

F S DYRNNESS 8433
 MAY 1933-R
 R D 2
 QUARRY PA

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-OCTOBER, 1932
 Vol. 3 No. 6

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

The Corporate Witness of the Church

THE primary task of the organized church as of the individual Christian is to bear witness. Our LORD's final command was: "Ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." In obedience to this command the apostles (as soon as the Holy Spirit had come upon them) entered upon a campaign of witnessing—a campaign in which they continued active until their memberships had been transferred from the church militant to the church triumphant (Acts 1:8, 22; 2:32; 3-15; 5; 32; 10:39-42; 13:31; 22:15; with which compare MATTHEW 24:14 and LUKE 24:48.)

This campaign of witnessing stressed both the facts and the doctrines that constitute the Christian religion. "I delivered unto you first of all," PAUL wrote to the Corinthians, "that which I also received: that CHRIST died for our sins according to the Scriptures." "CHRIST died"—that was the statement of a fact. "CHRIST died for our sins"—that was the statement of a doctrine, i.e. the true explanation of the fact. The fact without the doctrine would have been meaningless: the doctrine without the fact would have been empty. He who is silent either as to the facts or the doctrines that lie at the basis of the Christian religion is worthless as a Christian witness.

It is conceivable that CHRIST should not have established a church. In that case we would be under obligation to witness for CHRIST as individuals; but would not need to be concerned about the

corporate witness of the church to which we belong. As a matter of fact, however, He did establish a church. Moreover there is nothing to indicate that He approves of un-attached Christians, those who accept Him as their personal LORD and SAVIOUR but who are not members of His organized church. Hence, the situation being what it is, we are both under obligation to be members of the organized church and to do all in our power to see to it that its corporate witness is both clean-cut and adequate. Ideally there should be but one church and this one church should bear faithful witness to a full-orbed gospel. Lacking this one church we must be content to belong to the church that best wit-

nesses to the gospel in the community in which our lot is cast. But, whatever the church to which we belong, we are under obligation, as much as in us lies, to see to it that in its corporate capacity it bears full and unequivocal witness to the gospel of the grace of God. This is not to say that it is enough that we belong to an organization calling itself a church. Conceivably all the churches in a community may have "so degenerated as to become no churches of CHRIST but synagogues of Satan" (Confession of Faith, Chapter 25). Suppose, for instance, that the Presbyterian Church should so modify its creed as to bring it into harmony with "Modernism." In that case its corporate testimony would be hostile to the gospel of the grace of God and as such an organization to which no genuine Christian should belong.

We would not be understood as minimizing the importance of the witness of the individual Christian. Important and indispensable as that is, however, it is insignificant as compared to the corporate witness of the church to which the individual belongs by as much as that organization is greater than the individual. How little, for instance, is the significance that attaches to the witness of any individual Presbyterian as compared with the corporate testimony of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. with its two million members! The corporate witness of the church is therefore a matter of great importance in the maintenance and propagation of the Christian religion, true as it is that

IN THIS ISSUE:

Editorial Notes and Comments	
A Significant Letter.....	2
"Needed Emphases in the Church Today".....	3
Two Calls to Repentance.....	3
Presbyterian Pelagianism.....	4
Wm. Childs Robinson	
Notes on Biblical Exposition—XXII... ..	6
J. Gresham Machen	
Let Us Become "Antioch Christians" Once More!.....	9
John C. Monsma	
Letters to the Editor.....	12
"Perfectionism": A Book Review.....	14
News of the Church.....	16

the effectiveness of this witness is greatly weakened by the fact that everywhere throughout the churches, and especially throughout the Protestant churches, what one man proclaims as saving truth another man denounces as fatal error. Hence distraction and confusion. "If the trumpet give an uncertain voice, who shall prepare himself for war?" There is therefore no more pressing need than the creation of a situation wherein the Church of CHRIST will bear undivided witness to the gospel of the grace of God.

Some churches boast of their "comprehensiveness" and seemingly glory in the fact that Arminians and Calvinists, Sacramentarians and Evangelicals, Liberals and Conservatives, feel equally at home within their borders. Such churches are little concerned about their corporate testimony. Other churches, however, like the Presbyterian Church (until recent times at least) have been keenly concerned about their corporate testimony. In order to maintain the integrity of this testimony the Presbyterian Church receives into its ministry only those who profess to believe the Bible to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and who profess to believe that its Confession of Faith contains the system of doctrine taught in the Bible. In proportion as ministers are intelligently loyal to their ordination vows it is obvious that the corporate testimony of the Presbyterian Church will be clear and definite. If it be true, as unfortunately it is, that the testimony given by the Presbyterian Church today is discordant and contradictory, this finds its explanation in the fact that its ministry contains many who have been false to their ordination vows.

It is impossible to close our eyes to the fact that there are many within the Presbyterian Church today who are bent on making it an "inclusive" or "comprehensive" church. This, if we mistake not, is the motive back of most of the union movements that are being pressed. In as far as this is the case, such movements should be determinedly resisted. If they succeed and the Presbyterian Church becomes an organization which in its corporate capacity ignores the distinction between Modernists and

Evangelicals not only its glory but its usefulness will have departed. Then there will be nothing left for those who worship CHRIST as GOD and who are conscious of themselves as sinners who have been redeemed by His blood except to leave the organization in order to join with some organization that in its corporate capacity would bear witness to the gospel of the grace of God. The fact that we are opposed to an "inclusive" church does not mean that we are opposed in principle to revision of the Confession of Faith. It does mean, however, that we are opposed to any revision that would weaken it as an expression of the Reformed Faith or that sits lightly to the Bible as divinely authoritative in all its length and breadth.

Whether we speak of the witness of the individual or the corporate witness of the church we mean, of course, a witness in deed as well as a word. The word without the deed is insincere. The deed without the word is dumb. An effective witness must be both sincere and articulate. In harmony with this the corporate testimony of the Presbyterian Church witnesses to the Bible as the infallible rule of practice (as well as faith) and so to Christianity as a mode

of life as well as a system of doctrines. These two are inextricably bound together, organically related as the tree and its fruit. In the interest of the Christian life itself, we must maintain the purity and vigor of our doctrinal witness. Get rid of the doctrines and the Christian life will be cut at its roots. Other things being equal, the life will be vigorous and well-developed as the doctrines are known and believed. Ours is not a religion that loves darkness rather than light or that thrives best where it is least understood.

Shall the Presbyterian Church maintain its historic and corporate witness as a church of the LORD JESUS CHRIST? That is one of the most important questions before us today. If we thought that the proposed basis of union with the United Presbyterian Church would purify and strengthen the corporate witness of our church, or even leave it unimpaired, we would heartily favor this particular union. But inasmuch as it seems to us that it would seriously weaken the corporate witness of our church and thus render it less efficient as an agent for furthering the gospel we are constrained to oppose it. Size gained at the cost of purity and integrity of testimony is secured at too great a cost.

Editorial Notes and Comments

A Significant Letter

CONFIDENCE in the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. on the part of men and women of evangelical conviction will not be strengthened by the information contained in the "Letter to the Editor" printed on page 12. Inasmuch as the significance of this information is in no wise dependent on the identity of its author we see no objection to allowing it to appear anonymously. Under the circumstances, however, it may not be out of place to say that the Editors of this paper have seen copies of the letter from which our correspondent quotes and vouch for the accuracy of its factual representations.

The significance that attaches to the letter from which our correspondent cites lies largely in the fact that it is signed by the Candidate Secretaries of the Board of Foreign Missions, i.e. the man and the

woman who interview prospective missionaries for the foreign field and upon whose recommendations, it is safe to assume, the Board largely depends in making its selections. We have previously directed attention to the fact that Mr. HADLEY is a signer of the Auburn Affirmation in which it is expressly affirmed that the full truthfulness of the Scriptures, the Virgin birth of CHRIST, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection and miracles of our LORD are not essential doctrines of the Word of God and our Standards. Mrs. CORBETT not being a minister is, of course, not a signer of the Auburn Affirmation. The fact, however, that she has joined with Mr. HADLEY in signing this letter would seem to indicate that she is in full sympathy with his position. Thus it would appear that neither a young man nor a young woman has much chance of being sent as a missionary under existing conditions unless he or she first secures the approval of those

sympathetic to the Auburn Affirmation. This does not necessarily mean that no Fundamentalists or Evangelicals or Conservatives—call them which you will—are being sent to the foreign field today; but it doubtless does mean that only such of these are likely to be sent as are judged willing to work in harmony with those ordinarily called Liberals or Modernists. It means in effect that militant Fundamentalists need not apply.

The letter under consideration is addressed not to those who have been accepted as missionaries but to those who are looking forward to it as their life work. Its purpose is to advise them as to how they can best prepare themselves for this vital task. It stresses the need of technical preparation but rightly insists that spiritual preparation is "the one essential element." "Bible study, prayer, devotional books and some real experience in sharing CHRIST here," the letter says, "will be for your spiritual preparation what your classroom lectures, theses and laboratory are doing for your technical preparation." Such satisfaction as we derive from this insistence on the need of spiritual preparation is, however, turned into dissatisfaction by the recommendation of the books mentioned by our correspondent as aids to spiritual preparation on the part of prospective missionaries. We have examined all of the books cited and fully agree with our correspondent as to their character. If space permitted it would be easy to show that each of these books is distinctly hostile to evangelical Christianity and fitted to cultivate a type of religious life diametrically different from that which prevails in evangelical circles. Two of these books, those by FOSDICK and FLEMING, are written by men connected with Union Theological Seminary of New York City and reflect the modernistic viewpoint of that institution. The other by J. H. OLDFHAM consists largely of quotations, taken almost exclusively from modernistic writers such as CANON STREETER and MIDDLETON MURRY of England and JOHN BAILLIE and E. F. SCOTT of America (the two latter being professors at Union Seminary, N. Y.). We have not read Mr. MURRY's "The Life of JESUS," from which numerous quotations are taken, but the editor of the Evangelical Quarterly has written thus concerning it: "The book is decidedly disappointing. JESUS is to MURRY a mere man, and a mere man can never be a SAVIOUR. Worse still, JESUS is to MURRY, although the best of men, a sinful man." It seems to us that it would be difficult to recommend books less fitted to serve the needs of those preparing for work on the foreign field.

In our judgment our correspondent's letter calls attention to a situation that must be remedied if the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is to continue to command the financial support of evangelical Presbyterians.

"Needed Emphases in the Church of Today"

UNDER this title the *Union Seminary Review* of Richmond, Va., for July contains a significant article by WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN of Union Seminary of New York City.

This article is significant, if for no other reason, from the fact that it was written at the request of the editor of "A Southern Presbyterian Theological and Religious Journal." When twenty-five years ago Dr. BROWN wrote an article entitled "Changes in the Theology of American Presbyterianism" it appeared in the *American Journal of Theology*, published under the auspices of the University of Chicago, which then as now was famous as a hot-bed of Modernism. Today, however, he writes an article that is far more radical in its implications and it appears in a theological review published under the auspices of an institution that hitherto has been noted for its orthodoxy. It is worthy of note that in this same issue of the *Union Seminary Review* there appears an article by Dr. J. P. ROBERTSON, entitled "Whither are We Drifting."

Dr. BROWN writes in the interest of an inclusive church—a church in which there will be a whole-hearted recognition on the part of all its members that the two types of mind, known as liberal and conservative, must be made to feel at home. His basic error is the assumption that what liberals and conservatives hold in common includes all that must be there emphasized in order that the church may bear an effective Christian witness. What he overlooks, as Dr. MACHEN made so clear in his little book *Christianity and Liberalism*, is that liberalism and conservatism, in any of their consistent forms are not varying expressions of the same religion but rather expressions of totally different religions. As a matter of fact the issues at stake between liberals and conservatives are not, as Dr. BROWN maintains, issues that may be solved in "an atmosphere of brotherly sympathy and understanding"; rather they are issues such as are at stake between mortal enemies. The success of the one means the defeat of the other. Here is a conflict in which there can be no peace without victory. A church such as Dr. BROWN desires would be a church in which no true evangelical could be content to remain a member. Suppose a church that stood only for what liberals and conservatives have in common. Such a church would bear witness to nothing that is distinctive of genuine Christianity.

Another basic error that vitiates all that Dr. BROWN writes in this connection is his assumption that the differences between liberals and conservatives lie in the realm of theory not fact. Such is not the case. They differ as much as regards the facts to be interpreted as they do in regard to the interpretations they put on the facts. What

is more, it is a major error to suppose that Christianity consists of its facts in distinction from its explanation of those facts. The facts are indeed basic. Apart from them there could be no such thing as Christianity. But give them no interpretation and they would be meaningless. Give them an interpretation other than that which the Bible gives and they would yield us something other than Christianity. It should never be forgotten that the Bible contains not only a record of the facts that lie at the basis of our holy religion but an authoritative explanation of those facts; and that the latter is as essential to our religion as is the former. It is quite impossible to distinguish as sharply between fact and theory as Dr. BROWN would have us believe. It is to seek to divide between things inseparable when he writes: "In religion we are concerned with God, only secondarily with our ideas about God." As a matter of fact Dr. BROWN merely substitutes an unsatisfactory explanation for the satisfactory one given in Scripture.

Dr. BROWN falls into serious error in his references to the fundamentalist-modernist controversy in the Presbyterian Church. He repeats, for instance, the thread-bare misrepresentation that the Assembly deliverances of 1916 and 1923 were attempts to make the so-called five points "the final test of ministerial orthodoxy," not to mention other equally unwarranted representations.

We agree with Dr. BROWN that there is need of emphasis upon the things in which as Christians we agree but it seems to us that if we emphasized nothing more than what Dr. BROWN emphasizes we would have to be silent concerning practically everything that makes Christianity a source of hope and consolation to a lost world.

Two Calls to Repentance

IN our news pages, our readers will find the text of two "calls for repentance and prayer"—one issued by the Federal Council of Churches, and one issued by the Reformation Fellowship. The difference between them is significant.

While appearing objectionless at first glance, the appeal issued by the Federal Council has one great, grave omission. It is surprising that the document has been so well received in many evangelical circles without notice being taken of this omission. While it has much to say about repentance, the appeal, in its list of sins for which the church should repent, is silent regarding the one great sin that has paralyzed and is ruining the so-called evangelical churches. That sin is, in short, *the sin of unbelief*. The rise of Modernism in the church has been the rise of unbelief in the Bible and in the great Reformed System of Doctrine alone taught in the Bible. The sins listed in the Federal Council's appeal surely ought to be

(Concluded on page 12)

Presbyterian Pelagianism

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

Professor of Church History in Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Ga.

JUST when the Church had comfortably settled herself to an idealistic, hypocritical doctrine of the innate goodness of human nature, modern psychology interrupted her slumbers with a realistic, Calvinistic note. By uncovering the subtle process of rationalization psychology destroys the illusions of the righteous, and discloses the grimace of the Devil even in the lives of the noblest."

These radio observations by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr of Union Seminary (N. Y.) were perhaps intended to support his socialistic program; but to one hearer they were a means of starting this train of Pelagian ponderings.

Every student of the history of Christian thought is aware that a Church may actually teach Pelagianism, while it officially rejects it. Pelagius was repeatedly condemned by the Mediaeval Church; but a neo-Pelagianism was surreptitiously re-introduced in the latter part of the Middle Ages and assiduously taught to Luther and his contemporaries by the scholastic modernists. Therefore it is theoretically possible for a Presbyterian Church, even though it profess the most anti-Pelagian creed in the world, nevertheless to teach Pelagianism.

The most conspicuous actual example of such teaching is to be found in President John Oman's *Grace and Personality*, Macmillan. According to one of his students this volume was commended, about two years ago, by Dean Weigle of Yale as an excellent example of the New Calvinism. One would naturally infer that the volume was Calvinistic from the very prominent place occupied by the author in English Presbyterian circles, as well as from the Introduction.¹ After reading the volume the student properly reported that he could find no Calvinism in it.

In the Introduction to *Grace and Personality* Mr. Nolan R. Best invites the reader to compare the volume with Calvin's Institutes. Such a comparison yields several misrepresentations of Calvin's teaching, both in Mr. Best's Introduction, pp. xi, xii, xiii, xiv, and in Dr. Oman's text, pp. 50, 86, 90. But more important than such details, the examination of this volume in its distinctive points of view, in its fundamental principles, in its specific doctrines, emphatically contradicts the thesis of the Introduction that, "in essence Dr. Oman is as Calvinistic as Calvin himself" (p. x).

Calvinism is the most consistent form of historic Christianity. If one undertakes to formulate the teachings of Dr. Oman's book on such historic Christian doctrines as sin (pp. 113, 123, 211), redemption (116-17), reconciliation (119), justification (254, 259, 262, 265), regeneration (76), the priestly (217), kingly (265) and prophetic (67) offices of Christ, the imitation of Christ (259), the Church (171), ethics (51, 67, 95, 251-4), he finds that the theology is not Calvinism; but Ritschlian "liberalism," with the earmarks by which Herrmann distinguishes that system. For example, Herrmann's statement, "the foundations of ethics can be laid without any regard for religion—the development is in connection with a religious view of the world," aptly describes Oman's book (pp. 51-2, 59, 95, 251). The same may be said of Herrmann's doctrine that Christian faith is simply trust in God's providence induced by the impression which Jesus makes on the soul. Oman's statement, "love is God" (138) is hopelessly Ritschlian; just as his rejection of the justice (138) and the sovereignty (154) of God are both Ritschlian and anti-Calvinistic.

Oman particularly rejects the Augustinian doctrine of grace, as the direct, inward work of the Holy Spirit "shedding abroad the love of God in our hearts," *Rom.* 5:5; cf. Augustine, *On the Letter and the Spirit*. Oman recognizes that in the distinction between Augustine and Kant there are two worlds (p. 60). Repeatedly he sides with Kant, condemning Augustine's doctrine that grace is the direct, inward, immediate, supernatural action of God on the heart (118, 95, 188), and ridiculing that doctrine as "irresistible violence," "mechanical," "impersonal," "arbitrary," "immoral," etc. (pp. 40, 71, 86). Augustine "from the beginning was on the wrong road" (68). Grace, for Oman, is always indirect, external, oblique, determined by his modernistic definitions of human personality. More correctly, Professor Emil Brunner has shown that these definitions lead to atomic individuality, not to gracious personality. *The Word and the World*, p. 116.

Dr. Oman is a Kantian. Neither Augustine nor Calvin would regard the Kantians as disciples. The burden of Brunner's book is that the modern mind with its self-sufficient reason derived from Descartes and its autonomous will derived from Kant is the true enemy of historic Christianity. And yet these principles are the very axioms of Oman's volume. The absolute antimony between Brunner (the neo-Calvinist) and Oman (the Kantian) is acutely sharpened in their respective treatments of autonomy and heteronomy. Oman agrees with Kant that whatever is heteronomous is morally worthless (252); Brunner contends that "faith is through and through heteronomous," *The Word and the World*, pp. 66, 105.

The great Dutch Calvinist, H. Bavinck, holds that even Kant, with an eye on the inborn sinfulness of men, comes in the end to an appeal to the will, the wisdom and the powers of man, i.e. to heathenism, *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*

¹Cf. also *The Union Seminary Review*, July 1931, p. 414, note.

A close reading of Dr. Oman's moderatorial address in the October 1931 number of this periodical reveals the same doctrinal positions referred to in the book. One remark in this article should be applied to its author: So pro-

foundly does the English Moderator disagree with the doctrines of the Westminster Confession that one wonders "by what liberality of interpretation" he can find any substance of his faith in these Presbyterian standards. *Union Seminary Review*, October 1931, p. 36.

iii, 425-6. Kant's axiom that man has the ability to do whatever the moral law demands is Pelagianism. Around the central principle of the plenary ability of the human will Pelagius built his autosoteric system. On this same foundation, plus the self-sufficiency of man's reason (pp. 65, 75), Oman has reconstructed the old building. The words of America's greatest Calvinist scholar offer the best characterization of this system. Dr. B. B. Warfield wrote: "The New Protestantism, attaching itself to the Enlightenment" (even Oman's philosophy of history follows Troelsch in depreciating the Reformation and magnifying the Illumination, Chapter 1)—"forgets even Kant's sense of radical evil—this modern thought reproduces ancient Pelagianism with a less profound sense of guilt and with no expiation for sins." Therefore it is "a Pelagianism which out-Pelagianizes Pelagius." *The Plan of Salvation*, pp. 53, 54, 56.

Dr. B. J. Kidd, the Oxford historian, resolves Pelagianism "into two main propositions: (1) We do not need supernatural Grace, because (2) We do not bring into the world with us Original Sin." *A History of the Church*, ii, p. 64. The first of these is conspicuous in Dr. Oman's volume. The second, whether or not one enters the world with original sin, therefore, awaits attention. Dr. John McNeil, the old Scottish evangelist, used to declare that one's doctrine of babies determined his whole theology. Certainly the doctrine of babies distinguished the views of Augustine more clearly from those of Pelagius than any other doctrine. An Augustinian believes that the souls of these little ones are so precious to the heavenly Father (Matt. 18:10, 14) that, though they are "by nature the children of wrath" (Eph. 2:3), they are sought by the Shepherd (Matt. 18:11-13), redeemed by His blood, and regenerated by His Spirit (West. Conf., Ch. 10, Sect. 3). The New England Primer expressed this teaching in its opening sentence: "In Adam's fall we sinned all." On the other hand, a Pelagian merely dedicates a sinless and spotless babe to God, believing that the child deserves Heaven for his own goodness. This doctrine of the innate good-

ness of human nature has been for centuries the orthodox Chinese teaching, inculcated by Confucius in his Analects and by Mencius in his philosophy. The following lines from a Chinese classic could as well be used by every Pelagian:

"Men, one and all, in infancy
Are virtuous at heart;
Their moral tendencies the same
Their practices wide apart.
Without instruction's kindly aid
Man's nature grows less fair;
In teaching, thoroughness should be
A never ceasing care."

—Translated by Giles.

The finest opportunity which a minister has for indicating his own views and for indoctrinating his people in this theme is at the baptism of a baby. The old Westminster form for administering baptism required the minister to exhort the parent as to the danger of God's wrath to himself and to his child. Both the U. S. A. and the U. S. Books of Church Order direct the minister to instruct those present at this sacrament that: "We are by nature sinful, guilty and polluted, and have need for cleansing by the blood of Christ and by the sanctifying influences of the Spirit of God." The Southern Presbyterian Book further proposes, as the first question to be asked the parents:

"(1) Do you acknowledge your child's need of the cleansing blood of Jesus Christ and the renewing grace of the Holy Spirit?" In other words, the official position of those who profess the Westminster Standards (in America) is Augustinian. Alas, too often ministers in both these great American communions conduct this ordinance without an intimation that infants are baptized "because they have a sinful nature and need a Saviour." Ministers make out questions of their own, no one of which parallels the first question in the Southern Presbyterian Book or otherwise indicates the primary reference which New Testament baptism holds to sin. The opportunity for testifying one's Augustinianism is allowed to pass and a service is presented that inculcates Pelagianism. This regrettable practice is about to be authorized in the largest

part of American Presbyterianism. The Directory for Worship for the use of the proposed American Presbyterian Church gives a thoroughly Pelagian form for the administration of infant baptism. *Documents relating to the Proposed Organic Union*, December 1931, p. 186. The Augustinian elements in the instructions and the promises of the older forms are carefully and completely deleted; so that parents are invited to dedicate their children to God, merely promising to instruct them. The Confucian lines quoted above are congruent with the proposed form. In direct antithesis stand the excellent Augustinian words of the editor of *Christianity Today*:

"We take it that no doctrine of infant salvation is *Christian* that does not assume that infants are lost members of a lost race, for whom there is no salvation apart from Christ."

Quoted from *Christianity Today*, January 1931, by Boettner, *Reformed Doctrine of Predestination*, p. 145.

Pelagianism is naturalism. Out of the caves of the old man it creeps upon every man and every minister. Only eternal vigilance and the continual illumination by the Word and the Spirit can keep any preacher from repeating its suave phrases. Therefore in the case of the writer the cries of the confessional must mingle with the pipes of the polemics. How easy it is to slip into the popular habit of praising the goodness of modern youth, commending them for never having known the deep things of sin, especially when one shuts his eyes to the things that are actually going on all the way from many circles of "high society" married people down to some junior and high schools. Cf. Sally Martin, Youth and Prohibition in *The Forum*, February 1932. As a young "theolog" conducting a "revival" meeting in a West Virginia mission point, I went up Saw Log Hollow to talk to a group of children. After I had wasted most of the available time telling the group how good all modern children were, I called on an old Methodist local preacher for a few words. This brother told the children that they were guilty,

(Continued on page 7)

Notes on Biblical Exposition

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

Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary

XXII. THE CROSS OF CHRIST

"O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was openly pictured as crucified" —(Gal. 3:1, in a literal translation).

The Divisions of the Epistle

WE have finished our consideration of the first main division of the Epistle, in which, in Gal. 1:11—2:21, Paul defends his independent apostolic authority over against the contention of the Judaizers that he was an apostle only through the mediation of those who had been apostles before him. Now we turn to the second main division, embracing the central portion of the Epistle from Gal. 3:1 to Gal. 5:12, in which Paul defends the *content* of his gospel of free grace as over against the Judaizers' contention that faith, in the attainment of salvation, must be supplemented by works.

But the divisions in the Pauline Epistles are not always easy to make; and so, in the present case, Paul's account of his meeting with Peter, which we have just been studying, belongs as much to the second main division of the Epistle as to the first. No doubt it is a part of the Apostle's defence of his independent apostolic authority: so independent was he, he says, that on one occasion he could even withstand the chief of the original apostles himself. But what he said to Peter on that past occasion at Antioch was the very thing that he wanted to say also now to those converts in the Galatian churches. So the passage Gal. 2:11-21 contains the very heart of that gospel of free grace which Paul is going on to defend in the following section of the Epistle.

How Did Peter Respond?

The fact that Gal. 2:11-21, especially in the latter part of the passage, contains what Paul was desiring to say now to the Galatians may help to explain

why we are not told how Peter took the rebuke which was given him at Antioch and what the result of the scene was. The silence of the Apostle about this matter has seemed to some scholars to leave room for very serious conclusions as to the history of the apostolic age. If Peter had been convinced by Paul's argument, why did not Paul point in triumph to so gratifying a conclusion of the Antioch scene? The real result of the scene—so the contention of these scholars runs—must have been far less edifying, and what really resulted was a permanent breach or at least coolness between Paul on the one hand and the Jerusalem apostles on the other.

With regard to this well-known contention of the "Tübingen school" of New Testament critics, it may be said, in the first place, that the notion of a permanent conflict of principle between Paul and Peter is contradicted by passages, written long after this Antioch scene, in which Paul refers to Peter with the utmost respect (I Cor. 3:22, 9:5, 15:5): it is contradicted, in the second place, by the entire subsequent history of the Christian Church, which is quite incomprehensible if there was a permanent breach between the apostles at the beginning; it is contradicted, in the third place, expressly by I Cor. 15:11, where Paul distinctly says that his gospel was the same as that of the original apostles; finally, it is contradicted by the very passage, Gal. 2:11-21, which is appealed to most confidently in favor of it, since in this passage Paul insists that his *principles* were the same as Peter's and objects only to Peter's inconsistency in the application of those principles.

Why Paul Does Not Tell

But—to return to the immediate point under discussion—why does not Paul complete the story of the Antioch scene if the end of the story was as edifying

as we have just tried to make it out to be; if Peter was really convinced by what Paul said to him at Antioch, why does not Paul say so in triumph in our Epistle?

Of course, it may be said, in general, in answer to such questions, that the Galatian readers probably knew many things that modern readers do not know; very probably they knew perfectly well that there was no permanent breach between Paul and Peter, so that it was not necessary for their attention to be called to that fact in this Epistle.

But something more definite can be said in explanation of Paul's silence regarding the outcome of the Antioch scene. The plain fact is that before the Apostle has finished his account of what he said to Peter at Antioch he is thinking far more of the present effect of his words upon the Galatian readers than of the effect of them long ago at Antioch. In the passage which we studied last month he has been upon the very heights; as the fine old eighteenth-century commentator, Bengel, remarked, the contents of that passage may be called "the sum and marrow of Christianity." Paul has been pouring out his very soul in that passage; he has been celebrating the glories of the Cross of Christ. For him to have returned after that passage to the details of what had happened at Antioch would have been almost pedantic. What he is thinking of as he pens those glorious words at the end of the second chapter of Galatians is the unspeakable grace of God contrasted with the fact that his beloved converts in Galatia have turned their back upon it and have done despite to the Cross of Christ. No wonder that he refrains from rehearsing pedantically what the Galatians probably already knew about the results of the Antioch scene; no wonder that, instead, he breaks out in the words, "O foolish Galatians,

who hath bewitched you?" "You have had bestowed upon you all the marvels of the free grace of God; you have received new life through the Cross of Christ; yet you are making it all of none effect in order to try to earn by your own miserable works what Christ has purchased for you by His blood. Who hath bewitched you to make you turn your back upon so great salvation?"

The Missionary Preaching of Paul

"Who hath bewitched you," says Paul, "before whose eyes Jesus Christ was openly pictured as crucified." Here we have one of the precious references in the Pauline Epistles to the missionary preaching of the Apostle as distinguished from the instruction which he gave to Christian people. There are many things that we do not know about the missionary preaching of Paul, since the Epistles are addressed not to the unconverted but to Christians and since the Book of Acts gives us only brief examples of the Apostle's preaching to the unconverted world; but one thing we do know about it—we do know that at the very heart of it was the Cross of Christ. "The story of the crucifixion," Paul says in our passage, if we may paraphrase his words, "was made so vivid and so plain in my first preaching among you that it was as though a great picture of Christ on the cross were being held up before your eyes, or [if we adopt a different interpretation of the word that is figuratively used] as though a great placard were being held up before you with the words on it, 'Jesus Christ crucified.'"

Of course, this story of the Cross was not presented by the Apostle merely as an inspiring story of a holy martyrdom; but it was presented as something that had profound meaning for those to whom it was proclaimed. "Christ died for your sins," said Paul to those unconverted people in the Galatian cities.

Should Doctrine Be Preached to the Unconverted?

According to the tendency of religious work which is prevalent at the present day, Christian doctrine, including the central doctrine of the atonement, is to be presented to people, if at all, after

rather than before they have been saved. The advocates of this method sometimes have kind things to say about doctrine; it is necessary, they admit, in its proper place. A man who has already entered upon holy living, some of them no doubt say, will go on to study his Bible and will attain an ever more correct view of Christ and of the meaning of Christ's death. But at the beginning all that, it is held, is unnecessary; at the beginning all that is needed is surrender of the human will. What a man needs to do first, it is thought, is to put away his sin by his own act of surrender; there is time enough later for doctrinal instruction.

Whether that non-doctrinal, anti-intellectualistic method of religious work is right or wrong, it may be observed at any rate that it is quite contrary to the New Testament from beginning to end. The New Testament does not, in the manner of these modern religious workers, offer a man salvation first and then preach the gospel to him afterwards; but it preaches the gospel to him first—with the blessed doctrine of the atonement at the centre of it—and then, through his acceptance of that gospel, it brings salvation to his soul. It was to unconverted people that Paul preached in Galatia the message of the Cross of Christ; and when they accepted that message—that "doctrine"—they were saved.

Presbyterian Pelagianism (Continued)

wicked, depraved little sinners, who needed the cleansing grace of the Holy Spirit. Both Pelagianism and Augustinianism were taught that day in the Hollow. But the Presbyterian "Seminoles" preached the Pelagianism; the Methodist brother supplied the Augustinianism.

Consider the average appeal made to the college man to accept Christ. Utterly oblivious to the Reformation doctrine that "faith is a certainty," the speaker begins with the assurance that Christian faith cannot be scientifically validated or historically vindicated as other truths are verified. Then he appeals to the student to exercise his good

will, and by the plenary ability of his autonomous will to throw himself on the side of Christ. Faith is presented as a glorious venture made by the will-to-believe, betting one's life that there is a God. This form of appeal has developed a considerable tradition. With such names as Donald Hankey, William James, Fichte, Kant, Erasmus, William of Occam and Pelagius, it might be said to constitute a "liberal" orthodoxy. Perhaps it is about time for Karl Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr to remind those who are cutting these ruts deeper that the free, autonomous will with plenary ability has fared worse at the hands of modern psychology than even at the hands of Calvinists. Indeed, Barth declares that if we are to have any will at all we get it by positing our freedom on the royal freedom of the Sovereign God. With biting irony Barth describes an ecclesiastical machinery with young people's programs well prepared to keep good people good or even to make them better. The magnificent response which German youth has thus far given Barth's own proclamation of the brokenness of man's will and the sinfulness of his self-affirmation would serve to indicate that he has approached a bit closer to the hard facts of human psychology by leaving the ruts of "liberalism." From personal observation and information the writer can testify to the wonderful response which the youth of the Southeast and the youth of the Southwest have given Dr. "Bill" (W. M.) Anderson's presentation of the Biblical portrait of man and his need. Youth needs something more than the unsuspected resources of spiritual power in his own soul; the latent energies of his own will. He needs the supernatural, inward, purging, regenerating and renewing grace of the living God. He needs to have the heart of stone taken away, to be created anew in Christ Jesus, to have the love of God shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost. The actual young man one faces across the pulpit of a college chapel needs the Gospel of a God Almighty enough to make a bad man good, preached by a man who repents of his own sins while he calls others to repentance.

Once more, Pelagianism shows itself

in a poorly learned doctrine of election. There is a very naive kind of complacency and self-satisfaction in the conception of election held by some Presbyterians. "Am not I rich, comfortable, ethical, cultured, one of the bon tons, the elite, yes the elect?" An old Gettysburg elder told an incident which happened years ago in Carlisle Presbytery illustrating this point. A younger brother was doing an excellent piece of missionary work among a neglected group of people of German descent. The successful mission was killed by the pastor of one of the stronger churches who told Presbytery that "Pennsylvania Dutch never would make good Presbyterians anyway." What an utterly amazing statement for a minister who professed to believe in unconditional election! A real Augustinian absolutely denies that he is of the elect in the sense of standing before God as one of the elite, the bon tons. The true Calvinist confesses that he is the chief of sinners, the last, the least, the lowest at the Lord's table. He sees his egocentricity, his opposition to God, his love of evil and hatred of good. The white light of God's holiness wipes away that smug complacency. Illusions are gone. The sinner stands naked and undone before his Maker, confessing "nothing good have I Thy grace to claim." Ah then, he catches a glimpse of the true character of grace. Grace is love to the undeserving, the ill-deserving, the hell-deserving. The election taught by Paul and Augustine was wholly unconditioned by anything the sinner could ever offer. Real predestination has its foundation and its ground solely in God. All its springs are in Him; none in the sinner. "When we were hateful and hating one another, then God's love to men appeared." Election by God unconditioned by anything in man, "not that we loved Him, but that He loved us," sings "God is love" (1 John 4:7-10).

Augustine was a preacher of grace, as the love-energy of the holy God. Pelagius was the propagandist of moral reform wrought by human ability. The disciples of each have walked in the steps of their masters ever since. It has been well said that Luther was a sinner seeking a saviour; while Erasmus was a

scholar seeking a religion. Luther certified his Augustinianism by teaching the bondage of the will; Erasmus indicated his spiritual ancestry by defending the freedom of the will. In our day the Augustinian preaches the Gospel; the Pelagian preaches a social gospel. The Augustinian is a witness called "to testify the Gospel of the grace of God." The Pelagian is an exhorter urging measures of moral reform. In his *Rutherford B. Hayes—The Age of Hate*, Mr. H. J. Eckenrode has distinguished the two. This author declares that Christianity is not a narcotic; but the most overpowering stimulant humanity has ever experienced; that the real narcotics are the reform movements to which men give themselves as substitutes for Christianity. Augustinians offer the Christian stimulant; Pelagians shift from one reform narcotic to another. A Lutheran friend once asked the writer of this article why the conservatives were so much slower in preaching pacifism than the "liberals." The reply, then and now, is: "For the same reason that they were so much slower in preaching war; they have something else to preach." About six years ago the American *Mercury* raised a storm by quoting the way in which the great Eastern pacifist preachers (of about 1926) had fervently damned the Kaiser, in the years from 1914 to 1919.

A Pelagian desire for a great ecclesiastical machine with sufficient numbers to dominate state politics is one reason why there are so many calls for church affiliation and union. This purpose may be unknown or unrealized to many good men who push such schemes. The writer has the highest regard for the doctrinal soundness of certain ones of his brother ministers both in the North and the South who have recently advocated membership in the Federal Council. These particular brethren could never be Pelagian themselves. They would never consciously tolerate a Pelagian position for their churches. May the writer have the temerity to ask them to consider whether in supporting the Federal Council they are not unconsciously asking their respective churches to take a position which is logically Pelagian? Does not the

history of the Federal Council to date show that Presbyterian Churches have held membership in it only at the cost of *sacrificing the Gospel for the sake of the social gospel, and is this not Pelagianism?*

In frankness the writer should perhaps say that he has three other questions about this Council. (1) Has not the Council taken up for discussion and pronouncement matters which are beyond the scope of the Church's activities according to chapter 31, section 4 of the Westminster Confession? (2) Has not the Council and its agencies professed to speak the mind of the affiliated Churches on matters on which these Churches hold divergent and contradictory opinions? For instance, the Westminster Confession holds that Christian magistrates "may lawfully, now under the New Testament, wage war upon just and necessary occasions" (Chapter 23, Section 2). On the other hand, the most recent protagonist of the Federal Council, Dr. William Adams Brown, maintains that Presbyterians "feel increasingly the fundamental contradiction between war and the spirit of Jesus." In the immediately preceding paragraph the New York professor affirms that there is room "for honest difference of opinion" as to the righteousness of using "force" to accomplish "a radical revolution in the whole social sphere," "among men who agree in holding the Social Gospel." (*Union Seminary Review*, July 1932, p. 401). Is this, then, the casuistry of the Social Gospel: first, that it is right for certain advocates of the Social Gospel to use force in a radical, socialistic revolution; second, that it is proper for all the other Social Gospellers to tolerate this armed attack upon the American Government, since "here there is room for honest difference of opinion"; but third, that it is wrong, in "fundamental contradiction" to "the spirit of Jesus," for the Chief Magistrate to wage war against armed revolt as well as against the foreign abettors thereof? Except His Apostles had given a very different interpretation of "the spirit of Jesus" in relation to civil authority (Matt. 22:21; Rom. 12:1-6; 1 Peter 2:13-17), this loved land

(Continued on page 11)

Let Us Become "Antioch Christians" Once More!

An address by
The Rev. John Clover Mosma

PERHAPS the most glorious day of my life was the one I spent some time ago in the old city of Antioch, in northern Syria, the city that may be rightly called the capital of early Christianity. That day represents a high tide in my spiritual life. Walking the streets of that ancient town I was stirred to my heart's depths by a strange and thrilling sense of the presence of the Holy Spirit. Time and ages seemed to submerge and become lost to sight and I felt myself identified with the great church that sent out Paul and Barnabas and a host of other evangelists and missionaries, that entertained and put life and spirit into more than thirty church conventions in post-apostolic times, and that served as a spiritual powerhouse for all the world, from India to Spain.

The church of Antioch was the church of the Holy Spirit *par excellence*. Its deep spirituality made it the institution it was. There was a real, direct, daily fellowship between Christ in heaven and the soul of every member, man or woman, in that church. And that meant faith, a deep, purposeful faith. That meant the exact opposite of apathy and indifferentism. That meant victory—though Nero thundered and the Jewish chief priests ground their teeth in impotent rage. Give me a hundred—a mere hundred—men and women that are daily in actual touch with God, and they will work wonders. The things that are impossible with men will prove possible with God—through their agency.

Deep spirituality. Is there anything our badly deteriorated Presbyterian Church needs worse than that? I do not refer to the effervescent emotionalism that is so much sought after among certain religious groups. That would be foreign to the genius of Presbyterianism, of the Reformed faith. What I have in mind is a quiet, steady, daily walk with God. "And Enoch walked with God." "And I will walk among you and will be your God, and ye shall be my people." "Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me." And then the outreach to heaven: "And they shall walk with Me in white, for they are worthy."

Walking with God! Yet—mind you—not just any God. Walking decidedly and unalterably with the God of the Holy Scriptures. We have committees on spiritual

emphasis these days, and evangelistic conferences, and ministerial retreats. But the trouble is that very many of the men that are engaged in these "spiritual" pursuits have a God in mind other than the One of the Scriptures. They will miss their mark. They have not set God—the God of the Scriptures—before their eyes. He will not let Himself be found of them. A true "walking with God," a deep and abiding spirituality, is possible only with those who embrace the God of the Bible in unfeigned love and in the passion of a great, unquestioning desire.

But that being understood, is there anything our Church in its distress stands more in need of than a true "walking with God," a genuine, intimate fellowship with the God of its life? Has not the pulsebeat of our spiritual life during the last decades been extremely weak and intermittent? Have we not administered overdoses of artificial stimulants, to the extent that our large and cumbersome body is rapidly becoming inured to them? Using the stethoscope of the Divine Word, have not many of us detected symptoms that literally affrighted us? And in these circumstances have we not cried out for the living God, realizing that human help is vain, that only direct action by the Holy Spirit can help and lift up and stir to new life and activity our sadly weakened Church?

And when God's Spirit begins to move—as we pray humbly and beseechingly that He will—the first thing that will stand out before us, sharply and vividly, will be our common guilt. I speak advisedly of "common" guilt. We orthodox have been too much inclined to cast the blame for the Church's condition upon our opponents. We say that Modernism has sapped our strength; that the Modernists have brought all this shame upon our Presbyterian Zion. We blame the false prophets; those whom Ezekiel described as daubing with untempered mortar; the wolves in sheep's clothing, as Jesus with His customary directness described religious deceivers. And we forget that if the orthodox had done their duty, long ago, these false prophets would never have had their chance. We also forget that if the orthodox were doing their duty today the assailants of God and His Word would be on the defensive everywhere, and their fight would be a losing one.

And so I speak of "common" guilt. There is on the one hand the enormous guilt of the

backsliders, preachers and people, who dishonor God's holy Name and despise His Holy Word. But there is also the grievous guilt of those who failed to watch, and to protest, and to act with definiteness and decision at the proper time; the guilt of the men and women of God whose love for their Lord was too tepid and lukewarm to emit sparks and flames when His honor was at stake.

If therefore we mean to attempt a real church reformation we must start out with real penitence, a genuine humbling of ourselves before Him whom we have grieved so deeply and so long. Our souls must weep tears of repentance. We must listen with deepest attention and sympathy to Israel's weeping prophet as Jehovah speaks through Him and says, "Many pastors have destroyed my vineyard, they have trodden my portion under foot, they have made my pleasant portion a desolate wilderness. They have made it desolate, and being desolate it mourneth unto Me." But our hearts must at the same time join themselves to Jeremiah when he begs and cries, "O Lord, though our iniquities testify against us, do Thou it for Thy Name's sake! For we are called by Thy Name; leave us not!"

Fellow-believers, the success of all attempts at church reformation is absolutely conditioned upon this attitude of soul and mind. Let us confess our frightful sins of omission and neglect. Let us plead for forgiveness in the name of Christ. And then let us beg for the Holy Spirit—the Spirit of loyalty and courage—, for a willingness to suffer, if necessary, the worst of pain and shame for Him who loved us and gave Himself for us.

I have spoken of courage. We shall need it. If we actually mean to follow King Josiah's example in destroying the high places and clearing away the rubbish from God's holy temple; if we actually mean to uphold the Book of God's revelation and defend its sacredness and inviolability against all attacks, under-handed and open; if we actually mean to subscribe to Paul's anathema upon the preachers of "another gospel" and to govern ourselves accordingly; we shall need a courage that is truly born of God. We shall need persistence, too. The sad conditions in which we find ourselves are not of recent date. Their roots run far down into the soil of church history. A spiritual and psychological atmosphere has developed in the course of long years that is far from homogeneous with our best Presbyterian traditions and that has permeated the whole of our church life and affected the minds of old and young, educated and uneducated, with its sweet, narcotic poison. Besides, there is the Father of Lies and the Prince of Darkness who will leave no stone unturned to hamper our efforts and spoil our good work. Persistence we shall need, as much as courage. Our battle will

not be a brief and spectacular one, with heavy casualties and a quick decision. But it will be the battle of the Lord God of Hosts, and we have His promise that He Himself will be in the van. I pray and trust that at least a measure of that grim determination that in ages gone by featured the warfare of the Scots, the Scots-Irish, the old Cameronians, the Huguenots and the Dutch, will be found in the hearts of the Presbyterian orthodox of today as they set about to defend and restore the heritage of their mighty fathers.

I have already spoken of our most fundamental need as I see it—a genuine and deep spirituality. There is a fearful decline in the personal, spiritual life of our people. A virile, personal faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and a consequent fearless witnessing for Him in every domain of life are almost like strange, exotic plants in our denominational garden. Men and women of conviction are extremely thinly sown. A worldliness is rampant among us so calloused and shameless and raw that in all the annals of our ecclesiastical history, from the days of Francis Makemie on, you will not find anything like it.

And upon the loss of personal faith a sad indifference as to faith's contents followed as a matter of course. We still have our precious Standards, but you and I know that the authoritative character of those documents is no longer recognized by thousands of our fellow-communicants; that even hundreds of ministers regard them as articles belonging in an antique shop or a museum, instead of upon the moderator's tables of our judicatories, small and large. We are fast becoming a non-confessional Church. We have opened our doors to doctrines un-Presbyterian and un-Biblical. Infidelity is trampling with amazing ruthlessness upon that which our fathers deemed holy and exalted, by which they lived and died, and we, their spiritual descendants, are actually expected to witness the spectacle with hands folded, as true "men of peace."

There is the question of education—in our seminaries, and also in our colleges. Of the seminaries not much need be said here and now. We are, I take it, familiar with the facts. The imperative necessity of the establishment of Westminster Seminary some years ago, in order to have at least one theological training school that dared to follow the apostle Paul in his wholesome intolerance of infidelity and doctrinal indifferentism, tells rather enough of the story. That colleges supported or endorsed by our Church are working both insidiously or openly to support the program of the ecclesiastical revolutionaries is perhaps not so generally known. I have just finished my investigation of one of them, as the chairman of a special presbyterial committee, and my heart is still filled with disgust and sorrow at the things we found. What a dis-

honor it all was for Him whom we worship in our hearts as the Wisdom of God.

That a church-political machine has been erected in our midst is a fact only too well known. And that the machine represents and promotes doctrines and policies that are contrary to Presbyterian principles, that violate our most sacred covenants, and that reduce in effect the Christ whom our fathers honored—the Redeemer-King before whom Calvin and Knox and Melville bowed in humblest reverence—to a gilded figure-head, while a coterie of high ecclesiastics hands its orders around quite in arbitrary fashion—these, too, are facts with which we are well acquainted.

In fact, our whole Presbyterian system of government and discipline has suffered a breakdown. In the circumstances it is really not to be wondered at that men ignorant of Reformed church polity and with selfish ambitions are lording it over the Church. This mammoth institution which we call the Presbyterian Church cannot be run without some form of government!

This breakdown of our governmental and disciplinary system has not happened with the suddenness of an earthquake or a volcanic eruption. There has been a slow process of disintegration that started generations back. Today we hardly know what Presbyterian government and discipline are. The subjects have been wiped off the curricula of seminaries. Principles of polity are only seldom discussed or debated at our judicatories. One would have a hard time to find even one Presbyterian Church session well posted on church discipline, and exercising it, for the benefit of the church and in the name of Christ, our King.

That our missions are in a bad plight everybody knows—even the dyed-in-the-wool modernist. Our Boards are having an extremely hard time getting their money together, and with all their mechanistic contrivances they have not been able to prevent the annual shortages that have begun as far back as 1925—long before the depression. The truth of the matter is that most of our people are growing indifferent, and that some of them are growing suspicious. Though these latter have not the facts on hand, they suspect that something is radically wrong and their enthusiasm has been waning. We who are here know that the preaching of the Gospel of the Son of God to poor and lost sinners is no longer the dominating feature of much of our mission work,—but "social uplift," education and cultural development. We know that our Boards are following more and more a policy of religious eclecticism, so that Hindus and Buddhists and Shintoists throw their arms around the shoulders of our missionaries and whisper sweet words of welcome and peace. I have for years been receiving mail from some of our outstanding missionaries, in Japan, in

China, in Korea, in India, and other lands, in which they lament the situation and mourn to God because of the attitude of the Boards. I repeat, we—you and I—know the facts. And we know, better than anything else in this connection, how our high officials by a conspiracy of silence in the denominational press and by threatening the reputations and livelihood of our orthodox missionaries in the field and our ministers at home seek to squelch or to forestall any effective criticism that might be directed at them.

God forbid that we should look upon this whole matter of church deformation as an abstract proposition, or that in thinking of the Church we should think only and merely of an organized institution, with its judicatories, departments, executives, local officers and general membership. We are handling a *living* thing, my brethren and sisters! We are treating a high and holy thing! We are dealing with the Church of the living God, the blood-bought possession of our Lord and Saviour! We are dealing with that of which you and I confess to be living members through sovereign grace, into which our children were born as the seed of the Covenant, and in and by which we and our children are prepared for eternity. Shall we be anything less than tremendously concerned about that which has so much to do with our eternal destiny and welfare? Shall we not shrink with horror from the prospect of having our children and grandchildren trained up under ministrations that cheat them out of heaven itself; that lead them along flower-strewn paths, to the tune of soft and indolent music, on to graves from which there will be no rising unto glory?

Then what must we do?

That a change in conditions is necessary needs no argument. I only want to emphasize the great need of avoiding anything superficial. We should and must have a *thoroughgoing* change, a reformation that goes to the *heart* of things, and that from heart reaches out to every section of the periphery.

Some of us seem in the past to have been satisfied with a sort of *laissez faire* policy on the part of the Church. "I won't bother you if you let me alone." In other words, they object to the control that the modernists are now exerting alone and by themselves, but would apparently be satisfied if the modernists and orthodox could "run" the Church on a basis of strict equality. Oftentimes such people are particular and careful when it comes to their own local church, but lenient and big-hearted when the Church as a whole is concerned. At home they want an exclusive church, doctrinally speaking; they prefer and even insist upon the old Gospel; but for the denomination at large they favor,—at least, they tolerate,—the inclusive idea. Such an attitude, of

course, is not only illogical, and even foolish, but dangerous in the extreme.

No, the inclusive Church idea must be torn up and cast out, root and branch. The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. stands unequivocally opposed to it, both historically and doctrinally. Those who belong to her membership and yet attack her Constitution, her doctrines, her polity, and her historical methods, are interlopers and seditionists. They have a full right to their opinions; they even have a full right to spread them as assiduously as brains and money will allow;—but not until they are outside our Church boundaries. And when once we have them outside—may God speed the day!—they will at once become the objects of our loving missionary effort. We can then try to win them for our precious, eternal faith.

I want to stress something else. A thoroughgoing reformation requires more than a *revival*. A genuine spiritual revival is the first requisite. I have already stressed that at the beginning. But we need more, far more, than the stirring of individual souls to a fuller and more zestful life. The whole, enormous structure of the Church needs overhauling. Great reconstructive efforts must be made in all departments. The great doctrinal and governmental principles to which our fathers held with utmost tenacity, by which they lived, for which they died, must again be brought to the fore; they must again be made to exert their powerful directive influence—everywhere.

Let Presbyterians no longer give heed to the twaddle that those principles are outworn; that they no longer fit in the twentieth century scheme of things. Gold is gold, whether you find it new in the gold mines of South Africa or bring it up from the darkness of King Tut-Ankh-Amen's tomb in Egypt. There is no old or new to it. It is never outworn or out of style. Let Presbyterians wipe the dust from the gold of their principles, those principles that hail from eternity and belong to the ages, and let them highly resolve that no materials will be found in their reconstructed temple that are out of harmony with their solidness and lustre.

To introduce, in the name and with the help of God, our desperately needed reformation we must organize our orthodox forces throughout the Church. If anywhere, the old motto is applicable in our situation: "United we stand; divided we fall." No battle has ever been won by soldiers acting individually and for and by themselves. In solid, compact, well-organized ranks we must meet our opponents. If we do, there is no doubt about a victorious outcome. Our opponents have really nothing to fall back on. They are religious privateers, everyone of them. They have nothing authoritative to back them. They soar on Icarus-wings and seek to reach the glamorous nothings of

a *fata morgana*, a mirage. We have *back* of us and *with* us and *in* us the history, the traditions, the Constitution, the doctrines, the world-conquering FAITH of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; we have going on before us the everlasting SON OF GOD;—and in these circumstances the outcome should not be in doubt. All we need do, and do carefully and thoroughly, is *organize*.

Presbyterian Pelagianism (Continued)

would have long since been Mexicanized, or Sovietized, or anarchized. This method of defending the Federal Council easily suggests the third question concerning that body: (3) Is the Federal Council patriotic or unpatriotic, pro-American or pro-Soviet? The wide prevalence of this question is acknowledged even by those who defend Presbyterian participation in the Federal Council, e.g., Rev. Dr. J. T. Bergen of Minneapolis in *CHRISTIANITY TODAY*, July 1932.

But even if each of these three questions were satisfactorily answered, from the standpoint of this article there would still be grave objection to Presbyterian participation in this organization. Are not Presbyterians taking a Pelagian position when, for the sake of accomplishing such social and political matters as the abrogation of the color line in the best hotels, the Americanization of Dr. D. C. Mackintosh, the proper disposal of Fiume, the removal of the German confession of unique war guilt in the Versailles treaty, the curbing of militarism, they support a Federal Council which uses as a radio preacher a man who has "decoded" the Resurrection of Jesus into the Greek doctrine of the immortality of His spirit (*The Modern Use of the Bible*), who has rejected the Virgin Birth and the Second Coming of Christ, who has used the pulpit of the First Presbyterian Church of New York to caricature and hold up to ridicule the doctrine of the atonement found in the Westminster Standards and taught by the Southern Presbyterian Church, namely, the satisfaction of Divine justice by penal substitution (*Shall the Fundamentalists Win?*), who

calls in question the supreme object of Presbyterian worship with a sermon, *The Peril of Worshipping Jesus?* Can Calvinists properly support for social purposes a Council whose radio preachers present a New Protestantism antagonistic to the Reformation battle standard—justification by faith—in the nature of faith, the function of faith, the certainty of faith, the ground of justification, the nature of justification, and the graciousness or meritoriousness of the whole process? Basing ecclesiastical organization on social interests, to the disregard of difference in belief, is the characteristic of Hinduism, not of historic Christianity.

Turning finally to the question of Church union, Dr. William A. Brown's article, already mentioned, furnishes the latest basis for discussion. In the interest of Augustinianism statements by prominent representatives of each of the two Union Theological Seminaries, will be opposed to the unionism advocated by this professor emeritus of Union, N. Y., in the *Review of Union*, Va. In his inaugural address Dr. Ben R. Lacy, Jr., of Union (Va.), very courageously drew a line of distinction and demarcation between those seminaries which accepted the supernatural and those which rejected the supernatural (*Union Seminary Review*, July 1927, p. 360). It does not admit of doubt that Dr. Lacy used the word supernatural in its usual and historical sense of miraculous; and that three years after the *Auburn Affirmation* he thus heroically placed himself and his seminary on the side of the miracles of the new Testament. On the other hand Dr. Brown defends the *Auburn Affirmation* and thus undertakes to destroy Dr. Lacy's line of distinction, since *The Affirmation* declares that the acceptance of the miracles of the Gospels is not necessary for Presbyterian ordination. A careless reader may not gather this from Dr. Brown's article. The New York professor comes out in large type for "THE RE-DISCOVERY OF THE SUPERNATURAL." But the sensitized reader will discern that in this section, *Union Seminary Review*, July 1932, pp. 390-392, Dr. Brown is not using the word supernatural in its usual sense of the miraculous. Of course,

Professors Whitehead and Oman do not wish to be understood as standing with Dr. Lacy for the literal acceptance of the miracles of the Gospels. To heed Dr. Brown's plea, then, and to unite on the basis of the *Auburn Affirmation* is to obliterate that line which the President of Union (Va.) so magnificently drew in his inaugural address.

Nor is this all. Dr. Brown closes by urging the submerging of lines of division by "simplifying our terms of subscription, putting all emphasis upon the central convictions which we share as Christians with all our fellow Christians" (Ibid, pp. 405-6). In the light of his defense of the *Auburn Affirmation* these central convictions would certainly not include the Virgin Birth, the bodily resurrection of Jesus, or that He offered up Himself a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice and reconcile us to God. It should also be remembered that not so many months ago Dr. Brown came out in the Introduction to Horton's *Theism and the Modern Mood* for the inclusion of the Humanists (men who do not believe in God) in Christian fellowship. Just which "central convictions" are common to the Southern Presbyterians, the Auburn Affirmationists, and the Humanists? Certainly, the lowest common denominator of that equation is a sacrifice of Augustinianism. The humanistic *motif* in American religion from Channing to John Deitrich and John Haynes Holmes has ever been the destruction of the Augustinian-Calvinistic doctrine of man.

Across the entrance to the broad road opened by Dr. Wm. Adams Brown stands a warning sign written by the grandest Augustinian who ever occupied a chair in the New York Union Theological Seminary. Dr. Wm. G. T. Shedd warned that denominational unity was undesirable since it would compromise the glorious Calvinistic doctrine of free and sovereign grace (*Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy*, p. 247). Dr. Shedd vigorously inculcated Christian philanthropy; but as a true Calvinist he refused to subordinate "the praise of the glory of God's grace" (Eph. 1:6) to the Social Gospel. Shall Presbyterianism walk the easy road down the valley of popular

Pelagianism; or shall she essay to re-climb the steep and lonely path that leads to the mountains where her true prophets—her Shedd, her Warfields, her Calvins, her Augustines, her Pauls, her Moseses—have seen GOD?

Editorial Notes and Comments (Concluded)

the occasion of our repentance. But they are all comparatively unimportant as compared with the great root sin of unbelief, from which they all flow. To talk of "repentance" in the great "evangelical" churches today, and to leave out the most flagrant sin for which we should repent is

in itself a fearful blasphemy as we approach the mercy seat. It is not enough to talk vaguely of "repentance." Our repentance to be Christian must be directed to the one great sin that is eating like a cancer in the heart of the church.

By contrast, the appeal of the Reformation Fellowship rings true. It places the sin of unbelief in its proper setting, and insists that before all else the church should repent of it. Where the appeal of the Federal Council in referring to "the way of the Cross" is so vague that any Modernist could assent to it, the reference to the Cross in the appeal of the Fellowship is clearly Reformed, which is to say, Biblical.

Which will bring blessing, a true repentance for the church's great sin of unbelief, or a pseudo-repentance that ignores it?

Letters to the Editor

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

The Board of Foreign Missions

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: In the columns of CHRISTIANITY TODAY attention has frequently been called to the theological drift which has taken place within the Presbyterian Church away from the evangelical position. This drift has now reached a point which a few years ago would have been thought impossible, but it has come so slowly and been manipulated with such skill that many are hardly aware of it even yet. This is evidenced by what has taken place at recent meetings of General Assembly, by reorganizations, by measures initiated within the Church itself which a few years ago could not have witnessed.

In this connection I wish to submit a little evidence which will give an idea of the length to which this drift has already gone and to what a deplorable extent it has affected even the Boards and Agencies of the Presbyterian Church. Recently there came to my attention a letter sent out by the Board of Foreign Missions of The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. to more than a thousand young men and women studying in Colleges, Seminaries, and other educational institutions with a view to devoting their lives to service as foreign missionaries. The letter is signed by Lindsay S. B. Hadley and Minnie W. Corbett, Candidate Secretaries. It is evidently the plan to keep in touch with this group of young people by a

letter every six months, so that when their time of service does begin they will be fitted spiritually and in other ways for their work as missionaries.

Your readers will be especially interested, as I was, in the character of the books suggested by the Board as an aid to the spiritual growth and development of the prospective missionaries. In this connection the letter says: "Then there are books like 'The Devotional Diary' by Oldham; 'Today,' an outline of Bible readings; 'The Meaning of Faith' and others by Fosdick; 'Marks of a World Christian' by Fleming." If this list of authors is the best the Board of Foreign Missions can give in witness to the Gospel of Christ, then the situation in Presbyterianism is indeed tragic! From the suggestions here made one would suppose there were no writers, either within the Presbyterian Church or any other denomination, who had not gone over to the extreme Modernistic position. As a matter of fact there are many safely evangelical authors that might have been selected. One of the men above mentioned, now perhaps the leading exponent of Modern Paganism in the U. S., was for years a cancer spot on the body of Presbyterianism. Finally the Church got rid of his blighting influence in a direct way, but the Board of Foreign Missions, in its position of power and trust, deliberately seeks to reestablish and maintain such an influence in the lives of prospective missionaries. The other authors suggested, though not so well known, are no less objec-

tionable from an evangelical point of view. From this it can be readily seen how insidious an influence is at work within the Board itself to poison the stream of foreign missions at its source. It is equally plain to be seen what sort of missionary candidates would be selected for foreign service by a Board so dominated. Satan himself could not devise a more refined or more effective scheme for killing the witness to the blood of Christ as the one and only means of Salvation for lost humanity in this or foreign lands. And this, we must realize, is actually being done within the organization of the Presbyterian Church. Surely the Great Apostasy is well under way.

A LAYMAN.

"Christlike" Modernists?

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: In CHRISTIANITY TODAY, May number, you answered the questions, "Are modernists more tolerant and Christ-like than fundamentalists?" also "Does it make any difference what one believes?" It is not what this or that one says, but what is recorded in God's Word. The Word is very clear in regard to both questions. Paul says: "But though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say we now again. If any one preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." (Gal. 1:8-9.) The gospel Paul preached has a clear, definite ring. "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." (I Cor. 2:2.) "We preach Christ crucified." "God commendeth His love towards us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him." "When we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His son." (Rom. 5:8-10.) "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation; now then we are ambassadors for Christ; as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God. For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." (2 Cor. 5:19-21.)

Paul did not preach a gospel of reformation but of transformation. Is it "not what one believes, but what he does?" Again the Word says: "Therefore by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in His sight." (Rom. 3:20.) "We conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." (Rom. 3:28.) "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the laws; ye are fallen from grace." (Gal. 6:4.) "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and

shall believe in thy heart that God hath raised Him from the dead thou shall be saved." (Rom. 10:9.) Jesus said: "When He (the Holy Spirit) is come, He will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and judgment; of sin because they believe not on me"; (John 16:8-9.) The sin of the world is unbelief. All transgressions are fruit of unbelief. The fearful and unbelieving head the list of all the abominable ones that are cast into the lake of fire which is the second death. Read Rev. 21:8. How about preachers who teach it does not make any difference what one believes?

The fact is *if it is not true* that: "By grace ye are saved through faith; and that not of yourself it is the gift of God." (Eph. 2:8), then ye are not saved now. Neither will ye be till the judgment day when the books are opened. What then? One frost kills the fruit buds and destroys the garden. One puncture makes the tire tube useless. One disobedience drove our first parents from the garden. They passed from life unto death. The wages of sin (not sins) is death. Once taking glory unto himself Moses did not enter the Promised land. To need no Saviour one's life must be perfect, sinless, from birth to death. No good act balances a bad one. For we should always do the good and never the bad. "When ye shall have done all these things which are commanded you, say we are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do." (Luke 17:10.)

If true, by grace through faith we are saved, then we are saved fully, freely right now. If Eternal life is the gift of God through Jesus Christ His Son, then we may have glory, honor, immortality, Eternal life now. "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not the Life." (I John 5:12.)

John says: "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not unto your house, neither bid him Gods speed; for he that biddeth him Gods speed is a partaker of his evil deeds." (II John 9-11.) The doctrine of Christ and that which Paul preaches are identical.

To see the kingdom of God first ye must be born into this world or of water. Any one who knows about physical birth knows it is a water birth. Second, ye must be born of Spirit. On one side born of water, of flesh, of will of man, of corruptible seed. On the other, born of Spirit, of Will of God, from above, of incorruptible seed. If the Spiritual birth is a figure of speech so is being born into this world. One who is born of Spirit is as conscious of fact as of physical life. "If any one is in Christ he is a new creature." (II Cor. 5:17.)

The doctrine of Christ: "As Moses lifted up the Serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish but have everlasting life." (John 3:14-15.) "I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." (John 10:11.) "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am the bread of life. I am the living bread which cometh down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever." (John 6:47-51.) "I, if I be lifted up from the earth will draw all men unto me." (John 12:52.) "He (Jesus) took the cup, and gave thanks and gave it to them saying, drink ye all of it. For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Matt. 26:27-28.) Jesus also said: "I and the Father are one." (John 10:32.) "What if ye see the son of man ascending to where he was." (John 6:62.) "Say not to Him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God." (John 10:36.) "Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." (John 17:5.) Jesus' consciousness of pre-existence and oneness with the Father is as clear a proof of his divine birth as Luke's gospel.

If Jesus did not come into the world as Luke affirms but was born of human parents He was no more divine than we are. Like produces like. Human only human. Then in Him did not dwell "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." He might have had more of the Holy Spirit and presence of Infinite God. But He would be only finite. The Jews said, "Is not this Jesus the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" How is it that he sayeth, "I came down from heaven?" (John 6:42.) No reasoning being can have "sound belief in Jesus as the Son of God and Saviour of Man" and not have as sound a belief in his virgin birth as Luke states.

In the sun's rays are blended the seven primary colors. Which color is most essential? Can part of them be not there and still have sunbeam? As all are essential, so with the Sun of Righteousness. He is the Eternal Son of God. By the Virgin Mary He becomes the Son of man. His sinless life made it possible for Him to become redeemer of man. The miracles were a natural result of His nature and life. He said "Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me; or else believe me for the very works sake." (John 14:11.) "If I do not the works of my Father believe me not." (John 10:37.) By His death He becomes the Saviour of man. His bodily resurrection proves that He is alive and can give eternal life. He said: "No man taketh it (life) from me. I have

power to lay it down and I have power to take it up again." (John 10:18.) His ascension shows that He lives as our high priest. God's Word makes clear that if any preach any other gospel than the doctrine of Christ which Paul and all other Apostles preached, they are accursed, fallen from grace, not from God, whose ways are evil. If any receive them into their house or bid them God-speed he is a partaker of their evil deeds.

B. E. JACOBS.

Albany, Ore.

"Signs of the Times"

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

SIR: Such is the condition of the world today, nationally, politically, morally, religiously and spiritually, that the absorbing question on the lips of every one you meet is, "What is the matter of the world?" I am enclosing an address by Judge Akerman, of Tampa, Florida, Judge of the United States District Court, delivered before the Rotary Club of Lakeland, Florida, on the subject, "The Signs of the Times." The address is so striking in the portrayal of world conditions, that I feel that it should have a wider hearing. Hence I am commending it to the readers of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. But before reading the address, and fully to appreciate its significance, the 24th chapter of Matthew, the 21st chapter of Luke and the 3rd and 4th chapters of 2 Timothy should be read. In answer to the question by His disciples, Christ gave "the signs of His coming and the end of the world." And then He said, "Learn a parable of the fig tree. When the branch is yet tender and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh. So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the door." And then he said "Watch." To fail to watch for these signs, indicates a want of interest or confidence in Christ's words!

Having read the signs given by Christ and Paul, you will be able to see the correspondence in the signs given by the Judge, and the signs given by Christ. The special importance that attaches to the Judge's deliverance on this subject, is that it is not by a preacher or even a Christian, but by one who disavows any interest in Christianity or its creeds—by a man of the world. There certainly is a responsibility and personal interest for every one to watch.

Excerpts from the address follow:

"In a time of peace," he said, "millions out of employment, large percentages of whom, with their dependents, are on the verge of starvation; manufacture is at a standstill; business is bankrupt; nations, states, counties, districts, municipalities and individuals are attempting to repudiate just debts; taxation in our country and all of its

political divisions is exorbitant; crime, corruption and graft are rampant; respect for law, order and decency are at a low ebb, and communism is spreading at a rate that those of us who are in the best position to know dare not admit even to ourselves.

"If I were asked to name the causes for all of this, the answer would be short and simple. Too much legislation; government in business; paternalism; extravagance, public and private; loss of respect for law and public officials; failure of courts, prosecuting officers and jurors to discharge their duties fully; the breakdown in the American home, and the departure from the religion of our fathers.

"Our governments, national, state and municipal, have regulated business, in many instances unwisely and unjustly until it has been almost regulated out of business.

"My old-fashioned idea of a home is a place where a tired man returns at night as a haven of rest; there the dear mother gathers her brood and teaches them principles of honesty, integrity and respect for law, order, decency and for the rights of others; a place to which the young men and women, as they go out in the world will always look back as sacred. Now in a mild way it has been turned into a bar-room and gambling den, and the children regard it as a sleeping car to crawl into in the early hours of the morning.

"I am not a church man and care very

little for creeds and dogmas, but history teaches that a nation without some religion is without patriotism and a nation without patriotism is doomed.

"Congress met last December and has remained in session until now, and most of the time has been taken up jockeying for political position. At the end of the last fiscal year, the national budget was two billions of dollars out of balance. Congress by a niggardly spirit of economy, and by taxing everything except the air we breathe, claimed to have balanced the budget, and then proceeded to provide for expenditures which would again throw it more than two billions out of balance.

"Our last legislature, elected on a platform of economy, after the regular session and two extra sessions, adjourned, after having appropriated more money than ever in the history of the state, and having added many new taxes including an additional automobile and gasoline tax.

"I have listened in on the two great political conventions and have read the long platform of the republicans and the short platform of the democrats and again I can see nothing constructive, but only a play for political position. In fact the only thing I got out of these conventions was that when I observed the antics of the women delegates, I became a thorough convert to the repeal of the 19th amendment."

E. E. BIGGER.

Clearwater, Fla.

"Perfectionism"—A Book Review

PERFECTION by Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield. Oxford University Press. Two volumes, pp. 399 and 611. \$3.50 per volume.

THE great interest that Dr. Warfield took in Perfectionism is indicated by the fact that it has required two large volumes to reprint his contributions to an understanding of this subject. It goes without saying that what he has written in this connection should not be ignored by any one interested in a movement that has played and continues to play an important role in the drama of Protestantism.

The first of these volumes is particularly concerned with Perfectionism as it has manifested itself in Germany. Here we have not only an account and explanation of the "Higher Life" Movement as it has appeared in the churches of Germany but an extended account of the assault on the Reformation doctrine of sin and grace made by Rationalist scholars like Ritschl, Wernle, Clemen, Pfeleiderer, and Windsch. The second concerns itself more particularly with Perfectionism

as it has found expression in these United States. Here we have not only an extended account and running criticism of "Oberlin Perfectionism" (Pres. Mahan and Charles G. Finney), of "John Humphrey Noyes and His 'Bible Communists,'" and of "The Mystical Perfectionism of Thomas Cogswell Upham," but of "The Higher Life Movement" (W. E. Boardman, and Mr. and Mrs. Robert Pearsall Smith) and "The Victorious Life Movement" (Charles G. Trumbull). While there is no independent treatment of the "Keswick Movement" there is frequent reference to it, Dr. Warfield apparently regarding it as the least objectionable of the Perfectionist movements.

According to Dr. Warfield the immediate source of most of the Perfectionism of modern Protestantism is to be found in the teaching of John Wesley, particularly in his teaching that justification and sanctification are two separate gifts of God to be separately obtained by separate acts of faith. He points out, however, that Perfectionist tendencies have appeared "constantly along the courses of two fundamental streams of

thought. Wherever Mysticism intrudes, it carries a tendency to Perfectionism with it. On Mystical ground—as, for example, among the Quakers—a Perfectionism has been developed to which that taught by Wesley shows such similarity, even in details and modes of expression, that a mistaken attempt has been made to discover an immediate genetic connection between them. Wherever again men lapse into an essentially Pelagian mode of thinking concerning the endowments of human nature and the conditions of human action, a Perfectionism similar to that taught by Pelagius himself tends to repeat itself. That is to say, history verifies the correlation of Perfectionism and Libertarianism, and wherever Libertarianism rules the thoughts of men, Perfectionism persistently makes its appearance. It is to this stream of influence that Wesleyan Perfectionism owes its origin. Its roots are set historically in the Semi-Pelagian Perfectionism of the Dutch Remonstrants. . . . Its particular differentiation is determined by the supernaturalism which it shares with the whole body of modifications introduced by Wesley into his fundamental Arminianism, from which Wesleyanism has acquired its Evangelical character" (Vol. I, p. 3; Vol. II, pp. 463 and 562).

Dr. Warfield maintains that Perfectionism in all its forms involves a rejection of the type of Christianity taught and exemplified by the Reformers and imbedded in the doctrinal formularies of the Lutheran and Reformed churches. "It belongs to the very essence of the type of Christianity propagated by the Reformation," he writes, "that the believer should feel himself continuously unworthy of the grace by which he lives. At the center of this type of Christianity lies the contrast of sin and grace; and about this center everything else revolves. This is in large part the meaning of the emphasis put on justification by faith in this type of Christianity. It is its conviction that there is nothing in us or done by us, at any stage of our earthly development, because of which we are acceptable to God. We must always be accepted for Christ's sake, or we cannot ever be accepted at all. This is not true of us only 'when we believe.' It is just as true after we have believed. It will continue to be true as long as we live. Our need of Christ does not cease with our believing; nor does the nature of our relation to Him or to God through Him ever alter, no matter what our attainments in Christian graces or our achievements in Christian behaviour may be. It is always on His 'blood and righteousness' alone that we can rest. There is never anything that we are or have or do that can take His place, or that can take a place along with Him. We are always unworthy, and all that we have or do of good is always of pure grace. Though blessed with every spiritual blessing in the heavens lies in Christ, we are still just 'miserable sinners'; 'miserable sinners' saved by grace

to be sure, but 'miserable sinners' still, deserving nothing but everlasting wrath. That is the attitude which the Reformers took, and that is the attitude which the Protestant world has learned from the Reformers to take, toward the relation of believers to Christ" (Vol. I, p. 113).

Pelagian Perfectionism involves so thorough-going a rejection of the Scriptural doctrines of sin and grace that it has found little advocacy in professedly Christian circles apart from the rationalistic scholars of Germany and their followers in England and America. Wesleyan Perfectionism, however, has not only characterized Methodist teaching but has exerted a large influence in non-Methodist circles. In fact, as already intimated, most of the Perfectionism of modern times grows out of or at least is intimately bound up with the Wesleyan teaching that justification and sanctification are two distinct experiences that are attained by two distinct acts of faith. According to this view we are freed from the guilt of sin by one act of faith and from the power of sin by another act of faith. Hence it is held that sanctification is as immediate as justification. This carries with it the notion that a man may be justified without being in any degree sanctified. It is to be noticed that while this view has much to say of the guilt and power of sin it is strangely silent concerning sin as pollution and corruption. "As wave after wave of the 'holiness movement' has broken over us during the past century," writes Dr. Warfield, "each has brought something distinctive of itself. But a common fundamental character has informed them all, and this common fundamental character has been communicated to them by the Wesleyan doctrine. The essential elements of that doctrine repeat themselves in all these movements, and form their characteristic features. In all of them alike justification and sanctification are divided from one another as two separate gifts of God. In all of them alike sanctification is represented as obtained, just like justification, by an act of simple faith, but not by the same act of faith by which justification is obtained, but by a new and separate act of faith, exercised for this specific purpose. In all of them alike the sanctification which comes from this act of faith, comes immediately on believing, and all at once, and in all of them alike this sanctification, thus received, is complete sanctification. In all of them alike, however, it is to be added, this complete sanctification does not bring complete freedom from all sin; but only, say, from sinning; or freedom from conscious sinning; or from the commission of 'known sins.' And in all of them alike, moreover, this sanctification is not a stable condition into which we enter once for all by faith, but a momentary attainment, which must be maintained moment by moment, and which may readily be lost and is often lost, but may also be repeatedly in-

stantaneously recovered" (Vol. II, p. 563).

It is obvious that in as far as Dr. Warfield's account is correct most Perfectionism stands or falls with the validity of this teaching as to justification and sanctification. Dr. Warfield maintains, rightly we believe, that such teaching is contrary to the New Testament. "According to New Testament teaching," he writes, "sanctification is not related to faith directly and immediately, so that in believing in Jesus we receive both justification and sanctification as parallel products of our faith; or either the one or the other, according as our faith is directed to the one or the other. Sanctification is related directly not to faith but to justification; and as faith is the instrumental cause of justification, so is justification the instrumental cause of sanctification. The *vinculum* which binds justification and sanctification together is not that they are both alike effects of faith—so that he who believes must have both—because faith is the *præ* of both alike. Nor is it even that both are obtained in Christ, so that he who has Christ who is made to us both righteousness and sanctification, must have both because Christ is the common source of both. It is true that he who has faith has and must have both; and it is true that he who has Christ has and must have both. But they do not come out of faith or from Christ in the same way. Justification comes through faith; sanctification through justification, and only mediately through faith. So that the order is invariable, faith, justification, sanctification; not arbitrarily but in the nature of the case" (Vol. I, p. 363).

Dr. Warfield of course is a "Perfectionist" in the sense that he holds that Christ saves to the "utmost" and hence that ultimately believers will be completely sanctified. He maintains, however, that God sanctifies the sinner not immediately but by process and that this process is never completed in this life. "The power of Christ to save to the utmost," he writes, "is the foundation of all our hope, and every one who believes in Him commits himself to Him for this and nothing less; we do, all of us, expect to receive and do receive it all, without limitation and without diminution, and in this expectation, sure and steadfast, lies all our comfort and all our joy. But the revelation of it (i. e. of salvation to the utmost) would not need to be made to us—we would not need to be told of it—if it were a present experience, not a matter of hope. Nor would the revelation made in this great declaration be true, if the measure of salvation we have already received were all we are to expect, if a complete salvation of soul and body were not the portion of His saints. And certainly it would not be true if even the measure of salvation we have already received from Him were unstable or liable to be lost tomorrow, its maintenance depending not on Him but on us. The whole force of the declaration hangs precisely upon

our being as yet *viatores* not *consummatores*; exactly what it does is to give us assurance of the consummation. The state of that Christian is sad indeed who must believe that what he is already is the uttermost which Christ is able to do for him, and that henceforth he must depend on himself" (Vol. II, p. 517).

Dr. Warfield holds that it is a very imperfect perfection that the Perfectionists advocate. At the best it is an absence of conscious or known sins rather than an inner purity of character. In other words it stresses freedom from the guilt and power of sin but deals lightly with the pollution and corruption of sin. What is more, he shows that an antinomian tendency has dogged the footsteps of all forms of Perfectionism. He does not of course maintain that all or even that many "Perfectionists" are antinomians, true as it is that he holds that "Perfectionism is impossible in the presence of a deep sense or a profound conception of sin."

Dr. Warfield also points out that at the root of most Perfectionism is a Pelagian conception of the will that leads its advocates to suspend sanctification in the last analysis on what man does rather than on what God does (Vol. II, pp. 533, 539, 578, 602). Nothing is more certain, however, than that according to the Scriptures salvation is in the last analysis all of God, nothing of ourselves. The doctrine of the autocracy of the human will cannot be reconciled with the Biblical doctrine of the sovereignty of God. It is primary Christian teaching to which Dr. Warfield gives expression when he writes: "It is not true that 'God can save no man unless that man does his part toward salvation.' Man has no part to do toward salvation; and, if he had, he could not do it—his very character as a sinner is that he is helpless, that he is 'lost.' He is very active indeed in the process of his salvation, for this activity is of the substance of his salvation: he works out his own salvation, but only as God works in him the willing and the doing according to His good pleasure. It is not true that 'God forces salvation on on man.' It would be truer to say that no man is saved on whom God does not force salvation—though the language would not be exact. It is not true that the 'eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord' which is the 'free gift of God' is merely put at our option and 'our wills are free' to accept or reject it. Our wills are free enough, but they are hopelessly biased to its rejection and will certainly reject it so long as it is only an 'offer.' But it is not true that God's free gift of eternal life to His people is only an 'offer': it is a 'gift'—and what God gives He does not merely place at our disposal to be accepted or rejected as we may chance to choose, but 'gives,' makes ours, as He gave life to Lazarus and wholeness to the man with the withered hand. It was not

in the power of Lazarus to reject—it was not in his power to accept—the gift of life which Christ gave him; nor is it in the power of dead souls to reject life—or to 'accept' it—when God 'gives' it to them. The God in whom we trust is a God who quickens the dead and commands the things that are not as though they were" (Vol. II, p. 604).

We have quoted at some length from these

volumes as it is safe to assume that they will not be available to most of our readers. We trust, however, that these citations will so whet the appetites of at least our ministerial readers that they will not rest until they have read the volumes as a whole. Both historically and doctrinally they are of first importance in any study of Perfectionism as it has appeared in modern Protestantism.

S. G. C.

News of the Church

Westminster Seminary Opens with Record Enrollment

THE opening exercises of Westminster Theological Seminary were held on the afternoon of Wednesday, September 28th, in Witherspoon Hall, Philadelphia. The fourth year of the Seminary's history was begun auspiciously before a large gathering of people from Philadelphia and vicinity. The Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D., chairman of the Faculty, presided. (The Seminary follows the old Princeton tradition of having no "President"—a tradition broken at Princeton with the appointment of J. Ross Stevenson to that office.)

After the hearty singing of the Long Metre Doxology, the Invocation was offered by the Rev. Joseph Taylor Britan, D.D., well known minister who is chaplain of the Presbyterian Hospital in Philadelphia. Then was sung the old Scottish Paraphrase beginning

Supreme in wisdom as in power
The Rock of Ages stands;
Though Him thou canst not see or trace
The working of His hands.

The Scripture Lesson, Ecclesiastes 1:1-11, was read by the Rev. Ralph E. Wallis, widely and favorably known as the active pastor of Philadelphia's Oxford Presbyterian Church. Prayer was then offered by the Rev. Burleigh Cruikshank, D.D., pastor of the great St. Paul Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and Moderator of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

The greeting to the entering students was given by Dr. Machen. Already this feature of the opening is becoming a tradition. In words that were simple, yet pulsing with the eloquent passion of a great conviction, Dr. Machen outlined to the entrants the kind of fellowship to which he welcomed them. He began by saying that it was a pleasure to welcome so many alumni to the exercises. Although the Seminary was only three years old it already possessed an active and flourishing alumni society. He rejoiced also in the fellowship of Christian friends of Philadelphia and vicinity, for all were united by a common desire that men should be sent out to preach the pure gospel. Then,

turning to the new students, he said that the faculty rejoiced to welcome the largest class by a considerable margin that had yet come to the Seminary. But he rejoiced still more in the conviction that they had entered in the sincere desire (1) to acquaint themselves with the Word of God, and (2) to proclaim it. There is always the danger that men will come to a theological seminary as to any graduate school,—simply following the line of least resistance, and entering the ministry as one of a number of possible professions. Westminster, he thought, was as free of this attitude as any institution in the world, because it is plain that students desiring "preferment" will not come to a seminary whose very existence is evidence of its struggle against the temper of the age and of the visible church.

There were some things, he continued, that the Seminary could not offer. The new students had discovered before this that the campus was rudimentary. But the students would be received into the warmest possible friendship. The speaker had had other academic experiences, in various parts of the world, but never had he shared such a warm experience as since the founding of Westminster. During that time he could say sincerely that he had learned more from his students, then he could have taught them—for they had come with a different purpose and ambition than students of other seminaries. The welcome, then, was to

(1) *A Fellowship of Testimony.* The fact of their entering Westminster Seminary is itself a testimony,—a protest against the current in the church and in favor of the great doctrines of the Word.

(2) *A Fellowship of Prayer.* All labor, study, or efforts of any kind were vain unless they had the blessing of Almighty God. That blessing comes to those who pray for it. From the beginning, and always, students and faculty should be united in a great bond of prevailing prayer. Nothing could take its place.

(3) *A Fellowship of Labor.* Young men had come to this Seminary because they wanted to learn in an institution whose re-

quirements and standards were exacting and high. He warned them against dissipation of energies in trying to become proficient in everything. Unity of Labor is best for work. The man who unifies his efforts and objectives is the man who actually accomplishes. The Seminary believed in that unity of effort. It was not trying to make either mere "Promoters of the General Welfare" or "Specialists in Religion." The Seminary had one special task: *to help men to become real specialists in the Bible.* The Bible as God's revelation was the central pivot in the Westminster Curriculum around which all else moved. He did not forget Church History or Philosophical Apologetics. These converge upon the Bible. We cannot understand the Word of God aright unless we see how, for nineteen centuries, it has been a fire in men's souls. The understanding that there have been periods of apostasy like this in the past helped now (1) to defend the Bible against its enemies (Westminster stands on the proposition that the truth is capable of defense so that men may not float in unbelief like chips on a stream) and, (2) to obtain a more than acquaintance with the contents of the Bible. This last result involved intellectual labor. He did not apologize for that. Intellectual slothfulness was a quack remedy for unbelief. The true remedy is the consecration of all man's intellectual powers to the service of God. They must speak out as defenders of the truth, with courage, because they had first heard the voice of God. In these days many men are too anxious to speak to others before they hear God speaking to them. First get God's message! *Then go and speak, and as you go forth you will have the great joy of bringing lost men and women to Christ, and to bring people to a solid and orderly acquaintance with the Word of God.*

Following Dr. Machen's welcoming words, the announcements were made. Then came the main event of the afternoon,—the address by the Rev. Harmon H. McQuilkin, D.D., pastor of the First Church of Orange, New Jersey.

Dr. McQuilkin delivered an unusual address on an un-hackneyed subject—"The World Well Past the Experimental Stage." It is hoped that the next issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY will carry this lucid and penetrating address, which made a deep impression upon the audience.

Following the address, prayer was offered by the Rev. David Freeman, pastor of the Grace Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia. Then all sang the hymn beginning,

At the name of Jesus
Every knee shall bow

and were dismissed with the benediction.

The student body at Westminster on October 12 numbered 76. This includes 29

"WHEREAS a union of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and the United Presbyterian Church is being proposed upon conditions that would in effect nullify certain important doctrines contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith, and vital to its system of doctrine, and thereby lead to an important change in our age-old confessional basis, now,

"THEREFORE, the Reformation Fellowship of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches of North America, assembled in annual meeting, this third day of October, 1932, desires to express itself with clearness and emphasis as not favoring the above-mentioned union upon the basis proposed, to exhort ministers and local churches everywhere to uphold and defend the historic confessional standards of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, and not to allow themselves under any conditions to be drawn into any process of church amalgamation that would mean surrender of vital Scriptural truths or compromise with forces inimical to the real interests of the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ."

—(A resolution unanimously adopted at the First Annual Meeting of the Reformation Fellowship, held on October 3, in the Hollond Memorial Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.)

new students in the Junior Class, 23 students in the Middle Class (of whom 3 are new), 10 students in the Senior Class, 7 students in the graduate division, 5 partial students, and 2 special students.

Associated Press Begins New Religious News Service

THE Associated Press from its New York headquarters on September 17 officially announced the organization of a department to cover the activities of the Churches, headed by Herbert Yahraes, Jr., religious editor. The Associated Press has for the past fifteen years been giving increasing attention throughout its service to the news developments of religious organizations and now centralizes control and direction of religious news throughout the United States by this assignment. Thus the greatest and most far-reaching news organization in the world recognizes the increased interest of the people in religious news.

The Reformation Fellowship

OCTOBER 2 and 3 have been dates of unusual importance in the calendar of the Reformation Fellowship. On the date first mentioned, that being a Sunday, the Fellowship held its first evangelistic church service, in accordance with the extensive announcement published in the September issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. The service was held in the Hollond Memorial Presbyterian Church, Broad and Federal Streets, Philadelphia, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. The Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths was in charge of the preliminaries, while the Rev. John Clover Monsma preached the sermon, his subject being "The Depth and Passion of Jesus' Love."

The objects of these services are to provide another much-needed service in the city of Philadelphia where the preaching is genuinely Reformed and absolutely true to the Word of God, and to provide an opportunity outside of the usual hours of worship for those who go spiritually hungry in their own churches to "come and eat." At the same time evangelistic and missionary work is attempted by inviting visitors and transients in the city to hear the pure and simple Word of God.

These services will continue to be held every Sunday, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, in Hollond Memorial Church, and Mr. Monsma will continue to be the preacher. The Fellowship has invited all lovers of a powerful and unadulterated Gospel to give themselves a spiritual treat by attending these services. One of Philadelphia's most talented organists, Mr. Thomas R. Birch, has consented to provide the instrumental music from Sunday to Sunday. Anyone who appreciates what inspirational and uplifting power exists in real church music and happens to know Mr. Birch as an organist will at once realize how fortunate the Fellowship has been in securing him for this function.

On Monday evening, October 3, the Reformation Fellowship held its annual meeting. A business meeting was held at 7 o'clock and a public meeting at 8.

The roll call at the business meeting revealed that the Fellowship now has members in twenty-eight States and in two Provinces of Canada. In its report to the members the Board of Trustees stated, among other things, "No actual reformation work has as yet been undertaken, unless our testimony against present-day evil conditions in the Churches be taken as such. An extensive correspondence has been carried on; thousands of pieces of mail have gone out; publicity has been secured through the church press, the secular press, and the radio. . . ."

The general secretary, Mr. Monsma, explained at the meeting that since the Fellowship had been organized only last spring, it had had only the slow summer

season in which to work, and that bigger and better things could reasonably be expected in the fall and winter. The treasurer, Mr. Kendrick C. Hill, of Trenton, N. J., was able to present a very encouraging report, but at the same time a report that indicated the great need of more members and more special contributions. The Fellowship is now praying and waiting for special funds with which to carry on several campaigns for members. It is fervently hoped that God will lead many of his children throughout the land to send liberal gifts for this purpose.

At the public meeting Prof. Dr. J. Gresham Machen delivered the main address, while the Revs. Griffiths and Monsma, President and General Secretary respectively of the Fellowship, also spoke. Dr. Machen brought a stirring message on the great need of reformation in the Presbyterian Church. In his usual masterful way he enumerated various evils that beset the Church and pointed out with great clarity, step by step, how the Church had in an astoundingly large measure become disloyal to its confessional writings and ordination vows. One actually shuddered at the picture drawn by Dr. Machen, the more so since every indictment was backed up with clear and convincing proofs. The speaker sounded a special warning against the union of the Presbyterian and United Presbyterian Churches on the basis proposed. He declared that the so-called Confessional Statement of the United Presbyterian Church had virtually meant the discontinuance of that body as a Calvinistic Church, and that if the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. were to enter the proposed union on the basis of that Statement and the proposed Constitutional questions it would cease to exist as a Presbyterian Church.

An observer said, "There was a wonderfully harmonious spirit at these meetings of the Fellowship. One was refreshed and encouraged by the knowledge that the peace that reigned was not a peace based on hypocrisy and a sinful neglect of the ordinances and commandments of Christ, but a peace born of true spiritual and creedal unity."

The Reformation Fellowship now has its permanent address at 4 Pelham Road, Philadelphia. Men and women all through the land are invited to correspond with it.

Death of Dr. Norwood

UNEXPECTED and sudden was the death, late in September, of Dr. Robert Norwood, Rector of St. Bartholomew's Episcopal Church in New York City. He died of cerebral hemorrhage. The forceful and mystical son of a Nova Scotia sea captain, he became an avowed "liberal" and one of Modernism's most popular preachers. He was frequently found in opposition to his conservative superior, Bishop Manning, of New York. Interment was in Nova Scotia.

Self-Appointed Modernist Mission Investigators Report

THREE changes occurring in the world during the last century were cited on October 9 as suggesting a "new orientation" which foreign missions should adopt.

They were listed in a portion of the report, soon to be issued, of a laymen's committee "representing" seven Protestant denominations which has made a two-year study of missionary work in Asia. Excerpts from the report have been made public by Albert L. Scott, chairman of the inquiry.

"Of the many changes in the world during the last century, a century of sweeping changes in the life of the Orient as well as in the life of the West," the report says, "three are peculiarly pertinent to the mission enterprises, an altered theological outlook, the emergence of a basic world culture, the rise of nationalism in the East."

Speaking of the theological change, the report says, in typical Modernist accents,

"Western Christianity has in the main shifted its stress from the negative to the affirmative side of its message; it is less a religion of fear and more a religion of beneficence.

"It has passed through and beyond the stage of bitter conflict with the scientific consciousness of the race over details of the mode of creation, the age of the earth, the descent of man, miracle and law, to the stage of maturity in which a free religion and a free science become inseparable and complementary elements in a complete world view.

"Whatever its present conception of the future life, there is little disposition to believe that sincere and aspiring seekers after God in other religions are to be damned; it has become less concerned in any land to save men from eternal punishment than from the danger of losing the supreme good."

With the emergence of a world culture the report says there arises again the question, "Why the missionary need leave his home to convey his message." There is no important idea which is not now an item of world knowledge, the report continues, including the knowledge of the Gospel.

With reference to the development of Nationalism in the East, the report observes there has come "a disconcerting consciousness of the defects of Western culture, much sharpened by the Great War, and a much more critical attitude toward our institutions, our democracy, our education, our religion."

Hall of Religions at Chicago World's Fair

ONE of the features of the Century of Progress Exposition to be held in Chicago next year will be a large and beautiful Hall of Religions. This building will be erected on the Lagoon, adjacent to Lake Michigan.

The Hall of Religions will house the exhibits of and be the headquarters for Protestant denominationalism. The growth of the Protestant Church during the past century will be vividly portrayed through exhibits brought from all corners of the earth. Statistical data, such as has never before been placed before the public, is being compiled with the avowed purpose of astounding those who declare that "Christianity is on the wane"—and that the "Church is losing ground." Refutation of these assaults is the main object of the Committee on Progress through Religion in the erection of this beautiful building.

A program of many conferences will be directed to clarifying the objectives and methods for the solution of present social problems. Emphasis will rest upon co-operation and not upon propaganda for special religious affiliations. These conferences will have for their subjects many phases of religious education, the attitude of youth toward religion, changing forms of worship, the methodology of charity and social service, the co-operation of religious bodies for peace, and the organization of religious leaders for the reduction of poverty.

Modernism, riding high, wide and handsome!

"Confessions of Dr. Fosdick"

RECENT press notices quote Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, famed for "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" and "The Peril of Worshipping Jesus" as saying some strange, though true, words about Modernism. He is credited with the following:

"You see, we modernists . . . pare down and dim our faith by negative abstractions until we have left only the ghastly remainder of what was once a great religion. Then seeing how few our positive convictions are and how little they matter, we grow easy going about everyone else's convictions and end in a mush of general concessions."

And this: "Old-fashioned religion often did produce an unconsenting and courageous individual conscience. At this point modernism often fails. It has breadth and easy-going complacency, and general good will, but lacks moral grip to life men above the ordinary levels of daily life and give them courage, if necessary, to defy the world."

"In comparison with the hard-headed candor and fearlessness with which the old theology faced the terrific facts of this world, our modernism often seems soft and lush and sentimental. We, fair-weather modernists, with our too easy gospel of God as a sentimental lover, would better salute those old Christians. They did not blink the facts; instead they achieved a faith able to rise above the facts and carry off a spiritual victory in the face of them, and at

their best, in the darkest hours that ever fell on human history, they stood like houses built on rocks."

Death of Charles H. Gabriel

CHARLES H. GABRIEL, singing evangelist and composer, died at the home of his son in Hollywood, Cal., September 14. He was born on an Iowa farm, August 18, 1859, and had little formal education. At the age of seventeen he started out to hold singing classes, and traveled widely. He afterward lived in California and Chicago. Possessing a fine natural tenor voice, and considerable dramatic power, he was associated in evangelistic campaigns with Sam Jones, E. O. Excell, William A. Sunday and others. Some of his immensely popular pieces are "Brighten the Corner Where You Are," "There Is Glory in My Soul," "Since Jesus Came Into My Heart." Over 20,000,000 copies of the "Glory Song" (written in 1900) were sold, in twenty languages. He edited fourteen song collections. Two score Christmas cantatas bear his name, besides larger pieces of church music—and three operettas. He had a natural gift for melody, and whatever else might be said of his music, people liked to sing it and hear it sung.

Mr. Gabriel was married in 1888 to Amelia Moore of California, who died in 1931. He is survived by his son and five sisters. Mr. Gabriel was a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Commemoration of 1500th Anniversary of Saint Ninian

PEOPLE from all parts of Scotland gathered at Whithorn, Wigtownshire, last month to commemorate the 1,500th anniversary of the landing on the coast of Galloway of St. Ninian, the earliest Christian missionary to Scotland. The service was held in the crypt at the ruins of Candida Casa, the first church in Scotland to be founded by St. Ninian. The address was given by Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.D., Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Those who took part in the service along with the Moderator were Bishop Darbyshire, of Glasgow and Galloway; Dean Thurn, Glasgow; the Moderators of the Presbyteries of Wigtown, Stranraer and Kirkcudbright; the Rev. Dr. Archibald Black Scott, President of the Scottish Ecclesiological Society, and the Rev. W. H. Rogan, minister of Whithorn. In the afternoon many of the pilgrims went on to the Isle of Whithorn to visit the ruins of the 13th century St. Ninian's Chapel marking the spot where Ninian landed. A few others were able to make the further journey to the cave at Gasserton. The commemoration services at Whithorn were followed by further celebrations in many churches all over Scotland. The response to the recommendation of the General Assembly that

ministers should direct the thoughts of their people to the life and work of St. Ninian was more general even than was expected.

Brilliant Indian Moslem Becomes Christian

FROM the Punjab, in India, comes news of the recent conversion of an outstanding young Moslem, who after carefully comparing the Koran with the Bible, wholeheartedly yielded his life to the Lord Jesus Christ. The young man is the son of a famous and widely acknowledged Moslem Doctor of Laws, the leading holy man and ecclesiastical ruler of the District of Jhelum; the family is directly descended from Hasham, the grandfather of the prophet Mohammed.

While but twenty-three years of age, Hakim Abdur Razzaq is a graduate of one of the most distinguished Mohammedan universities, and a noted scholar of Persian and Arabic. After four months of wandering about as a secret believer he finally went to the home of a Christian friend and openly confessed Christ. Subsequently, in August, 1931, he was baptized by the Rev. J. James, of the United Presbyterian Church.

When once the news got around, there was a tremendous stir in Mohammedan circles. His own father was stunned with amazement, and wrote his son a most pathetic and beseeching letter, seeking to persuade him to reconsider his ways and return to the family fellowship and the Moslem fold. An interview between father and son, lasting several hours, was marked by eloquent pleading on the part of the father, and equally eloquent testimony to his newly found Saviour on the part of the son, who confessed that he was now gladly willing to die, if need be, for Christ.

Throughout the whole district the Moslems are deeply agitated, but Razzaq loses no opportunity to witness for Christ, and is for the time being residing with the Rev. A. W. Gordon for the purpose of studying the Bible.

The St. Hilary Case

DESTINED perhaps to rank as one of those incidents in church history which possess a significance far beyond their local importance, is the recent taking down of images and other articles of worship in St. Hilary's Church (Anglican), in Cornwall.

The acts have been variously described as "wanton vandalism," "sacrilege" and "a great and needed purification."

St. Hilary's Church is ministered to by an anglican clergyman who styles himself "Father" Walke. He is of the Anglo-Catholic group, and, after coming to the church, as its vicar, he introduced certain Anglo-Catholic practices. In the Church of England it is illegal to install statues, crucifixes, etc., into a Church without a "faculty"

or authorization from the Chancellor of the Diocese. Ignoring this, "Father" Walke installed a number of articles to which the evangelical Protestant people in his congregation had decided objections. One of the parishioners, a Miss King, receiving no satisfaction from the church wardens, petitioned the Chancellor of the Diocese to have the offending articles removed. After extensive hearings, in accordance with the law of the English Church, the Chancellor issued a "faculty" ordering the removal of the following:

"(1) The Tabernacle composed of wood wherein are placed the Reserved Elements.

"(2) The lighted lamp hanging over the said Tabernacle.

"(3) The figure of the Madonna and Child.

"(4) The stone Dais or Step on which is engraved the words JESUS MERCY MARY HELP situate under the Crucifix against the North Wall of the said Church.

"(5) The two large candles and stands on either side of the said Crucifix.

"(6) The Green-colored Crucifix of two feet nine inches in height or thereabouts on and above the Tabernacle on the Holy Table.

"(7) The pictures commonly called the Stations of the Cross, being fourteen in number, and displayed on the walls of the said Church.

"(8) The Votive Candle Stand in the Lady Chapel in the said Church.

"(9) The Votive Candle Stand in the Chapel on the South Side of the said Church.

"(10) The Blue Votive Lamp hanging from a bracket on the right hand side of the Altar in the said Lady Chapel.

"(11) The Canopy or Baldacchino over the Holy Table in the said Church.

"(12) Six Candles and Candle sticks on the said Holy Table.

"(13) The Sanctus Bell.

"(14) The Image of St. Joseph.

"(15) The Image of St. Anne."

After receiving this order from the court of his own church, "Father" Walke did nothing.

Miss King with her two fellow petitioners, a Mr. Orman and a Miss Smitham, who claim to represent an overwhelming majority of the parishioners, waited many weeks for the obedience of the Vicar. The order of the Consistory Court was dated April 14, and the Vicar was given until May 14 to carry it out. An appeal to the Bishop of Truro was without effect. Time and time again the petitioners asked the Vicar for a time when the removals could be made quietly and peaceably, but their overtures were spurned. The Vicar even caused most of the doors of the church to be screwed shut, in order to prevent the removals.

At last the Chancellor issued a "faculty" to the petitioners authorizing them to carry out the removals in their own name. This was done on August 9th. Miss King was assisted in her work by Mr. J. A. Kensit,

doughty champion of the Reformed character of the Church of England, Secretary of the "Protestant Truth Society" and head of the "Wycliffe Preachers," who tour Great Britain constantly in "Motor Caravans" in defence of Protestantism.

Gaining admission to the edifice with the order of the Court, the work began. In describing it, Mr. Kensit said,

"We commenced with prayer in the church. I asked that God would grant us all guidance in the action we were about to take, and that everything might be for His glory. The Vicar came in and took a seat in the front of the church. Then I made a statement. I said we were there to carry through the order of the Consistory Court, and we were about to take part in a scene such as was universally enacted in England in Reformation days. The vicar had broken the law. To-day we were about to vindicate it. Many of the services in this church, as the Chancellor stated, went far beyond what was permissible in the Church of England.

"Then I proceeded to read the order of the Court under which we were acting, concluding with the schedule which names the articles to be removed. I said in the end that the Bishop should have been present, but as the Bishop had failed, and as the vicar had failed, we were there to aid the parishioners.

Vicar's "Challenge"

"The vicar challenged us as to who was taking the responsibility for the action, and I said Miss King was responsible, but that we were there to support her. I said, 'We will proceed to the work in order of the schedule.' . . .

"We had a number of fairly friendly altercations with the vicar, but he was quite affable and did not lose his temper. Of course, he was very distressed because we were too strong for him. We refused to allow him to leave the church. If he had done so and collected assistance there would have been a regular riot in the church.

"We took away everything that blocked the old window, which window in itself is a memorial to a former vicar, and should never have been blocked.

"The Baldacchino was a very difficult thing to get down. We had to get a ladder from the belfry of the church and it really took strong men with a good deal of skill. In order to get it out of the church it had to be dismantled. . . ."

Anticipating the coming of those who would carry out the Court's order, the vicar had actually had a new "Tabernacle," in the form of a safe embedded in concrete. This was removed because the order of the Court specified the Tabernacle "wherein are placed the reserved elements."

What is described, however, as the most brazen piece of audacity on the part of the vicar was his *substitution of plaster images*

for the original images, and the fact that on the next day of worship, he brought in the images ordered removed and set them up in defiance of the law.

After the work of clearance was over, Mr. Kensit's account concluded:

"When we had everything ready for bringing out we felt it would be a suitable thing if we went down to the vestry and brought back the old lectern and replaced it in its former position. This we did, and I then read from it the first and second Commandments, after which we proceeded to leave the church with the articles.

"Each one of us carried something. I headed the procession with the wooden tabernacle from the main Communion table. We carried the thing to a van which had been drawn up at the bottom of the steps. It would not take all the things at once, and had to return a second time. The articles were safely deposited in Miss King's custody.

"Then we had a short meeting on the steps leading to the church, at which I spoke, and explained to the parishioners what had taken place, saying that in England everybody had a perfect right of liberty of conscience to worship God as they chose, but that our objection was to men carrying Roman Catholic practices and introducing Roman Catholic ornaments and images inside the Protestant church. There were general cheers. We had practically the whole crowd of parishioners with us, and the meeting concluded with three ringing cheers for Miss King. . . . We have to give formal notice as to where the things are deposited, and I said to the vicar, 'Even now, if you like, if you will give me your pledge that the articles are not going back, we will deposit them straight away in any place you indicate,' and he said, 'I can give no such pledge.'

"Then I said, 'It will reduce the whole case to a farce if we say where they are to be put and you simply collect and restore them.' That is the stand-point we now take up. As soon as the vicar gives a written pledge that they are not going back into the church he can come and collect the articles as his property. If he won't give that pledge we shall hold on to them."

By the Sunday following the clearance, the Vicar hurled complete defiance at the law. He had brought in the images, sacring bell, candles, and stations of the cross, condemned by the Chancellor, he had set a new Tabernacle on the main Communion Table, and had re-erected the ancient font as a holy water stoup though he had endeavoured to represent that it had been smashed. At the morning service he went the rounds with holy water sprinkling the various places which he declared had been "desecrated." He had "Mass" on most approved Roman lines. In the evening he had "Benediction with the Sacrament" and a procession of the Virgin Mary carrying round the building

the image which the Chancellor had condemned.

Miss King was present and was supported by a large number of parishioners but no protest was entered. The feast of the Assumption was observed by a Rosary procession on August 15th.

The English Churchman comments: "It is all very well for the Anglo-Catholics to pour scorn on those who are seeking to vindicate the law, and to accuse them of sacrilege and desecration and of wanton damage in the process of carrying out the order of the Court. But the fact remains that the whole situation has been built up by defiant lawlessness and treachery to the very plain requirements of the Church of England. Much nonsense has been written to the newspapers, chiefly in support of the plea that these 'good men' should be allowed to worship according to their conscience. This they are at perfect liberty to do elsewhere, but not in the places of worship which are governed by laws which forbid their conscientious eccentricities—laws which they themselves accepted and by acceptance of which they have been appointed to their benefices. This is a view of the case which it is not only foolish but criminal to ignore."

International Protestant League Meets in Stockholm

THE fact that Sweden this year celebrates the tercentenary of the death of Gustavus Adolphus, that great leader of the Protestant cause, has contributed to the choice of Stockholm as the setting for the Fifth National Assembly of the International League for the Defence and Furtherance of Protestantism. Here, in September, delegates from all over Evangelical Christendom met together, both in the spirit of pilgrimage and of enquiry into the best means of keeping alive, in our time, the inheritance and spirit of the Reformation.

The five day programme of services, discussions and social functions included the departure from Stockholm of a special delegation bound for the old Cathedral Church of Uppsala, the largest church in Scandinavia, there to hold a special memorial service at the tomb of the late Archbishop Nathan Söderblom, to whose initiative and zeal the League owed so much of its inception, and among whose last writings were found the words, "The helplessness of the nations in the elementary questions of life, and the intellectual confusion even in the Christian Churches demand more than ever a decided No, and Yes, as testimony to an earnest Christian confession and a firm ecclesiastical standpoint."

The meetings of the League were held in the Swedish Parliament House under the chairmanship of Professor Slotemaker de Bruine, a member of the Dutch Government; while the Church of Scotland's representatives were the Rev. Professor Curtis, Dean

of the Faculty of Divinity at Edinburgh University, and the Rev. John Burleigh, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Edinburgh. Prince Oscar Bernadotte, brother of the King of Sweden, who has always taken a keen interest in Church matters from the evangelical standpoint, also took part in the gatherings and was one of those who signed the general invitation of the Swedish National Committee. Other notable dates in the programme included a civic reception of the delegates by the City of Stockholm, a visit to the Chapel of St. Ansgar, where Archbishop Eidem, D.D., Uppsala, gave an address, and a solemn procession to the ancient Riddarholms Church where the body of Gustavus Adolphus lies surrounded by the painted shields of Swedish Knights and the torn banners of his many campaigns.

The delegates considered such matters as, (1) Mixed Marriages, (2) The Interpretation and Falsification of the History of the Reformation; (3) Bolshevism and Christian Culture; and (4) Evangelical Movements.

The League adopted the following resolutions, among others, in regard to the question of Mixed Marriages:—

"It protests against the action of the Roman Church in demanding from Protestant Churches promises on oath, or bringing them before its Courts. It expects of its fellow-believers that they reject all such efforts with earnestness and dignity. It expects of the Churches that they will protest energetically against every case of re-marriage or re-baptism.

"It requests the Evangelical Churches of all countries to take up a position in public proclamations against the mixed marriage law of the recent Codex Juris Canonici and the mixed marriage practice based on it, and especially to endeavour that the State shall defend the impartiality of the law against the claims of the Roman Church; and that the marriages of Protestants with Roman Catholics be defended against depreciation or complete destruction."

Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem Enthroned

THE Rt. Rev. George Francis Graham-Brown, D.D., was enthroned in St. George's Collegiate Church, Jerusalem, as Bishop of the Church of England, in Jerusalem, and installed as Dean of the Collegiate Church, on the Feast of St. Michael and All Angels, September 29. His consecration took place at Canterbury last June 24. He succeeds Bishop Rennie MacInness, whose death occurred on Christmas Eve, 1931. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London nominate to this office.

Among the officials taking part in the ceremony in Jerusalem were representatives of the Church of England in Palestine, Syria and Transjordan, in Cyprus, Egypt and Iraq, a representative of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, Canon Bridgeman,

representing the Episcopal Church in the United States, officers of the English Church Missionary Society, the Church Missions to Jews, and the Palestine Native Church Council. Representatives were present from the Orthodox, Armenian, Jacobite and other Eastern Churches. Parts of the service were read in Arabic and Hebrew, as well as English. The offering was for the building of a new church in Baghdad.

Bishop Graham-Brown was born in China, where his father was a missionary, but he has lived mostly in England. He has worked constantly for Church unity and was foremost in promoting the agreements which have resulted in intercommunion between Anglicans and Old Catholics. His was the first Anglican consecration in which an Old Catholic Bishop took part.

In recent years, as Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, Bishop Graham-Brown has annually conducted groups of Wycliffe students to Jerusalem. It was some of his students who, in 1929, rushed to the rescue when anti-Jewish mobs were threatening the home of the Jewish scholar, Dr. Joseph Klausner, near Jerusalem, and defended him and his house until more official relief arrived.

Two Organizations Protest Disarmament Failure

DEEP concern over the possible consequences of failure at Geneva to reach any satisfactory solution upon disarmament is expressed by the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, who also give warning of the bitter disillusionment, which may spread throughout Christendom. The Universal Christian Council for Life and Work, which met late in the summer at Geneva, also expressed its grave dissatisfaction with the present achievements of the Disarmament Conference.

The Management Committee of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, assembled at Geneva, passed unanimously the following resolution on disarmament:—

"The Management Committee of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, having observed the proceedings of the World Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments between the months of February and July, 1932, and having considered the draft resolution adopted by the General Committee of that Conference on July 23 . . . expresses with deep sorrow the feeling of bitter disillusionment throughout Christendom in face of the fact that the Disarmament Conference has not yet reached any satisfactory result in spite of discussions which have lasted for six months.

It expresses with a feeling of deep concern its conviction that a failure of this Conference would inflict terrible injury not

only upon international trade and international peace but also upon the Churches and their work. . . .

"And therefore it appeals to the Churches to arouse public opinion in each country in support of an immediate substantial reduction of armaments, and requests the National Councils of the World Alliance, by every means in their power, to urge their own governments and their representatives at the Disarmament Conference that they carry forward without delay the proposals in the draft resolution, especially that part providing for an immediate and substantial cut in both armaments and budgets, so that it may become a really effective instrument for the reduction of armaments."

The Universal Christian Council for Life and Work assembled at Geneva, August 9th-14th, 1932, said that it "desires to endorse the action taken with regard to Disarmament by its Executive Committee at Cambridge in 1931, and expresses its grave dissatisfaction with the present achievements of the Disarmament Conference.

"It would be not only a disaster to the peace of the world, but also a scandal to the conscience of mankind, if the Conference were to end without effective results, only with a superficial compromise of a merely pretended solution.

"The Council gives notice of this resolution to the World Alliance for international Friendship through the Churches, and expresses its hope that the World Alliance according to its special task within the ecumenical work should take up the whole question of Disarmament and exert its influence in the sense of the resolution of Cambridge in 1931."

Mexico Versus Rome

FOR six years the episcopate of the Roman Church in Mexico has been in bitter, almost continuous strife with Mexico's Government. Grieved with what he considers persecution and what Mexican legislators call regulation, Pope Pius XI has watched in patience, hoping for peace chiefly through the truce arranged between Church and State by the late Ambassador Dwight Whitney Morrow. Late in September the Pope, uttered a sharp protest in an encyclical headed *Acerba animi* ("bitterness of soul.")

Addressed to the Mexican hierarchy, *Acerba animi* attacked anti-religious propaganda, expropriation of churches, exile of clergy and suppression of religious instruction in primary schools by Mexico's National Revolutionary Party (Government). "Iniquitous" and "impious," said the Pope, are the laws limiting clergy, designed under the Constitution to "correspond to the religious needs of the faithful and of the locality" but actually administered to "eliminate [the Church] gradually from the republic." Of the many State laws limiting clergy (the latest provides 24 churches and 24 priests

for the million-odd inhabitants of the Federal District of Mexico City), the Pope cites those of Michoacan (one priest for 33,000 Romanists), Chiapas (one for 60,000) and Veracruz (one for 100,000). This "unheard-of persecution," exclaims Pius XI, "differs but little . . . from the one raging within the unhappy borders of Russia. . . ."

The Pope counseled Mexican Catholics to obey the law but to protest unremittently. "To approve such an iniquitous law or spontaneously to give to it true and proper co-operation is undoubtedly illicit and sacrilegious. But absolutely different is the case of him who yields to such unjust regulations solely against his will. . . . His behavior consequently is not much different from that of one who, having been robbed of his belongings, is obliged to ask his unjust despoiler for at least the use of them."

The retort of Mexico's new young Provisional President Abelardo L. Rodriguez was prompt: "In an unforeseen and absurd manner there has been published the encyclical . . . whose tone does not surprise us because methods filled with falsehood against this country are characteristic of the Papacy. . . ."

"In answer to the open incitation made to the clergy to provoke agitation, I declare that at the slightest manifestation of disorder the Government will proceed with full energy to resolve definitely this problem, which has cost this nation so much blood and sacrifice. . . ."

"If the insolent, defiant attitude . . . continues, I am determined that the churches will be converted into schools and shops for the benefit of the nation's proletariat classes."

Archbishop Leopoldo Ruiz y Flores, Papal Legate to Mexico, said he hoped the President "and all the enemies of the Church will be pleasantly surprised when they read *Acerba animi* in full, find it pacific and patriotic."

The Archbishop's hopes, however, were destined to be rudely and quickly shattered. Early in October he was awakened in the small hours of the morning, haled before the authorities, and deported from Mexico as an undesirable. This action had been demanded by the Mexican Congress, and President Rodriguez was astute enough to have the order for expulsion in effect before the representatives of the Congress called upon him to acquaint him with the legislative request.

On October 7, Roman Catholic Priests in the State of Vera Cruz were deprived of their citizenship by decree of the State Legislature and all church property was ordered confiscated by the Governor for other purposes.

The action was taken at a special session of the Legislature. The decree declaring the priests no longer citizens leaves them liable to expulsion from the country under provisions of the Federal Constitution.

At the same time the Legislature indicated its desire to encourage similar action in the other States by voting to call the attention of its action to the other Legislatures and to the Federal Congress.

The procedure, an aftermath of the expulsion from Mexico of Archbishop Leopoldo Ruiz y Flores, papal delegate, was accompanied by a decision on the part of Senators and members of the Federal Congress who belong to the National Revolutionary Party to investigate the status of Archbishop Pascal Diaz, of Mexico City, to determine whether he is performing religious functions and whether he is entitled to do so by being registered under the ecclesiastical laws.

The party caucus also decided to investigate whether the Federal District law limiting the number of churches and priests in Mexico City to twenty-four is being enforced.

Declaring all priests have lost their citizenship, the new Vera Cruz law provides that because of this they are subject to the application of Article 33 of the Federal Constitution which empowers the President to expel foreigners from the country.

It also directs the Governor to begin immediately to dispossess the clergy of all churches and other religious property they have been using and to convert it into social and educational centers, or put it to other public or social uses.

Vera Cruz last summer limited the number of priests in the State to one for each 100,000 people, the strictest limitation effective in any State in the country. Most of the priests left the State when the law went into effect.

Observers generally are agreed that had the Roman Church remained out of Mexican politics in the "palmy days" it would not now be the football of politics.

Annie Johnson Flint Called Home

ON Thursday night, September 8, Annie Johnson Flint, well known the world over for her Christian "poetry of affliction," was called from Clifton Springs, N. Y. to go Home to Heaven. She was sixty-six years of age, and had been confined for thirty years to a wheel chair as a sufferer from arthritis. Yet she was no complainer, and the songs that she wrote with trembling fingers (almost the only part of her body she could move, it is said) went out over the world to bring strength and encouragement to those for whom the days were dark. Her death was peaceful, and when the physician asked whether she had anything to say, she replied, "No, it's all right." The *Sunday School Times*, in which many of her poems were published said, "Like blind Fanny Crosby, Miss Flint sang amid her suffering and transformed affliction into blessing for multitudes. Of both it could be said that they 'out of weakness were made strong' through faith. 'Redeeming love' was Miss Flint's theme, as it was William Cowper's; and now she can sing of it 'in a

nobler, sweeter song,' for she has passed beyond all her suffering and is 'with Christ; which is far better.'"

United Church of Canada Board Favors Birth Control

The board of evangelism and social service of the United Church of Canada has declared in a report issued recently that married persons may employ birth control methods providing these are justifiable "under all the particular circumstances and in the light of Christian conscience."

The report was referred by the general council of the church, meeting here, to its sessional committee on evangelism and social service.

The board also urged that a civil marriage be established in all provinces for those who do not wish a marriage solemnized with Christian sanctions.

A third recommendation was that the church should hesitate to take an absolute stand against divorce and remarriage.

Regarding its views on birth control the board said every Christian married person has the right to determine "in the light of all the facts and obligations involved how far precautions against reproduction shall be employed in his or her own life."

Birth control should not be employed, it added, "without competent medical advice."

Great Losses by Theft of Canadian Church and College Funds

A great financial loss amounting to some \$800,000 has come to the Church of England in Western Canada. The episcopal endowment funds of the missionary districts of Moosonee, Keewatin, Athabasca, Mackenzie River, and Yukon have been seriously depleted or entirely lost, while much of the endowment of the diocese of Rupert's Land has been lost.

Pension funds of the province of Rupert's Land and the endowment of St. John's College, Winnipeg, are gone. All of these had been entrusted to Chancellor Machray, of the diocese of Rupert's Land, who is now faced with the charge of misappropriation of nearly a million dollars of the funds of the University of Manitoba, of which he was chairman of the board of governors and bursar. Mr. Machray is now seriously ill. The trouble is thought to have begun with unsatisfactory investments, especially in loans on land, the value of which has been greatly depreciated, and with general bad management. Mr. Machray was one of the most honored and trusted citizens of Winnipeg. The news of his defalcations came like a thunder bolt to the whole Dominion of Canada.

At the executive board meeting of the Anglican Missionary Society it was decided to help meet the emergency by an appeal to

the bishops and clergy throughout Canada to make up for the next three years the salaries of the missionary bishops, to which the agents of the Missionary Society have been asked to give 7% of their salaries. An appeal is to be made to the laity throughout Canada on a three year basis to an Episcopal and Clerical Endowment Fund to be invested through the Consolidated Trust Fund of the General Synod.

The Primate has issued a statement to the effect that all funds of the General Synod and its boards are intact and well invested.

The Canadian Churches and the Census

THE proportion of The Presbyterian Church in Canada which on June 10, 1925, united with the Methodist Church and Congregational Churches to form the United Church of Canada is an important question, for upon representations in that regard legislation was passed, property distributed, and the world estimate of Church Union in Canada based.

At the time it was difficult to determine with exactness that proportion, but it was claimed by the United Church to be very large and so overshadowing the body remaining Presbyterian as to warrant reference to the latter as but a "remnant," reduced, in some reports abroad, to "a few parishes" and even "a few families." As high as 85% was publicly claimed for the uniting section, but a definite proportion was adopted by the Federal Commission, appointed to distribute the general property of the Presbyterian Church, namely 64%, and division was made accordingly.

Now the Dominion Census, 1931, compels a revision of that estimate for it gives the number of Presbyterians as 870,482. At the previous census, 1921, the number was 1,409,407. Therefore the number in 1931 is in excess of 50% of that in 1921 by 165,792. Allowing for growth between 1921 and 1925, in keeping with the previous decade, a larger proportion than 40% cannot be conceded as the part of the Presbyterian Church entering Union. Two able analysts of the census, a former minister of the Crown, and the Deputy Registrar of a provincial Supreme Court, support this conclusion, the former fixing 38% as the proportion of Presbyterians who went into the Union. Thus the Dominion Census has turned the tables, demonstrating that the general property should have been distributed in almost reverse proportions, that is, instead of 64% to the United Church and 36% to the Presbyterians, 38% to the United Church and 62% to the Presbyterians.

It has been contended, however, that the large number of Presbyterians reported by the census is explained by the fact that "Presbyterians" in the United Church registered as Presbyterians, having been taught before Union that they would remain Pres-

byterians in the United Church. This is incredible in view of the extraordinary precautions taken by the United Church in carefully instructing its people in this particular a year before the census; and was impossible under the requirement of the Chief Census Commissioner that:

Owing to the organization of the United Church of Canada since the last census, persons calling themselves Presbyterians, Methodists, or Congregationalists, should be asked if they are or are not members or adherents of the United Church, and the answer should be recorded as given.

Be it noted that in the Dominion Census we have an independent official declaration of denominational standing, made by the State, and based upon an authoritative and exhaustive individual canvass.

What misapprehension therefore has prevailed throughout the world about Union in Canada, and how great the injustice done the Presbyterians outside the Union both in repute and in the distribution of property!

Death of Dr. Stuart L. Tyson

THE Rev. Dr. Stuart Laurence Tyson, a Congregational minister since 1925, who had been a leader of the modernist wing during his twenty-eight years in the ministry of the Episcopal Church, died September 16th of double pneumonia in St. Luke's Hospital, New York, after a week's illness. His age was 58 years. He was pastor of the Community Church in Summit, N. J.

Dr. Tyson was born in Penlyn, Pa., on November 12, 1873. He was graduated from Nashotah House, Wis., in 1895, entered the ministry in 1897, and two years later became a special preacher at Oxford, England, and later an assistant in St. Paul's Church there. He was also a tutor at Oxford for a time, and eventually held three degrees from the university—M.A., 1903, and B.D., and D.D., awarded in 1923, the last "in course."

After teaching at the Western Theological Seminary and the University of the South, Dr. Tyson was appointed honorary vicar of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in 1919. In 1924 he was appointed to the staff of St. George's Church, where he remained until he joined the Congregational Church.

Noted especially for his vigorous preaching and writing, Dr. Tyson fought for the modernist cause in many important controversies within and without the Episcopal Church. In 1923 he supported the view of certain modernists who accused bishops of the church of encroaching on the freedom of both the clergy and laity. He demanded that any settlement must establish the right of Liberal Episcopal clergymen to "think freely and use present-day knowledge in religion, as in all other relations of life."

When he gave a public explanation of his leaving the Episcopal Church he called his resignation the final result of a process that

began during a period in which he defended Bishop-elect Herbert Shipman, the Rev. Percy Stickney Grant, and the Rev. Lee Heaton of Dallas, Texas, against the opposition of the conservatives.

The Fourth Annual Conference of the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship of Canada

THE watchword of the Fourth Annual Conference of the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship of Canada this September seemed to be "Advance!" In all the addresses delivered by the speakers this was the most prominent note, and Christ was looked to as the One who had not only redeemed those present, but who was going to show His power in the universities this year.

The conference opened on Friday, September 16, at 8:00 P. M. in the Prayer Room of the China Inland Mission, 150 St. George St., Toronto. This meeting was addressed by two young men who were leaving for China the next night. They gave challenging calls to the students, to consecrate their lives to Christ's services.

The next day the conference continued with discussions of personal problems and reports from a number of centers. In the afternoon a hike and picnic supper was held and after that a missionary meeting took place which was attended by over 170 delegates.

On Sunday the delegates went to churches in the city and in the afternoon held a meeting where they discussed the problem of winning students to Christ.

Monday and Tuesday were taken up with business discussions and conferences on fraternal relations with other Christian bodies. On Monday night the conference was addressed by Dr. John McNicol of the Toronto Bible College on "The Biblical View of the Kingdom of God." On Tuesday night Mr. Paul Guinness, Evangelical Theological Seminary, Dallas, Texas, spoke on the "Gospel Distribution Crusade," which he is launching this year. By this plan one person will give out three hundred Gospels of St. John every year at a total cost of \$3.00.

Then the day for breaking up came. After a conference in the morning the students went as guests to the house of Mrs. R. J. Fleming which is situated outside the city of Toronto. Here relaxation of all sorts and kinds was followed by supper and, after the send-off of the London delegates in a \$12.00 Ford, the conference went to prayer.

That prayer-meeting will not easily be forgotten by those present. The Holy Spirit seemed to be present in a very real way; and there many young people gave themselves unconditionally to their master for His work, whatever it might be.

So ended the conference and the students turned back again to their universities realizing that there were great things to be

done and great powers with which to do them. They realized more than ever that it was not their work but Christ's and if they would follow Him completely it would mean great and glorious things done for Him.

Federal Council "Appeal for Penitence and Prayer"

ALTHOUGH the date for which the appeal was issued is now past, CHRISTIANITY TODAY publishes the text of the "Call to Penitence and Prayer" recently issued by the Federal Council of Churches. The call follows:

"Greeting: Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

"We address you on urgent business. The Church and the nation face a grave and serious situation. There is on every hand physical and mental suffering. This condition has long continued and no one can point the way of escape. Our best men are powerless before the devastating effects of commercial distrust and moral confusion. While we long for the return of prosperity, we pray rather for the correction of those causes of distress, without which prosperity may prove to be other than a blessing.

"In many areas within the Church there is an urgent desire for a religious awakening. On every hand thoughtful Christians feel that the root of our trouble is moral and spiritual. All laws are moral laws and, while we cannot trace their working, of one thing we are sure, that out of the past has come the present. We reap what we sow.

"We have worshipped at the shrines of false gods—the false god of mammon, money, things; the false god of power, production, bigness; the false god of nationalism, individualism, social injustice; the false god of pleasure, amusement, disregard for things sacred; the false god of success, high living, careless thinking; the false god of magic, reaping where we had not sowed, profiting where we had not toiled.

"The Church dares not stand aside and whisper peace either to itself or to the nation when there is no peace. Only a national turning to God in repentance and moral restitution, seeking His divine forgiveness, will restore the spiritual health of our people. We have looked for signs of repentance and the fruits thereof. We have not seen them. On every hand there is a demand for prosperity but little evident desire to return to the ways of faith and prayer. The times are giving us moral discipline. God waits on man's response. No social or political revival can come out of spiritual destitution, and no national awakening can arise out of religious indifference. The only adequate way is the way of Christ and the Cross.

"We, therefore, call upon our people to give themselves by an act of will, personally and corporately, in penitence and prayer to Almighty God. And in order to secure the

A CALL TO PRAYER

While the cause of our Lord Jesus Christ has need continuously of the prayers of believers, there have been in the history of the Church periods when crucial events have brought the saints to a more keen recognition of that need. The perilous condition of the Church today, not to speak of the world, calls anew for penitence and prayer.

We are profoundly convinced that the present tragic situation in the Church is the inevitable result of the rise and progress of Modernism. We are beginning to reap the consequences of the seeds of unbelief which we have allowed to be planted and watered with scarcely any protest. The Church has not lifted up the Cross, whereon Christ in His suffering satisfied Divine Justice and bore man's sin, as the only way of reconciliation between God and man. We need to pray that God will grant us penitence for our unbelief, for our indifference and coldness toward a Gospel which we have professed to love. We need forgiveness for our indifference toward the defense of that Gospel. God's truth in itself will never suffer from the scorn of men, but had we contended more diligently for that truth, precious souls might not have been led astray. We need to repent with unfeigned sorrow for our indifference toward the eternal destiny of our fellow-men—an indifference which stamps us as hypocrites in the sight of the world. We need to repent in that we have loved the world, its standards, ambitions and treasures, while our love for God has grown cold. We have neglected continual prayer to God in Christ, not remembering that only as we ask in Christ will we receive power from on high. The present decayed condition of the Church calls for penitence and reformation.

Therefore, we call upon our members and upon Christian people everywhere, to begin praying and to continue diligent in prayer that God may bring a mighty wave of repentance for these and other sins; that the Church may be purified of unbelief, and be warmed again with a mighty flame of passion to win men to Christ through the blood of the Cross, so that the whole Body of Christ may be strengthened and renewed for the glory of God Who is blessed forever. Amen.

(A call issued by the Trustees of the Reformation Fellowship, October 7, 1932.)

spirit of fellowship in united intercession, we set apart the week beginning October 2, 1932, as a time when pastors and people shall search their hearts and conduct, and by personal dedication and public services appointed to meet the need of the hour, discover for themselves and for the nation the way to peace and power."

British Methodists Unite

ON September 20th in Albert Hall, London, was held the final ceremony in the uniting of the three branches of Methodism in Great Britain. Before an audience of ten thousand persons, the Presidents of the three Churches, Wesleyan Methodist, Primitive Methodist and United Methodist signed the "Deed of Union" following which Dr. John Scott Lidgett signed as the first President of the United Church.

The new body includes 5,000 ministers, 200,000 Sunday School teachers, 1,200,000 Sunday School scholars, and approximately a million communicant members. Its properties are valued at about \$280,000,000.

The union, however, was not consummated without serious question having been raised. When the matter was first broached, it is alleged that promises were made that the doctrinal basis of union would be subject to final changes before union. This right was denied in one of the negotiating churches on the ground that the other two churches had already adopted it as it was. The basis is regarded as vague and unsatisfactory, concessive to modernism. The opposition to it was led by Dr. H. C. Morton, Editor of *The Fundamentalist*. On the surface, however, the actual act of union was without incident. One of the significant features of the day was a speech to an evening meeting by the Anglican Bishop of London, who said, in part, "I hope I shall live to see another great gathering in Albert Hall when, without any re-absorption of one with the other, a great reunited Church, with the fire of Wesleyans combined with the faith and order of the historic Church, shall advance with new power and conviction. And why confine this reunited Church to Wesleyans and the Church of England? Why should not the Baptists, Presbyterians, Greeks, Old Catholics and, at last, a reformed Roman Catholic Church all join with the molten glory of the holy catholic Church throughout the world? While, therefore, I welcome this reunion and wish you godspeed, I look upon it as only a prelude to the greater reunion in days to come."

It is significant to note that in the union suggested between Anglicans and Methodists, the Bishop's suggestion was that the Methodists should bring in their "fire"—that is, their work and effort, while the faith and order, would be that of the Church of England. (Whatever that "Faith and Order" actually is!)