

F. S. DYBESS
 MAY 1933
 R. D. 2
 QUARRYVILLE
 PA.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY NUMBER

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-MAY, 1932

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

Vol. 3

No. 1

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

Being a Christian Today

THE situation confronting Christians at the present time has often been compared, not without warrant, with the situation that existed at the beginning of the Christian era.

During the first three centuries Christians had to make their way against a Pagan culture and civilization. In that day, as later, there were those who counselled compromise with the thought and life of the day; others who, despairing of producing a Christian culture and civilization sought refuge in asceticism. Christians in general, however, realizing that what CHRIST demands of his followers is separation, not from the world but only from what is evil in the world, challenged the right of Paganism to continue to dominate the culture and civilization of mankind. Humanly speaking, their efforts must have seemed more foolhardy than DAVID's challenge to GOLIATH. None the less Christians won that conflict with the result that civilization, as we know it, with all its defects, rests upon and is permeated by Christian principles.

Ever since Christianity's initial triumph over Paganism there have been those who have regretted its victory; but until comparatively recent times they have been too few in number, in Christendom at least, to seriously challenge its rights to continue to reap the fruits of that victory. About 150 years ago however the "Empirico-Scientific" life and world view which professes to explain everything including man, religion and morality without the aid of any supernatural factor made its appearance. Within the last seventy-five

years this movement has made such headway, has been accepted by so many, especially in university and scientific circles that it has gained the courage to openly challenge Christianity's right to dominate the thought and life of the world.

As a result of this rapid spread of naturalistic thought and sentiment, Christians in the second quarter of the

twentieth century face a situation not unlike that which existed during the first three centuries. In the days of our fathers, or at least of our grandfathers, the Christian conception of life and destiny was generally accepted in science, literature, and education, and so by public opinion and the better forms of social intercourse. Generally speaking those who were not Christians felt that they ought to be and expected to become such before they died. On the other hand those who were Christians had the consciousness of being in accord with the dominant thought and life tendencies of the age in which they lived. They were supported and carried along as it were by the spirit of the age and so were like men swimming with rather than against the stream.

Today however, there is hardly a fundamental Christian idea about GOD, creation, man, sin, redemption, conduct or the future—ideas once all but universally accepted by our not distant forefathers—that is not opposed in the name of science, ridiculed by educators, questioned by public opinion and banished as a topic for serious consideration in many circles. ARNOLD BENNETT in a book written shortly before he died spoke not only for himself but for many of the intellectuals of our age when he said: "I do not believe, and never have at any time believed in the Divinity of CHRIST, the Virgin birth, the Immaculate Conception, Heaven, Hell, the immortality of the soul or the Divine Inspiration of the Bible. These denials of belief are taken for granted in the conversation of the vast majority of my

IN THIS ISSUE:

Editorial Notes and Comments	
The Approaching Assembly	
The Moderator.....	2
The Proposed Union of Churches.....	3
The Federal Council.....	3
The General Council.....	3
The Presbyterian Magazine.....	4
The Revised Book of Discipline.....	4
The Budget and Finance.....	4
Modernism on the Mission Field.....	4
Federal Council Seeks to Dominate Seminaries.....	5
The Jamison Case.....	5
Is Presbyterianism Prepared to Surrender the Deity of Christ?.....	6
Wm. Childs Robinson	
Religion and Trouble.....	8
Clarence Edward Macartney	
Notes on Biblical Exposition.....	10
J. Gresham Machen	
Questions and Answers	
Are Modernists Christlike and Tolerant?.....	13
The Second Coming of Christ.....	13
Do Beliefs Matter?.....	14
Current Views and Voices	
Chaos as Camouflage.....	15
Problems of a Humanist Minister.....	15
Ministerial Changes.....	16
News of the Church.....	17

friends and acquaintances. And far from seeming bold they are so commonplace to us that we rarely trouble to repeat them, much less to argue about them."

Nothing is to be gained by concealing from ourselves or by seeking to conceal from others the nature of the existing situation. Whether we like it or not the validity of the Christian confession is widely rejected even in so called Christian lands. The dominating tendencies of the age in thought and life are determinedly hostile rather than friendly. What is more, their spokesmen are not content to question the validity of individual facts and doctrine and precepts as they were accepted and understood by our fathers; they question the Christian system as a whole considered both as a creed and a way of life. Men no longer merely ask whether and to what extent they will permit Christianity to have practical sway over their lives. They are asking, Is Christianity true? Does intellectual honesty demand the adoption of another and different confession and catechism?—and giving a negative answer to the first and an affirmative to the second. Hence Christians are no longer carried along by public opinion. They can no longer drift with the current. They must struggle against prevailing tendencies in thought and life. Everywhere, not only in schools and colleges but in popular books and magazines a purely naturalistic conception of life and destiny is boldly set forth as the only valid one. One might read almost endlessly in modern literature without so much as learning that there is such a thing as a Christian life and world view.

The situation would not be so serious if those who called themselves Christians were standing unitedly about the cross proclaiming the praises of their king and bearing undivided testimony to the Gospel of the grace of God. As a matter of fact however there are many not only in the ranks but among the so-called leaders who reject almost every fundamental Christian belief. Yet we need not despair. CHRIST being what he is we may be sure that the Christian life and world view will ultimately be seen by all to be valid. Let us not suppose

however, that it will maintain itself apart from bold and intelligent testimony on the part of true believers—both in their individual and corporate capacity. God grant that the approaching General Assembly at Denver will make increasingly clear that there shall be no weakening of the corporate testimony of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

It is not strange in view of this widespread antagonism to Christianity both as a creed and as a life that the differences which separate the various churches should seem comparatively trivial to many. Assuredly the situation calls loudly to the various branches of the Christian faith to unite their forces. And yet fully as we believe that the divisions of Christianity are one of its chief weaknesses in the face of encroaching modernism, we are far from supposing that the thing most needed is the erasing of denominational lines and the formation of one great church organization. That were to overlook the intellectual nature of the conflict. We are the advocates of a Christian morality and culture because we believe Christianity to be true. Others are the advocates of a different morality of culture because they believe Christianity to be false. The fundamental reason for the present-day defection from Christianity is that on more or less solid grounds men have been led to believe that Christianity is not true. Chris-

tianity claims to be a revelation of the truth and to teach the truth and it is futile to suppose that we can advance its interest while ignoring this fact. A closer coordination of the forces of Christianity is much to be desired. And yet, if such a coordination should be brought about at the cost of loyalty to truth, our last state would be worse than our first. Such a church would be little more than a mob and utterly unable to defend itself against the intelligently conceived and scientifically applied attacks of modern naturalism. Let us seek a closer union of the forces of Christendom but let us not suppose that Christians can get along without a life and world view of their own. If they are to defend their own camp, still more if they are to conquer the enemy's territory, they must confront the consistent and scientifically conceived naturalism of today, within as well as without the churches, with a consistent and scientifically conceived supernaturalism. An eclectic half-way system will not suffice. "One thing is certain," to cite the late HENRY B. SMITH, "infidel science will rout everything except thorough-going Christian orthodoxy. The fight will be between a stiff thorough-going orthodoxy and a stiff thorough-going infidelity." This is the main reason why we are opposed to having our Presbyterian Church unite with any other church except on the basis of the Reformed Faith.

Editorial Notes and Comments

The Approaching Assembly: The Moderator

THE first problem to come before the Assembly at Denver will be the election of a Moderator. Six ministers have already been mentioned for the position: DIRK LAY of the Presbytery of Phoenix, LEON D. YOUNG of the Presbytery of Dallas, CHARLES W. KERR of the Presbytery of Tulsa, HARRY C. ROGERS of the Presbytery of Kansas City, J. A. VANCE of the Presbytery of Detroit, and DAVID DE FOREST BURRELL of the Presbytery of Northumberland. They all hail from the middle West or Southwest except Dr. BURRELL who is located in Pennsylvania.

It is safe to say that Drs. KERR, VANCE and ROGERS are the ones most in sympathy with the tendencies that have been most in

evidence in the Church in recent years and hence the ones most likely to have the support of the group that has elected all the moderators since Dr. MACARTNEY. Dr. KERR is a member of the General Council, Dr. VANCE is president of the Board of National Missions, while Dr. ROGERS was a member of the Commission of Fifteen, the adoption of whose report in 1926-1927 made clear that the Modernist-indifferentist party was in control in the councils of our church.

Dr. BURRELL, who polled such a vote last year as an anti-machine candidate, has been put forward as a compromise candidate. In sponsoring him *The Presbyterian* while assuring us that no suspicion attaches to his orthodoxy and that he adheres strongly to the Standards yet recommends him as one who is not "too violent and vehement

in his adherence to the Standards," which we judge to be *The Presbyterian's* way of saying that while he is personally loyal to the Standards he will not be outspoken in his opposition to those who are not. We have no specific information as to the ecclesiastical affiliations of Drs. LAY and YOUNG. Both have rendered conspicuous service in difficult fields and both have in their favor the fact that they are not connected with any Board or Agency or Council of the Church.

It is highly probable that other names will be mentioned before the Assembly convenes. We have no suggestions to offer other than that we hope that the man elected will be a pastor or missionary and that his point of view will be that of the working pastor rather than that of the Boards and Agencies of the Church. We hope also, even though it seems a case of hoping against hope, that he will be a man who is not only personally loyal to the faith as it is set forth in the Standards but that he will be a man who will bear clear-cut witness to that faith against all who oppose it whether within or without the Church.

The Proposed Union of Churches

RELATIVE to the question of organic union with the United Presbyterian Church the Department of Church Cooperation and Union will report according to the *Blue Book* as follows:

"Following the action of our own Assembly and the Assembly of the U. P. Church authorizing its committees to prepare a Plan of Organic Union and make report to the Assemblies of 1932, your Department has had two meetings . . . These meetings have been most harmonious and have resulted in the unanimous adoption of the Plan of Union which is herewith submitted. As it has been impossible in the allotted time to make a thorough and satisfactory study of the Book of Discipline and the Directory of Worship, and as a Pension Plan involving further negotiations between the Pension Boards of the two Churches has not yet been worked out, the Department recommends that the proposed Plan, in so far as it is completed, after it has had the careful consideration of the Assembly, should be referred back to the Department with instructions that a complete and final report be presented to the Assembly of 1933."

When it is recalled that the Assembly of 1930 instructed the Department of Church Cooperation and Union to submit "a complete plan for organic union" to the Assembly of 1931 one begins to wonder when this Department will have something definitive to report. It is obvious that the most the coming Assembly can do will be to repeat the action of last year's Assembly, viz.,

refer the matter back to the Department in the hope that it will be able to accomplish something worth while—that is unless it does what the United Presbyterian Assembly has been overtured to do, viz., vote to drop the whole matter. In our judgment this would be the wisest disposition of the matter. Should such a motion be offered, it would undoubtedly precipitate a lively debate and make this one of the outstanding issues before the next Assembly. Otherwise the matter will probably receive but small attention. On another page we record the overture relative to this matter that was unanimously adopted by the Presbytery of Muskingum of the United Presbyterian Church.

The Federal Council

IT is quite possible that the question of the future relations between the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. and the Federal Council of Churches will be one of the outstanding issues in the Denver Assembly. It will be recalled that the last Assembly referred to the General Council the following resolution:

"That the whole question of the construction of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and the participation in it by the Presbyterian Church be carefully considered by the General Council, and that through the General Council the Federal Council be instructed hereafter to hold its peace on questions of delicacy and morality, until the General Assembly has had an opportunity of expressing its opinion upon them."

Some fourteen pages of the *Blue Book* (pp. 130-143) is taken up with the General Council's report and recommendation relative to this resolution. In addition pages 76-79 are devoted to the "Report of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America" included in the report of the Department of Church Cooperation and Union. As was to be expected, in view of the membership of the General Council, this report is a somewhat labored defense of the Federal Council that ends with a eulogy of the Federal Council and the recommendation that it be again included in the Benevolence Budget of the Church.

The General Council's defense of the Federal Council is largely taken up with an attempt to show that in its actions and deliverances it has not transgressed or exceeded the acts and expressions of our own General Assemblies. We do not think its efforts successful. Such a defense quite ignores the facts relative to the Federal Council brought out, for instance, by Col. E. N. SANCTUARY in his book, "Tainted Contacts," the introduction to which is written by Dr. MARK MATTHEWS. Moreover such a defense, even if successful, would merely show that the Federal Council has not acted any worse than have some of our

General Assemblies, not that its actions have been wise and right. All the General Council has succeeded in showing in this connection, it seems to us, is that the General Assembly itself has repeatedly transgressed its rights under the Constitution of the Church as set forth in the Confession of Faith, Chap. XXXI, sec. 4: "Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical; and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary; or by way of advice for satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate."

The General Council's defense, more especially, quite ignores what we consider the main reason why the Presbyterian Church should sever connections with the Federal Council, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say assumes that this reason is devoid of truth. It speaks of the Federal Council (*Blue Book*, p. 131) as "standing on the rock of Evangelical faith and the deity of CHRIST;" again (p. 143) it "rejoices that the Evangelical Protestant Churches (through the Federal Council) can unitedly bear testimony to the nation and to the world of the power of the Gospel to meet every social crisis with sure and adequate guidance." Evidently the General Council takes the statements as to the evangelical character of the Federal Council, made by the officers of the Federal Council itself (*Blue Book*, pp. 76-77), at their face value. In our judgment the claim made by the Federal Council that its work is "fundamentally evangelistic" has no real basis in fact. The report refers to the unprecedented facilities the Federal Council has secured "for the proclamation of Christian messages over the air" (p. 76). Most of these messages are delivered by Dr. FOSDICK and those like-minded. It is a sin against honest nomenclature to call such messages evangelical. It is more than doubtful whether Dr. McCONNELL, President of the Federal Council, even believes in the deity of CHRIST. Instead of saying that the Federal Council "is evangelistic in its purpose and results" we would say that its influence is pronouncedly anti-evangelistic and in many respects definitely anti-Christian. We hope, therefore, that the Assembly will reject this report of the General Council and do what the last Assembly should have done—sever both financial and functional relations with the Federal Council, as the Presbytery of Hudson has overtured it to do.

The General Council

AN examination of the *Blue Book* discloses the fact that (apart from the pages devoted to the tentative docket and the tentative draft of a revised Book of Discipline) 112 of its 178 pages are taken up with the report of the General Council—a fact that bears eloquent witness to the

dominant place that this organization occupies in the government of the Church. As matters now stand the Presbyterian Church for all practical purposes is under the control of the General Council. This means that at present even the General Assembly plays but a secondary part in determining its policies. It is hardly too much to say that in recent years the General Assembly has been little more than a rubber stamp still needed to give validity to the actions of the General Council. It is not surprising, therefore, that there should be a growing unrest over this situation on the part of those who believe that in the Church as well as in the State we should have a democratic rather than an oligarchic form of government. This unrest has found expression in an overture from Philadelphia-North Presbytery asking the next Assembly to take steps to dissolve the General Council as now constituted and to substitute for it a commission of nine members with powers not inconsistent with a Presbyterian form of government. This overture has much to commend it. It wisely recommends that no member of any board or agency be eligible to membership—a provision which we think should include the Stated Clerk. We think also there should be no members ex-officio except perhaps the Moderator during the year following his election. Probably the provision whereby the Stated Clerk, two ex-moderators and representatives from each of the Boards are members of the Council has done as much as any thing to enable the General Council to exercise a virtual dictatorship. It is high time that something were done to remedy this situation. A super-executive body like the General Council, as now constituted, has no proper place in a representative democracy. The General Assembly should take back the power it has all but surrendered. The tail should not be allowed to wag the dog.

The Presbyterian Magazine

IT will be recalled that the last Assembly empowered the General Council to discontinue *The Presbyterian Magazine* provided it proved possible to merge the weekly church papers so that there be no more than two of them (1931 minutes, p. 224). We are not told what efforts were made to accomplish such a consolidation of papers. It is to be inferred, however, that nothing was accomplished along this line inasmuch as the Magazine has not only been discontinued but is placed on the budget to the extent of \$12,000 for the coming year (Blue Book, p. 173). We could wish in this connection that the General Council had explained why the same amount is needed as last year in view of the fact that adjustments have been made that "make possible a saving of \$6,000.00" (Blue Book, p. 188). We think it highly questionable whether this expenditure is justifiable; (1) because we think there is

little reason to believe that the Magazine is an effective organ in promoting the work of the Church, and (2) because, edited as it is by an Auburn Affirmationist it reflects a view-point that in our judgment is other than that of the Standards of the Church. Naturally those who look upon the Auburn Affirmation as an heretical document resent having any part of their contributions used to further its point of view.

The General Council's report rightly stresses the importance of the religious papers in the life of the Church. It tells us that "there are several splendid periodicals to choose from—*The Presbyterian Magazine*, *The Advance*, *The Banner*, *The Presbyterian*." In this list of recommended papers CHRISTIANITY TODAY is conspicuous for its absence. We can only conjecture whether this omission is due to an oversight, to the fact that it is not regarded as a Presbyterian publication, or to the fact that it is not looked upon as coming within the class called "splendid periodicals."

The Revised Book of Discipline

THE "Revised Book of Discipline" as revised has just been issued—as a part of the "Blue Book" of the forthcoming Assembly, and as a part of the "Plan of Union" put out by the Joint Committee on Organic Union. For the present we withhold comment, excepting to observe that a number of changes have been made. For example, the provision making mandatory secret sessions of church courts has been changed. In the Blue Book it is provided that doors may be closed by a two-thirds vote, while in the copy of the new Book in the Union report, the vote required is three-fourths. We think that, on the whole, there is no necessity for a new Book of Discipline, and that the church would be better off if some of those who have the itch to tinker ceaselessly with its laws would take a needed vacation.

The Budget and Finance

MANY matters will come before the Assembly that will not constitute "problems." It is safe to say that most of the Assembly's time will be taken up with non-controversial subjects. It is perhaps even safe to say that these non-controversial subjects will be the most important subjects to come before the Assembly. Much of its time will be taken up with the reports of the Boards of the Church; but while there exists considerable difference of opinion as to the wisdom and efficiency with which some or all of these Boards are carrying on the tasks assigned them, there is no difference of opinion among intelligent Presbyterians as to the paramount importance of the tasks themselves—tasks which the Church can neglect only at the cost of dis-

loyalty to its great Head. It goes without saying that the Assembly will hear much of the difficulties that the Boards and Agencies of the Church are having in balancing their budgets. In view of all circumstances, it is surprising that the deficits are not larger than they are. It is natural, no doubt, that those most immediately responsible for raising the budget should resent any criticisms that tend to increase the difficulties of their task. It seems to us, however, that they should not condemn without reference to the question whether these criticisms are warranted. In the General Council's report (Blue Book, p. 181) we are told that "a factor of considerable significance in the decline of the Boards has been the practice of religious periodicals which derive their support from our Church, to reflect upon the integrity and loyalty of Board members and officers in their direction of the sacred trust committed to their care." Before we can rightly apportion the blame in this connection, however, we must ascertain the degree to which these reflections are warranted. We think it self-evident that the Boards are entitled to and should receive the support of members of the Church only as they are true to the Bible and the gospel it contains. A true evangelical will not knowingly contribute to the support of modernist mission-aries, at home or abroad. Neither will he knowingly assist in distributing Sunday School or other literature that treats the Bible as other than the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice. It seems to us exceedingly naive to assume otherwise.

Modernism on the Mission Field

UNDER the title, "Dr. Eddy's Campaign and its Implications," *The China Fundamentalist* for March contains an article by Chancellor ARIE KOK that is of concern to all interested in foreign missions.

Dr. Eddy, as many of our readers know, has recently conducted an "evangelistic" campaign in China under the auspices of the National Committee of the Y. M. C. A. with the whole-hearted cooperation of the National Christian Council of China. Chancellor Kok's article has been written in answer to many requests from missionaries and others desirous of knowing the real significance of this campaign. The gist of Chancellor Kok's conclusion is contained in the following extract: "The mere fact that a campaign amongst Christian constituencies under leadership of a man like Dr. Eddy has been possible is in itself a most significant sign of the times and affords fresh proof of the alarming degree in which modernism in its various ramifications is rapidly gaining ground on the mission field."

In support of his conclusion Chancellor Kok cites from the utterances of Dr. Eddy to show what manner of man it is that has been put forward as a spokesman for Christianity in China. He then points its implications. We quote as fully as our space permits:

"Whatever Dr. SHERWOOD EDDY may have been a decade or two ago, it is quite evident, that, at present, he is an outspoken modernist, an advocate of birth control, a member of the Socialist Party and a Soviet-sympathizer.

"This should be clearly understood because of its most serious implications. There is no possibility of mistaken judgment. It is a fact, well-established and undeniable. . . . And yet in spite of this, it was the National Committee of the Y. M. C. A. that invited him for this campaign, it was the National Christian Council that wholeheartedly cooperated with him, it was the local churches that opened their doors for him, it was missionary institutions that placed their students under his influence. This was done with full knowledge of the facts, consciously and deliberately.

"It is no use closing one's eyes to these deplorable conditions, neither is it in the best interests of the cause of CHRIST in this country that facts like these be hushed up. . . . Directly responsible in the first place are the National Committee of the Y. M. C. A. and the leading men of the National Christian Council of China, as well as those churches and institutions where Dr. EDDY was invited to speak. . . . But indirectly, also those particular Mission Boards and individual supporters at home, that make the activities of the N. C. C. and kindred organizations possible, must share the responsibility for this sad state of affairs. It is, therefore, more imperative than ever that true evangelicals everywhere should refrain from giving to Mission Boards, unless they are fully satisfied as to how their donations are being used on the field. And, finally, the Missionary societies and churches on the field which have associated themselves with the National Christian Council, are likewise implicated as they cannot escape bearing co-responsibility for the actions of the Council of which they are official members.

"Two things have again been clearly demonstrated. First, those Missions and individual Christians, who desire to be loyal to the Christian faith, the Christian home and Christian civilization, cannot remain yoked together with religious bodies which have gradually drifted away from the truth to such an extent that they do not hesitate to put their imprimatur upon the teachings of a man who is an avowed modernist, a birth-controller, a Socialist and a Soviet-sympathizer. And second, that the existence on the mission field of such a state of affairs

calls for humiliation and penitence on the part of all true believers and at the same time constitutes a new challenge for a united, positive and more effective testimony to the CHRIST of the Scriptures, the truth of God's Word and the sanctity of Christian life and conduct."

The Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church because of its connections with the National Christian Council of China cannot wholly escape responsibility for the fact that for five months Dr. SHERWOOD EDDY carried on a so-called "evangelistic" campaign in more than twenty of the large educational centers of China. If such things are to continue, loyal Presbyterians will be compelled either to contribute to missions through non-Presbyterian channels or to establish an independent Board that can be depended on to support truly evangelical missionaries only. In our judgment, a campaign conducted by a man like Dr. EDDY is all but certain to be a campaign against, not for, the Gospel of the grace of God.

Federal Council Seeks to Dominate Seminaries

We have had public pronouncements from the Federal Council on a great diversity of subjects ranging from difficulties with labor to difficulties with marriage, and always there appears to lie in the background the calm assumption that the Council speaks for some twenty million protestant church members throughout this land.

Recently there have appeared signs that other fields are to come under its way. A letter has been sent out addressed "To Presidents of Theological Seminaries and Deans of Schools of Theology," which contains the following paragraphs:

"Following action taken at a recent meeting of this Committee, we are approaching you in this way to ask that you now make training in interchurch cooperation a regular part of your prescribed courses for young men preparing for the pastorate. . . . We are convinced that this work is now so vital to the continued effectiveness of the churches themselves that it should be among the interests receiving first attention. The demand for it comes direct from the people. It was in response to such a demand from all parts of the country that the Federal Council at its last Quadrennial Meeting established this Committee with instructions to promote such instruction. . . . Hitherto seminaries have hesitated to place this subject in a prescribed course, partly for the reason that there was no textbook available and most of the literature at hand was not adapted to

classroom use. As you will see from the enclosed publisher's announcement, this is no longer the case. The author of this new book is our own Extension Lecturer, and we heartily commend it to you. We suggest that its eight chapters be made the basis of as many class hour discussions. Other literature should be available in the libraries, but this book should be in the hands of every student. . . ."

We have long been familiar with the standardization craze in our schools of higher learning. It extends from the type and color of shirt a man must wear to be recognized as an equal by his fellow-students in some universities to the number of minutes which must be spent sitting in a class-room supposedly studying a certain subject to be recognized as acquainted with that particular branch of learning in others. And now this standardization is to be extended at the behest of the Federal Council to the curricula of our theological seminaries. Personally, if a choice must be made, we prefer it in shirts.

We recognize that there are certain basic essentials which must be comprised in any theological education that is worthy of the name. But when it comes to methods of church work and cooperation we believe that there is still room for the use of a little intelligence and practical initiative on the part of the minister and we hope that the time will never come when the Federal Council will need to be consulted before Pastor A can intelligently ask Pastor B whether they can work together to proclaim the gospel in a community.

There have been signs of revolt against Federal Council domination recently. Last year one of our great churches, the Presbyterian Church U. S., took the noble step of severing its connection with that body. We understand that all the arts of diplomatic finesse and pressure are being applied to bring the Southern Presbyterians back into the fold at the approaching General Assembly. May we express the hope that they will not only reaffirm their noble stand, should occasion offer, but that other churches may soon be found to join the ranks of those who will not be standardized by dictatorial mandates from the voice that assumes to speak for twenty million protestants.

The Jamison Case

THE attention of our readers is called to the serious questions raised by a recent action of the Presbytery of Los Angeles in the case of the Rev. MILO F. JAMISON. A full report of the matters involved is found in our news pages.

Is Presbyterianism Prepared to Surrender the Deity of Christ?

By the Rev. Wm. Childs Robinson A.M., Th.D.

Professor of Church History in Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia

PRESBYTERIANISM has been defined as a system of Church government by courts composed of elders elected by the people; these courts being so related as to preserve the unity of the Church. According to the plain implications of this definition a doctrine is held by Presbyterianism as long as her courts maintain it; and conversely whenever that system of courts is no longer able or willing to vindicate any particular doctrine which may be called in question the Presbyterian Church has virtually surrendered the aforesaid doctrine.

It is evident to those aware of present conditions in the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. that her supreme court and many of her lower courts are no longer able or willing to maintain the doctrine of the Virgin Birth of Christ as essential for ministerial ordination. Certain of the steps leading to such a condition may be noted. A group of over twelve hundred ministers affirmed that the Virgin Birth, together with several other doctrines, such as Christ's bodily resurrection and that He offered up Himself a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice and reconcile us to God, was a mere "theory," which it was not necessary to accept for ordination in the Presbyterian ministry. This Auburn Affirmation was signed December 26, 1923. What a Christmas present for the Head of the Church! The General Assembly of 1925 in a judicial decision reversed the position of the Auburn Affirmation by condemning the ordination of two men who were unable to affirm their acceptance of this doctrine. *Immediately* the Moderator of that Assembly appointed a committee of fifteen to consider the bearing of this decision on the purity, peace, unity and progress of the Church. The effect of the reports of this committee, as even an article devoted to proving the theological soundness of the

U. S. A. Church indicates,⁽¹⁾ has been to minimize the Judicial Decision of 1925 and to support the positions of the Auburn Affirmation.

If further evidence were necessary it might be found in recent articles by Dr. J. G. Machen in *CHRISTIANITY TODAY*, November, 1931 and by Dr. W. F. Eagleson in *The Presbyterian* (Philadelphia), January 14, 1932. According to the former four of the eight ministerial members of the Permanent Judicial Commission of the General Assembly (U. S. A.) are signers of the Auburn Affirmation, while a fifth signed and then withdrew his name. Dr. Eagleson affirms that others are almost of the same viewpoint. In other words, a majority of the ministers on the General Assembly's Judicial Commission have already committed themselves by solemn signature to the position that the Virgin Birth is not essential for Presbyterian ordination. The General Assembly of the largest Presbyterian Church in America is so organized that it cannot vindicate this doctrine as essential to ordination. That is the largest Presbyterian body in the United States has juridically surrendered the doctrine of the Virgin Birth.

Just now the United Presbyterians are planning to place themselves under the wings of this same General Assembly. Reports are rife that influential men in the Southern Presbyterian Church are anxious to join in this union. Certain influential leaders in both these branches of American Presbyterianism, whether wittingly or unwittingly, deponent saith not, are working to that same end, the surrender of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth by Presbyterian courts. The placing of any body under the control of a supreme court which has surrendered the

vindication of this doctrine is a surrender of that truth!

Now naturally and normally the Virgin Birth is an integral part of the doctrine of the Deity of Christ. The writer is, of course, familiar with the "Liberal" hue and cry that the men who denied the Virgin Birth are assuredly sound on the Deity of Christ—"that even we New York 'Liberals' would countenance no uncertain note here." In fact one remembers that a former Moderator of the Southern Assembly understood and interpreted the President of Union Seminary (N. Y.) as avowing that he was determined to bring Union into line on such a great evangelical doctrine as the Deity of Christ.

Since such reports Union Seminary (N. Y.) has retired her professor of Systematic Theology and installed in his place Dr. John Baillie. Dr. Baillie has favored (?) the public with *The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity*. We picked up the book with avidity to discover how nobly Union was being brought back to evangelical Christianity. Alas! what a crushing disillusionment. This book nowhere affirms that Jesus is God; nowhere affirms His deity; nowhere affirms His divinity; nay, it never even applies to Him the adjective Divine. Evangelical Christianity? Why the doctrine of Christ in this volume is vastly lower than the doctrine taught by William Ellery Channing, the leader of the Unitarian schism. It is lower than the doctrine taught by Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick in the *Modern Use of the Bible*—tho' in all conscience that is desperately low. Channing is generally classed as a high Arian. But even old Arius would denounce this view as a psilanthropist (mere man) doctrine. Dr. Baillie holds that Jesus Christ "is altogether one of ourselves, a man among men, a human brother among us, with the same handi-

(1) *Union Seminary Review*, January, 1931, p. 130.

caps and the same opportunities." In the human search for God "He represents the highest point to which the human race has yet attained." (p. 107-8) "God has been revealed to us in the soul of man" (p. 115) "The Christian gospel is rather that in Christ God *did* something for the human race greater and more splendid than He had ever done before" (p. 116). On the human side Dr. Baillie does not avoid ontological terms: On the other side, in reference to that which should have been the Divine, he uses only functional terms. The sense of the book is that Jesus was a man only in whom God did something unique for the enlightenment and salvation of our race. Even this uniqueness is by no means absolute. God has also acted uniquely in the life of Buddha—indeed He does something unique in every great life. "Jesus Christ is not another name for God but the name for a Man in whom God was and through whom God came to meet us" (p. 201). He is not the eternal Word by whom the vast cosmos was made. No, God has other Words for other worlds; Christ is merely the Word of God for this world. In the eternities there shall be a million alien Gospels, "when, in our turn, we show to them a *Man*." And then perhaps for fear some might not get the full significance of his viewpoint, Dr. Baillie dismisses the doctrine of the Trinity by declaring that the Christian piety of today does not naturally express itself by means of "the old triadic mould." To do so were "to do nothing but lazily perpetuate the mistakes of the great men of the third and fourth centuries." (p. 194-5.)

If the purpose of this article were to refute Dr. Baillie one might begin by remarking that those who study such Trinitarian scholars and thinkers as Dr. B. B. Warfield, E. G. Calvin's *Doctrine of the Trinity in Calvin and Calvinism*, Oxford, 1931; Dr. A. E. Rawlinson and his collaborators in the *Oxford Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*; Dr. C. J. C. Webb, *God and Personality*; Dr. F. Gogarten, *Ich Glaube An Den Dreieinigen Gott*, find it difficult, nay impossible, to regard these men as lazy perpetuators of any man's mistakes.

But the purport of this article is rather to call attention to the repre-

sentative character of Dr. Baillie's book and its consequent deadly threat to the doctrine of the Deity of Christ in Presbyterianism. This representative character is, in the first place, instanced by the position which the author occupies. He is professor of systematic theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York, the most influential center of "liberal" thought in the Presbyterian world. Further the implications of the preface to this book are that Dr. Baillie has been elevated to this eminent position on the basis of the acceptability of the lectures which the book contains. That is Dr. Baillie virtually says that his lectures so delighted the Union clientele that he was invited to repeat them—and ultimately to form a permanent part of the Union faculty. Again the title of the book is representative. Dr. Baillie is not merely professing to present his own views—as important as those are in view of his commanding position—but the place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity. While this comprehensive title is not to be limited to Presbyterianism, surely Dr. Baillie has in the foreground of his picture the "liberal" or modernistic Presbyterians with whom he has fellowshipped. The introduction of this and his former volume surely warrant the inference that the professor of systematics believes he is representing the Presbyterians (or erstwhile Presbyterian) Modernists of Canada, of Scotland (Edinburgh and the pastor of Cupar-Fife are mentioned) and the Presbyterian "liberals" of the United States particularly of Auburn, Union (N. Y.) and Wooster, Ohio.

Moreover the representative title of the book, the position of the author, its endorsement as the book of the month has secured for it wide reading. Thereby its views have been widely disseminated and are undoubtedly more representative than at the time of its publication. The reading of the volume serves as a means of crystallizing the views of men already uncertain as to the Deity of our Lord. Is this Unitarian volume to be the means of a greater and more serious defection in Calvinistic America than the defection led by Channing? Echoes of the widespread influence of the book are even resounding as far from New York as Arkansas, and that in the

Southern Presbyterian Church. A prominent Little Rock pastor wrote the chairman of the Presbytery's Commission appointed to determine where there was any foundation for rumors as to his theological unsoundness, as follows (March 21, 1930):

"In your letter you ask about my views of the deity of Christ, I have never had any doubt, nor have I ever expressed any about the divinity of Christ—However, I would probably not interpret divinity by means of some of the old categories. I think it is qualitative rather than quantitative. My view is pretty well expressed by Dr. Baillie, in his book, *The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity*."

"The old categories," e. g. the Westminster Confession, the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Twenty-five Articles declare that Jesus Christ is "very and eternal God." Baillie's volume declares, "Jesus Christ is not another name for God, but the name of a Man in whom God was, and through whom God came to meet us." And on this record a Southern Presbyterian Presbytery satisfied itself that there was no ground for rumors of the theological unsoundness of the prominent pastor!

Dr. Baillie's book has acutely raised the question of the stand of Presbyterianism on the Deity of Christ. For any branch of Presbyterianism to accept these views as satisfactory is to surrender the Deity of our Lord. The challenge cannot long be avoided in any branch of worldwide Presbyterianism. There may be men in the Southern Presbyterian Church who are anxious to be known as progressives. The writer is very loathe to believe that these men are willing to surrender the deity of Jesus Christ. Will not these progressive brethren also add their voice that the Presbytery of Arkansas must go deeper into the question of the orthodoxy even of the pastor of a prominent Church, deep enough to find out whether the aforesaid pastor holds with Baillie's book that Jesus Christ is merely "altogether one of ourselves," or with the Apostle Paul that he is also "God over all, blessed for ever" (Rom. 9:5)?

Coincidentally with Baillie's invita-

tion to lower our doctrine of the Lord Christ there comes a pressing call to all true Presbyterians to an even clearer conception of His glory. According to a recent issue of the *Christian Observer* the Pan-Presbyterian Meeting in Richmond, Va. appealed to all Presbyterians to study the work of our greatest American theologian Dr. B. B. Warfield in his presentation of our theology (*Calvin and Calvinism*, Oxford, 1931). In this volume Dr. Warfield declares that the

history of the efforts of the Church to work out an acceptable statement of the great mystery of the Trinity has been "dominated from the beginning to the end by a single motive—to do full justice to the absolute deity of Christ." (p. 284.)

In this effort the three whose names stand out in high relief are Tertullian, Augustine and Calvin. Calvin held that Christ is God, *a se* (autotheos). From Calvin this doctrine of the self-existent

Deity of Christ (autotheotes) has become a distinctive hall-mark of the Reformed faith. Presbyterian hosts, as you face Him who loved you and gave Himself up for you, will you sink His honor to the depths which the ancient Church never allowed, will you become mere Psilanthropists; or for His glory will you rally anew in the Reformed army of Autotheanites holding against all comers that your Lord and Head is indeed God the self-existent Jehovah?

Religion and Trouble

A Sermon from Life by The Rev. Clarence Edward Macartney D.D., LL.D.
Minister, First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Job 4:5—"But now it has come upon thee and thou faintest; it toucheth thee and thou art troubled."

THIS is a time when a man either turns to religion or turns against it." So spoke a business man who recently came in to see me, and had been telling me of the difficulties and anxieties through which he was passing.

When trouble comes, some turn to religion; that is, it increases and deepens their faith. The winds of adversity only drive them the nearer to God. But others seem to turn away from religion. If they have been going to church, now they stop going, and disassociate themselves from public worship and from Christian activity; and others again not only turn away from religion and neglect it, but turn against it. Thus there was profound truth in what this business man said to me, that this is a time when a man either turns to religion or turns against it.

The Book of Job is still the incomparable classic on this great subject, suffering and life. Life is always thrusting this question upon us, for whether we desire it to be otherwise or not, man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward. Without trouble, "life would be sort of a Dead Sea, a sea of bliss in which one could float, but neither swim nor explore." Yet the fact of adversity and trouble always raises difficult questions when we think upon God and his

dominion over our lives. "When I think upon God," said the Psalmist, "I am troubled."

The Book of Job is a very old book, one of the oldest in the world, but you cannot hurt its reputation by saying it is old, anymore than you can hurt the reputation of a rock, or a tree, by saying that it is old. Some of the greatest things of the world will always be the oldest. Here in this book, as Carlyle put it in his "Heroes and Hero Worship," is "sublime sorrow, sublime reconciliation, oldest choral melody as of the heart of mankind, so soft and great; as the summer midnight, as the world with its seas and stars."

From the pinnacle of prosperity, Job had suddenly been hurled into the deepest valley of adversity. One calamity after another had broken over him, and when possessions and family and health have all been stripped from him, we see the desolate patriarch sitting upon the ash heap and cursing the day he was born. Job, indeed, did not curse God nor charge Him foolishly. But he did curse the day he was born, and lamented his existence. But he discovered, as we all do when life hurts, that to curse the day of our birth and to lament existence effects no change and accomplishes no good. The date of our birth cannot thus be expunged from the calendar; life is here and we must face it.

Job had not lived carelessly or fool-

ishly in a fool's paradise, when, as he tells us, his steps were washed in butter and the sun of prosperity was in the mid heavens. He was not unmindful of the fact of the instability and uncertainty of all earthly things, for he says, "I was not in safety, neither had I rest, neither was I quiet; yet trouble came." And when trouble did come, and the storm broke over him, in spite of all his preparation and contemplation, Job is shaken by the successive calamities which seem to mock at all his preparation and go beyond all his apprehensions. There is a popular saying spoken with the purpose of keeping people from undue anxiety, that the "things we contemplate seldom happen, and the things that happen we seldom contemplate." But this is only a half-truth. Sometimes the very things which we have contemplated, and perhaps dreaded, come to pass. So it seems to have been with Job, and when the storm was over we behold this God-fearing and right-living man deluged with a wave of misery, not abandoning his faith, it is true, but getting no comfort and little hope out of it.

In his day of trouble, Job had true and faithful friends, and these three friends came and sat with him on his ash heap. Whatever mistakes they made in their theology and in their efforts to justify the ways of God to Job, their intent and purpose was true and honorable. After seven days of sympa-

thetic silence, which is sometimes the deepest ministry of sympathy, Eliphaz breaks the silence with his speech. With true Oriental grace and courtesy, he introduces his remarks by saying, "If we assay to commune with thee, wilt thou be grieved? But who can withhold himself from speaking?" With that for an introduction, he commences by reminding Job of his former faith and his godly life, and expresses astonishment that a man with such a record should now be so upset and staggered by his adversity. He reminds Job how often he had helped and steadied others when adversity came, and they were tempted to rebel against God and all His ways. "Behold thou hast instructed many, and thou hast strengthened the weak hands. Thy words have upholden him that was falling, and thou hast strengthened the feeble knees." Eliphaz appeals from Job in adversity to Job in prosperity. "You are the man," he says, "once noted for faith, and you are able to strengthen others in the time of trial. But now you do not seem to be able to take the cure which you prescribed for others. But now it has come upon thee, and thou faintest. It toucheth thee, and thou art troubled."

What disturbed and perplexed the friends of Job in his hour of trial and trouble is something which still perplexes and disturbs the mind. It is painful to see those who have entertained Christian faith for themselves, and have also given comfort and help to others, without comfort and without courage or hope in the time of their own trial, and still more painful is it to see men actually abandon religion or turn against it.

How shall we account for this lack of strength and courage in the day of trouble. In part, no doubt, it is due to the lack of definite instruction in Christian truth. "Prophesy unto us smooth things" is still the popular request and counsel to those who proclaim the great truths of religion. So we have the reign and sway of what is merely entertaining in religion. I frequently receive invitations to deliver what is called an "inspirational" address at some meeting. Inspiration is good, and we all need to have the gift that is in us stirred up and

to be urged on towards the great goal. But in straits of life, what the soul must rely upon is Christian knowledge of great granite facts and truths. It is the neglect of those fundamental facts and truths which leaves so many people without spiritual resource or reserves upon which they can call in the day of trouble.

It may not be a smooth thing to say, but it is said over and over again in the Scriptures, that adversity and trial are a part of this earthly experience. To be forewarned is to be forearmed. There is not a sentence in the New Testament which would lead one into the great error of thinking that his life as a Christian is to be free from trouble and from temptation, and temptation to doubt both the love of God and the reality of the Christian faith. On the contrary, we are told repeatedly to expect testing, trial, loss and tribulation. "In this world ye shall have tribulation." If this fact were clearly stamped upon our minds then we should not be in a panic and ready to abandon our faith when trouble comes.

Not only is the uncertainty and instability of all things earthly taught by our faith, and not only the fact of tribulation and sorrow, but the spiritual and moral purpose of it all. The grand proposition of Christian faith is that our life here is not an end in itself, but a probation, and that the purpose of this probation is not to give us a good time, not to make us lie down in a meadow of flowers and ease, but to produce and develop moral and spiritual qualities with a view to their complete expression and their full reward in a future life. This is the only key which fits the lock of life's experience. Every other key has been tried and has failed. But if this is so, that life is a trial system with this great purpose back of it, then none can say that life is not well adapted for such an end.

When the Psalmist was brooding over his own troubles and wondering how it fared so ill with him, when others who did not obey God, indeed gave Him no place at all in their lives, basked in prosperity and rejoiced in success, he comforts himself with the reflection that the things which have happened to him,

painful though they are, are bringing him nearer to God; whereas, the unbroken prosperity of other men leads them to forget God. "Because they have no changes, they fear not God." That is, without any reverses, without any changes, or overturnings in fortune, man would hardly believe in God. The only God he would need would be himself, and the only heaven this life. If you and I, then, when things go wrong, as we say, and life sometimes hurts rather than delights, would only remember this, that the great purpose of life, moral and spiritual character, and the way that purpose is fulfilled through trouble and trial, it could never be said of us, that in the time of trouble we turned away from religion, or, what is worse, turned against it. "Tribulation," said one of the most tried and troubled of men, "tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope, and hope maketh not ashamed." All things work together for good to them that love God. But the trouble is that we are so often unwilling to admit that moral and spiritual good is the supreme and abiding good. Instead of that, the health or position or friendship or affection or money we have lost bulks so large that it shuts out from our eyes the nobler and greater proportions of those things which nourish and adorn the soul.

The most wretched and unhappy of men is he who has turned against religion. The very energy with which such a person gives expression to the revolt and unbelief in his heart is a witness to the deep unrest and unhappiness of his life. Newman, after reading one of the brilliant and anti-Christian writings of Voltaire, made this comment, "plausible and terrible." So far as an argument goes, the man who is sorely afflicted may find something plausible about a theory of life without God. In his own experience he can point to so many things which appear to crush and overwhelm what he has believed. But always a theory of life without God, a theory of trouble and adversity without great spiritual purposes running through it, is terrible; and to avoid that terrible state, we must keep in mind the great purposes running through life, and also

the great possessions of life, that a man's life consisteth not of the abundance of things which he possesseth.

Not only for our own sake, but for the example we set, and for the sake of others, those of us who confess to a faith in God and in Christ dare not speak and act when trouble comes, as if that faith made not the slightest difference in the world. Where would the world be today, where would the church be today, if when trouble came upon them, those great souls of the past, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, had turned against their God and against their faith. Instead of that, they made the adverse winds drive them nearer to the shores of faith and hope. They were able to say, "Troubled on every side, yet not distressed; perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed."

In time Job was given deliverance out of all his troubles, although the path was not that which he mapped out for himself, or which was mapped out for him by his well-meaning, but often mistaken friends. During the storm, Job holds on to God. "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him," is his only creed. But at length God Himself speaks. Job is permitted to behold the majesty and the goodness of God, and in that vision his thought, which hitherto had centered on himself and his vicissitudes, is transferred to God. Up to this time he had

wanted to argue and dispute with God, but now all that he wants to do is to repent, to worship, and to believe. "I have heard of thee with the hearing of the ear, but now mine eyes seeth thee; wherefore, I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes." Hitherto his faith had been dependent upon the incidents of his own life. When the sun of prosperity shone upon him, the thermometer of his faith stood high; but when adversity came, it sank to the lowest depths. But now his faith is based not upon his own life or its incidents, but upon God. Instead of standing on its apex, the pyramid of his faith now stands upon its true, broad, and grand base, the infinite power and wisdom and love of God. Job has got free of the world, and nothing which might happen to him now could shake the tower of his faith.

This is a day for Christian men to show the faith that is in them. To a world whose stock of faith is exceedingly low, what could have a worse effect than the spectacle of Christian men giving up the Church, absenting themselves from divine service, or becoming bitter towards religion because of the difficulties through which they are passing, and worst of all, because they have lost that which Christ and the Scriptures tell us is of all things least valuable—money. One of the most noted of writers on industrial and financial conditions has recently said that the prosperity which the country enjoyed for so long a time

led people to neglect the Sunday School, the Church, abandon the family altar and turn Sunday into a pagan common holiday. Hence, when the change came and men no longer had easy employment or easy money, when employment and profits had both vanished, they had no spiritual resources upon which to fall back.

Two men were once discussing why it is that you cannot see the stars by day. The stars are still there, the distance is not greater by day than by night,—why then cannot these mighty lamps be seen by day? One man maintained that they could be seen if one went far enough down in a well. The other denied the proposition, but permitted himself to be lowered into the well. After he had been lowered a certain distance, he was asked if he could see the stars, and said, "No." Still further down, the same question was asked with the same answer. But when he had been lowered to a great depth, then, looking up towards the heavens, he said he was able to see the stars. Go down deep enough into a well and you can see the stars by day. So to those who are willing to cooperate with God, and will for themselves the things which He hath willed for them, the deep well of adversity and trouble is a place whence we can see the stars of the spiritual heavens and know that in all and above all and through all is God, and that God is love.

Notes on Biblical Exposition

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

Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary

XVII. Consequences Versus Truth

"But when Cephas came to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was condemned. For before certain men came from James; he ate with the Gentiles; but when they came, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing those who were of the circumcision. And there dissembled together with him also the rest of the Jews; so that even Barnabas was carried away with their dissembling. But when I saw that they were not walking straight according to

the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before them all . . ." (Gal. 2:11-14a, in a literal translation).

A Vacillating Policy

IN the last number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, we finished our exposition of Gal. 2:1-10, which passage, it will be remembered, presents the second of Paul's arguments in defence of his apostolic independence. The first argu-

ment (in Gal. 1:11-24) was that his conversion was not brought about by human persuasions or teaching but by the immediate act of Christ, and that even after his conversion he had not had the early or extended contact with the original apostles which the Judaizers' notion of his dependence upon them would require. His second argument (in Gal. 2:1-10) was that when he did discuss his gospel fully with the Jerusalem leaders they took his view, not the

Judaizers', about the matter and recognized that his gospel was the same gospel of Christ as the gospel which they preached, and that it had already been given to him, without their instrumentality, by divine commission. Now, in Gal. 2:11-21, Paul presents the third and last of his arguments for his apostolic independence. So independent was he, he says, that on one occasion he could even oppose the chief of the original apostles himself.

"But when Cephas came to Antioch," says Paul, "I withstood him to the face, because he was condemned." It is not necessary to ask *by whom* Peter "was condemned;" Paul means that his very act condemned him. When he says that he "was condemned," that is only a more forcible way of saying that he was worthy of condemnation.

Certain Men From James

"For before certain men came from James," says Paul, "he ate with the Gentiles; but when they came, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing those who were of the circumcision." In interpreting the phrase "from James," extreme views should be avoided. The phrase seems to mean more than that these men came from Jerusalem—as it would mean if "James" were merely used instead of "Jerusalem" because James was the head of the Jerusalem Church. But the opposite error is much more serious. It is a great mistake to jump to the conclusion, as some have done, that these men were sent by James with the express purpose of accomplishing what their coming did as a matter of fact temporarily accomplish—namely, the withdrawal of Peter and other Jewish Christians from table-companionship with Gentiles in the Antioch Church. Perhaps all that we can surmise is that these men had stood in some way closer to James than did the generality of the Jerusalem Church. But what their connection with him was, and whether they had any kind of commission from him at all when they went to Antioch—these questions can probably never be answered. It is important in such cases not to read too much between the lines.

We cannot even be perfectly sure that these men are blamed by the Apostle

Paul. Their coming to Antioch had an unfortunate effect, but whether they intended it to have that effect is by no means clear.

Separation From The Gentiles

After the coming of these men, Peter "withdrew and separated himself" from the table-companionship in which he had previously engaged with the Gentile members of the Antioch Church. The tense of the verbs may indicate that the process of withdrawal was a gradual one; possibly Peter at first merely made his table companionship with the Gentiles less frequent than it had been before; possibly we are meant to understand that he entered upon a policy of withdrawal rather than that there was any sudden or definite break.

He acted in this manner, Paul says, because he feared "those who were of the circumcision." This latter phrase might be taken as designating "those the starting-point of whose life was circumcision," "the advocates of circumcision;" but here it is perhaps better just to take it as meaning "Jews." Of course, the particular Jews who are meant are the men who came from James. Peter withdrew and separated himself because he feared to allow his table-companionship with Gentiles to continue in the presence of those Jews.

To understand such conduct on the part of Peter, it is necessary to envisage the situation somewhat more clearly than is sometimes done. At that time, the Church had not yet abandoned the work of offering the gospel to the Jewish people as such. The gospel was to be offered, as even Paul intimates (Rom. 1:16), "to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." So at the conference described in Gal. 2:1-10 we need not suppose that Paul asked the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem to cease circumcising their children or to cease attendance upon the Temple. These things were not, indeed, regarded as being necessary to salvation either by the original apostles or by Paul, and the Gentile Christians were expressly exempted from them; but the Jerusalem Christians, for the time at least, continued to observe them. Any final abandonment of them on the part of the

whole Church was left to the further guidance of God.

Paul did not, therefore, demand that Peter or other Jewish Christians should relinquish, for the present at least, their Jewish manner of life, especially if (in accordance with Paul's principle of becoming all things to all men, I Cor. 9:19-22) it seemed necessary for the winning of the non-Christian Jews. But a strict Jewish manner of life involved, or was thought to involve, avoidance of table-companionship with Gentiles. If, therefore, Peter had never entered into such table-companionship, it is not altogether clear that Paul at that time would have urged him to do so.

The Order Of Events

At this point, however, a difficulty seems to arise. Was not the very purpose of the four prohibitions of the Apostolic Decree (Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25) to make table-companionship, as well as other kinds of companionship, possible between Gentile Christians and Jewish Christians in mixed churches? Was not the very notion of the Decree that the Gentile Christians were to avoid certain particularly abhorrent things, especially in the sphere of foods, in order to avoid giving offence to their Jewish brethren? Could the difficulty at Antioch, then, ever have arisen if the Apostolic Decree had been passed? Would not all that have been settled if the Decree was only observed?

Such considerations, especially when taken in connection with those mentioned when we were dealing with Gal. 2:1-10, have led some modern scholars to reject the identification of the meeting described in that passage with the Apostolic Council of Acts 15:1-29 and to adopt the identification with the "famine visit" of Acts 11:20; 12:25. The order of events, these scholars think, then becomes perfectly easy to understand. First, the leaders of the Jerusalem Church agreed with Paul in holding, against the Judaizers, that the Gentile Christians did not need to be circumcised, and gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship (Gal. 2:1-10). But—say the advocates of this view—there were many things that were not settled at that time. It was not contemplated that Jewish

Christians should give up their Jewish manner of life. What, then, should be done in mixed churches where Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians lived together? How could the Jewish Christians possibly maintain their Jewish manner of life and at the same time hold companionship, especially table-companionship, with such Gentiles? These questions—so the hypothesis continues—gave rise to the trouble at Antioch. Peter at first solved the problem in the interests of the unity of the Church. He relinquished the strictness of his Jewish manner of life in order to hold table-companionship with his Gentile brethren. But then, fearing those who came from Jerusalem, he went back on his decision and withdrew from such table-companionship. Finally, however, the whole matter was settled—according to the hypothesis which we are now considering—by the Apostolic Council of Acts 15:1-29. That Council solved the problem of mixed churches by decreeing that the Gentile Christians, while not observing the whole ceremonial law, should refrain from certain particular things which would give the most poignant offence to their Jewish fellow citizens.

There is no question but that this reconstruction of the order of events is in some respects very attractive. But there are also serious difficulties about it; and we do not think, in particular, that it is rendered necessary by Gal. 2:11-21. Even if the Apostolic Decree had already been passed before the time dealt with in this passage, still there may have been strict Jews in the Church who thought themselves required to avoid table-companionship with Gentiles even if the Gentiles observed the four prohibitions of the Decree, so that even after the Apostolic Council there was room for such a situation as that which this passage describes.

A Policy Of Concealment

"And," Paul continues, "there dissembled together with him [Peter] also the rest of the Jews, so that even Barnabas was carried away with their dissembling." The Greek word translated "dissembling" in this passage is the word from which our English word "hypocrisy" comes. But it does not

necessarily involve anything like such sharp condemnation as the English word does. The English word means "pretending to be better than one really is," while the Greek word means merely "playing a part," "making an incorrect impression," no matter in what particular way or with what particular motive the incorrect impression is made.

What Paul means is that Peter and Barnabas and the other Jewish Christians were concealing their real principles out of fear of those who had come from James. They had seen clearly that in the new era ushered in by the redeeming work of Christ it was God's will that already the strictness of the Mosaic Law (or of the current interpretation of its implications) should be relaxed to permit full fellowship between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians in mixed churches. They had ordered their lives accordingly. Yet now, in the presence of these men from Jerusalem, they were acting as though their principles were of a different kind. Their present conduct did not correctly express their convictions. To characterize such conduct, Paul uses a word of which there is no exact translation in English. It was certainly not "hypocrisy," and even "dissembling" is too strong.

The Danger Of "Splitting The Church"

Yet, despite such explanations, we can see clearly that the situation was serious enough. What poignancy of sorrow lies behind Paul's words: "Even Barnabas was carried away with their dissembling!" Barnabas, the man who had introduced Paul to the leaders of the Jerusalem Church (Acts 9:27), who had later (Acts 11:25) brought him from Tarsus into that very Gentile work at Antioch to which he was doing so much harm by his present conduct—even Barnabas was carried away by a miserable policy of concealment and compromise!

Moreover, the situation was not only painful but exceedingly delicate and dangerous. Paul had against him not only Barnabas and the entire Jewish Christian part of the Antioch Church, but also the chief of the Jerusalem apostles, the chief of the original Twelve who had

been chosen by the Lord Himself. Surely such a situation demanded the utmost caution; one false move, and the Church would be "split." No doubt such considerations might have been presented to Paul at Antioch, as they are presented to the evangelical minority in the Presbyterian Church of the present day. But Paul did not think much of them. He was not an adherent of the fashionable modern policy of unanimous reports; he did not believe in settling the affairs of the Church in secret committee chambers, and in concealing the underlying differences by pages of verbiage like that produced by the Commission of Fifteen appointed by our General Assembly of 1925. He would have nothing whatever to do with the policy of concealment and compromise. What he did do is presented in sharp, clear fashion in his own words. "But when I saw," he says, "that they were not walking straight according to the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas *in the presence of all . . .*" (italics not Paul's, but ours; but we doubt whether Paul would disagree with our use of them).

The Truth Of The Gospel

Why did Paul take such a dangerous step as that, and why do supposedly evangelical leaders refuse to take such steps today? The answer is given by the phrase, "according to the truth of the gospel." Peter's conduct was not in accordance with the gospel. That was enough for Paul. Regardless of consequences, he was obliged to speak out. He withstood Peter to his face; he rebuked him before them all.

The difference between Paul and many ostensibly evangelical leaders in the Presbyterian Church today may be put very briefly. These ostensibly evangelical leaders consider consequences; Paul considered truth.

There is no question which kind of conduct has the blessing of God. Under the present policy of concealment and compromise, evangelicalism is becoming weaker and weaker in the Presbyterian Church and in the other churches of today; under Paul's brave policy of withstanding to the face and of speaking out, the apostolic Church went on to conquer the world.

Questions Relative to Christian Faith and Practice

Are Modernists Christlike and Tolerant?

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

Is it not true that the modernists are more tolerant, and so more Christ-like, than the fundamentalists? While you are constantly protesting against the presence of the modernists in the Presbyterian Church, I do not know that any of them have protested against your remaining in the church. Why can't both groups live together in peace and harmony? How do you explain this difference of attitude?

R. D. C.

WE are quite willing to admit that there is a sense in which the modernists are more tolerant than the fundamentalists, but not that they are more Christ-like in this respect. There is in fact a sense in which Christ was the most intolerant person that ever lived. It is wholly to misrepresent Him to picture Him as one who was tolerant of evil or error. In this connection, moreover, it should be remembered that the Presbyterian Church is a voluntary organization of a creedal type. No one is compelled to remain in its membership and no one has a moral right to function as one of its ministers or elders who does not believe its creed. Those you call fundamentalists believe that creed; those you call modernists do not. We submit that it is not intolerance in any proper sense of the word to protest against men continuing as ministers or elders in the Presbyterian Church when they no longer believe the creed they have pledged themselves to maintain—in the face of persecution or opposition if need be. As long as the creed of the Presbyterian Church remains substantially as it is, it is vain and futile to try to make it appear as though modernists and fundamentalists have equal rights within its walls.

Probably no one has dealt more pointedly with this question than has Floyd E. Hamilton. We can hardly do better than avail ourselves of his words: "A common charge against evangelicals today is that they are more intolerant than the liberals . . . Why is it that the evangelicals have to show such a cantankerous spirit as to refuse to allow the liberals to live and work quietly in the church, while the liberals are willing to cooperate if they are only left alone? . . . The answer is simply this: The evangelicals believe that the liberal's teaching is sending men to eternal punishment and that Christianity would disappear and no souls be saved if the liberal teaching triumphed in the church. The liberals on

the other hand have no such concern over the souls of evangelicals, for they believe that a good character will save the soul . . . and they recognize that evangelical Christians have good characters as well as the liberals, so that there is nothing to be vitally concerned about. To us it is a matter of life and death, while to them it is merely a matter of abstract truth or error. To them the matter of the deity of Christ and the substitutionary atonement is of the same importance as the truth of the Einstein Theory is to us, for to them the essence of Christianity is in the kind of a life which men lead rather than in what they believe. They can afford to be tolerant of the beliefs of the evangelicals, for to the liberal these matters are of no more real importance than would the fact that a child believes in Santa Claus be to an indulgent parent. The evangelical, however, believes that the eternal welfare of men's souls is at stake, and in such matters he must be intolerant of error or be untrue to his Lord as well as to himself . . . We are not discussing the question whether liberalism is right or wrong. We are merely pointing out the reason why they can appear tolerant, while the evangelical cannot.

"An appeal is being made today by the liberal party in the Presbyterian Church for peace and harmony. They demand that we be big enough to find room for both factions to live in the great Presbyterian Church without constant bickering and quarreling. Would that it were possible to assent to such a winsome plea! God knows that we do not rejoice over the dissension in our church! The mission work of the church is crippled by lack of funds, and perhaps thousands of souls are turning away from the kingdom of God because they are disgusted at the spectacle of a divided Christendom. But how can we do otherwise than resist the propagation of false doctrine if we believe as we do that that beautiful-sounding but untrue gospel is sending souls out into eternity . . . without the spotless robe of Christ's righteousness to cover their sin-stained souls? Of what avail to win men to the church if the church does not give them a Christ who can save to the uttermost? We believe that false doctrine is killing men's souls for time and eternity. We believe that if we permit it to spread peacefully through the whole church, that the whole church will cease to be Christian, and that souls will cease to be saved by it, though hundreds of thousands be gathered into it. Can we hold such a belief and be tolerant of those who teach what we believe to be error in the most vital point of Chris-

tianity? Never, and be true to our Lord and our God!

"We must fling the banner of a holy intolerance of sin and error and false doctrine to the winds of heaven. We must struggle to purge the church of liberalism, until either the church is purified or the liberal party is victorious. If the time should ever come when the latter alternative should occur, we must withdraw from the church which we love and carry on the blessed gospel of a crucified and risen Saviour outside the bounds of a church which is no longer the church of our Lord and Master."

The Second Coming of Christ

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

I should be glad if you would explain just what you mean when you state you are neither Pre-millennial nor Post-millennial but A-millennial, giving Scriptural references.

E. E. B.

WE are not aware that we have ever stated, editorially, that we are A-millennial in our view of the Lord's return. What we have contended is that such differences as exist between those who look forward to the personal, visible return of Christ as the outstanding event of the future are such differences as may exist between brethren. While we do not regard these differences as unimportant, we do not think they are sufficiently important to be an occasion of dissension between Evangelicals. It is a serious mistake, it seems to us, to identify Fundamentalism with Pre-millennialism after the manner of many. In our judgment A-millennialist, Pre-millennialists and Post-millennialists should stand together as over against that encroaching Modernism that knows nothing of a supernatural redemption through the expiatory death of the God-man and cherishes no hope of His return. If we have had more to say about the A-millennial view than about the other, that finds its explanation in the fact that many—why or how we do not know—seem to take for granted that all believers in the "Blessed Hope" are either Pre-millennialists or Post-millennialists.

We have been somewhat surprised to learn that there are even Presbyterians who apparently look upon the A-millennial view as a new and strange doctrine, despite the fact that it is the view taught in the Westminster Standards. We do not mean to imply that all true Presbyterians are A-millennialists because we think that one can subscribe to the "system of doctrine" set forth in the Standards while being a Pre- or a Post-millennialist. If, however, subscribing to the Standards meant subscribing to each and all its individual doctrines none but A-millennialists would be

able to subscribe. The term may be relatively recent but the view itself is so little recent that Professor Louis Berkhof would seem to be on solid historical grounds when in his recent "Reformed Dogmatics" he writes: "The A-millennial view is older than either one of the others in the Christian world; has always been the view most widely accepted, is the only view that is expressed or implied in the great historical creeds, and has always been the prevalent view in Reformed circles" (Vol. 2, p.326).

The term "a-millennial" is self-explanatory if it be remembered that the "a" is purely privative. The A-millennial view, then, finds no place for a millennium either before or after the return of our Lord. The A-millennialist agrees with the Pre-millennialists that our Lord's return may be relatively near, but as against the Pre-millennialists holds that the return of our Lord will be followed immediately by the general resurrection and the general judgment and the end of the world. The A-millennialist agrees with the Post-millennialist that there is no Scriptural warrant for the series of notions associated with the word "Rapture" and the phrase "the visible, personal reign of Christ on earth" (as used by the Pre-millennialists) but as against the Post-millennialists holds that there is no Scriptural warrant for the notion that there is to be a golden age on earth preceding our Lord's return. The A-millennialist holds in effect that the parable of the tares (Matt. 13:24-30) supplies the clue to the true philosophy of history. The tares and the wheat are to grow together until the end, but the time of that end no man knoweth.

The A-millennialist holds with Herman Bavinck that "the idea of a millennium stands in direct opposition to the description of the future which runs through the whole of the New Testament" (Philosophy of Revelation, p. 313). In support of his view, therefore, he attempts to show first of all that there is no Scriptural warrant for believing in a millennium either preceding or following Christ's. This means, of course, that he holds that Rev. 20:1-6 when rightly interpreted affords no warrant for the millennial notion. He attempts to show in the second place, as against the Post-millennialists, that the notion of a millennium preceding our Lord's return is contradicted by the picture of the end of the age given in Scriptures. They cite such passages as Matt. 24:6-14; Luke 18:8; Luke 21:25-28; 2 Thess. 2:3-12; 2 Peter 3 and 2 Tim. 3. He attempts to show in the third place, as against the Pre-millennialists, that, according to the Scriptures, the second coming of Christ, the general resurrection and the general judgment are concomitant events that are immediately followed by the eternal state. They cite such passages as Matt. 13:37-43, 47-50; Matt. 24:29-31; Matt. 25:31-46; John 5:25-29; I Cor. 15:22-26 and 2 Thess. 1:7-10.

Does it Make any Difference What One Believes?

Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

Recently I heard a modernist minister say, "it does not make any difference what you believe, it is all in the life" and then he quoted the verse, "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure." Please tell me what you think of this statement together with the meaning of the verse quoted.

Mrs. S. S. W.

IN our judgment the statement, constantly on the lips of the modernists, that "Christianity is life not doctrine" is false and misleading. We recognize as fully as any, we trust, that Christianity is a life and that orthodoxy of belief is of value only as it issues in Christian life. It does not follow, however, that doctrinal indifferentism is justifiable; and that because the Christian life is a fruit that grows only on the tree known as Christian doctrine. We might as well suppose we can have apples without apple trees as suppose we can have the Christian life apart from the Christian doctrines. We do not indeed maintain that the doctrines have any power to produce life apart from the operations of the Holy Spirit but, ordinarily at least, the Holy Spirit operates only in connection with Christian doctrines. We can have the doctrines without the life. It does not follow, however, that we can have the life without at least some belief in the Christian doctrines. As a matter of fact, according to both Christ and His apostles, Christianity is both life and doctrine—with the life the expression of the doctrine rather than the doctrine the expression of the life. It may be added that the statement of this modernist minister flatly contradicts the Standards of the Presbyterian Church since they declare "that truth is in order to goodness . . . and that no opinion can be either more pernicious or more absurd than that which bring truth and falsehood upon a level and which represents it as of no consequence what a man's opinions are . . . there is an inseparable connection between faith and practice, truth and duty."

The verse cited, rightly interpreted, does not support the contention of this modernist minister. In order to rightly understand this text it is imperative that we note that it is addressed to Christians and to Christians alone—in the words of Paul to "the saints in Christ Jesus at Philippi," "my beloved, even as ye have always believed . . . work out your own salvation with fear and trembling."

What is meant is that as Christians we should work out our salvation, not in the sense of earning it but in the sense of realizing what is involved in it. We obtain full and immediate salvation the moment we put

our trust in Jesus Christ but the process by which enter into a personal realization and experience of that salvation may be a long and difficult one. As Christians we are somewhat like a man who owns a farm under whose surface lies an inexhaustible supply of gold. We own the farm but we have little appreciation of its value or enjoyment of its riches. And so by faith we have full and immediate salvation in Christ but may have little appreciation of its value and so need to be exhorted to work it out in the sense of entering into a conscious appreciation of and enjoyment of what we possess in Christ. It is to mislead the non-Christian at a vital point to tell him that he can work out his salvation in the sense of earning or procuring it. The most fatal of all heresies is the heresy that man can save himself. Either he must look to Christ for salvation or he is a lost and dying sinner. Even in the process of working out our salvation, in the sense indicated, we are dependent on God. Here God and man cooperate. No progress except in dependence on God, but also no progress without effort on our part. Only as God works within us both the willing and the doing can we work out our salvation even in the sense of realizing what it involves.

But while it is imperative that we note that this text affords no warrant whatever for the notion that anyone can work out his salvation in the sense of earning it as a reward, this should not be pressed so far as to deny that the principle of reward has any place in the Christian scheme of things. In full harmony with the thought expressed in the text, "By grace have ye been saved by grace; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works that no man should glory," we are taught that we are rewarded, not on account of but in accordance with our good works (see I Cor. 3:8; 2 Cor. 5:10; Gal. 6:5-10 and 2 Tim. 4:8). It would hardly be inaccurate to say that as a matter of grace, pure and simple, we receive general admission tickets to the kingdom of God but that the sort of reserved seats we receive depends on our works. We cannot save ourselves. Christ and Christ alone can save us. There is to be no dead level of uniformity in heaven, however, any more than there is a dead level of uniformity on earth. But while nothing that we are and nothing that we do enter in the slightest measure into the ground of our salvation, they have an important bearing on the relative positions that we will occupy among the redeemed.

But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed.

All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all. (Isaiah 53: 5, 6.)

Current Views and Voices

Chaos as Camouflage

WM. T. ELLIS in *The Cincinnati Enquirer*

ALMOST every day's mail brings to this desk clever letters and circulars which cloak moving appeals for money in the guise of remedies for the depression.

Here is one from the Federal Council of Churches, personally addressed, as if an individual communication from my friend, the president, to me. It begins:

"As a third difficult winter approaches, our people face an acute need for food, clothing and employment."

The second paragraph declares that "The Federal Council of Churches has been called upon to mobilize the local churches of the country to carry out the program of President Hoover's Committee on Unemployment Relief."

Such words compel attention. They raise the hope that the Federal Council intends to do something for unemployment relief, instead of merely issuing "deliverances."

But as I read on, I find that the real purport of the letter is a plea for money to maintain the Federal Council itself. It needs \$65,000 at once to make up its regular budget.

In other words, this big, expensive organization, which gets its funds regularly from some of the denominations, and from a significant group of very rich men, is riding on the shoulders of the unfortunate men out of work to fill its own treasury.

That letter arouses feelings of unchristian resentment in the breast of the man who is straining every nerve to help his fellow men in this emergency. The hand is the hand of Esau, but the voice is the voice of Jacob.

This business of camouflaging organization and institutional and commercial appeals in the rags of the present chaos needs to be rebuked. There is only one paramount public duty at the moment, and that is to relieve, in direct, brotherly and professional fashion, the needs of the unemployed.

Practical Problems of a Humanist Minister Who Faces Dangers to Church and Himself

GORDON KENT in *The Christian Register*
(Unitarian)

THE humanist trend of our liberal churches is not only tentative and slow, it is disputed and beset with danger.

The ministers usually lead the way, naturally, and carry the responsibility. Of the congregation, some rush forward, some move steadily on, some lag behind and some drop out. This situation is full of danger to the minister's career and to the stability of the society. It is required that the change should be evolutionary by growth, and not revolutionary by shock. It is to the best interests of all concerned that the transition, though necessary, be made as painless as possible.

It is to a minister's credit that he is uncompromising, but his worth may well be questioned if he has wrecked the church committed to his charge.

To patch the old garment of traditional religion with humanist sermons is risky. The rent is made worse. There is a glaring discrepancy between the religion that is proclaimed and the religion that is practiced in prayer and sung in the hymns. The new cloth must be made into a whole new garment. Old shoes are easiest to the feet, and old clothes are comfortable to the point of luxury, and it becomes a question whether many will wear the new garment. Everything hangs upon that "will" or "won't."

If the minister had to do only with those who have found the old garment worn and threadbare and have thrown it away to go religiously naked his problem would be different. To persuade those who are warm and comfortable to doff the old and on with the new is a delicate task, one to test both his patience and his skill.

That it may appeal to the bulk of the conservatives the new garment must resemble the old in as many ways as possible. The material is fresh from the loom of thought. In design and color, pattern and style it must not look too strange. If it takes two or three seasons for staid people to adopt new fashions in dress how long will it take them to accept and enjoy a new fashion in religion? And the general run of an old-established society is staid. So many people have graduated from church. The element that is left is apt to be "steadfast, immovable."

This is not to say that a bold bid for humanist support, a complete break with tradition in both form and substance, may not be successful. It sometimes is. But it takes an exceptionally strong man to make it, and a wide field from which to draw. In a small parish such an attempt would almost certainly be doomed to failure. It is likely to incur heavy losses any-

where. The public safety requires that instead of swimming the ford we bridge the river.

As a matter of policy, then, the humanist minister should keep close to the accepted order of service. Innovations in externals seem to excite more resentment than changes of emphasis in teaching. To omit the prayer is more annoying to the congregation than to change its terms from petition to meditation or aspiration or affirmation. To do away with the responsive reading is to create a sense of privation that will be borne with less grace than the use of a responsive reading compiled from new sources. Indeed the latter may be a decided gain, and be more stimulating and agreeable than the Psalter with its archaic language and more archaic ideology. Many old hymns may be used by the discreet omission of some stanzas, and many more by such changes as were found advisable before they found their places in the present liberal hymn books.

The humanist sermon is an accomplished thing, done by scores, perhaps hundreds, every Sunday. It may be done brashly or it may be shaped by the same policy of the public safety and without sacrifice of the humanist vision and message. It can follow the pattern of the Sermon on the Mount. If it is both instructive and inspiring—forceful delivery being taken for granted—it will make its own way with any liberal congregation. Few are the congregations among liberal churches that watch their minister's utterances for indications of heresy. If he is giving food for mind and spirit, help for daily life in this present world, he will meet with appreciation and response. The brotherhood of man has always been recognized as a primary Christian objective. It is one of the fundamentals. It is orthodox doctrine. To stress it in a tactful way will not arouse antagonism and challenge. Spiritualists will complain that nothing is said of the spirit world above this, others that there is no promise made that they will meet their "mother in heaven," and the Brother Lawrence mystics will say that nothing is said about the practice of the presence of God, but they will find scant sympathy among the general in a congregation that feels it is receiving the bread of life. If they feel they are not supported they will subside for they will feel that it is the congregation they are opposing, and not merely the minister.

As the humanist minister may make allies of the traditional church usage and of the Christian tradition of the brotherhood of

man, he may also avail himself of another strong tradition. Biblical language and material. Liberal churches are fed from the ranks of orthodoxy. Many of the people in a liberal church have the background of some narrower church. Nearly always they have a lingering sense of the validity and authority of the Bible. To these people one may commend his message by freely using Bible texts, and Bible terms. It is surely no detriment to a humanist minister to have been steeped in the Scriptures from his youth up. His vocabulary will gain richness, dignity and force if, in good taste, his preaching is flavored with this old speech. His power to prevail with the many is greatly increased.

Illustrations also may be drawn with advantage from the Old and New Testaments. One should not neglect an authority which is old, recognized, and unquestioned. There is much support in the prophets and in the gospels of which the humanist minister should avail himself to the uttermost. On the affirmative side the validity of humanism is unshakable even on a Scriptural basis. He should not, by an exclusive appeal to modern science and modern authorities, give the impression that he is come to break down all old monuments and remove all the ancient landmarks in favor of some new thing. His mission is not to alienate but to lead. He is come not to destroy but to fulfil.

The church that follows its minister in supporting a humanistic type of religion is doing its part to save an age for religion that was in danger of lapsing from it. It makes religious development continuous and not violent. In saving others it saves itself.

Those who assume the responsibility of leadership cannot avoid difficulty and risk. The greatest danger is not persecution from without but rebellion within the ranks of their own following. It was the children of Israel themselves that would have stoned Moses. What can be done to minimize antagonism and disarm opposition? Compromise is futile. Pretence that no traditions are abrogated is false. The law and the prophets must be brought to the support of the gospel, but subordinate to it. The new dispensation must be proclaimed, but with the wisdom of the serpent and the harmlessness of the dove.

(Subterfuge or dishonesty on the part of a minister in the Unitarian Church is evidently, according to the article above, a virtue rather than a vice. Unfortunately this same method is upheld and preached by liberals in Presbyterian pulpits.—Ed.)

Ministerial Changes

Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

Calls

George B. Gensemer, Sayre, Pa. to Clarendon Church, Somerville, Mass.;
Fred F. Schell, Phoenix, Ariz. to Erin Church, Bearden, Tenn.;
E. Frank White, to Erwin, Tenn.;
Eugene A. Hessel, to Fulton Cal.;
T. J. Miles, D.D., Vonore, Tenn. to Toqua, Tenn.;
E. R. Armstrong, to Kouts, Ind.;
Amos B. Shepard, Coldwater, Kans. to Medicine Lodge, Kans.;
Otho Clark, to Narka-Mahaska, Kans.;
J. Wood Parker, to Electra, Tex.

Calls Accepted

H. P. Alexander, Washington, Kans. to Miltonvale, Kans.;
W. E. Baskerville, Seattle, Wash. to First Congregational Church, Sidney, Mont.;
Charles Bridges, Valley, Neb. to Middletown, Ia.;
Wm. A. Crawford, Bloomfield, N. J. to Monticello, N. Y.;
T. C. Duncan, Bandon, Ore., as Stated Supply, North Bend Church, Marshfield, Ore.;
James M. Hamilton, D.D., Tarkio, Mo. to Fowler, Cal.;
Donald J. Henry, Myton, Utah, as Stated Supply, Bandon-Port Orford-Langloisfield, Ore.;
D. Art Ray, Appleton City, Mo. to Early, Ia.;
H. L. Weir, Berea, Ky., as Stated Supply, Malin, Ore.;
E. B. Whitney, Clyde, Kans. to Washington, Kans.;
J. C. Whitsett, Malin, Ore., as Stated Supply, Brownsville, Ore.;
Roy H. Wollam, Trinity Church, Tucson, Ariz. to Pomona, Cal.;
H. G. Mathis, D.D., Iola, Kans. to Great Bend, Kans.;
Thomas Lambert, Oil City, Pa. to Bakerstown, Pa.;
Henry D. Smith, to Cape Vincent, N. Y.;
Owen J. Roberts, Ph.D., D.D., to Waddington, N. Y.;
Rowell Park Johnson, to First Church, Yeadon, Pa.;
H. H. Rayburn, Medicine Lodge, Kans. to Derby, Kans.;
John P. Clelland, to Eastlake Church, Wilmington, Del.

Resignations

Edwin F. Rippey, D.D., Westminster Church, Minneapolis, Minn.;
O. N. Roler, Harlan, Ky.;
Fred F. Schell, Phoenix, Ore.;
Robert J. Johnston, Ph.D., Granite, Mt. Parian and Randallstown, Md.;
David S. Graham, West Sunbury, Pa.;
Max G. Cook, Wallowa and Lostine, Ore.;
E. L. McIlvaine, D.D., First Church, Meadville, Pa.;
John Waite, Jackson Center, Pa.;
C. B. Driver, Jesup, Ia.;
R. L. Biddle, Mt. Pisgah, Pa.;
H. O. Gibson, Castle Shannon, Pa.;
William A. Atkinson, Rochester, Pa.;
Paul L. Rider, South Church, Rochester, N. Y.;
James M. Burdge, Grace Church, Peoria, Ill.;
Martin Johnson, Bruno, Minn.;
J. Mark Irwin, Delta, Colo.;
J. Herbert Cruickshank, Hawley Memorial Church, Blue Ridge Summit, Pa.;
Lane C. Findley, Spencer Memorial Church, Lemmon, S. D.;
J. R. Jones, Scottsville, Kans.

Changed Addresses

Edwin N. Kline, D.D., 1614 W. 15th St., Erie, Pa.;
J. B. Oakley, Plano, Tex.;
W. B. McCrory, Artesia, N. M.;
Hugh B. Sutherland, 533 4th St., Eureka, Cal.;
L. H. Shingledecker, Morrill, Neb.;
William Burgess, Russell, Ky.;
A. L. Whitfield, Redfield, Ia.;
George H. Whiteman, 1118 5th St., Napa, Cal.;
Hugh S. Claypool, 2125 N. Jefferson St., Springfield, Mo.;
Joseph A. Johnston, 80 N. Allen St., Albany, N. Y.;
J. H. Glanville, Salem, Mo.

Ordinations

Martyn D. Keeler, Yonkers, N. Y., May 13.

Installations

Carroll S. Whitehouse, Stated Supply, Honey Creek and California, Ia.;
Ernest E. Loft, First Church, Harriman, Tenn., April 28;
Paul M. Meikle, Olivet Church, Baltimore, Md., May 3;
Robert C. Patterson, Anna, Ill., April 28;
Chester Carroll Carnahan, Fredonia, Kans., April 29;
John R. Fraser, Wapello, Ia., April 11;
Joseph W. Gray, Winfield, Ia., April 24;
J. Walker St. Clair, Utica and Sugar Cork, Pa. April 29;
J. H. Oonickshank, North Warren, Pa., April 26;
N. V. Andrews, First Church, Vincennes, Ind., April 28;
Harold G. Morehouse, Community Church, Garberville, Cal., April 14;
Rene Aeschlinvan, Troy, Ill.;
John S. MacDonald, D.D., First Church, Syracuse, N. Y.;
Theron Alexander, Park City Church, Knoxville, Tenn.;
J. A. McGaughey, Coleraine and Bovey, Minn., April 26;
William J. Willis, Nevada, Mo., April 26;
John N. Lukens, First Church, Portsmouth, O., April 29;
August H. Wessells, Mt. Leigh-Eckmansville, O., May 6;
Wistar R. Smith, First Church, El Paso, Tex., April 24.

Deaths

John H. Bone, Burkburnett, Tex., Mar. 16;
George H. Bonsall, Sebring, Fla., Mar. 13;
Alexander H. Manly, Decatur, Ala., Mar. 15;
Elmer E. McVicker, Bandon, Ore., Aug. 11;
Claude B. Porter, Medford, Ore., Jan. 21;
James H. Salsbury, D.D., Woodrider, Neb., Mar. 22;
Harry E. Vail, Ironton, O.;
William McAfee Wilson, Walla Walla, Wash., June 23;
William B. Worrell, M.D., Blair, Ill., Mar. 5;
Jacob E. Snyder, North Bend, Ore., Aug. 22;
Howard S. Brumbaugh, Murray, Ky., Mar. 22;
W. Francis Irwin, D.D., LL.D., Irvington, N. Y., April 22;
Frank J. Nash, North East, Pa., Mar. 20.;
Joseph L. Weaver, Jr., Towanda, Pa., April 26;
D. Forest Williams, D.D., Oak Hill, O.

Presbyterian Church, U. S.

Calls Accepted

George Mauze, Kinston, N. C. to First Church, St. Joseph, Mo.;
S. I. Nash, Gallatin, Tenn. to Somerville, Tenn.;
Wade H. Harrell, Avondale Church, Birmingham, Ala. to First Church, Port Gibson, Miss.;
Norman Johnson, Blacksburg, Va. to Rocky Mount, N. C.;
A. H. Sargent, Liberty, Mo. to Lees Summit, Mo.;
H. L. Saunders, Lees Summit, Mo. to Festus, Mo.;
Geo. W. Diehl, D.D., to First Church, Corpus Christi, Tex.;
H. J. Dudley, Lynchburg, Va. to Kinston, N. C.;
E. D. Witherspoon, Winchester, Va. to Blacksburg and Roanoke Valley, Va.;
Bolling Hobson, Elkton, Va. to Massanuttan Cross Keys-Roads, Va.;
James R. Tolley, to Northumberland, Pa., (U. S. A.);
Harold F. Branch, to First Church, Tuscaloosa; J. B. Nelson, to Lavonia-Hartwell, Ga.;
A. F. Doty, N. Charlotte, N. C. to Willington, S. C.;
James R. Marshall, Appalachicola, Fla. to Chattanooga, Fla.;
W. E. Powell, Somerville, Tenn. to Eaton and Zion, Tenn.;
J. C. Bobb, to First Church, Hugo, Okla.

Resignations

W. T. Skinner, Mt. Olivet, Mt. Vernon, Spring Creek, Watertown Churches, Tenn.; James M. Robison, Wink, Tex.

Installations

Frank H. McElroy, LaFayette, Lebanon, Roanoke and New Harmony Churches, Ala.; C. A. Calcote, Aveleigh Church, Newberry, S. C.; C. H. Nabers, First Church, Greenville, S. C., May 1; Robert King, D.D., Johnson City, Tenn.; M. J. Murray, Banner Elk, N. C.; Robert L. Bell, D.D., Tuskegee, Ala., April 3.

Deaths

W. H. Hoover, Sikeston, Mo., Mar. 21; N. H. McCain, Patosi, Mo., Mar. 23; C. E. Sullivan, D.D., Columbia, S. C.

Presbyterian Church in Canada

Calls

W. E. Davies, Cardigan, P. E. I. to St. Luke's, Finch, Ont.; R. J. Kirkland, to St. Columba, Kirk Hill, Ont., April 7; G. C. Little, Guelph, Ont. to Alhston and Angus, Ont.; Wm. Patterson, Vancouver, B. C. to Bluevale and Eadies, Ont.

Calls Accepted

Geoffrey D. Johnstone, Belfast, Ireland to Central Church, Brantford, Ont.

Resignations

M. J. Macpherson, Woodlands, Farrans Point and Aultsville, Ont.; Roderick G. MacBeth, D.D., LL.D., St. Paul's, Vancouver, B. C.; James McIlroy, Carmel Church, Hensall, Ont.; P. M. Colquhoun, Ashfield, Ont.

Inductions

T. DeCourcy Rayner, St. Andrew's Church, Lachins; Douglas C. Hill, Roslin, Fuller, and Foxboro, Ont., Mar. 31; W. Gordon MacLean, B.D., First Church, Winnipeg, Man., Mar. 18; James H. Moore, Wallacestown and West Lorne, Ont., Mar. 22; R. Bertram Nelles, St. Peter's, Madoc, Ont., March 23; John R. Waldie, Burns Church, Kilmartin, Ont., April 14; W. E. Davies, Finch and Chrysler, April 14; L. Beaton, Havelock, Ont., April 29.

Deaths

W. K. Thompson, Edmonton, Alta., Feb. 5.

Reformed Church in America

Calls

A. Karreman, Lansing Ill. to Trinity Church, Orange City, Ia.; E. Furdá, Harrison S. D. to Randolph, Wis.; Richard Oudershus, Holland, Mich. to Milwaukee, Wis.

Resignations

Martin H. Zual, Second Church, Newtown, N. Y.

Installations

F. W. A. Sawitzky, Canarsie, N. Y., Mar. 18; A. H. Voerman, Greenwich, N. Y.; Bernie Mulder, Bethel Church, Grand Rapids, Mich., Mar. 10.

Death

Christopher Bauer, Brooklyn, N. Y., April 12.

United Presbyterian

Calls

A. W. Wishart, Latrobe, Pa. to Second Church, Washington, Pa.; Peter McCormack, to 3rd Church, Spokane, Wash.; S. M. McConnell, to Washburn, Ill.; A. J. Visser, to Albie, Ia.

Calls Accepted

R. H. Gordon, Washtucua, Washington, to Riverside, Cal.; H. A. Bruder, to Vandergrift, Pa.

Resignations

Robert A. Campbell, Glen Echo Church, Columbus, O.

Installations

Harvey T. McClellan, Bovina Center, N. Y., Mar. 15.

Reformed Church, U. S.

Calls Accepted

W. M. Billman, to Harrisburg, Pa.; C. H. Kichline, to Quarryville, Pa.; Albert Klinger, Saegerstown, Pa.; F. W. Knatz, Trinity Church, Detroit, Mich. to Emanuel Church, Milwaukee, Wis.

Resignations

Harry A. Welker, First Church, Burlington, N. C.;

B. H. Holtkamp, St. Paul's Church, Meadville, Pa.; J. Stanley Richards, Dewey Avenue Church, Rochester, N. Y.; William E. Huber, Calvary Church, Crestlin, O.

Changed Addresses

D. G. Glass, 327 N. Lime St., Lancaster, Pa.; A. W. Barley, R.F.D., Woodstock, Va.

Installations

W. H. Bollman, Lancaster, Pa., April 17.

Deaths

B. M. Meyer, Lancaster, Pa.; H. L. Hart, Sugar Grove, O.

Christian Reformed

Calls

C. H. Bode, Mountain Lake, Minn. to Monroe Church, Aplington, Ia.; M. J. Vanderwerp, Peoria, Ia. to Putphen, Mich. and Prinsburg, Minn.

News of the Church

The Overtures

THE votes on overtures, up to May 12, were as follows:

	Yes	No	No Action
A	139	116	10
B	35	223	4
C	140	113	10
D	115	131	13
E	135	89	20

An affirmative vote of 146 Presbyteries is necessary to the adoption of any overture.

Great Issue Raised by Action of Presbytery of Los Angeles

ON April 27, the Joint Committee of Los Angeles, in regular session, took action regarding religious work among the students of the University of California at Los Angeles which will probably become a widely known and bitterly contested case in Synod and General Assembly. The issue raised by the action of the Presbytery is, in brief, whether student work in colleges must be confined to those who are officially appointed as "Student Pastors" and who are willing to join with other faiths—including the Roman Catholic and the Unitarian—in carrying on a "Religious Conference." The situation was aggravated by the fact that Dr. Wm. L. Young, a secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Christian Education was quoted as writing and wiring to the west urging the termination of an unofficial conservative work among students conducted by the Rev. Milo F. Jamison, which had been begun years before the appointment of a student pastor and which had been a signal success. Although he wrote that "I have never met Mr. Jamison"

he wired that he viewed his work among students "with keen regret and alarm." This was, he explained, because "the Board of Christian Education strongly endorses Presbyterian participation in religious conference at U.C.L.A."

The University Bible Club movement was launched in November 1927 on the old Vermont Avenue Campus of the University of California at Los Angeles. When the location of the campus was changed to Westwood, the student work naturally went with it. The movement was the outgrowth of several years of intensive preparatory work with college and university young people. It is an independent, interdenominational work engaged in presenting an uncompromising, avowedly conservative christian testimony in various school centers. It is an evangelical and evangelistic effort to win young people to Christ and to hold them true to the old time faith.

After intensive investigation and careful experimentation, the Bible Clubs have developed a new method of approach to the whole problem of Christian activity in schools and colleges. The movement is not a "drive" or a campaign which touches the student once and then leaves him, but is a permanent method of developing the spiritual life of each young person, helping him to meet the insidious temptations and intellectual problems of campus life. The work is divided into seven departments: (1) *Education*, a new devotional Bible study course; (2) *Extension* a new method of personal evangelism in which students not Christians are brought to the Word of God as to a four week's personal laboratory study, having conferences each week with a Christian fellow-student who understands the plan, making possible an adequate approach

to the question of acceptance of Christ as Saviour; (3) *Mobilization*, a new type membership and club plan; (4) *Expression*, student-conducted meetings for expression and testimony; (5) *Inspiration*, monthly conferences in each school center; (6) *Information*, a new circulating library and bulletin service; (7) *Recreation*, an adequate, consistently christian social fellowship program. The work has grown steadily and is now being conducted in educational centers on the Pacific Coast from Washington to Southern California. The Rev. Milo F. Jamison, a graduate of Princeton Seminary before its "reorganization" is the directing genius of the movement. The field secretary is the Rev. S. H. Sutherland, also a graduate of the old Princeton, who resigned Grace Presbyterian Church in Los Angeles in order to devote his unusual talent for student work to this cause.

In 1926 the Hollywood Presbyterian Church began a movement to provide a church for the University of California at Los Angeles when it should be moved to the new campus at Westwood. The Hollywood Church, internationally known for its vigorous conservatism, organized a "Westwood Committee" of which Mr. Jamison, then an assistant pastor in that church, was chairman. The plan was made to build a church building on a lot purchased by the Hollywood Church. On September 22, 1926, the Presbytery voted confidence in this plan. Later in time the work done by Mr. Jamison had borne such fruit that from a beginning at zero a congregation was organized by him which asked to be received as a church of the Presbytery and which also called Mr. Jamison as minister with a guarantee of a stipend of \$2400 per year.

In the meantime, a movement had been begun to have a "Student Pastor," supported by the Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, at the campus. In October, 1930, the appointment was made. The student pastor at U.C.L.A. since that time is the Rev. Glenn W. Moore, a graduate of San Francisco Theological Seminary. Mr. Moore has cooperated and continues to cooperate with the "University Religious Conference" which is a kind of religious headquarters building with rooms for "pastors" of various faiths. On the outside of the building is the list, in large letters, of cooperating denominations. The last two listed are:

PRESBYTERIAN
UNITARIAN.

Mr. Jamison evidently never felt able to cooperate with this "Conference" but quietly went about his own work. While the slogan of the "Conference" is "Cooperation without Compromise" yet in the opinion of many, it is impossible to cooperate in it without compromise, for its code tacitly and implicitly bans proselyting. Should a student come in to the Presbyterian pastor, for example, the first step should be to find

his religious affiliation. Should he say that he had Roman Catholic, or Unitarian connections, the pastor could not honorably seek to win him to the Reformed Faith, but would have to direct him down the hall. It is also reported that the emphasis in the student work at the "Conference" is mostly upon war and peace, international relations, etc., etc.

Although Mr. Jamison and his Bible Clubs made no effort to try to keep the campus closed to other student work, and did not object to its establishment, yet from the beginning the sponsors of the "official" work viewed the work of the "Bible Clubs, Inc." with disfavor. Some declare that this was because of the great success of the Bible Clubs, and the comparatively small interest aroused in the "official" work.

The opportunity of those who object to the deeply spiritual and evangelical work being done by the Bible Clubs came when it was apparent that the new congregation, at Westwood would soon call Mr. Jamison as pastor. A resolution was passed at the meeting of Los Angeles Presbytery on January 26, 1932 naming a committee "to determine relationship between the Presbyterian persons and agencies working at the University of California at Los Angeles." The committee named soon evidenced that it was about as friendly to Mr. Jamison as would be a Republican or Democratic committee to the Administration if the other party were in power. Its written report as offered at the April meeting of Presbytery was obviously full of bias, and replete with ignorance of Presbyterian law.

After the presentation of the report of this *ex parte* committee, with its recommendations, heated debate ensued. The Modernist-Indifferentist coalition which is so opposed to Mr. Jamison's work fought unceasingly and bitterly to carry its point. This group, sometimes called the "Church Union Group" indulged in repeated personal reflections and insinuations unrebutted by the Moderator, and then finding itself a majority, trampled rough shod over the constitution, rules and usage of the Presbyterian Church.

The Presbytery voted to enroll the University Presbyterian Church at Westwood, and then, after having secured jurisdiction over it, refused to put the call in Mr. Jamison's hands. It adopted the following motions by various votes, the first motion carrying by 116-53.

"1. Moved that the Presbytery of Los Angeles direct all or any of its members or persons under its jurisdiction now conducting Bible classes, religious services or activities of any kind at U.C.L.A. not authorized and directed by our University Pastor and the Committee of Christian Education of the Presbytery representing the Board of Christian Education, to withdraw themselves from all such activities, as Presbyterian ministers or workers, this direction and order to take effect on or be-

fore close of the present semester of the University."

"2. It is moved by the Committee and its Chairman as a Presbyter, when a call for the pastoral services of the Rev. Milo F. Jamison be presented by the church newly organized at Westwood, that Presbytery place it in the hands of the Stated Clerk as custodian of the Presbytery indefinitely without any other action whatever, and that the pulpit of this church be placed immediately in the hands of the Presbytery's Committee on Vacancy and Supply."

"3. Moved, that whenever in the Westwood Community or elsewhere the organization of a new Presbyterian Church is desired by a group of people, the approach to the Presbytery for such proposed organization shall be through Presbytery's Board of Church Extension, and that Presbytery will consider such a proposition only upon the recommendation of said Board of Church Extension."

During the debate, the attitude of the Board of Christian Education was represented by the Committee on Work at U.C.L.A. as follows:

"Dr. William Lindsay Young gives the position of the Board of Education as follows:

"I have just sent you a telegram worded as follows:

"The Board of Christian Education strongly endorses Presbyterian participation in religious conference at U.C.L.A. Therefore I view with keen regret and alarm Mr. Jamison's work among students. In my judgment it should be terminated by Presbytery. Letter follows."

"It is not easy for me to send this kind of telegram in view of the fact that I have never met Mr. Jamison. However, I am quite convinced that something must be done to clarify the situation at Los Angeles. At present the department of University Work of our Board looks upon the Rev. Glenn Moore as the one officially responsible for work among Presbyterian young people at the University. I trust that my motive in writing you thus will not be misconstrued, but I am anxious that our work in Los Angeles be in line with the national policy of our Board in its work with students."

This representation of the attitude of the Board seemed to have a profound effect in convincing doubtful members that the Board wished the Bible Clubs work terminated. However, it has since come to light that the letter of Dr. Young was given to the Presbytery only in a garbled and mutilated form. The omission was of such a character, in the opinion of Dr. Young himself, as to give a false impression of his attitude. Two sentences were omitted from the letter of Dr. Young in the report as given to Presbytery, with no indication of such omission. After the sentence ending "at the University" and before the sentence beginning "I trust that my motive . . .," Dr. Young

actually wrote: "We shall have an anomalous situation if we allow two Presbyterian clergymen to run what might soon become competitive programs. If, in the judgment of Presbytery, there is room for two men to work among the students, and if in its judgment Mr. Jamison is rendering a service that ought to be continued, then my suggestion would be that the work be unified under Mr. Moore." Dr. Young claims that these words made it clear that he meant that jurisdiction belonged to the Presbytery, and that he feels the committee did not give a fair statement of his views. Dr. Young now regrets, he has declared, that his telegram was so worded as to give an erroneous impression that the Board was trying to put pressure on the Presbytery. It simply represented his opinion given in response to a telegraphic request from Glenn Moore himself. In a later letter to Dr. G. A. Briegleb of Los Angeles, who has prepared a complaint to the Synod of California concerning the case, Dr. Young has said:

"The content of the report you have sent me, and the statement on page 23 of The Presbyterian of May 5th, indicates clearly that the situation in the Presbytery has developed an issue which I greatly regret but which belongs entirely to Presbytery. It has seemed to me that from the beginning the problem was purely a matter of procedure consistent with the laws of our church. Please note

"First, that it is for the Presbytery to determine whether two men are needed on the campus of U.C.L.A. to minister to the religious needs of our young people.

"Second, that it is for Presbytery to pass upon the qualifications of an additional man if one is necessary.

"Third, that Presbytery should see that a unified program is developed on the campus.

"Please write me again if I have not given adequate, or satisfactory, reply to your letter."

Cordially yours,

WLY:h

Wm. Lindsay Young

The future action of the Presbytery of Los Angeles and the Synod of California will be watched with interest. It is the hope of many that action will be taken to demonstrate clearly that college campuses are not to be closed to non-"official," evangelical movements, contrary to the American tradition and the spirit of Presbyterianism.

Cayuga Presbytery Overtures Asking New Form of Creed Subscription

THE Presbytery of Cayuga, at its April meeting overtured the next General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. asking as follows:

"That in place of questions 1 and 2, in Section IV of Chapter XIII of the Form of Government, and of questions 1 and 2 in Section VII of Chapter XIV, and of ques-

tions 1 and 2 in Section XII of Chapter XV, there be submitted the following questions to ministers, elders and deacons for ordination:

"1. Do you believe in one God—Father, Son and Holy Spirit; and do you now confess anew the Lord Jesus Christ as your Saviour and Lord?"

"2. Do you believe the Word of God, which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, to be the supreme rule of faith and life?"

"3. Do you believe the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith as contained in the Confession of Faith of this Church?"

This overture may cause vigorous debate at the forthcoming Assembly.

Westminster Seminary Commencement

THE third annual commencement exercises of Westminster Theological Seminary, were held in Witherspoon Hall, in Philadelphia, on May 10th at 8 P. M. A large throng gathered, bearing witness to the affection with which Westminster is regarded in the church. Friends and alumni gathered from North, South, East and West, representing many communities, states and provinces.

In the absence of the Rev. Frank H. Stevenson, D.D., the President of the Board of Trustees, the exercises were presided over by the Rev. H. H. McQuilkin, D.D., of Orange, New Jersey, a member of the Board.

The service was begun with the entrance of the student body in procession, singing the mighty strains of the hundredth Psalm in metre—

All people that on earth do dwell,
Sing to the Lord with cheerful voice,
Him serve with fear, His praise forth tell,
Come ye before Him and rejoice.

As the entrants arrived at their places at the conclusion of the Psalm, the Psalm merged into the long metre Doxology, to the same old tune.

The invocation was offered by the Rev. H. P. Melcher, minister of the Cliveden Presbyterian Church, Germantown, Philadelphia. Then followed the singing of the old hymn of William Cowper,

There is a fountain filled with blood,
Drawn from Emmanuel's veins,
And sinners, plunged beneath that flood
Lose all their guilty stains.

Prayer was offered by the Rev. Addison B. Collins, D.D., pastor of the Logan Memorial Presbyterian Church of Audubon, N. J., and Moderator of the Synod of New Jersey.

The Commencement Address was then delivered by Dr. R. B. Kuiper, the President of Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Michigan. Dr. Kuiper made a masterly and eloquent presentation of an unusual theme: "The Popularity of Jesus."

Certificates and prizes were awarded as follows:

The Wm. Brenton Greene, Jr., prize in Systematic Theology and The Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield prize in Old Testament, both to Leslie W. Sloat, of Monticello, N. Y.

The Wm. Brenton Greene, Jr., prize in Apologetics to John Davies, Oostburg, Wisconsin.

The address to the graduating class was given by Dr. J. Gresham Machen.

The closing hymn was:

Thy life was given for me,
Thy blood, O Lord was shed
That I might ransomed be,
And quickened from the dead.
Thy life was given for me;
What have I given for Thee?

The Benediction was pronounced by the Rev. Robert S. Marsden, the president of the Westminster Seminary Alumni Association.

The Seminary awarded its certificates to the following members of the Senior Class:

John Paul Clelland, Grove City, Pa.;
Percy Bartimus Crawford, Los Angeles;
John Davies, Oostburg, Wisconsin;
Robert Henry Graham, East Orange, N. J.;
William Sturtevant Hawks, Endicott, N. Y.;

Claude Edgar Hayward, Hartland, N. B.;
Oscar Holkeboer, Holland, Mich.;
Newton Artin Kapp, Collingswood, N. J.;
Joseph Rankin MacDonald, Coatesville, Pa.;

Malcolm Ross MacKay, Halifax, N. S.;
Leon Monroe Maltby, Watertown, N. Y.;
George Walter Marston, Wheaton, Ill.;
Reginald Heber McIlwaine, Kochi, Japan;
Benjamin Franklin Moss, Jr., Ocean City, N. J.;

Leslie Winfield Sloat, Monticello, N. Y.

The graduate certificate of the Seminary was awarded to:

Robert McVey Campbell, Upper Darby, Pa.;

Goji Tanaka, Kochi, Japan;
Kelly Grier Tucker, Louisville, Ky.;
Jacob Van Bruggen, Chicago, Ill.

President Kuiper's address will be published in an early issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. Dr. Machen, in his brief address to the graduating class, pointed out the fact that the present class stood in a unique relation to the Seminary. Unlike the classes that preceded, it has spent the entire three years of its seminary course at Westminster; unlike the classes which in the Providence of God will follow it could say at graduation that it has witnessed the entire history of the Seminary's life. It was moreover the first class which had entered the Seminary without passing through Princeton; and it had shown clearly by its understanding of the great issue, and by its ringing testimony, that Westminster Seminary has a permanent place in the life of the Church.

Dr. Machen further spoke of the unsearchable riches of Christ as contrasted with the prevalent preaching of the day. The preaching heard in leading pulpits might seem to be rich and varied and brilliant if it were contrasted only with the wisdom of this world; but when contrasted with the marvelous riches of God's Word it seems to be but weak and beggarly after all. God has now sent physical poverty upon the world. We can not presume to penetrate within His counsels, and we should never indulge in glib and unfeeling explanations for the widespread suffering of these who long today for honest toil and have it not. Yet we may perhaps venture the thought that by revealing thus the transitoriness of human wealth and power God is calling men back unto Himself. The members of the graduating class, said Dr. Machen, are ministers of reconciliation. By their prayers and by their proclamation of the Gospel message, they should seek to bring a lost world, through the blood of Jesus, into peace with the living God.

The Reformation Fellowship

A PUBLIC "Preliminary meeting" was held on the evening of May 9th, in Hollond Memorial Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, of the Reformation Fellowship, the new organization of ministers and "laymen" that plan to seek the restoration of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches of America to their former condition of doctrinal purity and true Calvinistic living. The meeting was of an inspirational nature. The speakers were the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths and the Rev. John Clover Monsma.

A really stirring feature of the meeting was the signing of a covenant, somewhat after the manner of the old Scottish Covenants, by a considerable part of the audience. The Covenant expressed in terse and stately language the determination of the signers to be forever true to the principles of the Reformed faith and by the grace of God to uphold those principles without faltering or fainting, at any cost or sacrifice.

The Reformation Fellowship is about ready to launch out upon its highly significant career. A Preliminary Committee has been functioning for several weeks, preparing diligently and prayerfully for a thorough organization and extensive nationwide work. The following men compose the committee:

H. McAllister Griffiths, minister, Hollond Memorial Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia;

Edgar Frutchey, president and manager, Frutchey Silk Shop, Philadelphia;

D. T. Richman, accountant, Philadelphia;

Gordon H. Clark, Ph.D., Department of Philosophy, University of Pennsylvania;

Kendrick C. Hill, Assistant Postmaster, Trenton, N. J.;

John Clover Monsma, minister, Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

Anyone interested in the plans and work of the Fellowship can obtain information from Rev. J. C. Monsma, 313 South Broad Street, Philadelphia. He will be glad to hear from either men or women, in the United States and Canada.

Westminster Seminary Rallies

A MEETING was held in the interests of Westminster Seminary in the Presbyterian Church of the Covenant in Cincinnati on Thursday evening, April 28th. Rev. Frank R. Elder, D.D., pastor of the Church and a trustee of the Seminary, presided; addresses were made by Dr. J. Gresham Machen, Professor of New Testament, and by Rev. Edwin H. Rian, Field Representative; and the benediction was pronounced by Rev. Gerard H. Snell, Assistant Minister of the Church, who graduated from the Seminary in the class of 1931. Dr. Machen preached twice on the following Sunday, May 1st, spoke over Station WPCO on Monday afternoon, May 2nd, and then preached in the Church the same evening. These last two engagements were by way of substitution for Rev. John C. O'Hair, of the North Shore Church, Chicago, who was unavoidably prevented from being present on the first day of the meetings in connection with a "Rally for the Faith" which he conducted during the rest of the week.

On Friday evening, April 29th, there was a large gathering in the interests of the Seminary in the Memorial Presbyterian Church of St. Louis. The pastor, Rev. Russell Paynter, presided and addresses were delivered by Dr. Machen and Mr. Rian. A notable feature of the occasion was the presence of the president, a number of the professors, and perhaps a hundred or so of the students of Concordia Theological Seminary, of the "Missouri Synod." The hearty sympathy in which these Lutheran brethren stand with Westminster Seminary serves to show how utterly fallacious is the contention of those church unionists who seem to hold that Christian fellowship is possible only in connection with what Dr. Macartney once called the "ramshackle unity" of committees and boards. Concordia Seminary is perhaps the largest theological seminary in the United States. It has a magnificent campus and beautiful and splendidly equipped buildings, not far from the noble edifice of the Memorial Presbyterian Church, in which the Westminster rally was held. More important than this material equipment is the fact that Concordia stands for the Bible as the very Word of God. To show that the scholastic standards of the institution are high, it need only be observed that "a working knowledge of English, German, Latin, Greek and Hebrew" is required for entrance. When one contrasts such requirements with

the low standards of many "Liberal" institutions, one is inclined to question the widely prevalent view that scholarship is altogether on the side of the enemies of the Faith today.

On Friday, May 6th, another successful Westminster rally was held in the Broadway Presbyterian Church of New York, where for so many years Dr. Walter Duncan Buchanan, a trustee of the Seminary, has upheld the banner of the Cross under the very shadow of Columbia University, Union Seminary and the Riverside Church. A notable company was assembled, including Presbyterian ministers and laymen from neighboring cities, and including also prominent evangelical leaders from other ecclesiastical bodies. Dr. Buchanan presided, and the claims of the Seminary were presented, as at the Cincinnati and St. Louis rallies, by Dr. Machen and Mr. Rian. The response was generous, and the meeting served to cement yet further the bonds that unite the Seminary with congregations loyal to the Word of God.

All of these gatherings, with those that have been reported in previous issues of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, are serving to accomplish something more than the immediate support of the Seminary, pressing though that need unquestionably is. They are serving (especially when taken in connection with the other work of Mr. Rian) to build up a great host of friends for the Seminary, who stand with its faculty, trustees, students and alumni in warm Christian fellowship and who labor for it not only by their gifts but by their prayers. It is becoming increasingly evident that the Westminster Seminary movement is not a coldly academic affair, but springs from the heart of the people of God.

Report of Union Committee

ON April 27, the Joint Committee on Organic Union of the Presbyterian U. S. A. and United Presbyterian Churches adopted the following report:

"The Joint Committee on Organic Union, composed of the Department of Church Cooperation and Union of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and of the Committee on Presbyterian Unity of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, submits the accompanying "Plan of Union" to the General Assemblies of the two negotiating Churches assembled in the year 1932, in accordance with the instructions received from the 1931 General Assemblies of said Churches.

"The Joint Committee on Organic Union prepared and distributed in December, 1931, a pamphlet containing documents relating to the proposed "Plan of Union." Accompanying this pamphlet was the request that comments upon its contents should be forwarded to the Joint Committee not later

than March 1, 1932. The Joint Committee on Organic Union received more than 200 letters from individuals, judicatories, and organizations of various types, and had also at its disposal the discussions of the documents contained in said pamphlet which appeared in the religious press of the negotiating Churches. The "Plan of Union" herewith submitted has been drafted after careful and extended consideration of all the available suggestions.

"The Joint Committee on Organic Union would respectfully offer the following recommendations:

"1. It is the unanimous opinion of the Joint Committee on Organic Union that action by the General Assemblies of the negotiating Churches on the "Plan of Union" with the purpose of transmitting said "Plan of Union" to their constituent Presbyteries for action thereupon, should be postponed at least until the General Assemblies of 1933. This unanimous opinion is based upon the conviction that further time should be given to the constituencies of the negotiating Churches for the consideration of the many important issues involved.

"2. The Joint Committee suggests its continuance that it may receive the instructions of the 1932 General Assemblies of the negotiating Churches, and pending the presentation of a report by it to the 1933 General Assemblies, comments from all interested parties who may desire to express their views.

"3. The Joint Committee recommends that the "Plan of Union" as herewith submitted, with such further revision as may be deemed wise in the light of the instructions of the 1932 General Assemblies of the negotiating Churches and of comments received from interested parties not later than September 1, 1932, be printed and distributed to the ministers of the negotiating Churches, to the clerks of the sessions of all the particular churches of the negotiating Churches, and to such other persons as may be willing to purchase copies of the "Plan of Union" at a nominal cost.

"WILLIAM J. REID, *Chairman*
"LEWIS SEYMOUR MUDGE, *Secretary*"

Final action upon the proposed union is, therefore deferred until 1933-1934, if both Assemblies resolve to proceed.

Hindenburg and the German Church in New York

THE German president, Von Hindenburg, recently presented St. Paul's German Lutheran Church at New York, on the occasion of the 90th anniversary of its foundation, with a large Bible, with an inscription in his own hand. The Bible was presented to the church through the German consul in New York.

United Presbyterian Assembly Overtured to Terminate Negotiations for Union

AT its meeting held April 13, 1932, the Presbytery of Muskingum, of the United Presbyterian Church, unanimously adopted the following memorial to the next General Assembly of that Church; "Bearing in mind the large number of members of both the Presbyterian and United Presbyterian churches, who are disinterested in any present union between these churches, or who are conscientiously opposed to the same; and bearing in mind the fact that under such circumstances any organic union would probably be superficial rather than effective; the Presbytery of Muskingum hereby memorialize the seventh General Assembly to be convened in Beaver, Pa., to discharge the committee on church union.

"We do this with no prejudice, whatever, against the case but believing that under existing conditions each denomination can, for the present, serve God by having a constructive program of its own, rather than attempting in unsettled times the difficult matter of a merger when so many other vital matters are demanding immediate attention."

Apparently opposition to the proposed union, on the terms now presented, is growing in both of the negotiating churches.

Presbytery of Newark Defers Licensure of Non-Affirmer of the Virgin Birth

THE Presbytery of Newark, N. J., of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. has deferred action on the proposed licensure of a young man who could not affirm belief in the Virgin Birth of Christ. At the April meeting of the Presbytery three candidates for licensure were before that body. The Rev. Robert Scott Inglis, D.D., Pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church of Newark asked the young men concerning three doctrines: (1) the inspiration of the Scriptures, (2) the Virgin Birth of Christ, (3) the substitutionary atonement. Two candidates, from Bloomfield and Princeton Seminaries gave satisfactory answers, but the third, Mr. John Martindale of Union Theological Seminary, New York, replied that he could not say that he believed that Christ was miraculously born of a virgin. After Mr. Martindale had read a prepared statement reiterating his position, Dr. Inglis declared that he could not vote for Mr. Martindale's acceptance.

"Much as I regret to seem to shut the door to any young man wanting to enter the ministry," he said, "I must call upon this Presbytery to remember that the Presbyterian Church has very definitely provided terms on which young men may be

taken into its ministry. There are other Protestant churches which do not require a young man to express his belief in the truthfulness of the record of Matthew and Luke. The Presbyterian Church has not yet taken that out of our Confession of Faith. There is only one thing I can do, therefore, and that is to vote against the reception of this particular brother coming in this way."

Later Dr. Inglis declared he protested against the examining committee's recommendation to receive Mr. Martindale and if the candidate were received he would take the matter to higher courts by way of complaint.

Various ministers took their stand in opposition to that of Dr. Inglis on the ground, it was pointed out by some, that Mr. Martindale's views are in part those of a young man and may change within ten years; his statement revealed sound belief in Jesus as the Son of God and Saviour of man and that his form of expression and earnestness argued well for his effectiveness as a minister of the Gospel.

Rev. Dr. Archibald G. Sinclair of First Church, Bloomfield, Mr. Martindale's pastor, told of the young man's decision to enter the ministry when he was only ten years old and declared: "He is one of the finest, most honest, cleanest young men I have ever had in any church of which I have been pastor, and he is one of the finest young men First Church in Bloomfield has turned out in the 135 years of its history."

"We've made it difficult for three men to come into the Presbyterian Church," said Rev. Dr. Alexander Cairns. "Don't let us do it for a fourth." He mentioned the names of Rev. Lester H. Clee of Second Church, whose case was carried to the General Assembly in San Francisco five years ago, "and who, on Easter Sunday this year received 141 members into his church," said the speaker; of Rev. C. E. Boyer of Broughton Church, Bloomfield, and of Clyde H. Roddy of North Arlington.

"It is painful," said Dr. Cairns, "to see a young man come with all the passion of consecration to Christ to preach Him and then see obstacles placed in his way."

The Rev. Chas. F. Bazata, pastor of the Sixth Presbyterian Church, Newark, said, "It seems to me that what we are objecting to is not an out and out denial of a great doctrine, but to Phraseology." He desired licensure of Mr. Martindale.

The discussion was ended with the vote to accept the motion of Dr. Arthur Northwood, chairman of the examining committee, that Mr. Martindale remain under the care of the examining committee for a period of three or six months. Dr. Inglis declared he was "delighted to accept that."

The Church will watch the next steps in this case with great interest.

"South India United Church" Scheme Again Attracting Attention

IN the recent session of the General Council of the Church of England in the "Ecclesiastical Province" of India, Burma and Ceylon, another step was taken toward consummation of union with Presbyterians, Congregational, German Evangelical and Methodist missions. The Church it is proposed to set up will be called the "United Church of South India." The scheme was first broached in 1926. Of course, the great obstacles to such a plan are Anglican insistence upon ordination by the Bishop, and Presbyterian insistence upon the rank of the presbyter and the parity of the clergy. The plan of union, therefore, necessarily was the result of compromise. It was proposed to admit all ministers of the contracting churches into the United Church without reordination. Then the United Church was to pledge itself to the Church of England that, after a fixed date for Union "all ordinations will be in the hands of the episcopate." From that date, for a further period of fifty years, the ministers of the contracting churches should be recognized "as ministers of the Word and Sacraments in the United Church." After this period, all the ministers who had originally entered into the arrangement having presumably died, it was assumed that only episcopally ordained ministers would remain.

The last Lambeth Conference—1930—gave only a qualified approval, from the Anglican point of view, to this arrangement, and while giving its blessing to the proposed church, intimated that it could hardly be regarded as a true episcopal church.

The recent session of the General Council was held in Calcutta. Since the Lambeth conference, the Joint Committee on Union had met and agreed upon proposing certain amendments, but what these were to be, and in what form the scheme was to be presented, the Council did not know. All that was on the agenda was "to consider a motion that general approval be accorded to the South India scheme of Union as submitted to the Council."

When, however, the revised scheme was in the hands of the members, it appeared to some that the wishes of the Council in 1930 had not in some respects been satisfactorily carried out. On the first day of a debate, which extended over two days, it seemed as though the sweet reasonableness of the former Council had been succeeded by a very different spirit, and resolution after resolution asking not for change but for clarity was swept away. It was asked that it might be made clear that Confirmation was not merely a means of admission to communicant membership of the Church on the same level as services used in the other bodies in South India, but that it had been associated from the time of the Apostles with the gift of the Holy

Spirit. It was asked that it might be made clear that bishops were not executive officers of the Council, but chief pastors of the Church. It was asked that it should be made clear that the administration of Absolution was one of the distinctive functions of a presbyter. In every case probably more than two-thirds of the Council were apparently voting that the Scheme should remain ambiguous, and it seemed as if some of those who had voted for general approval at the earlier stage would now withdraw their assent.

On the last morning of the Council, however, other counsels prevailed, and the following resolutions were passed:

1. That the Council, believing that the real union of Churches can only be effected when every Church brings its full contribution into the united Church and has full opportunity to teach what it believes to be true, instructs its delegates to endeavor to secure that the constitution of the united Church shall provide: (a) that the teaching office of the bishops shall be declared to include their responsibility of stating as necessity arises what the faith of the Church has always been, both in the exercise of their ministry in their several dioceses and as a body, in published statements issued from time to time, after consultation with presbyters, in accordance with rules laid down by the synod of the united Church; (b) that it is one of the special functions of presbyters to declare God's message of pardon to penitent sinners.

2. That the Council instructs its delegates to bring to the notice of the Joint Committee the advice of the committee of the Lambeth Conference (p. 127, clause 4) as expressing its own mind on the subject. [That is, the importance of Confirmation and its association with the gift of the Holy Spirit from the Apostles' times.]

3. That this Council accepts the advice of the Lambeth Conference with regard to the participation by presbyters in the consecration of bishops, and instructs its delegates to present that advice as representing the opinion of the Council which was asked for in Resolution 19 of the Joint Committee of November, 1930. [The opinion is, of course, adverse as regards consecrations after inauguration, though the validity of the consecration would not be affected.]

The more important points of the resolutions rejected by sweeping majorities on the previous day were thus in some measure restored. The advice which the Lambeth Conference had given on the subject of Confirmation was pressed on the Joint Committee. Strong condemnation of the proposal that in the consecration of bishops after the inauguration of the Union presbyters should share in the laying on of hands was expressed by several members of the Council, and the delegates were asked to urge the opinion of the Lambeth Conference, that, though such participation by presbyters would not affect the validity of the consecration, it was to be deprecated.

The motion of general approval was then carried in the Council, if not quite unanimously, yet by a majority so overwhelming that it was clear that every part of the Province was warmly in favor of persevering with the Scheme. Two votes only were recorded against it.

The stage which the proposals have reached seems now to be this. The Province has given general approval after asking for certain modifications. There are four Wesleyan Councils, and three of these have approved, while the decision of one is

awaited. In the organization known as the South India United Church there are nine Councils, and six of them have approved. The decision of every authoritative body concerned is expected by 1933. It remains for all the diocesan councils to be asked for approval, and the Scheme must be passed by not less than two-thirds of the fully organized dioceses of the whole Province. There are thirteen such dioceses; Nasik as yet being ranked as a missionary diocese, and so it means that at least nine of the diocesan councils must approve.

The next General Council of the Province will be held in 1935, and it seems probable that a resolution of final adoption may then be proposed, and if so, it must be passed by simple majorities in each House, and by a three-quarters majority of the members of the whole Council present and voting. Presumably, also, the Governing Bodies of the Wesleyans and the S. I. U. C. will also have to pass resolutions of final adoption, but it now seems possible that the Union may be inaugurated about the year 1936. The question of the diocese of Colombo coming into the new united Church has not been settled as yet, but the indications point to Colombo remaining in its old province.

Commenting upon some of the provisions of this scheme, *The Living Church*, the Anglo-Catholic organ in the United States, said, in part:

"... there appears to be a considerable amount of ambiguity as to these 'episcopally ordained ministers.' Are they to be priests or not? If so, what is to be their relation to the other ministers who are not priests? If not, just what significance is to be attached to the episcopal ordination?"

"Subsequent events developed the fact that, though it is proposed to maintain the historic episcopate, 'no particular interpretation of the fact of the historic episcopate is to be demanded.' A form is to be provided for consecrating bishops, and another form whereby bishops—and only bishops—can ordain ministers, but no explanation is to be given as to fact of the episcopate or the nature of the 'episcopally ordained ministers!' Can anyone suggest a more flagrant case of pure superstition than the requirement that a minister be recognized only after the laying on of a bishop's hands, while not defining the status of the bishop or the minister, or the significance of the act?"

"Again, according to the terms of the draft agreement, 'The United Church will seek to be in communion with the churches of the Anglican communion' and also 'will seek affiliation with or memberships in the World Presbyterian Alliance, the World Union of Congregational Churches, and the Ecumenical Methodist Conference.'

"If intercommunion with all these bodies is established, what will be their relation to one another? . . .

"Before any one of the Anglican Churches becomes a party to any such far-reaching scheme of unity the entire communion, including the American Church, is entitled to know officially and without ambiguity exactly what the new United Church will stand for, and especially whether or not its doctrines will be those of the Catholic Faith. Unless satisfactory guarantees can be given on that score Catholic Churchmen can have no part in the new Church, nor can the Churches of the Anglican communion seriously consider the question of intercommunion with it. If one province of the Church does unite with such a body, it will not have taken a step toward reunion, but rather will have cut itself off from the Catholic Faith, from fellowship with the historic Church, and from communion with the see of Canterbury, regardless of how valid its episcopate may technically be, or how loud its protestations of inclusiveness.

"A union based on misunderstanding or ambiguity is far worse than continued division based upon honest differences of view with respect to fundamental principles. We hope, therefore, that a definite statement as to the vague parts of the South India proposal will be published to all the world before the proposed union is consummated. Whether Catholics and Protestants can agree on such a statement is a matter that remains to be seen."

New Slogan Adopted by Board of Education

THE Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. at its meeting on April 20, adopted the following statement:

"The Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church knows no remedy for the iniquity of our modern world except the Christian gospel. New words have been discovered to describe old sins, but sin against God and wrong against man remain the same from generation to generation. There is no cure but God's great remedy of grace.

"The Board calls the Church to the proclamation of the gospel message through all its educational agencies and programs, and commends to the Church for the coming year the watchword,

EDUCATE TO EVANGELIZE.

"Let parents 'educate to evangelize,' endeavoring to win their children to Christ, as if they and they only were appointed to this high privilege.

"Let teachers and officers of the Church School 'educate to evangelize,' endeavoring to win their pupils to Christ, as if to them and to them only were given this supreme opportunity.

"Let college presidents, faculties, and university pastors 'educate to evangelize,' acknowledging that to be content with less

than winning the youth of our generation to Christ is to fail short of what Christian education means.

"Let pastors and church officers 'educate to evangelize,' confessing openly that the proclamation of the gospel is their one inescapable obligation and that the call of Christ must be sounded unceasingly and with certainty.

"The Board of Christian Education accepts this program for itself and commends it to the Church."

Southern Church and Congregational Rights

OF absorbing interest to all Presbyterians are the terms of the report of the "Ad Interim Committee on Title to Church Property" of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. (South.) It will be presented as follows to the next General Assembly of that Church:

"Your Ad Interim Committee on Title to Church Property begs leave to submit the following report:

"The Committee presented a report to the General Assembly of 1931, and that portion dealing with Safeguarding Against Excessive Debts of Synods and Presbyteries was adopted, but the portion dealing with Title to Church Property was recommitted to the Committee, and with it Overture No. 91 from Muhlenburg Presbytery.

"Your Committee met in Memphis, Tennessee, on February 11, 1932, restudied the whole matter, giving special consideration to the thoughtful overture from Muhlenburg Presbytery.

"The Committee feels that the suggested amendment submitted to the last General Assembly is not out of harmony with the principles of representative government set forth in said Overture, but is in strictest accord with the principles of justice and equity embodied in the Constitution and usage of our Church. Our Church limits in a constitutional manner the rights of Congregations, Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods and General Assembly. The uniform usage of our Church and the Book of Church Order justly give in principle the power of control, management and disposal of their respective properties to the congregation, the Presbytery and the Synod. The amendment submitted by your Committee proposes to incorporate in a definite form in our Book of Church Order what is already the usage of our Church. And your Committee believes that if this amendment is adopted it will avoid future misunderstandings and controversies in our Church and preserve its peace and harmony.

"Therefore, your Committee again recommends that the General Assembly approve and recommend to the several Presbyteries for their adoption the following amendment to Chapter 13 of the Book of Church Order as Paragraph 60a, namely:

"Each Church, Presbytery and Synod owns and has the power of control, management and disposal of its respective property, whether the title thereto be held by trustees, individual or corporate, or otherwise; and, except as provided in Section 158 of the Book of Church Order, it is not within the power of any one or more of such bodies, or of the General Assembly, to impair or divest such title so held by any other of such bodies without the consent given by the affirmative vote of three-fourths of those present at a meeting of such body constitutionally called for that purpose. The right of a Church, a Presbytery and a Synod in and to its property is a civil right and cannot be involuntarily impaired or affected by any ecclesiastical action of any other Church Court."

"Respectfully submitted,

J. B. Hutton.

Jno. M. Wells.

W. G. Gillis.

Alian D. Sanford.

John J. Davis.

E. T. Miller,

Chairman."

"Silver Anniversary" of Tennent College

TENNENT College of Christian Education, formerly the Philadelphia School for Christian Workers, will commemorate its twenty-five years of service in the field of Christian education at its forthcoming commencement exercises on May 16, 1932, at 8.00 o'clock, P. M. The Rev. Clarence Edward Macartney, D.D., LL.D., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, and former pastor of the Arch Street Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, and also a former Moderator of the General Assembly, will deliver the commencement address. Dr. Macartney will speak on the spirit and service of William Tennent, for whom the College has been named. President Clinton H. Gillingham will confer the degrees and award the diplomas of graduation, and will, also, on the preceding day, Sunday, May 15th, preach the baccalaureate sermon in the Chambers-Wylie Memorial Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia. The College trains young women for vocational Christian service in the churches and on the mission fields, and also admits as candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Religious Education those desiring a college education with majors in the Bible and Religious Education.

Free Postage

ACCORDING to recent reports, the Serbian Government has decreed that all official correspondence, telegrams, money-orders and packet-post of all Protestant clerical authorities and institutions in Jugo-Slavia, may be sent free from all postage.

Scotland and the Irish Oath

THE attitude of the new Irish government on the Oath of Allegiance has found Presbyterian Scotland in two minds. As loyal subjects of the British throne they deplore the Irish Free State leader's purpose to dissolve the tie that binds his people in common partnership with the other nations of the British Empire. As loyal Protestants, they welcome an action which will at once make aliens of that large body of Roman Catholic immigrants whose native land is the Irish Free State.

Should Mr. de Valera abolish the Oath then Irishmen born in South Ireland and resident in Scotland become aliens, who will require to register at the nearest police station, and become liable to deportation for the reasons which make them now eligible for public assistance.

Scotsmen have therefore a deep domestic interest in the action of the Republican Government. For the Irish Free State to contract itself out of the British Empire will mean a considerable lightening of local burdens in many industrial communities, and a consequent relief to industry. Large numbers presently in receipt of relief would automatically be liable to deportation. New school erections rendered necessary by increases of Roman Catholic Irish population would not need to be undertaken. Teaching staffs would, in consequence, be reduced. Police rates, and charges on public funds for prisons and sanatoria would shrink to feasible proportions. Unemployment figures would be slimmed as if by a magical reducer.

Commenting upon the possibilities of the situation, the *Scots Observer* says: "There would be other direct gains. The Clyde Trust would have numerous vacancies. Scotsmen would no longer be turned at works' gates because some son of Erin had stepped straight from the steamer to the pay-roll. A blissful calm would descend upon Brig'ton and Bellshill, while the Rangers-Celtic match would become as innocent of thrills as a Sunday school picnic. The Billy Boys would also sleep quietly in

their beds o' nights. The long rows of tenantless new houses would gleam ghostly on moonlight nights.

"As a fitting termination to 'Buy Scottish' week nothing would have been more acceptable than a declaration by Mr. de Valera that he was about to summon his exiled fellow-countrymen home. The Scots would then have felt that they were at long length to have Scotland for the Scots. The Nationalist party would have entered on a new lease of life, because freed from the suspicion that Home Rule for Scotland meant government by Irish Roman Catholics.

"If Mr. de Valera does not abolish the Oath of Allegiance after all, it can only be because for patriotic motives he has no wish to be sung by C. M. Grieve and the Scottish Renaissance, as the successor to Robert the Bruce, the second deliverer of Scotland from the foreign yoke. Yet we find it difficult to join with the bhoys in shouting 'Up Dublin.' Sentiment is a queer thing."

Modernization of the Vatican

THE present Pope, Pius XI, in addition to his work in the sphere of the church and politics, will long remain known as the Pope who has contributed most to the

modernization of the Vatican. He is not only the first Pope who has installed his own bathrooms in the Vatican, who possesses his own automobiles, who has a golden telephone on his writing table, who can send forth his missionaries by aeroplane, who can set the church bells going by means of electricity and discourses over his own broadcasting station, but he is also the first Pope who has modernized the services in St. Peter's Cathedral. A microphone and loud speakers have been so installed that both the spoken word and the music can be heard in the most extreme corners of the enormous building and in the square outside. The domain of the Vatican is the only one which has been modernized at practically no expense, for American, German and Italian firms have vied with one another in supplying gratis all that was necessary!

Matrimonial "Ads" in the Christian Press

THE Netherlands Standard, the organ of the Anti-Revolutionary Party in that country, the editor-in-chief of which is Dr. Colyn, the leader of the Anti-Revolutionary Party and a Netherlands statesman who enjoys a European reputation, recently published an advertisement from a lady teacher who sought an eligible life-mate. She described this method as becoming more and more customary. In the Reformed church press, considerable opposition arose against the insertion of such an advertisement and some controversy followed. The Standard has now declared that measures had been taken to prevent such advertisements being inserted in future.

Sleeping in Church

THE presbytery of the Reformed Church of Middelburg, in the Dutch province of Sealand, has published the following resolution: "After hearing its representatives, the presbytery regards as a special sin in the churches within its jurisdiction, sleeping in church during the service. It urges all church councils to use every means in their power to banish this sin from their midst. Perhaps a first step in this direction would be to hold the afternoon service in the evening."

Islam in Africa

IN Africa, propaganda for the Islamic faith has lately assumed a decided anti-European character. In the Soudan propaganda is openly carried on against the white race and prophets who travel round announce victory in the name of Islam within three years. The Roman Catholics, especially, are said to feel the influence of this propaganda strongly in their sphere of work.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., as well as the Assemblies and Synods of other Churches will be fully reported in the June issue. Whatever happens, you will receive fair, truthful and able reports of these gatherings. Can you afford to miss them? To Commissioners and all others interested we make a special offer—The Assembly Reports Number AND a whole year of Christianity Today for only ONE DOLLAR—if your order is sent on the blank below. Do it now!

CHRISTIANITY TODAY,
501 Witherspoon Bldg.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Yes, I accept your SPECIAL OFFER. Please enroll me as a subscriber (or renew) for thirteen months, beginning with the June number. I enclose my remittance of one dollar in full payment.

Name

Address