

Was there a Compromise?

But could Paul ever have agreed to such a measure, even if it was intended in the way that we have just indicated? Could he have agreed to such a method of avoiding offence to the Jews?

About one hundred years ago, the scholars of the so-called "Tübingen school" were ready with their answer. "Of course Paul could never have done any such thing," they said. "Paul was no compromiser or time-server; he would have insisted on full Gentile freedom without any concessions to Jewish narrowness; and when the Book of Acts represents him as agreeing to such concessions the Book of Acts clearly is wrong."

But the general trend, at least, of subsequent scholarship is somewhat away from such a conclusion as that. The plain fact is that there are in the Pauline Epistles themselves, the very authorities to which the Tübingen scholars appealed, elements which show that on occasion Paul was perfectly ready to advocate exactly the kind of concession to Jewish feeling that is advocated in the Apostolic Decree. In I Cor. 9:20, for example, Paul says that he became to the Jews as a Jew, in order that he might gain Jews, and that he became to those who were under the law as under the law (though not being himself under the law), in order that he might gain those who were under the law. It would be difficult to imagine a more complete agreement than that passage contains with the purpose of the Apostolic Decree as it is explained in James' words in Acts 15:21.

The truth is that where no principle was involved, where it was only his own convenience that was at stake, Paul, the heroic and uncompromising defender of

Christian liberty, was the most concessive of men. One thing is clear—he would never have agreed to the Apostolic Decree if it had been, as it is often represented as being, a “compromise.” Paul was no compromiser either at Jerusalem or anywhere else. If the prohibitions of the Apostolic Decree had been intended as being necessary to salvation, they would have been an addition to Paul’s gospel, and Paul would never have agreed to them in the world. But if they were merely an effort to win the Jews in mixed communities to the Lord Jesus Christ by avoiding unnecessary offence under certain special circumstances, then they were quite in accord with Paul’s practice, and Paul could well have accepted them in the sense in which they were meant.

The Limited Address

It should be observed that this Decree, according to Acts 15:23, was not addressed to Gentile converts everywhere, but only to those in “Antioch and Syria and Cilicia.” It is true, that Paul did, according to Acts 16:4, give the Decree over to converts in certain cities not in Syria or Cilicia but in the southern part of the Roman province of Galatia; and it is true that in Acts 21:25 James, in his reference to the Decree, does not mention the geographical limitations of the address. But these observations cannot obscure the significance of the fact that the Decree was formally addressed by the Jerusalem Church only to the converts in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia. It was not a piece of formal legislation for all Gen-

tile converts everywhere—if it had been, Paul might well have been less ready to accept it—but it was a direction given, in view of certain special conditions, to certain mixed communities in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia, where, presumably, there were many Jews and where the congregations were probably in a relation to the Jerusalem Church much closer than that which prevailed in distinctly Pauline churches.

The outstanding fact, however, about the Apostolic Decree which shows it to be in harmony with Galatians is not the limitation of its address but the fact that it was not an addition to Paul’s gospel; it was not an addition to what he had said about the way of salvation. Paul had said: “Believe on the Lord

(Concluded on Page 19)

Why I Am a Fundamentalist

A Sermon by

The Rev. J. A. Schofield, Jr.

Minister, First Presbyterian Church, Gouverneur, N. Y.

“Another gospel which is not another.”
(Galatians 1:6-7)

WE have all heard a great deal about Fundamentalism and its opposite, Modernism. We have heard preachers who have strongly aligned themselves on one side or the other. We have all heard how the conflict between the two has threatened to disrupt every Protestant Church, and still threatens to do so. And consequently, I need make no apology at all for the position that I assume nor for my frank discussion of it. In his letter to the Galatians, Paul was telling them how surprised he was that they had left the purity of the Gospel of Jesus Christ that he had preached unto them and had been called unto “another gospel which is not another.” That is to say, Paul was telling them that the thing they were adopting, which called itself another gospel was really not another gospel, for it was no gospel at all. And his remarks about the false gospel of his day may well be applied to the Modernism of this day, which while calling itself another gospel is no gospel at all.

So, I am a Fundamentalist. But what is a Fundamentalist? There are several definitions. Originally a Fundamentalist was one who belonged to an organization that adopted that name. Today the word has a much wider application. It refers to all those who adhere strictly to the funda-

mentals of the Christian faith, to the great central doctrines and historical facts of Christianity. A Fundamentalist, then, is one who accepts certain great truths, doctrines that the Bible teaches and that every Christian Church, Protestant, Roman Catholic and Greek Catholic, has always included in its official teaching. A Modernist, on the other hand, is one, not necessarily *modern* at all, who denies one or several or all of the great foundation doctrines of Christianity; such as the Virgin Birth of Jesus, His true Divinity, His resurrection, His oneness with the Father, the Trinity, the sinfulness of man, salvation through the vicarious death of Christ, regeneration through the presence of the Holy Spirit, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting.

Why, then, am I a Fundamentalist? Before I list my reasons for being what I am, I desire to say that I am not judging the eternal destiny of Modernists, in saying what I am about to say. Only God is their judge. I cannot say that this one or that one has not true faith in his heart. I can say, however, that what they teach is not Christianity. What they believe is a matter between them and their God. What they teach is open to all to see and consider and know. And so if I say bluntly that such a person or some other is not teaching Christianity in his pulpit, I do not care to be

understood as saying that down deep in his heart he may not have a saving relationship to Christ.

With this word of caution, we are ready to begin to list our reasons. I am a Fundamentalist, in the first place, because I believe that the Bible is the very Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice. That is to say, I believe that it was given to man by God. I believe that God saw to it that it was perfect and complete. I believe that, when rightly understood, it will be found to be infallible, without error, the only Divinely given rule of faith and practice. I believe the Bible to be God’s Word. I accept it and try to follow it.

Modernism, on the other hand, does not so view the Bible. It does not accept it as authoritative. It does not accept it as coming from God with His divine sanction on every part of it. Modernism not only dishonors the Bible but page by page, chapter by chapter, book by book, it destroys it. The most famous radio preacher in America, Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, does that every time he speaks over the air. Now a passage from Genesis, now a passage from Thessalonians, now a part of Daniel and now a part of John is discarded with a glibness that is nothing short of astounding. A mutilated and bleeding Bible is the result, Modernists accepting and believing and following only those parts of it that appeal to

their purely human reason. Listen to another Modernist, one of their professors, speak of Paul: "Paul appeals to a state of mind that has forever passed away—at least among civilized peoples, though his theology may still be helpful to African savages" Hear what another Modernist theological professor has to say about the Book, "The Bible is not now, and has not been in the past, an authority in any sense of the word."

In the second place, I am a Fundamentalist because Fundamentalism honors Christ. It sees Him as the Eternal Son of God, one with the Father in power and glory before the world was. It teaches, as the Bible plainly sets forth, that Christ freely and voluntarily left His place at God's right hand in heaven and came to the earth to redeem the world from its sin. It teaches that Christ is God in the flesh, that He was born of a Virgin, that His teaching was the very teaching of God, that He performed miracles, that He healed the sick and raised the dead, that He was crucified for us, being our substitute on the cross, that after being dead and buried, He arose again from the dead. Fundamentalism, or true Christianity, honors Christ as the Son of God and as the Saviour of the world.

Modernism, on the other hand, at least in any of its consistent forms (although we should say that there are many types of Modernists and many of them are not consistent and do not carry out their own teachings to their logical conclusion), dishonors Christ. It claims not to do so, but essentially that is just what it does. For often it teaches that He was not born of a Virgin, that the beautiful accounts of His conception and birth in the Bible are merely camouflage for a wicked mother and for a shameful birth. Often it denies His miracles. Often it denies His bodily resurrection. Often it denies His divine knowledge. Often it denies His God-consciousness. Often it denies His deity. Modernism always reduces Christ's Person and His honor and His divinity in one or several of these ways. Hear, for example, what a professor at the University of Chicago says of Him: "Jesus was the child of his time, a merely human Christ, who does no more and no less than interpret to us the eternal revelation of God in human nature."

In the third place, I am a Fundamentalist because Fundamentalism sees man for what he is. And this is the true Christian attitude. Man was created for fellowship with God, for human perfection. But he fell and sin came into his being. From that time forth, he was a fallen creature, a creature of sin who needed a Saviour. Man is essentially, then, a sinner and God alone must save him from the power, the guilt and the consequences of his sin. Sin is a great and awful universal fact. Sin is what keeps the savages of Africa down and that just as well keeps cultured Americans

from knowing and loving God. True Christianity recognizes man's sin and his dreadful need.

Modernism, on the other hand, ignores or makes light of sin. It sees nothing in it which man himself cannot overcome. It does not see man as a sinner but it glorifies him as a saint. Indeed, carried away with the so-called goodness of man, a goodness which is entirely imaginary, Modernism sets man up upon a pedestal and worships him. One of its preachers is even able to substitute for the glorious article in the creed: "I believe in God" the hollow words, "I believe in man."

I am a Fundamentalist in the fourth place because doctrine produces life. What a man believes will determine what that man does. Some one has put it bluntly thus: "Teach a boy that when he dies he will die like a dog, and that boy will soon begin to live like a dog." The more sublime your beliefs, then, the more sublime will be your deeds. The Form of Government of the Presbyterian church starts out with the statement that "truth is in order to goodness." Truth produces good deeds. What a man believes will always determine what that man does. Believe the truth and your life will show the works of light. Believe a lie and your life will show the works of darkness. Truth produces good deeds. Put it negatively and we see that loose doctrine leads always and inevitably to loose morals. That is a startling statement but a true one. Loose thinking always leads, sooner or later, in the person doing the loose thinking or in his children, to loose morals, to questionable ethics. Modernists are always talking about ethics. They are always talking about right and wrong. But in them we see this principle strongly illustrated, that loose doctrine leads to careless and questionable ethics.

Let me illustrate what I mean, when I say that the ethics, the every day honesty of the Modernists is to be questioned. Many of their methods are highly unethical. For example, many men who have given up old fashioned Christianity still use the terms of Christianity. But they give to these terms entirely new meanings; meanings which they attach to them but which they know perfectly well the average layman in the pew does not attach to them. They use the terms, but they have given up the things that the terms stand for, and dare not abandon the terms lest the average Christian suspect them of the infidelity of which they are guilty. This is hardly ethical, is it?

Take another example. Harry Emerson Fosdick occupied the pulpit of the First Presbyterian Church in New York for some years, teaching deliberately what he knew the Presbyterian Church did not stand for, and all the while being a guest in a Presbyterian pulpit; a guest trying to destroy the very foundations of the church that harbored him. Take another example. In the largest Modernist Theological School in

America, constantly teaching is given in the classroom which the professors plainly state is not safe to be given in the pulpit. It is not safe because it is not Christian and they know that the church will not permit it. But they teach it in the classroom. Take another example. Many a minister of our day has gone over body and soul to Unitarianism but remains in some evangelical denomination to "hold down his job." He stays in a denomination which he despises and whose standards he discredits and whose teachings he tries to destroy in order that secretly he may win that denomination to a system of teaching that it has always thoroughly disapproved of. Thus it is that a prominent Unitarian of this country says of these men: "A good many Unitarians are doing more good where they are than they can do anywhere else. They are undoubtedly capturing strongholds that we could never carry by direct attack. They are the modernists of Protestants who are working within the fold. . . . We want more of them and we want them where they are."

In the fifth place, I am a Fundamentalist because Fundamentalism produces fruit. The old fashioned religion of our fathers built hospitals, erected schools, built churches in rural places and established missions in every country of the world. The mission enterprise as it extends out over the world is an enterprise that was built up by the old faith and is sustained by the old faith. The old belief produces fruit. Lack of belief produces none, except deterioration and despair. Skepticism soon goes to pieces. Doubt soon disintegrates. And instead of going out and establishing missions, it cannot even keep itself alive. Insofar as Modernism is a denial of truth, just so far it is bound to decay and go to pieces. It cannot make converts to its cause. It cannot even keep itself alive.

In the sixth place, I am a Fundamentalist because laxity of doctrine produces chaos, sooner or later; chaos intellectually, morally, spiritually. It may not produce it in the man who starts upon the road of doubt; but if it does not come in him it will in his children or in his children's children. By the third generation, skepticism is sure to produce despair.

I am a Fundamentalist, in the seventh place, because Modernism rejects almost *in toto*, the supernatural. Christianity is a supernatural religion. It is based on God, upon His supernatural revelation of Himself, upon His supernatural coming to the earth, upon God's dying for man, upon His supernatural rising from the tomb. Every where Christianity is a supernatural religion. On a wholesale scale, Modernism rejects the supernatural, denies God's hand in the affairs of men. Thus another professor in Chicago says: "The New Testament story of supernatural birth, miracle, resurrection is an antiquated affair, a relic that is worthless to cultivated classes. . . . His-

torical science must repudiate the entire supernaturalist position. . . . The hypothesis of God has become superfluous in every science, even that of religion itself."

Finally, my eighth reason for being a Fundamentalist, is because Fundamentalism and Modernism are entirely different religions. And if Fundamentalism is Christian, then Modernism in its consistent form cannot be Christian at all. Harold Paul Sloan, the great Methodist, says this about Dr. Fosdick, the great Modernist (these are Sloan's words and not mine): "It ought to be perfectly evident even to a dull understanding that Professor Fosdick has completely separated from Christianity. He has no more in common with historic Christianity than Buddhism or Mohammedanism has. He is a refined gentleman who accepts the ethics of Jesus with more or less fullness; but he is not in any sense a Christian thinker. The cleavage between Professor Fosdick and Christian thought is a great deal wider than that between Christianity

and Judaism." This is strong language and I merely quote it to illustrate what I mean when I say that Fundamentalism and Modernism are totally different religions. Dr. Machen, the world's greatest authority on the New Testament, says that they are not only different religions, but belong to totally different types of religions. True Christianity is a redemptive religion. Modernism is a religion of human merit.

I am a Fundamentalist because I believe the Bible is the Word of God, because Fundamentalism honors Christ, because Fundamentalism sees man for what he is, because doctrine produces life, because Fundamentalism produces fruit, because laxity of doctrine produces chaos at least by the third generation, because Modernism rejects the supernatural, because Fundamentalism and Modernism are entirely different religions and if Fundamentalism is true Christianity, then certainly Modernism is not. It is not another gospel. It is no gospel at all.

to assume a saving attitude toward Christ who denies His deity, or the atoning character of His death, we are not disposed to go so far as to affirm that none of those who lack faith in His virgin birth are real Christians. It is one thing to maintain that the Virgin Birth is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and of the standards of the Presbyterian Church; it is quite a different thing to maintain that belief in the Virgin Birth is an essential condition of salvation. We affirm the former but not the latter. We think indeed that only a few of those who deny the virgin birth of our Lord possess a saving faith in Christ but we do not think there is any warrant either in Scripture or the Confession of Faith to justify the assertion that no one who denies the Virgin Birth can possibly be among the saved.

Our correspondent is of the opinion that "all leading Calvinistic theologians" hold that belief in the virgin birth, the deity and the atoning death of Jesus stand or fall together. We agree that such is the case but that is not to say that they all hold that belief in His virgin birth must exist in all those who are real Christians. It will generally be agreed that the late Dr. B. B. Warfield was a leading Calvinistic theologian. It seems fitting, therefore, that we cite in this connection the paragraph with which he concludes his discussion of the question, "Is the doctrine of the supernatural birth of Jesus essential to Christianity?"—a paragraph that admirably as well as somewhat adequately expresses the thought we had in mind when we expressed the notion that belief in the virgin birth is not absolutely necessary to salvation. It reads thus:

"If, then, it cannot be denied that the supernatural birth of Jesus enters constitutively into the substance of that system which is taught in the New Testament as Christianity—that it is the expression of its supernaturalism, the safeguard of its doctrine of incarnation, the condition of its doctrine of redemption—are we to go on and say that no one can be saved who does not hold this faith whole and entire? The question is thoroughly impertinent. We are discussing, not the terms of salvation, but the essential content of the Christian system; not what we must do to be saved, but what it behooved Jesus Christ to be and do that He might save us. Say that faith is the instrument by which salvation is laid hold upon; the instrument by which the prerequisites of the salvation laid hold on by faith are investigated is the intellect. As it is certain that the only Jesus, faith in whom can save, is the Jesus who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the virgin Mary, according to the Scriptures, it is equally certain that the act of faith by which He is savingly apprehended involves these presuppositions, were its implicates soundly developed. But our logical capacity

The Virgin Birth and Saving Faith: A Question and an Answer

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

I am very sorry that in your August number you have made the concession to the modernists that one who denies the Virgin Birth may still be a Christian. I do not understand how the Scriptures and our Confession have given you any occasion to warrant such an interpretation. I have no doubt but that all leading Calvinistic theologians here and on the Continent would unhesitatingly inform you that the divinity of Jesus and His virgin birth would stand or fall together; also that the doctrine of the atonement stands or falls with these. This is not only Calvinistic theology but also Roman Catholic. I have also studied in a Roman Catholic university and there is scarcely anything of which this Church is so sure as the virgin birth of Jesus. . . .

How can you maintain Scripturally the divinity of Jesus and deny the Virgin Birth and at the same time maintain that a person holding such a view may be a Christian? What kind of a Saviour must such a person have and by what sacrifice has such a man been redeemed? If this be true we can no longer maintain our Presbyterian doctrine of sin which cannot in anywise be atoned for except by the immaculate spotless Lamb of God "who became like unto us in all parts except sin." What construction must then be given the distinct Word of God: "she was found with child of the Holy Ghost . . . for that which is conceived in her is of the

Holy Ghost." A few words of explanation will be appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,

T. O.

THE letter printed above is one of a number we have received relative to what we said in our August issue concerning the question whether one who denies the virgin birth of Jesus can be a Christian.

It seems to us that those who have taken exception to what we said on that occasion have overlooked the fact that we were discussing, not what kind of person it is necessary for Christ to be and what kind of a death Christ must have died in order that He may be our Saviour from the guilt and power of sin, but rather what measure of knowledge of the facts about Christ is necessary in order that a man may be a Christian—more particularly whether one may possibly exercise a saving faith in Christ who denies or at least refuses to affirm that He was virgin-born. We do not think it is possible successfully to defend belief in Christ as a supernatural person while denying His virgin birth. What is more, we do not believe that it can be successfully maintained that Christ on the Cross offered up Himself as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God while denying either the divinity of His person or the supernaturalness of His birth. But while it does not seem to us possible for any one

can scarcely be made the condition of our salvation. The Scriptures do not encourage us to believe that only the wise are called. They even graciously assure us that blasphemy itself against the Son may be forgiven. It would surely be unfortunate if weakness of intellect were more fatal than wickedness of heart. On the whole, we may congratulate ourselves that it were more imperative that Jesus, by whom our salvation has been wrought, should know what it behooved Himself to be and to do that He might save us, than it is that we should fully understand it. But, on the other hand, it will scarcely do to represent ignorance or error as advantageous to salvation. It certainly is worth while to put our trust in Jesus as intelligently as it may be given us to do so. And it certainly will over and over be again verified in experience that he who casts himself upon Jesus as his divine Redeemer, will find the fact of the virgin birth of this Saviour not only consonant with faith and an aid to it, but a postulate of it without which he would be puzzled and distressed" (*Christology and Criticism*, p. 457).

It does not seem to us that to admit that one who denies the Virgin Birth may be a Christian is a concession to the modernists provided it be insisted on that they only are Christians who worship Christ as Lord and rest upon Him alone for salvation. We fully share our correspondent's contention that the Bible teaches the virgin birth of Christ and hence that no one who denies the Virgin Birth can believe in the full truthfulness of the Bible. But while we hold it important that Christians believe in the full truthfulness of the Bible we would not go so far as to say—as we pointed out in October issue—that only those are Christians who believe the Bible to be fully trustworthy. Some of those who have denied the Virgin Birth have held—on what seem to us utterly insufficient evidence—that those passages in Matthew and Luke that assert the virgin birth are interpolations and so no part of the original Scriptures. Such might conceivably maintain that they believed in the full truthfulness of all genuine Scripture (provided they could also explain away other relevant passages) despite their denial of the Virgin Birth. But even if deniers of the Virgin Birth maintained that it is not taught in the Bible despite what we look upon as plain and unambiguous statements to that effect, it would become us to hesitate about pronouncing them non-Christians before enquiring as to whether they worshipped Christ as Lord and trusted Him and Him alone for salvation. It will hardly do to take the position that a person is not a Christian merely because he rejects what we regard as the plain teachings of Scriptures. In that case, for instance, the pre-millennarians would have to maintain that a-millennarians and post-millennarians are not Christians and *vice versa*; also Cal-

vinists would have to deny that Arminians are Christian and *vice versa*. The man in the Gospels who said, "Lord I believe; help, thou, mine unbelief" was saved. Let us not forget that today as well as in former days there are many whose faith is small

and largely unintelligent. The essential thing is not that we have a strong faith but that we have faith at all. Christ is able to save and Christ does save all those who put their trust in Him even though their faith be weak and more or less unintelligent.

Current Views and Voices

The Missionary Call

Editorial in *The English Churchman*

DURING the next few months many men and women who have heard the call to go forth and proclaim the glad tidings of Christ's Salvation to the uttermost part of the earth will be preparing to leave home and kindred to enter on the great work entrusted to them. Valedictory meetings will be held in the early autumn to bid God-speed to the outgoing missionaries, and these meetings will not only be held in London but in many provincial centres. It is well that this should be so, in order that personal contact and interest may be established between those who go forth and those who stay at home. Such personal touch is of the utmost importance, for it means the more effective and intelligent exercise of missionary intercessions. Those who have heard and seen God's messengers can pray for them with greatly increased appreciation of their work and its needs. We hope therefore that the valedictory meetings may be very largely attended, and that those who cannot attend them may not the less earnestly take up the burden of prayer for the great work of world evangelisation. For there can be no more important subject for prayer if we remember the active and determined efforts of the Evil One to hinder or destroy the carrying out of God's purpose in the world. His attempts to keep back those who have heard the missionary call are in some cases successful, but if he fail in this respect Satan will seek to thwart and hinder them in their work and to tempt them not to declare the whole counsel of God. This design on his part can only be defeated by a faithful adherence to the Word of God. "I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest Me" was our Lord's description of His ministry. Nothing short of this must mark the ministry of those who seek to follow in His footsteps. They do not go at their own charges, neither must they go with their own message or with the message of a too often unfaithful Church. Unless their own hearts have received the Seed into good ground, and they have learned its unique value and power, it were better that they should stay at home. An unscriptural Gospel is no Gospel at all. It was because of this solemn fact and its tremendous implications that so many of God's earnest people felt it their bounden duty to ask for definite

safeguards in the case of candidates for work under the Church Missionary Society, and when, after long and painful discussion, these safeguards were refused, they felt that fresh channels must be opened up which should convey to the heathen a message which was marked by confidence in the inspired Word and which could unhesitatingly pass on every utterance of the Incarnate Word as true. The need for watchfulness and fidelity is no less to-day. The downgrade tendency is not likely to be lessened as the days go by. Rather will it be increased. When the Son of Man cometh shall He find faith on the earth? All the signs of the time suggest a negative answer, and the Word itself warns us that in the latter days false teachers shall arise.

All lovers of the old paths of strict fidelity to the Word written should, therefore, pray and continue steadfastly in prayer, that men and women who respond to the missionary call may be kept very faithful to the faith once-for-all delivered.

Prayer is needed also that missionary work may be kept on true Scriptural lines. The Lord Jesus has laid these down very clearly in His direction that those who go forth in His Name should preach the glad tidings and should heal the sick. Medical Missions have therefore a very complete justification from the lips of Him Who Himself bare our sicknesses and Whose daily works of healing proved His own deep concern for the woes of humanity. The records of missionary work prove how great has been the blessing vouchsafed to the medical side of the missionary calling. We thank God that so many skilled doctors and nurses have given themselves to work in heathen lands. They have supplied an emphatic and valuable answer to the unbelieving adjuration to leave the heathen alone because their own religions are more suitable to their needs! Medical Missions should be multiplied and well equipped. But they must never be allowed to take precedence of the administration of medicine to the soul. They deal with the life that now is, but the preaching of the Gospel deals with both the present and the future. A missionary doctor reminds us of this when in a recent letter he writes:—"The medical work goes ahead and is most interesting, and we have almost every type of case. I think the new wards will be quite filled when the winter comes.

Yes! How glad they are to partake of what we will do for them, but how rarely does one really see anxiety to come to a knowledge of the Truth. We can do medical work at home under more comfortable and interesting conditions, but we are here to win souls, and if they are not being won then our work is a failure."

There is not the same direct warrant for educational missionary work, and there is real danger lest it should fall short of the supreme purpose of the missionary call. It is possible to make the heathen "wise and prudent" in intellectual development and at the same time to rob them of the babe-simplicity which receives God's revelation of the things Divine. We should therefore pray very earnestly that every true missionary engaged in educational work should be daily taught by the Holy Spirit and enabled to teach, as the highest learning, the need and the way of salvation.

The Ethics of Lying

Is It Ever Right to Tell a Lie?

T. MILLER NEATBY, M.D., in
The Christian (London)

UNDER the title "When Truth is Wrong and Lying Right," there appeared in one of our morning papers a short notice of an address given by the headmaster of a well-known school at a recent Conference of Modern Churchmen held at Oxford. In this address—so it was stated—the claim was made that there were occasions when it might be right to tell a lie. Another speaker at the same Conference was reported to have said that a lie would be justified in the case of a mother who is asked by the would-be murderers of her children where they are.

The first speaker, we are told, said that "the moral teaching of the Bible had to justify itself at the bar of our otherwise established ethical convictions rather than the other way round." The second speaker considered apparently that the moral teaching of the Bible had to justify itself at the bar of expediency.

Neither of these two positions, as defended at a Conference of Modern Churchmen, can cause much surprise. When the Bible has been dethroned from its place as the authoritative Word of God, not only does its science become "dated" and its history unreliable, but its religious and moral teaching is jeopardized by being brought to a human bar—the bar of "our otherwise established ethical convictions."

But what really is surprising is that there are evangelical and Bible-loving Christians who can be found to maintain that God's most solemn moral law may upon occasion be broken without guilt. It is easy, of course, to imagine hard cases, but, proverbially, "hard cases make bad law." No one would find it in his heart to pass any severe

condemnation upon a mother who, in a frenzy of fear for her children, told a lie in order to save them. One would say in meekness, "I pray that I may never be so tried."

But that is an entirely different thing from saying that such a lie is *justified*. To say this is to say that the duty of truth-telling depends upon its issues. And its issues may be of every kind and degree. To say this is, in fact, to take the first step upon a long, long road—a road whose only logical end is that "lake that burneth with fire and brimstone" in which "all liars shall have their part."

* * * *

If an exception may be made to the obligation of truth-telling in the case of the mother who sees her child in peril of its life, may it not also be made in the case of anybody who thinks a lie will save another's life? And many there are who would answer "yes," and would say that in the sacred cause of saving human life any lie was justifiable. It is but another step for a man to ask whether, if he finds his own life threatened by a murderer, he may not justifiably save it by means of a lie.

The end is not there. If the lie that will save life is justifiable, what about the lie that will, in the judgment of him who utters it, preserve somebody—or, to go a step further, preserve himself—from some grievous bodily suffering short of death? Or from some grievous mental suffering? (For we cannot think of mental suffering as of less consequence than physical.) And then obviously the questions must arise: "How grievous must that physical or mental suffering be in order to justify a lie?" And "at what precise stage are we to decide that we really must tell the truth and chance the results?"

We have, in short, only to follow up the question along logical lines, to see plainly that we are really, however little we may at first have imagined it, endorsing the base contention of Jesuitism that "the end justifies the means."

The duties of truth-telling and of personal chastity—both lightly regarded in heathenism, ancient and modern—are, next to the reverent acknowledgment of the one true God, the most fundamental and characteristic in God's full revelation.

The Mosaic law does not seem to have definitely and unequivocally forbidden *all* lying (that is not to say that it *sanctioned* lying); thus, the Decalogue only forbids lying to a neighbour's hurt ("Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour")*, and in the light of this fact should be estimated those departures from the truth which Scripture, with characteristic frankness, records against some of the great saints of the old dispensation. The lies they told were not designed for another's hurt but for

* Lev. 19:11 is perhaps to be interpreted in the same way.

their own safety. It is a striking fact that, even when Gehazi stood convicted of "obtaining money under false pretences" (he did not lie to another's hurt, for he received of Naaman only what Naaman had already shown himself abundantly willing to give), Elisha did not rebuke him for lying but for the unseasonableness of his attempt to enrich himself—"Is it a time to receive money . . .?" (2 Kings 5:26).

* * * *

Nevertheless, it is just to remember that the Old Testament contains, especially in the Psalms and the Proverbs, a great many unqualified rebukes of lying. "The mouth of them that speak lies shall be stopped." "He that telleth lies shall not tarry in My sight." "A righteous man hateth lying." "Lying lips are an abomination to the Lord."

Many Old Testament scriptures show that the peculiar offensiveness of lying resides, not in any noxious reactions it may have on other people, but in *its denial of the truth*. Lying is hateful because it ousts, denies, sullies the truth. Thus in Psalm 119:29, the writer says: "Remove from me *the way of lying*," and immediately afterwards he says: "I have chosen *the way of truth*." Lying is the flat denial of the truth, that is, of God's law—thus, I "hate and abhor *lying*: but *Thy law* do I love" (Psalm 119:163).

A remarkable passage in Proverbs definitely distinguishes general untruthfulness from the particular form denounced in the ninth commandment—lying witness against one's neighbour, and definitely condemns both as hateful to God. "These six things doth the Lord hate: yea, seven are an abomination unto Him: a proud look, a *lying tongue*, hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, a *false witness that speaketh lies*, and he that soweth discord among brethren" (Prov. 6:16-19).

In the New Testament we find the holy nature, as well as the holy requirements, of God displayed—"evidently set forth"—in the Person of the Divine Son. He proclaimed Himself the Truth. He did no sin, neither was guile (or deceit) found in His mouth. He was the Express Image of the Person of the only God, who cannot lie.

His character as Incarnate Truth is set forth in radiant contrast to that of His (and our) great enemy. "The devil abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him . . . He is a liar and the lie's father." Between these two there can be no agreement. "Ye know that no lie is of the truth," however "white" or "justified" men may call it. So deadly and everlastingly is the hostility, that "all liars," in a common lot with murderers, whoremongers and idolaters, "shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death."

* * * *

Lying is a sin against God—it is anti-theistic. But the sin that is against God is sure, in the long course or in the short, to be against man. "In the keeping of God's commandments is great reward," and "godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is as well as of the life that is to come." Whereas truth-telling preserves and consolidates society, the sin of lying is anti-social—socially disintegrative. The man who tells a lie, however "white," is playing an anti-social part.

It is interesting to note the sanction to which Paul appeals in his exhortation to the Ephesians to "put away lying" and to "speak every man truth with his neighbour" (Eph. 4:25). It was not merely because the "new man" which they were exhorted to put on is "created according to God in righteousness and holiness of truth," but because they were all members of a common body—"we are members one of another." Lying is a destructive treachery against the "one body."

So it is in every society. The lie that is told—wrong perhaps from reluctant lips—in some dread emergency of life and death is, however much we may be disposed to condone it, a treachery against society.

Society rests on credit. The successful lie owes all its success to the fact that most people tell the truth. But every lie diminishes credit to some extent, and to that extent defeats itself. For when everyone has adopted the view that circumstances may justify a lie, no one will believe anyone, credit will be gone, and the social structure will be irretrievably undermined. All lying, therefore, is definitely and demonstrably anti-social; for in organized society, as in the Church of God, "we are members one of another."

* * * *

When someone put it to Jowett of Balliol that there were occasions upon which it was permissible to lie, he is said to have replied: "Well, if there are such occasions, I should like to think of them as little as possible beforehand and to forget them as soon as possible after."

But what, someone may ask, is one to do in those great and terrible—often sudden—crises in which it seems that a lie alone can save the situation? Offer one brief falsehood to the father of lies? Burn a few grains of incense on the altar of Diana? Or rather suffer torture, "not accepting deliverance?" What shall we do? What confessors and martyrs have done in all ages of the Church's history—the will of God, in loyalty and trust. Loyalty to God's moral law—trust that "with the temptation God will also make a way of escape that we may be able to bear it."

The following noble words are borrowed from Dr. R. F. Horton. "You need not go

about asking when it is necessary to tell a lie. You need not follow the Jesuit casuistry. Go into life believing that you can tell the truth, and determine that you will tell it at all costs; and those difficulties do not occur, for by some great power of God you are lifted over them without staining your soul."

Does God Smell a Sweet Saviour?

In *The Indian Christian*, Belgaum, India.

IN GENESIS viii:21, we read: "The Lord smelled a sweet savour." Aaron was ordered to burn incense, "a perpetual incense" on the altar, so that it might be a "a sweet savour unto God." The modernist might say: "Those were the days of the Old Testament!" But, is there not a sacred TRUTH in them? Is not our heart an altar to be consecrated to God? If it be so, should we not burn "a perpetual incense" upon it? How can we worship the Holy Being if we have no sweet odour? In the same verse God states plainly what is the atmosphere of our wicked heart, viz: "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." O ye young men, and women, so long as there is no odour of sweet incense—which is prayer (cf Rev. v:8)—rising continually from the altar of your hearts, how can you keep yourselves unspotted from this world?

Our hearts burn with the fire of enthusiasm of different kinds. All of them are not good, nor are they pleasing in the sight of God. God wants only a "sweet odour," not every odour of ardent enthusiasm. A man, zealous for his community, good and unselfish as he may be, may yet fail to yield to God a sweet savour.

The first kind of odour that should rise every moment from the depths of our hearts is that of a broken and a contrite heart, for "There is none righteous, no, not one." Our heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked! How can he be clean that is born of a woman? Yea, the stars are not pure in His sight! How often do we "drink iniquity like water?" "Who can tell how oft he offendeth?" Many times have we smiled over the Pharisee's prayer; but have we ever realized the same element pervading our prayers? If the apostle Paul were to speak of himself as the greatest of all sinners, what are we poor creatures? It is our ignorance and spiritual blindness that makes us dull, and hinders us from understanding our errors, and our secret sins. Do we allow the Holy Spirit "to search us, and know our thoughts" every day? At least every evening before we retire to bed, we should sit awhile, and review our life in His presence. The more sincerely we do it, the more bitterly would we have to mourn, and falling at His feet would cry: "Lord be merciful to me a sinner." Such a prayer springing from a penitent heart rises above and reaches unto the throne of grace.

"My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. For He hath regarded the lowliness of His handmaiden." This is the sincere expression of a heart burning with deep gratitude for what God has done for it. This sprang from the innermost corner of Mary's heart; so God was pleased with her sweet song—such an odour of sweet incense of gratitude should rise from those whom the Lord hath brought up out of a horrible pit, and out of the miry clay. God daily loadeth us with benefits, but we, alas, fail to realize it. We cannot breathe for a single moment without His aid and still more abundantly is God's grace bestowed upon us through our Lord Jesus Christ. For the unspeakable gift of His Son, we shall adore Him eternally; how much more for the manifold graces lavished upon us, quite unworthy though we are. Only when we realize the greatness of His love and mercy, shall we be able to feel our tremendous responsibility towards Him. Prayer from a thankless heart is an abomination to God.

Sincere penitence, and loving gratitude should create in us a zeal for God. We should be moved to tears when we see our fellow-men still lingering in the woeful valley of sin, from whence we have been redeemed. As this compassion is awakened in our hearts, we shall be numbered among those that "sigh and that cry for all the abomination that be done in the midst thereof" (cf. Ezek. ix:4). Such sighs, the mere closing of our eyes in horror, or the lifting up of our hearts to God at the sight of sin, above all—our travail in secret for the conversion of our comrades—yea, all these stand before His glorious throne as a sweet memorial! In this age of materialism, when religion seems to fade in the distance, do we "sigh and cry" in our hearts? How often have we to repeat the blessed words of our Master "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do?" Or do we make Him repeat the same prayer about us still? Is our spirit always on the alert to discern occasions for "Silent breathing to God?" Have we ever spent an all-night in prayer?

Every time we kneel down before His throne, He, as it were, smells that which proceeds from our hearts; may His Holy Spirit help us to keep a perpetual incense burning there, so that all our prayers may be "a sweet odour unto God."

This Is Life Eternal

Editorial in the *Christian Standard*

IS one hypercritical and supercilious when he becomes oppressed with the idea that much of what passes for Christianity these days lacks the first elements of it because there is no evidence of any genuine emotional reaction toward God or Jesus Christ? We gather together great crowds of people, and we amuse them by leading them in

"peppy" singing, and by entertaining them with special musical numbers, and there is no evidence of any deep feeling, any devotion to God. They may sing with volume and exactness songs expressive of devotion, but evidence of feeling is lacking.

The crowd may be very loyal to a church, a Bible school, a convention, a missionary society, an evangelist, a singer, a preacher or even to a doctrine or institution; but there is little evidence of loyalty—personal and deep devotion—to Jesus Himself and the Father. They are able to argue and prove certain propositions, and some of them would die rather than yield on these convictions. And that is right. But there appears to be no personal affection for God, no such affection as that we have for a mother, a babe, or a sweetheart. What is there is an abstract and formal loyalty.

Can it be that, in our zeal to abstain from the sort of religion that is built upon emotionalism predominantly, and our effort to guide sinners to those simple terms of gospel salvation that are usually lost sight of in the excitement of emotional revivals, we have produced a race that has never had a genuine emotion with respect to Jesus, and with respect to God? If that is so, it is a serious lapse. What shall it profit us to have won the whole realm of the intellectual assent if we lose the soul of religion itself?

For, mark you, the first and greatest commandment, is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God." Upon this everything else in religion hangs. That is more than intellectual assent. It is more than mere submission to a plan of salvation out of a selfish sense of terror.

There is a peculiar fascination in that story of the eloquence of Walter Scott when preaching upon the lordship of Jesus Christ, eloquence that brought from the logical and stoical Alexander Campbell the involuntary "Hallelujah" so embarrassing to "the sage of Bethany." That is what we need. We need in our meditations and our sermons to be lifted to our feet with an overmastering emotion of admiration and affection for the Lord Jesus Christ. We need to feel the lump in the throat, and a sentiment beyond our power to express, as we study the character, life and service of our Redeemer. There is an ineffable charm in the words of James Black when, as he writes of the actions of Jesus in His temptation, he fairly lifts the reader out of his seat with the exclamation, "Man, what a Master!" We need to experience something comparable to what inspired those tremendous doxologies of Paul. We need to be able to understand first-hand the exclamation of Thomas: "My Lord and my God." We need to stand amazed with love.

For, let it be remembered, this business of salvation is no mere bargain-counter—no merchandising, clear as the terms of salva-

tion are. It is a vital thing. It means individual relationship with God, or it means absolutely nothing. The climax of the Great Commission is, "Lo, I am with you always."

Jesus' statement of His purpose is clear, "I am come that they might have life and might have it abundantly." Is He not talking of the same thing when He defines "life eternal": "To know God and him whom thou hast sent"? Not—mark you—just to know *about* God and *about* Jesus; that is the privilege of the lowest devil in hell. To *know* God—to *love* Him—that is the birthright of the child begotten again from the dead through the power of Jesus Christ's blood; and we do something less than our duty when we do not rise to the challenge of this tremendous privilege, this intimate fellowship with God. In our crass democracy we value the privilege of knowing a President, a Senator, a Governor, a judge, any nabob. We thrill to it. Shall we seize the opportunity to grow in personal knowledge of God and of His will through study of His ways, reading of His Book, meditation upon His doings, prayer for His help and experience of His personal guidance? If we do not, we have missed the goal, after all.

These trying times are testing-times for the church. Those who love God—who are growing in the knowledge of Him—they will, because of that love, remain His despite even their own craven denials. Those who never loved Him will sell Him for any price.

We can not build life on excitement, jazzy entertainment, "good times" or even social service. There is not other foundation than passionate personal love for God through Jesus Christ.

Good Advice

Editorial in *The Lutheran*

IT IS not our advice nor is it offered to Lutherans or to the Lutheran Church. It is wisdom which *The Living Church*, a journal of the Episcopal group in America, extended politely and yet pointedly to the General Conference of that communion just before its meeting in Denver, Colo. The editor of *The Living Church* advises the Upper House of Bishops and the Lower House of Deputies jointly and severally, to confine their deliberations to what is purely and unmistakably ecclesiastical business. "Keep clear of advice to Congress, to the League of Nations, and to the International Chamber of Commerce" one derives from the editorial to which we are making reference. "Do not undertake to regulate forces, organizations and movements over which you have no control" is the gist of the exhortation.

There is an old Latin motto which seems to have been adopted by many ecclesiastical

assemblies as their major principle. One person's very free translation is "anything any human being thinks about or might possibly think about, is part of my business." Be it economic, political, moral, industrial, athletic or cultural, it calls for a resolution. The current "issue" duly lodged in a standing or a special committee is ponderously phrased, solemnly reported, sonorously debated, tremulously adopted and decorously delivered to the journalists for proclamation. But the crowning triumph is the "Findings" of the convention, wherein the statements passed are assembled and published. Of the numerous and comprehensive reviews of the rights of man, some of the most specific have originated in ecclesiastical gatherings. Taken as the expression of the convictions of those who voted or as an interpretation of the prevailing sentiment of an ecclesiastical body's constituency, they can be understood. But they cannot be treated as regulations.

The Living Church advises the Episcopal General Conference to confine its deliberations to matters in which it has authority. The editor observes very correctly that his church's triennial assembly has extensive legislative powers vested in it, whereby it is authorized and empowered to pass upon the business in which the church is engaged. Of this, there is a great quantity of high quality and importance. Much of it deals with the spiritual interests of the church's membership. In its own domain the Conference has real authority. It can lay down laws, determine objectives, set up standards and execute judgments. It can reward and it can punish.

Probably there is a mild compliment in the desire of various secular and social agencies to enlist the aid of the churches in support of their objectives. Assuredly a large amount of publicity is obtained by securing "declarations" on various questions under agitation. But when an ecclesiastical body is in corporate assembly; that is, when duly elected representatives of the church are in session for the legislative and judicial purposes of their organization, they have neither the right nor the wisdom to make laws beyond the domain of their church. When they indulge in rulings on general industrial, economic and political questions, they voice an opinion. The value of a law is the power of enforcement back of it. We point with pride to the minutes of the United Lutheran Church. They are delightfully free from paragraphs of resolutions on matters concerning which the delegates have no jurisdiction. There is ample reason for continued watchfulness against intrusions into the Church's domain.

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.]

The Macintosh Case

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I note that the pro-Macintosh infection has seemingly spread even to CHRISTIANITY TODAY. Pardon me, but I rather shied at seeing such a staunch paper as yours print that long list of Modernists among whom some orthodox have strayed. Allow me to give my belief that we should stand squarely with the Majority Opinion of the Supreme Court.

Whoever desires to become a citizen of the United States must pledge allegiance to the Constitution on its prima facie showing. Justice Sutherland therefore said very much to the point that whosoever would become a citizen may not "bargain" about it, i.e., he may not make private stipulations or reservations as to how he views it and proposes to conduct himself. If that should be allowed in Dr. Macintosh's case, it can be allowed in every case, and what a situation that would bring! The content of the allegiance is a *general* one, and neither party ought to *import* specifications which will only cause misunderstanding and embarrassment. Therefore the straightforward and sensible thing to do is to take the Constitution bona fide.

It is a principle of our government that freedom of conscience is guaranteed. The very first article of our Amendments reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." "The chief purpose for which many of the early settlers came to America was that they might worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. Hence their descendants put first among the individual rights to be protected, the freedom of religion. But this provision does not authorize anyone to commit crime in the name of religion" (McCleary, *Studies in Civics*, p. 228). Likewise, the U. S. does not permit polygamy though it might be made the tenet of some religion. Nor does it permit prior allegiance to the Pope in matters political. And other instances might be named.

How to worship God according to the dictates of one's conscience is a matter for the person concerned to make out. To his own Lord each one standeth and falleth. Now a situation may arise in which some one may conscientiously differ with the government. In such a case a person will have to bear

the consequences and perhaps have to suffer for his convictions. In the matter of participating in war and in bearing arms such is the case. The only remedy is special action by Congress, which has in certain cases been given.

The government is run with the knowledge that attack by enemies is possible and that defense is always obligatory. It contemplates war. The government is not theologically inclined, but it is nolens volens very sound in its conception of human nature and conducting things accordingly. It is Scriptural in that direction, and Scripture does not make war per se sinful. Modernist rejectors of Scripture, to whatever extent, think otherwise. Bad as the war-system is, any other is *impracticable*, and will prove an *illusion* with even greater disastrous result.

As to the kind of wars to be waged, Congress is the judge and citizens will have to abide by this. This does not mean that Congress is infallible in its judgment, but it acts as all other people act, namely, *according to its own light*, thereby not laying claim to infallibility. Therefore it is wrong to make such an ado about Congress carrying our consciences in its pockets. And it is a grave mistake to aver that the decision of the Supreme Court is tyrannical compulsion; the Court simply proceeded on *straightforward general principles*. And if situations should arise from time to time which strain the sense of allegiance and subservience to the government, that is a matter to find its solution *when the exigency arises*. And indeed, Congress has been very tolerant in the matter. However, if wholesale refusal to bear arms should eventuate, it is going to become a question as to the very existence of our country as a free nation.

The Majority Opinion also expresses itself most admirably on the matter of the will of God. "When he [Dr. Macintosh] speaks of putting allegiance to the will of God above allegiance to the government then it is plain that he means to make his own view of the will of God the decisive test." Exactly. The objectors arrogate to themselves a monopoly of conscience while they complain that the Supreme Court overrides the conscience of the country. The people complained of as tyrannical have just as much right to their conscience as the others. The whole situation therefore resolves itself into this, that everyone standeth or falleth

to his own lord" (Rom. 14:4). That is, God is lord of the conscience; before Him we shall be eventually accepted or rejected. Hence, conscientious actions *as such* do not avail us, but *His* judgment of them. We are safe, therefore, only when we act *according to His revealed will*, and not according to private views however laudable in our own sight. And so, if the government decrees matters contrary to the conviction of some of its citizens, which convictions may or may not be absolutely correct, they cannot help themselves and must bear untoward consequences unless some special way of relief is provided. The government *must* carry on, even to the extent of war. Somebody will have to defend our liberties, and opponents of the war-system can thank those men who shed their blood to make it possible for them to enjoy our liberties.

The petition to President Hoover and to Congress carries this extract from the Minority Opinion of the Supreme Court: "In the forum of conscience, duty to a moral power higher than the State has always been maintained. . . . The essence of religion is a belief in a relation to God involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation." It is not clear to me where that has been maintained, or in what manner. We humbly think that the right construction of all the facts and circumstances involved, as we have tried to give them above, dispose of this beautiful though ambiguous statement. It is likewise a misleading remark on the part of *The Christian Century*: "This principle of the subordination of conscience to congress, says the supreme court, is *inherent in citizenship under our constitution*" [italics their's]. We beg leave to submit that this conclusion does not follow.

Another expression in the Minority Opinion has it: "It is not told us [in the Constitution] that a person cannot become a citizen because of his views on war." We submit that a *negative* inference cannot carry much weight in such a grave point at issue.

Finally, Justice Hughes argued that the question "does not arise except in the actual event of war." Very true; and it should have been left there, and Dr. Macintosh should not have prejudged the case, and simply decide about crossing the stream when he gets there.

GERRIT H. HOSPERS, SR.
East Williamson, New York.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: I thank you for keeping in touch with me. Yes, I have been receiving CHRISTIANITY TODAY as a gift from a friend, but I do not know who the friend is. Some day I may get to know when I will certainly show my appreciation.

Allow me to say I surely appreciate your valuable and timely paper. Thank God for

you folks, the stand you have taken, and for your journal. As one who in 1925 in Canada refused to leave the Presbyterian Church and enter the United Church merger and identify myself with "Modernism" for that is really what it meant to cross over, I am heartily in sympathy with you and your stand for the integrity of the Sacred Scriptures, and your loyalty to the Person of Christ and to the Whole Council of God.

I trust and pray you will receive the support you deserve, and long may you be spared to carry on the good work.

I am enclosing my year's subscription and I will endeavor to interest others.

Thanking you, I remain yours in the Master's Service,

DUNCAN MUNRO.

West Oshawa, Canada.

"The Heretical Auburn Affirmation"

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

SIR: I want you to know as a member of the Presbyterian Church that I most emphatically commend the bold and resolute stand taken regarding the Auburn Affirmation as we read about it in the newspapers. Don't think for a minute that right living and right thinking people sanction the deliberate act of perjury committed by these men when they took their ordination vows. The great mass of laymen in the Church at large are sick and disgusted with the present condition and for me I can never see how these men by their refusal to honor God can call on Him to bless their work.

Regardless of the cost hold fast to those eternal truths which God alone can bless and honor. I am thinking of that great verse, 1 Sam. 2:30, For them that honor me, I will honor.

Thanking you I beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

WARREN H. ALLEN.

Collingswood, N. J.

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

SIR: I have read the newspaper accounts of the sermon "The Heretical Auburn Affirmation" of last Sunday, and have just finished reading it in full, in CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

I glory in our zeal, and pray the Almighty God to move more of our ministers to sound the battle cry. Keep up the fight.

But remember, the fight is just begun. It will be fought out on the floor of the General Assembly, and the only way to win there is to have a majority of our representatives who are true to our historic faith. The only

way to elect a majority is to carry the fight into every Presbytery and down into every local church. This takes organization and still more organization. I cannot believe that the majority of our membership have become "Modernists"; the real trouble in my estimation, is that they are not interested, many have never even heard of the Auburn Affirmation, much less understanding it. If each local Pastor will come out as you have done, the fight will be won.

With best wishes for success, I am

Sincerely yours,

ASHTON GARDNER,

Attorney and Counsellor at Law.

Hollidaysburg, Pa.

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

SIR: Permit me to express my very sincere appreciation of your stand against Modernism in the Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia.

If you can create an opposition to Modernism among the laity, so that they would demand the resignation of these traitors, you would have accomplished a wonderful thing. My experience is, however, these men don't resign. This is the Laodicean Age. The procedure seems to be that Fundamentalists have to retire.

I am an Anglican, tired of Anglo-Roman Ecclesiasticism, Modernism and Worldliness in the Church. What can we do? "He is Coming." "Even so, come Lord Jesus."

Sincerely in Him,

ANGELICAN RECTOR.

Canada.

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

SIR: Hurrah for Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths! He talked "right out in meeting" on Sunday in Philadelphia. More power to him. Now if . . . and a few others of their caliber and doctrinal position will move up to the firing line we shall see the beginning of the end of Modernism in the next General Assembly. The time is ripe. The Modernists have been conducting a "gum-shoe" campaign for quite a while. Let the faithful and valiant hosts drive them out into the open. That will finish them.

Mr. Griffiths has fired the shot that was "heard around the world." The Modernists have been depending upon a retreat of the defenders of the historic Christian faith. They have expected the great body of loyal Presbyterians to surrender the church which Christ purchased with His own precious blood so that they might convert it into a temple in which the Divine Son of God is dethroned and a false god, a mythical deity

born of an erratic human mind is enthroned in His place. Such insolence ought to be rebuked with all the fire and indignation of an aroused and faithful body of believers who are loyal to their Christ and resent disloyalty to Him in any form. "Gates of hell shall never 'gainst that Church prevail."

O. A. ERDMAN.

Denver, Colorado.

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

SIR: Allow me to express my gratitude to you for your sermon on "The Heretical Auburn Affirmation" as it appeared in the February CHRISTIANITY TODAY. Such information, printed and sent broadcast to the people, will do more, we are persuaded, to stay the progress of Modernism than any other thing man can do.

Most sincerely,

W. LEE JOHNSTON.

Lansing, Mich.

Ministerial Changes

Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

Calls Accepted

E. E. Bacon, Seville, O. to Pierpont, O.;
 Lauren E. Brubaker, D.D., Ensley, Ala. to Memorial Church, St. Augustine, Fla.;
 C. C. Carnahan, as Stated Supply, Fredonia, Kans.;
 W. E. Dysart, Beaver City, Neb. to Bridgeport, Neb.;
 P. H. Elliott, Slippy Rock Church, Ellwood City, Pa. to Millvale, Pa.;
 John R. Fraser, D.D., Mt. Pleasant, Ia. to Wapello, Ia.;
 William M. Gardner, D.D., First Church, Joplin, Mo. to Cote Brilliant Church, St. Louis, Mo.;
 Joseph W. Gray, to Winfield, Ia.
 H. G. Mathis, D.D., Iola, Kans. to Great Bend, Kans.;
 Daniel V. Poling, D.D., to First Congregational Church, E. Orange, N. J.;
 E. T. Roney, Cleveland, O. to Seville, O.;
 W. J. Willis, Superior, Neb. to Nevada, Mo.;
 Julian C. Whitsett, Malin, Ore. to Brownsville, Ore.;
 Ferdinand Zissler, Monroe, S. D. to Steamboat Rock, Ia.

Installations

Simeon Jewkes, Lake Side Church, Rochester, N. Y., Feb. 21;
 Harold McMillan, Dauphin, Pa., Feb. 29;
 Samuel E. Frytherch, Welch Church, Granville, N. Y., Feb. 28.

Resignations

Lewis A. Galbraith, Bryn Mawr Park Church, Yonkers, N. Y.;
 George C. Kersten, Fourth Church, Lincoln, Neb.;
 E. A. Krapp, First Church, Homestead, Pa.

Changed Address

T. J. Hedges, 363 Glenn Ave., Fresno, Calif.

Deaths

Robert P. Gibson, Pinebluff, N. C.;
 James M. Wilson, D.D., Omaha, Neb., Feb. 19.

Presbyterian Church, U. S.

Calls

E. D. Witherspoon, Winchester, Va. to Blackburg, Va.

Calls Accepted

J. F. Eddins, Clinton, La. to be Stated Supply, Picaune, Miss.;

R. A. Young, D.D., First Church, Troy, Ala. to Central Steele Creek Church, Charlotte, N. C.

Installations

R. G. Newsome, Opelousas, La.

Changed Address

J. E. Knight, Oak Hill, W. Va.

Presbyterian Church in Canada

Calls

Lachlan Beaton, Riverfield, P. Q. to Havelock, Ont.;
James H. Moore, Bethel and Bryanston, Ont. to Wallacetown and West Lorne, Ont.;
R. Bertram Nelles, Port Hope, Ont. to St. Peter's, Madoc, Ont.;
William A. Young, Manotick, Ont. to Belfast, P. E. I.

Calls Accepted

J. Fred Goforth, M.A., Knox College, Toronto, and Szepeingka, Manchuria, to Knox, Wallaceburg, Ont.;
W. Gordon MacLean, Alexandria, Scotland to First Church, Winnipeg, Man.;
John R. Waldie, Knox College, Toronto, and Acton, Ont. to Burns Church, Mosa, Ont.

Resignations

A. A. Acton, St. Andrew's, Hamilton, Bermuda;
George Atkinson, St. Paul's, Guelph, Ont.;
Geo. J. MacKay, Avonton and Avonbank, Ont.;
Wm. Patterson, West Point Grey Church, Vancouver, B. C.;
Jas. O. Ralston, St. James Church, Winnipeg, Man.;
Thomas Wilson, Gordon Church, New Westminster, B. C.

Inductions

M. Edgar Burch, Forbes Church, Grande Prairie, Alta., Jan. 11;
W. N. Fergusson, P. R. G. S., as Stated Supply, Kintyre and Bothwell, Ont., Feb.;
W. T. McCree, M.A., Glebe Church, Toronto, Ont., Feb. 4;
A. J. McMullen, Holstein and Fairbairn, Ont.;
Arthur S. Oliver, New Glasgow and Rodney, Ont., Jan. 7;
Frederick Oliver, Great Village and Portauquiue, N. S., Jan. 5;
William Ooms, Oxford and Pugwash, N. S., Dec. 21;
F. G. Purnell, Thornton, etc., Ont., Dec. 16;
T. DeCourcy Rayner, St. Andrew's, Lachine, P. Q.;
Frederick Smith, B.D., of Scotland, Fairmount-Taylor Church, Montreal, P. Q., Dec.;
Roy J. Stewart, St. Andrew's, Westville, N. S., Dec. 1st.

Deaths

Daniel MacVicar, Thorburn, N. S., Dec. 14;
William Mitchell, Guelph, Ont., Jan. 8;
Thomas Smith, Red Deer, Alta., Dec. 1.

Reformed Church, U. S.

Calls Accepted

H. E. Harsh, Ellerton and Mt. Carmel Churches, Dayton, O. to Culver, Ind.

Resignations

A. W. Barley, Brush-Creek Church, Manor, Pa.;
Frank S. Bromer, First Church, Charlotte, N. C.;
Harry A. Welker, First Church, Burlington, N. C.

Deaths

D. F. Boomershine, Maquoketa, Ia.;
J. F. Braun, Columbus, Neb.

Reformed Church in America

Calls

Richard Ouderluis, to Milwaukee, Wis.

Calls Accepted

Alexander Wouters, Kew Gardens, N. Y. to Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.;
F. Zissler, Monroe, S. D. to Steamboat Rock, Ia.

Death

George S. Bolsterle, Astoria, N. Y., Feb. 11.

United Presbyterian

Calls

Howard M. Brittain, Ezel, Ky. to First Church, Kirkwood, Ill.;
Thomas H. Newcomb, First Church, Buffalo, N. Y. to 8th Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.;
John Simpson, Pittsburgh, Pa. to North Park Church, Buffalo, N. Y.

Calls Accepted

Joseph F. Daubert, to First Church, Hoboken, N. J.;
James R. Speer, to Oakdale, Pa.

Installations

W. C. Latta, Oil City, Pa., Feb. 17.

Changed Address

John N. Wolf, 541-34th St., North Bergen, N. J.

Death

Robert W. Evans, Greeley, Colo., Feb. 10.

Christian Reformed

Calls Accepted

H. Blystra, Sully, Ia. to Graafschap, Mich.;
J. M. Van de Kieft, Oakdale Park Church, Grand Rapids, Mich. to Bethel Church, Paterson, N. J.

News of the Church

Coming Assemblies and Synods

Cumberland Presbyterian Church

Chattanooga, Tenn., May 19

United Presbyterian Church

Beaver, Pa., May 25

Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

Denver, Colorado, May 26

Presbyterian Church in the U. S.

Montreat, N. C., May 26

Presbyterian Church in Canada

London, Ontario, June 1

Reformed Church in America

Kingston, N. Y., June 2

Christian Reformed Church

Grand Rapids, Mich., June 8

Reformed Presbyterian Church

Winona Lake, Ind., June 8

Reformed Church in the U. S.

Akron, Ohio, June 21

Judicial Commission of the Synod of Pennsylvania, elected to try the 'Barnhouse Case,' to pronounce its Judgment of Admonition. The Moderator of the Presbytery of Philadelphia wishes to state that he has no desire whatsoever to be disobedient to the mandate of Synod's Judicial Commission and expresses his entire willingness to comply with its behest, nevertheless, with certain reservations or exceptions which he wishes to have entered upon the records, in reporting the case to Synod, as dissents or protests; and with the definite understanding that the execution of the Judgment of the Judicial Commission shall be *without prejudice* in the further proceedings of this case in the higher courts.

"Our Form of Government intimates what all of us are ready to admit that our courts are not infallible and that they sometimes err 'through the frailties inseparable from humanity.' Our Book of Discipline, Chapters 9 and 10, provides the way and method of bearing testimony against errors and erroneous proceedings, viz: by General Review and Control, advising superior judicatories against irregularities, references, complaints, appeals, dissents and protests.

"Chapter 10, Sec. 107, of the Book of Discipline says—'When a case has been decided by a Judicial Commission, any member of the judicatory to which the decision is reported may enter his dissent or protest . . . in the same manner as if the case had been tried by the judicatory itself.'

"In accordance with these and other provisions of the Book of Discipline, the Moderator files the following exceptions as dissents and protests:

"(1) It is the opinion of the Moderator that the Judicial Commission of the Synod of Pennsylvania did not exercise its powers wisely in directing the Moderator of the Presbytery of Philadelphia to execute its Judgment of Admonition prior to making its report to the Synod of Pennsylvania and securing its approval, 'that the Judgment of the Commission be the Judgment of the Synod.'

Mr. Barnhouse "Admonished"

AS reported in the January number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, the Rev. Donald Grey Barnhouse, Pastor of the Tenth Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, was found guilty by a judicial commission of the Synod of Pennsylvania of certain charges referring to his alleged remarks concerning other ministers of the Presbytery. The judgment of the commission, regarded by competent observers as simply an *ex parte* document, abounding in errors, provided that the censure of admonition should be imposed on Mr. Barnhouse, not by the commission that tried him, but by the Moderator of the Presbytery of Philadelphia. Generally regarded as the crowning illegality in a long succession of blunders, there were many who felt that the Presbytery should not permit the admonition in its presence. At the meeting on March 7, however, the Moderator of the Presbytery, the venerable Rev. Wm. P. Fulton, D.D., proceeded to inflict the censure as directed, first, however, guarding himself and conserving all legal rights by reading the following statement:

"Fathers and Brethren:

"The Moderator of the Presbytery of Philadelphia has been directed by a Special

"(2) It is the opinion of the Moderator that the Judicial Commission of the Synod of Pennsylvania did not exercise its powers wisely in directing the Moderator of the Presbytery of Philadelphia to execute its verdict of Admonition prior to action of the General Assembly on two complaints now pending before the Assembly against the action of the Synod of Pennsylvania in receiving the Barnhouse Case, when the case was in process of trial before a Judicial Commission of the Presbytery. The ends of justice are not usually secured by hasty action in executing a Judgment prior to its final settlement in the supreme judicatory.

"(3) It is the opinion of the Moderator that the Judicial Commission of the Synod of Pennsylvania did not exercise its powers wisely in recording on page 3 of its official report that the Judicial Commission of the Presbytery of Philadelphia did not proceed to hear and decide the case submitted to it; or that the Presbytery of Philadelphia, convinced of the inability of its Judicial Commission to try the case, voted to refer the case to synod. The real facts should be ascertained as they seem to be at variance with these statements.

"(4) It is the opinion of the Moderator that the Judicial Commission of the Synod of Pennsylvania did not exercise its powers wisely in refraining to record on page 5 of its official report the real reasons, as reported by the Stated Clerk of Presbytery, why the special committee, urged by Synod and directed by Presbytery, did not get together in efforts to close the case and withdraw it from the Judicial Commission of Synod. These reasons, it would seem, should be stated in full in the report, for the information of Synod and to complete the record in the case.

"(5) It is the opinion of the Moderator that the Judicial Commission of the Synod of Pennsylvania did not exercise its powers wisely in exacting a promise or pledge of secrecy from all the witnesses testifying before it; and, also, in sending its official report of the case to the secular press of the city simultaneous with the lodging of the official report with the parties in the case, both of which would seem to be without precedent in judicial procedure in ecclesiastical courts.

"(6) It is the opinion of the Moderator that the Judicial Commission of the Synod of Pennsylvania did not exercise its powers wisely in prescribing the form of Admonition and the very words to be used in the execution of its Judgment. There is no form prescribed in the Book of Discipline for Admonition, which is the mildest form of censure. It would seem to have been better, in this case, to have omitted the form to be used, inasmuch as a portion of the prescribed words does not seem to be applicable or necessary."

After the statement had been read, Dr. Fulton read to Mr. Barnhouse the admonition in the very form prescribed by the Commission. Then he gave a few fatherly words of encouragement to Mr. Barnhouse, and told him that, having now been admonished he was a "free man." Prayer was then offered by Dr. C. A. Herrick, President of Girard College, and Vice-Moderator of the Presbytery.

After this, a resolution was offered and adopted by an overwhelming vote commending Mr. Barnhouse for his loyalty to the Word of God, the conspicuous character of his services, and his zeal for the purity of the Church. A minority opposed it, and asked to be recorded as voting "no." A number also filed a dissent and protest against the illegality of inflicting the censure before the Presbytery.

Just before being admonished, Mr. Barnhouse made the following statement:

"I have appeared before the Presbytery today to receive the admonition in this case in the same spirit which animated my refusal to appeal. It must be understood that my attitude contains no admission of guilt whatsoever. I have not been asked to retract any statements, and I do not retract any statements in this case. As far as I can see today, in the presence of God, I would repeat any or all statements made by me under like circumstances."

Notes on Biblical Exposition— Concluded

Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved quite apart from the works of the law." The Jerusalem leaders said: "That is entirely right; we have nothing to add to it; salvation is, as Paul has told you, by faith alone and not by faith *and* works."

This great result of the Jerusalem conference was not invalidated at all by the solution which the Apostolic Decree found for the problems of certain mixed communities, where there were many Jews whom both Paul and the original apostles desired to see won for Christ.

The foregoing treatment of the Apostolic Decree must be regarded only as a summary. For a fuller treatment the reader is referred to the book by the same writer, *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, where also the entire comparison between the Book of Acts and the first two chapters of Galatians is treated in

greater detail than in the present series of expository studies.

Next month we shall turn to easier matters, and shall be able to make much more rapid progress.

Philadelphia Presbytery Overtures Regarding Minority Rights

AT its meeting in March 7, the Presbytery of Philadelphia adopted an overture offered by the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths asking that minority rights be conserved in the proposed union with the United Presbyterian or other churches. After some debate the overture received what appeared to be a unanimous vote. It is as follows:

"TO THE VENERABLE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A., REQUIRED TO MEET IN DENVER, COLORADO, THE TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF MAY, 1932, GREETINGS:

"The Presbytery of Philadelphia, in regular session this seventh day of March, 1932, respectfully overtures the General Assembly, praying that:

"In accordance with well-recognized reformation and Presbyterian principles, provisions be inserted in the plan of union with the United Presbyterian Church of North America, or any other church or churches, when and if submitted to the presbyteries, providing for the rights of minorities who may not be able, in good conscience, to enter the proposed union; guaranteeing the right of any congregation, if voting not to enter the proposed union at a meeting duly called, to retain its properties, free from any control by or right of reversion to the said united Church; to the end that the said proposed union, when and if consummated, may be free from the intense bitterness and strife occasioned in other countries by the un-Presbyterian attempted application of coercion and force."

Presbytery of Cayuga Overtures Assembly Regarding "Union"

THE Presbytery of Cayuga, on Feb. 16th, overtured the 144th Assembly concerning the proposed basis of union with the United Presbyterian Church, as follows:

"The Presbytery of Cayuga, having considered carefully the basis of union presented in the 'Documents Relating to the Proposed Organic Union of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and the United Presbyterian Church of North America,' is impressed by the radical departures from the policy and constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., which will be brought about if the union is effected on the present form of the proposed basis.

"Among these radical departures are the following:

"1. Requirement of a theological examination for admission to church membership.

"The proposed Form of Government (chap. XXIV, 2, 3) requires the session to examine applicants for membership in certain theological subjects, and to exact from them affirmative answers to certain precisely worded theological questions.

"This is contrary to the declared historic policy of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. The General Assembly of 1911 said: "The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., gathered in General Assembly, solemnly declares and reaffirms, in loyalty to the Great Head of the Church universal, that the only conditions of admission to the Church are, a profession of faith in Christ and obedience to Him, followed by baptism in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The provisions of the proposed Form of Government, if adopted, would take away what has always been one of the chief glories of our church, that it asks of applicants for membership only what Christ asked, and no more.

"The Presbytery also thinks it very important that the declaration of the General Assembly of 1911 was adopted with explicit reference to litigation arising out of the reunion with the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. To depart from the policy here declared would be a violation of a solemn assurance given in connection with a union with another church.

"2. Changes in method of amendment of constitution.

"The proposed Form of Government (chap. LIX, 2) requires a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly to send an overture to the presbyteries, instead of a majority vote, as provided in our present Form of Government.

"It proposes a new method of voting on overtures. The votes of the presbyteries are not to be decisive. The votes of the members of the presbyteries are to be counted, and the decision is to be by a majority of these votes, if two-thirds of the presbyteries take any action.

"It gives to the General Assembly a power of veto on an overture adopted in the presbyteries.

"Furthermore, our present Form of Government wisely provides that amendments to the doctrinal standards may be made only by a two-thirds vote of the presbyteries. The proposed Form of Government would allow such amendments by majority vote of the members of two-thirds of the presbyteries.

"3. Changes in the size of presbyteries and synods.

"The proposed Form of Government (chap. XXXI, 1) makes 12 pastors necessary to form a presbytery. In chap. XXXI, 6, it requires 7 ministers for a quorum of a presbytery. In chap. XLVII, 1, it requires 12 presbyteries to form a synod, unless two-

AN ANNOUNCEMENT

by the Rev. John Clover Monsma

May I take this means to announce to the readers of CHRISTIANITY TODAY that a meeting will be held in Philadelphia, in the month of April, for the purpose of effecting the organization of the Reformation Fellowship? For information concerning the Fellowship see the February issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. Its general purpose will be the banding together of our orthodox "laymen", men and women, to oppose in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ the forces of Modernism and infidelity that are asserting themselves so boldly at the present time in the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches.

We are looking forward to a great meeting. We are constantly in prayer that by the grace of God this meeting may prove to be of historical moment; that it may afterwards be regarded as a turning point in the history of American Calvinism.

If there are men or women who would like to attend this meeting, and who have not yet written to me, will they kindly write at once? We expect people from New York City, Baltimore, and many other places outside of Philadelphia; also people from different Presbyterian denominations. You need not be a church officer or church worker to be welcomed at this meeting. Just so you are definitely convinced that we need a reformation, for the honor of Christ our Lord, and in the interests of tens of thousands of immortal souls.

If I hear from you, a Preliminary Committee will send you notice as to the exact date and place of the meeting.

Please send your correspondence to my temporary address: Rev. John Clover Monsma, Hotel Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

thirds of the General Assembly order otherwise.

The carrying out of these provisions would seriously disturb the organization of our church.

"4. Statements about church government.

"The proposed Form of Government (chap. VII, 2, 3) makes assertions about early church organization which are open to dispute, and criticizes the forms of organization of churches which are not Presbyterian. Such statements are not found in our present Form of Government, which wisely confines itself to describing our own organization.

"5. Veto of session on election of elders and deacons.

"According to the proposed Form of Government (chaps. XIX, 1, XXII, 1) the session may forbid the ordination of elders and deacons elected by the congregation. No such limitation on the free choice of the people is allowed by our present Form of Government.

"6. Constitutional provisions regarding theological seminaries.

"Our present constitution contains no provisions on this subject. The proposed Form of Government (chap. LVI) makes requirements regarding the relation of the General Assembly to theological seminaries which

may be found to be in conflict with civil law. It also requires that every professor in a theological seminary be a member of a presbytery of the church, which seems to the Presbytery of Cayuga to savor of sectarianism and to be unnecessary limitation of the freedom which educational institutions ought to enjoy.

"7. Mandatory forms of worship.

"The proposed Directory for Worship is entirely new to the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Its adoption would involve the abandonment of our ancient and noble Directory. Furthermore, the proposed Directory contains prescribed forms for baptism and marriage, which is contrary to our church's time-honored principle of freedom in worship.

"The Presbytery of Cayuga favors the proposed union with the United Presbyterian Church. But it cannot think that it is wise to complicate the decision on the union by proposing, as conditions of the union, so many radical constitutional changes. The Presbytery feels that these proposed changes ought to be considered on their merits, aside from the question of the union.

"The Presbytery of Cayuga also thinks that the presbyteries ought to be consulted about these changes. The General Assembly of 1931 asked the opinions of the presbyteries about the proposed new Book of Discipline, which is a part of the basis of the union, before its formal submission for action. But the presbyteries have not been asked to express themselves regarding the far more important questions presented in the proposed Form of Government, and have been allowed little time to acquaint themselves with the proposed great changes in the constitution of the church.

"The Presbytery of Cayuga is aware of the fact that the proposed Form of Government and Directory for Worship are designated "provisional." But if the union is effected on the basis of these documents they will be the Form of Government and Directory for Worship of the united church, with full authority, and will continue to be such until amended. It seems to the Presbytery that the time to consider documents involving such important changes is before the vote on them, rather than after it.

"Therefore, the Presbytery of Cayuga, because of the extensive departures from the policy and constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. which are proposed in connection with the contemplated union with the United Presbyterian Church, respectfully overtures the General Assembly of 1932 to provide that the presbyteries shall be consulted regarding the proposed basis of union, and that they shall not be asked to vote on the question of the union until they have had opportunity to express their opinions regarding this basis, for the guidance of the Joint Committee of the two churches in framing the conditions of union."

Editorial Comment—Concluded

tant. Yet even the Reformed Jew has a racial sense which the Modernist lacks, a sense which gives him a stability not possessed by the Modernist. The true Protestant, in such a situation, has no truth to sacrifice in exchange for good-will, nor has he anything of which to be ashamed. True heirs of the Reformation are both positive of the truth of God's Word, and tolerant of the rights of others. It is hard to imagine the Apostle PAUL at one of these conferences. He certainly would not have abandoned the "offense of the cross." Jews do not cease to be Jews in these deliberations, nor do Romanists cease to be Romanists. Both of them indulge in harmless and genial platitudes. If truth is to be compromised, it is the "Liberal Protestant" who is called upon to do it. And he usually appreciates the honor bestowed upon him sufficiently to be obliging.

Philadelphia Affirmationists Refuse To Meet Issue Raised in Sermon

MODERNIST Auburn Affirmationists—eleven in number—in Philadelphia Presbytery have apparently agreed to make no answer to the sermon of the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths, preached in the Hollond Memorial Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia on February 21st. The sermon has attracted wide attention throughout the United States, and has apparently given new courage and hope to thousands of loyal Presbyterians who are praying and working for a purification of the church.

In its issue of February 22, the Philadelphia Record headed its account of the sermon "Fundamentalists Open Fire on Presbyterian Modernists and Demand Eleven Resign." It described the sermon as the beginning of "a war to the finish for control of the Presbyterian Church," and gave lengthy excerpts from it. The Philadelphia Public Ledger began its account by saying that "the conflict between liberal and conservative ministers of the Presbyterian Church, which threatened to split the denomination eight years ago, flamed anew yesterday." Other Philadelphia papers printed large portions of the sermon. The issue raised was also carried by Associated Press reports.

Reactions to the sermon were immediate. Dr. J. Gresham Machen issued a statement which said, in part, "It is altogether timely in view of the present condition of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. That church is controlled today very largely by forces sympathetic with, or complacent toward the Auburn Affirmation and the Auburn Affirmation is derogatory to the Christian religion at its very roots. With this undermining of Christian doctrine within the church has gone the undermining of Christian ethics. In the recent conduct of a secret trial by a

commission of the Presbyterian Synod of Pennsylvania and in the proposal in a suggested new book of discipline that all church courts shall be secret, the church stands on a lower ethical plane than that which prevails in the world at large. A thorough going moral as well as doctrinal reform is needed in the conduct of ecclesiastical business. The church needs to abandon its present policy of secrecy and tyranny, and return to the openness and freedom of a true Christian church. Mr. Griffiths has uttered a courageous and eloquent plea for Christian doctrine and Christian ethics. He deserves the support of all who really love the things for which the Presbyterian Church stands."

The eleven Affirmationists, all of whom had received invitations to be present, attempted to pass the issue off as negligible. According to the Philadelphia Record Dr. J. B. C. Mackie, one of those named, dismissed the charges as "bunk." To the Evening Bulletin he said that the matter was "laughable." In the same paper Dr. Alex. MacColl, another Affirmationist, is quoted as saying that the charges were "quite unimportant!" Dr. W. R. Rearick, another of the eleven, said "Mr. Griffiths knows a great many things about me which are not true. The leaders of the Church today have their eyes on constructive work and are too interested in combating the evils which are rampant to return to a controversy eight years old." The reaction of Dr. J. A. MacCallum, another Affirmationist, was thus described by the Bulletin. "Dr. MacCallum called the Auburn Affirmation 'ancient history.' 'It was simply a plea for retention of the constitutional rights of the Church,' he said. 'Its justification has been proved by the fact that what was asked for has been retained, and is still the law of the Church, without any sign of being changed in the near future.'" The Philadelphia Inquirer of February 23 said, "The question of alleged heresies to be found in the Auburn Affirmation has been satisfactorily answered in the report of the now famous peace commission appointed by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in 1925, liberal Presbyterian clergy here maintained yesterday. . . . It was Rev. Edward B. Shaw, of the North Presbyterian Church, who explained that the allegations made by Mr. Griffiths actually had been thoroughly aired by the denomination and added that 'there should be room for two schools of thought within the denomination, but if Mr. Griffiths and his friends think otherwise, they have our permission to withdraw.'"

On February 23 Mr. Griffiths released the following statement, which was widely quoted in the daily press:

"The smoke screen sent out by the local Presbyterian Modernists was exactly what I expected, but it will not deceive intelligent people who are interested in facts rather than in indignant adjectives. Of course they don't want to discuss the heretical document which they have signed. The reason is simple. For once, Modernists have actually made their convictions known instead of hiding them. No doubt they are sorry about it,—not sorry that they have

denied the necessity of great and essential doctrines of the Christian faith, but sorry that they have so incautiously allowed the light to stream in upon their infidelities, where the public may see and draw its own conclusions.

"If Dr. MacCallum was correctly quoted as saying that 'The Auburn Affirmation, which is ancient history now, was simply a plea for the retention of constitutional rights in the Church,' then Dr. MacCallum stated what was not true. The Auburn Affirmation did make a plea for what it regarded as 'constitutional rights,' as I pointed out and recognized with fairness in my sermon on Sunday. If it had stopped there I agree that it would have been ancient history by now. But it did not stop there. It went on, in the most thorough manner, to make a modernist doctrinal statement that stands logically separate and apart from the plea mentioned by Dr. MacCallum. Anybody who takes the trouble to read the Affirmation can find out for himself that this is true. Dr. MacCallum can hardly be ignorant of what he signed.

"No doubt the Modernist Affirmationists would very much like to forget their offense, and to ignore any reminder of it. So would any malefactor. It would be surprising to find law-breakers, whether civil or ecclesiastical, showing much enthusiasm over being exposed. And Affirmationists have violated their vows in a very flagrant manner. I am overwhelmed with gratitude that they have decided not to prosecute me for telling the truth, but I greatly fear that they have been obliged to make a virtue out of necessity. They know that everything I have said is the truth. They dare not prosecute for the simple reason that an open, public exposition of their views is the very thing they fear and dread most. Those who 'bore from within' never like the pitiless white light of publicity. No wonder that many persons who make no profession of Christianity look with unconcealed contempt upon the ethics of clergymen who tear down the very truths they have, of their own free will, vowed to maintain.

"Although Affirmationists have tried to dismiss this matter by silence, explosive adjectives, and irrelevant observations, yet one fact emerges above everything else; they dare not deny that they have declared the doctrines of an inerrant Bible, the Virgin Birth of Christ, Christ's death as a satisfaction of Divine Justice, the bodily resurrection of Christ, and his miracles, to be mere 'theories', which are not necessary, singly or altogether, to the church's faith. And I repeat that this is the worst kind of blasphemy and heresy.

"This fight has just begun. It will not stop merely because Affirmationists don't like the truth brought home to the man on the street. In telling the truth I have broken no law of the church, rather, I have upheld it, and I and many others propose to continue telling the truth everywhere and anywhere until the church has been purified. Then we will enjoy peace—with the Modernists on the outside, troubling us no more.

"I see that Mr. Shaw is reported as having 'explained' that the issues raised by the Affirmation were 'satisfactorily answered' by the report of the 'Special Commission of 1925,' appointed by the General Assembly. Mr. Shaw surely knows that this Commission was not a judicial commission, that it could not, therefore either convict the Affirmationists or give them a clean bill of health. As a matter of fact it was composed of men who were dominated by the 'peace at any price' idea, and who brought in a non-controversial report in an attempt to smoothe everything over. That effort was not successful. Nor ought it to be successful, as long as men value truth above expediency. If Mr. Shaw thinks that the matter has been settled he will discover that nothing is ever settled until it is settled right. The Auburn Affirmation may be eight years old but I have noticed that the eleven men in our Presbytery who signed it are still preaching and have never publicly retracted its doctrinal pronouncement. It is amusing to see them so suddenly solicitous for the 'peace of the Church,' when they have broken that peace. This conflict is a conflict to bring true peace back to the Church, by the elimination of the disturbing factors. It is a war to end war—in which we expect the support of all those who love the truth of God."

On Sunday, February 28, Mr. Griffiths, preaching on "Tolerance, False and True," declared:

"Everyone ought to be truly tolerant in the right meaning of the word. But tolerance does not mean compromise. It does not mean that Christians are to admit to the world that after all the world may be right and the Bible wrong. Truth is absolute, and there is a sense in which truth must be intolerant of error. True tolerance is the granting to another of the liberty he asks to follow his conscience, provided that the pathway he marks out is not dishonest, and provided also that it does not endanger the public welfare. The man who is tolerant of dishonesty partakes of it. The public welfare demands that men shall not be allowed to teach, for ex-

ample, that murder is a respectable way of earning a living, or that the social order should be overthrown by force.

"The Heretical Auburn Affirmation involves a course of dishonesty. The men who subscribe to it have broken solemn vows. Whether they are conscious of it or not, their course is not honorable. How can the Church expect to give moral leadership to the nation, when it sets an example of allowing its ministers to make scraps of paper of their ordination vows? How can the Church urge business men to respect the sanctity of contracts, or how can she insist that public officers shall keep their oath to support and defend the constitution of the United States when she herself is setting an example of complacently tolerating cynical lawlessness? These men speak of freedom, as though it would take away their freedom to insist that they do not attack the doctrines of the Church they have vowed to defend. Nobody forced them into the Presbyterian Church. If they were involuntary Presbyterians, the case might be different. But they have come into the Church of their own free will, and they ought to leave in the same manner. They have the whole outside world in which to exercise the freedom they crave. There are other churches to which they could belong without breaking vows. Why do they not peaceably withdraw from a Church whose doctrines they cannot believe? Their cry of 'freedom' will deceive no one. They can have honest freedom any time they want it, and of their own motion, when they resign their pulpits and leave the Church.

"Further, the teachings of the 'Affirmation' are a danger to the existence of the Church. The Church does not exist for the purpose of giving employment to ministers, but for the sake of bringing men to Christ, that they may be saved through His death to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us to God. The Affirmation denies the necessity of the substitutionary atonement as explained by the General Assembly of 1923. Its teaching at this central point is poison, not the truth to which the Church is pledged. This conflict is a conflict in defense of souls, and people who are being misled certainly command my sympathies to a greater extent than do the men who are deceiving them. The 'Affirmation' is treasonable disloyalty to Christ,—a treason that is undermining the witness and the moral fibre of the Church, which, if it is successful, will eventually destroy the Church and all that it stands for. The demand that we make is a demand for honesty, a demand for the purity of the Church. It is not intolerant to ask men who have violated their vows, either to disavow their heresy, or to withdraw from the Church and to leave us in peace.

"But Modernism is itself intolerant. It is intolerant of the Gospel. It is intolerant of the exclusiveness of that Gospel. It is intolerant of sound doctrine,—the doctrine to which its signers themselves are pledged. Why else was the Auburn Affirmation ever issued? Modernism is intolerant of the true freedom of the Christian minister. It wants to stop men from doing what I am doing today: exposing dishonesty in the Church. They would stop me from preaching like this if they could, but they know that every word I say is true. They want secret courts, so that if they do prosecute those who tell the truth about the condition of the Church they can do it out of the light. Ever since the time of the Star Chamber, the conviction has been strong among English speaking people that a secret court is a crooked court. Why should the Church be unwilling for the public to know what is going on? 'Don't wash our dirty linen in public' they cry. Why should the Church have any 'dirty linen' at all? There is the true wrong. And if the light were allowed in fully and completely, upon Church trials, we would soon find it unnecessary to have any. Yes, Modernism is intolerant—so intolerant that if any man speaks out boldly about the condition of the Church, modernist politics is almost sure to pass the word around to see that the man is denied all ecclesiastical preferment and influence. Many a man is being stifled in this way. But if all would speak out together who really love the Gospel, and would refuse to be intimidated, they could purify the Church of the intolerance of Modernism in things ecclesiastical.

"Modernism is spiritual and ecclesiastical Bolshevism. I do not say that all Modernists are dangerous radicals, or that any 'Affirmationists' are. But that there is in this country a connection between Modernism and political bolshevism is undeniable. And just as the red wave of bolshevism would destroy the very fabric of our civilization and country, so does the red wave of Modernism threaten the existence of the Christian Church and all the moral teachings which flow from Christian doctrine.

"The Church is becoming aroused. From all over the nation in this past week have come letters and messages from laypeople and ministers pledging their support to a movement to purify the Presbyterian Church. The demand for such purification is a rising tide and the

heretical Auburn Affirmationists in Philadelphia and elsewhere will do well to heed it now. As last Sunday, so again today, in perfect good faith, I appeal to them to cease their evasions, their ignoble silence in the face of these inescapable truths I have presented, and to leave us in peace. Let them do the honest, the fair, the only square thing, and withdraw from the Presbyterian Church."

On Sunday, March 6, beginning a series of sermons on the Five Doctrinal Points declared non-essential by the "Affirmation," Mr. Griffiths challenged the signers of the document either to prove the errors they said existed in the Bible, or to leave the Presbyterian Church. To this challenge the Modernists returned only silence.

At the meeting of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, on March 7, no complaint regarding the substance or manner of Mr. Griffiths' accusations was made. This was in spite of the fact that the Rev. Donald Gray Barnhouse was then publicly "admonished" for allegedly saying privately only a small part of what Mr. Griffiths has said publicly and openly.

No "Marriage Overture" in 1932

NO overture on amending the "Marriage and Divorce" chapter of the Confession of Faith will be sent down to the presbyteries, if the 144th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. adopts the report of Assembly's special committee on the subject. This has been decided upon by the committee, which was appointed by the Pittsburgh Assembly in 1931 to consider the advisability of the 1932 Assembly's submitting the overture.

Dr. H. C. Swearingen, the chairman, stated after the committee's adjournment that as a substitute for the proposed action the special committee had decided to recommend certain changes in the voluntary forms of worship which would acknowledge the principles of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. regarding marriage and divorce. The proposed changes would also instruct ministers on their proper procedure when requested to marry divorced persons, and would provide for instruction of young people, and persons contemplating matrimony, on the meaning of Christian marriage.

This announcement has been interpreted by some as heralding a probable attempt to change the practice of the church while leaving the Confession untouched. The exact text of the report is being awaited with some interest.

Appeal Concerning Sino-Japanese Conflict

THE Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, has just addressed an appeal

to American and Canadian churches regarding the Sino-Japanese situation. It is, in part, as follows:

"The international situation in the Far East is so tangled that we should be very slow to judge the merits of it. We may well remind ourselves in all humility of the past transgressions of Western nations in their relations with the Orient and with each other.

"Any day may bring new perils both in Japan and in China that we do not now anticipate, but we should not be stampeded by incomplete or faulty press dispatches which often exaggerate actual events. Reports predicting certain disaster to Christian forces and their work in either country should be greatly discounted, for similar predictions in the past have proved to be unfulfilled.

"We can be perfectly assured that however great may be the political and social disturbances in the Orient, the Christian light burns brightly in many Oriental lives and the darkness will never put it out. We know from personal acquaintance many Christians in each country who have seen the Lord and are ready to suffer with and for Him. They are worthy of affection, confidence and co-operation and have much in their Christian experience which will enrich the life of the West. Messages received reveal their deep distress and they now need our sympathy and fresh assurance of our support and the best encouragement that we can offer.

"This is the opportunity for Christians of North America to do much to maintain warm relationships with these Christian brethren across the seas. Personal letters to our friends, not discussing the political situation, but sharing our best Christian experience, will serve to create bonds of fellowship which will hold us all together through all the stress and strain for common service for the future. The Kingdom of God transcends geographical and racial boundaries and must unite all Christians in the household of faith . . .

"Our conviction is that any lasting and righteous settlement of difficulties can be based only on a reasonable and peaceful agreement between the disputing parties. The appeal to force in the Far East threatens to destroy all the confidence so hardly won in the fabric of peace machinery which is gradually being erected in international relationships. The world is in danger of reverting to conditions that prevailed before 1914 . . .

"We call upon the Christian Church to enlist its energies to support and improve the existing peace machinery so that the more than fifty nations signatory to the Pact

of Paris shall be able finally to renounce war as an instrument of national policy and unreservedly agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or origin shall never be sought except by pacific means. The recent developments in the Far East are a demonstration again of the danger of building up great armaments, and they challenge, therefore, the united efforts of all lovers of humanity to make the present Disarmament Conference succeed in achieving its purpose.

"In response to cabled messages from Christian groups in both Japan and China imploring aid in averting the threat to world peace, we have cabled the National Christian Councils in both countries that we are appealing to all North American Christians to join with the Christians of all lands in a strong fellowship of prayer that Christian principles may be victorious in international relationships.

"It is vital that the churches of Christ in North America should give themselves to prayer for an early settlement of the existing conflict. . . . We can well lift up in prayer the masses who are suffering under this load of armed conflict, and all those messengers of peace who are seeking to bring men everywhere into acquaintance with our Lord."

New Swedish Primate to Be Ordained

THE appointment of Erling Eidem as Primate of Sweden to succeed the late Archbishop Nathan Soderblom, has been received with satisfaction by Swedish public opinion as represented by the press and by leading laymen and clergymen. He is considered a learned and pious churchman who will do honor to his new post, even if he lacks the many-sided brilliance of his predecessor. He will be the seventieth Bishop of Upsala and the sixty-second Archbishop of Sweden. Being but fifty-one years old, he also will be the youngest of the present Swedish bishops.

This friendly reception is all the more remarkable as he ranked third among the nominees, the others being Knut Westman and Tor Andrae, both professors at Upsala. But not only did the government have the legal right to choose any one of the three as of equal rank, but the precedent of Nathan Soderblom, who also was a third nominee in 1914, stood the government in good stead. Furthermore, Professor Eidem had twice been nominated for Bishop in other dioceses and he also outranked the others in age.

Dr. Eidem was born in Gothenburg, or Sweden's west coast, where his father was a businessman. His mother comes of an old Norwegian family of the Trondhjem district. When but nine years old, he told the re-

If your address label says March 1932 or any month previous, your renewal is due. A blank is enclosed for your convenience. We value our loyal friends and hope the association will be long-continued. If your renewal is not yet due, please disregard the notice.

porters when notified of his appointment, he resolved to be a clergyman. The representatives of the Free Church as well as those of the State Church give him credit for a sincere personal religious devotion.

As scholar his work has been devoted chiefly to the teachings of St. Paul and a new volume from his hand is expected shortly. In theology he is neither ultra modern nor wholly traditional. Though he will in all likelihood be ordained as Bishop this Spring, his term will not begin until the end of 1932.

Honorary Doctor of Godlessness

HONORARY Doctor of godlessness is certainly a novum among academic degrees. The honour of creating it naturally goes to Russia. The leader of godless propaganda at the godless university at Moscow, Jaroslowski,—the university was opened on November 10—was recently made an honorary doctor in this faculty.

Church Membership in Germany

DURING the last few years, church membership in Germany and more especially in Berlin, has shown a remarkable decline. The reason for this is chiefly the economic depression and the consequent poverty. The State claims 20% of the income, and the assessment papers of church members another 10%. For many this is impossible. In 1927, 36,700 members of the 3,000,000 belonging to the Protestant church in Berlin, laid down their membership. In 1928 the number increased to 46,000; in 1929 to 50,500 and in 1930 to 59,300. In the Roman Catholic church the figures are in proportion. Of the 400,000 Roman Catholics in Berlin, 4,500 resigned membership in 1927, 5,600 in 1928, 6,600 in 1929 and 6,800 in 1930. In Berlin there are about 177,000 Jews, of whom about 560 break their connection with the synagogue every year. During the last five years, 260,700 Protestants, 30,400 Roman Catholics and 3,410 Jews have left their respective churches.

A Japanese View

THE Japanese minister for education has addressed a communication to the Christian missionaries which, with his consent, has been published in the press. In this communication the minister declares: "Hitherto, the policy of our ministry has been too materialistic and this has led to the regrettable result of a decline in public and private morality, a revival of communism and even in the last few years of a pronounced anarchistic spirit. We must from now onward spiritualize our educational system. For this purpose, the cooperation of religious educational institutions seems to us absolutely necessary and we consequently make an urgent appeal for your help."

National Board Salary Cuts Recommended

THE annual meeting of the national staff of the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. was held in Columbus, Ohio, January 26 to 28.

In the face of conditions, the staff voted as a recommendation to the board a voluntary reduction of salaries affecting all headquarters and field executive secretaries, including clerical help. The action approved a 10 per cent reduction of all salaries above \$3,000; 5 per cent reduction of all salaries above \$1,800 to \$3,000; 2½ per cent reduction of all salaries above \$1,200 to \$1,800, to become effective April 1, 1932. It was recommended that all salaries should be automatically restored at the end of the year unless otherwise ordered by the board.

The above action does not apply to missionaries' salaries on the field, although, owing to the uncertainty of the financial outcome of the year, it was voted that units undertake to appropriate to the fields only 94 per cent of the budget approved by the staff until after the April meeting of the board. It is hoped that the tentative margin of 6 per cent may be made up by the reduction on salaries of the headquarters and field staff or by income during the remainder of the year which is not now very hopeful. In any case, an effort will be made to readjust fields and positions so that there will be the slightest possible reduction of missionaries' salaries.

"Calendar Reform" Defeated

FRIENDS of the Sabbath Cause throughout the world are rejoicing at the news that the International Conference at Geneva has rejected the (so-called) Calendar Reform Proposals.

These proposals, which have obtained support in a number of countries, are that the present twelve-months Gregorian Calen-

dar shall be abolished and a thirteen-months Calendar of 28 days each shall be substituted. This arrangement accounts for 364 days. Since it takes $365\frac{1}{4}$ days for the earth to revolve around the sun, a day is left unaccounted for. The Calendar Reformists propose that this day should be called a "Blank Day," and be allowed for in the last week of the normal year, two such "Blank Days" being included in the last two weeks in Leap Years. It is claimed that this new arrangement would save money in business, and offer other commercial advantages.

These "Calendar Reform" proposals seem innocent enough on the surface, but on reflection many Christian people have seen that a vital Scriptural principle is at stake. If a "Blank Day" were introduced immediately the cycle of the seven-day week would be broken. Once a year, and twice in Leap Years, the week would consist of eight days. The seven-day week instituted by our Heavenly Father at the Creation would be threatened. It would endanger the principle upon which the observance of the Lord's Day is based. If adopted by the legislators of the Nations, it would, it is believed by many, be a blow aimed at the Authority of Jehovah. It has been declared that the adoption of the scheme would give an immense impetus to the forces which seek to abolish the decrees of God in governing the affairs of mankind.

The Lord's Day Observance Society of Great Britain has taken an active part in the defeat of these proposals. First, it exerted influence in Government circles in favour of the appointment by Parliament of a trusted British Representative, and Sir John Baldwin was appointed. The Society's Committee also adopted a Declaration against the Calendar Reform Proposals, and commissioned their Secretary, Mr. H. H. Martin, to present it in person to the Conference at Geneva.

The Assembly which was held in the League of Nations Palace at Geneva was attended by 110 Delegates, who represented the following countries:—

Union of South Africa	Hungary
Albania	India
Argentina	Japan
Austria	Luxemburg
Belgium	Norway
Great Britain	Netherlands
Bulgaria	Portugal
China	Roumania
Cuba	Saar Territory
Egypt	Governing
Estonia	Commission
United States	Siam
of America	Sweden
Finland	Turkey
France	Uruguay
Germany	Yugoslavia
Greece	

"THE HERETICAL AUBURN AFFIRMATION," the sermon that is awakening the Presbyterian Church, has been reprinted by public demand in a form convenient to carry and mail. It is so light that it may be enclosed in an ordinary envelope with a one-page letter and yet cost only two cents to mail. Pastors and office-bearers are urged to send for copies for distribution among their associates and friends. Get a supply and enclose them in your letters. It is not printed for profit, and the low prices are only made possible by the help of those who want to get the truth in the hands of the people. Circulation of this sermon on a large scale will be of incalculable benefit to the Church. All prices are postpaid. They are

5c each
50c per dozen
\$3.50 per hundred
\$30.00 per thousand

Address: Tract Dept., 501 Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.

(We will be glad to receive contributions from those who wish to have a share in this work of faith.)

Opposition was offered by Mr. H. H. Martin on behalf of the Lord's Day Observance Society, and other organizations. After a week of discussion the Assembly decided that the time was not opportune for Calendar reform, and the Bible-dishonoring proposals were defeated.

Egypt's Ambassador to the United States

THE recently appointed ambassador of Egypt to the United States, Seostris Sideroes Pasha, is known in Egypt as the head of one of its oldest Roman Catholic families. The house of the new ambassador in Cairo contains a complete chapel where the mass is celebrated every day by a priest, while many of the same faith are present at the service. The new ambassador was received in audience by the Pope before his departure for America. It is somewhat remarkable that the by no means Christian Egypt should have sent so pronounced a witness of the Roman Catholic faith as its ambassador to America.

The Prince of Wales' Visit to Lourdes

ROMAN Catholic newspapers have made much of the fact that the Prince of Wales recently visited the Romanist Shrine at Lourdes, France. The shrine is based upon the idea that the Blessed Virgin Mary descended to earth there in 1858. In the daily press, even, such statements as these were made:

"Not since the days of Charles II, it is believed, has the heir to the British throne been present at the solemn Roman Catholic ceremony of Benediction."

"Then, when the time for the final Benediction came, the Prince knelt in the wet like everybody else and received the Blessing."

Mr. J. A. Kensit, doughty champion of the Reformation and Secretary of the Protestant Truth Society, thereupon addressed a letter to the Prince, saying, in part:

"It has always been the proud boast of our Royal House that it is firm and true in its Protestant convictions, as indeed it must be by the terms of the Bill of Rights and Act of Settlement. Therefore, a question of grave constitutional import arises when the heir to the throne is involved in a religious matter of this kind. It is evident by the comment in the "Daily Herald" (cutting enclosed) that your presence has been looked upon as evidence of an advance in favour of the Roman-Catholic Church. . . .

"I am hoping that you will be able to say that your visit to Lourdes was but a matter of sight-seeing, and had no religious significance about which the great mass of British Protestants need have concern.

"I remain, with the greatest respect, sir,

"Your royal highness's most obedient and dutiful servant,

(Signed) J. A. KENSIT."

The Reply received from the Prince was most reassuring, and is as follows:

"St. James's Palace, S. W.

Dear Sir:

I am desired by the Prince of Wales to acknowledge the receipt of your letter with regard to the visit which His Royal Highness paid to Lourdes last month.

The Prince motored over one afternoon from Pau to Lourdes, and you can most certainly rest assured that His Royal Highness's visit, which happened to coincide with one of the periodical pilgrimages, was but a matter of sight-seeing and completely devoid of any religious significance.

Yours truly,

(Signed) GODFREY THOMAS,
Private Secretary."

The Vatican Broadcaster

THE Italian press reports that the wireless transmissions from the Vatican are gradually being improved and extended. The aim is to make the station one of the best in the world. A method is now being sought which will enable cardinals and nunci all over the world, to keep in regular communication with the Vatican.