

F. S. DYRNES
MAY 1934-R
RD 2
QUARRYVILLE 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, 1933
Vol. 4 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

Editorial Notes and Comments

THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM



THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE, in its issue of September 21st, contains an article by E. Stanley Jones of more than passing interest. It is entitled "Jesus Enters the Soul of the East," and purports to indicate the ways in which the Kingdom grows or rather the ways in which Dr. Jones has watched it grow in the East. In the first place, it has grown in a way that can be seen and measured—the mustard seed has become a great tree. In the second

place, it has grown through the silent permeation of human society by the ideas and mind and spirit of Jesus—the leaven is leavening the whole lump. More concretely expressed, Dr. Jones says he has not only seen the Church in the East grow as an organization at the rate of 12,000 a month during the last ten years; he has also seen the ideas, the outlook, the spirit of the whole people changed to such an extent that an Indian Christian editor writes: "The religion of the educated Indian is an indistinguishable blend of Hinduism and the spirit of Christ." Dr. Jones says that while the mustard seed growth is very remarkable, the leaven growth is still more remarkable. Christ, he writes, "is entering into the texture of the soul of the East and it may be that this quiet, silent coming will, in the end, be more permanent and make men better Christians than the more sudden acceptance."

Dr. Jones writes attractively and persuasively and yet it seems to us that every truly Christian heart must be conscious that there is something wrong in this representation. What is that something? Is it not the more or less suppressed assumption that if men accept "the ideas and mind and spirit of Jesus" we need not be greatly concerned about their personal attitude toward Him as Lord and Saviour? It seems to us that he does not give adequate recognition to the fact that Christianity owes not only its origin but its continuance to the person of Christ. The place that Christ occupies in Christianity is quite different from the position that Buddha and Mohammed occupy in their respective religions. Christ is not merely one who lived and worked some 1900 years ago. He has lived and worked through all the years that have followed, so that Christianity has been as dependent upon Him throughout the Christian ages—is as dependent upon Him today—as when He trod the earth. Buddha and Mohammed might be forgotten without necessitating any essential changes in the religions they founded, because that which binds their followers together is not loyalty to their persons but loyalty to the principles and precepts they taught and exemplified. If they beheld the things done on the earth, it is quite supposable that they are satisfied in proportion

as they see the principles they taught ruling the hearts of men. It is otherwise in the case of Christ. He is not satisfied to see men observing the things He commanded, even if they observe them in a spirit of love unless they act out of a consideration for Himself. He promised to be with His disciples unto the end of the world and desires their love, trust, obedience and worship. Where He is forgotten or ignored, even if His spirit lives on in individuals or even communities and much of what He taught is known and done, Christianity does not exist. For Christ Himself is Christianity. He does not merely point out the way to God and salvation. He is the Way itself.

That Dr. Jones' own work in promoting the coming of the kingdom in India leaves much to be desired is indicated by an excerpt from a letter received from a missionary in India. He writes: "I have listened to him six times. I have heard him give a great address on Christ, not as Saviour, but as one who died for truth! I have never heard Dr. Jones speak of the guilt of sin and I have never heard him preach the Gospel. I am not saying he does not know it but I have not heard him preach it. But I have heard of Hindoos who were thinking of baptism after hearing Dr. Jones draw back from it. I have heard of two law students who said, 'We like Dr. Jones, for he allows us to stay in our own religion,' and adds, 'Oh, if Dr. Jones would only preach the Gospel, what might we not see?'"

THE PLAN OF UNION



THE Joint Committee on Organic Union of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and the United Presbyterian Church reported to their respective Assemblies that "important changes" had been made in the proposed Plan of Union and requested "the General Assemblies of the negotiating Churches to permit the Committee to continue its study of the Plan of Union until the Fall of 1933 with the understanding that on or before January 1, 1934,

the Plan of Union as amended to that date will be printed and distributed to the ministers of the negotiating Churches, to the clerks of sessions of all the particular churches of the negotiating Churches, and to such persons as may be willing to purchase copies of the Plan of Union at a nominal cost."

"The most important of these changes is," in the language of the Committee's report, "the confining of the Doctrinal Basis of Union to 'the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the supreme standard, acknowledged as the inspired Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice; and upon the subordinate standards of the Westminster Confession of Faith, together with the amendments adopted in 1903 by the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms; all of which subordinate standards are recognized as agreeable to and founded upon the Scriptures.'"

(A Table of Contents will be found on Page 24)

That the proposed "Doctrinal Basis of Union," as thus far made known, will not be confined, in any strict sense of the word, to the Bible and the Westminster Standards is indicated, however, by the fact that the Committee's report states that "the Confessional Statement of the United Presbyterian Church and the brief statement of the Reformed Faith adopted by the 1902 General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. have been made a part of the Plan of Union as 'historical interpretative statements.'"

In its previous reports the Committee on Organic Union indicated that it welcomed comments from interested parties and that both criticisms and suggestions would be given due consideration. While no such invitation was included in this year's report it is to be assumed, we suppose, that the Committee still welcomes criticisms and suggestions from interested parties. Be that as it may, it seems advisable to put on record our opposition to the Plan of Union in its latest published form lest silence be interpreted as approval.

While we think the Plan of Union, as proposed to the last Assembly, a great improvement over that Plan as it was originally proposed, we judge other "important changes" still necessary before it should prove acceptable to loyal and intelligent Presbyterians. Our dissatisfaction with the latest published form of the Plan of Union is due especially (1) to the inclusion of the Brief Statement adopted by the General Assembly of 1902 and particularly of the Confessional Statement adopted by the United Presbyterian Church in 1925 as "historical interpretative statements" and (2) to the proposed Formula of Subscription.

The Confessional Statement is not really a Reformed confession and therefore cannot be looked upon as truly interpretative of the Westminster Standards. What is worse, it is derogatory of the Bible inasmuch as in Article III it gives expression to one of the central errors of Modernism, viz., that we should distinguish "spiritual truth" from historical and scientific truth and that it is only in the sphere of spiritual truth that the Bible is "the supreme source of authority."

The proposed Formula of Subscription is not only needlessly long but vague in its reference to the system of doctrine contained in the standards of the Church. While our present formula states that that system is *the* system taught in Scripture, i. e., the only system taught in the Scripture, the proposed formula contents itself with stating that system is taught in the Scripture and so is not exclusive of the notion that other systems of doctrine are also Scriptural.

In considering this proposed Plan of Union we should not be forgetful of the fact that church unions have frequently been actually productive of divisions. Canada affords us an illuminating illustration. If there is to be a union of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. with the United Presbyterian Church that will not be productive of division (at least in the former) it would seem essential (1) that the 1925 Confessional Statement and the 1902 Brief Statement be altogether eliminated from the Plan of Union and (2) that there be no weakening of the present Formula of Subscription of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

GODLESS CHRISTIANITY



IN our May issue we commented on an article by Mrs. Pearl S. Buck in the *Cosmopolitan* in which she made clear that such Christianity as she advocates is essentially a Christless Christianity, i. e., a Christianity in which Christ Himself as a living reality (either now or in the past) occupies no essential place. In that article she maintained that nothing essential would be lost even though it be shown that Christ is a product of "men's dreams," "the personification of the highest we human beings can know." "Whether Christ had a body or not," she

wrote, "whether He had a time to be born in history and a time to die as other men have is no matter now; perhaps it never was any matter. What lives today is not the ephemeral body of flesh and bones. If once it lived, then well enough; if not, then, well too."

In her most recent article—in the October issue of *The Forum*—Mrs. Buck is not content to appear as an advocate of a Christless Christianity. In an article entitled, "What Religion Means to Me," she appears as an advocate of an essentially Godless Christianity. In this, too, there is nothing particularly new. Readers at all familiar with modern religious literature have long been aware of the fact that there are those who sponsor an atheistic Christianity. Strange as this may seem to the man in the street, there is nothing particularly surprising about it when we remind ourselves that a Godless Christianity is quite consistent with the views of those who identify Christianity with morality or altruism or loyalty or, as Mrs. Buck does in as far as at least as she calls herself a Christian, the highest life of the soul. For cannot even the atheist be loyal or moral or altruistic or seek to live in right relations to the universe and his fellows—after a fashion at least? That Mrs. Buck's religion is a Godless religion—in any sense of the word "God" unacceptable to most atheists—seems only too clear from the following passage among others:

"What God is we may not know. Whether he is an entity outside the spirit of mankind, or not, one cannot know. I think it does not matter if God is found one day to be not as many have believed him to be, a spirit separate from ours. He may be made up of some quality, some spirit force, some essence of the spirit of mankind. We cannot know. What God is we may not know, but we can be aware of unity with that spirit and of living in the presence or out of it. There is none of us, I think, who has not been conscious of hours, moments, perhaps days and even years, when our souls have been made tranquil by a certain high way of life we have chosen for ourselves as being the best we know; and then when we have departed from that way, uncertainty and in-tranquility have come. I suppose, individually, religion may be defined as the highest life of the soul, that is, the soul's firm determination to find the highest relation in the universe and live in that relation; and that in the second place, this individual soul, in its relation to the universe, must take into consideration its relation also to its fellows."

Again Mrs. Buck writes in words that not only throw further light on what she means by the word "God" but indicates her doctrine of salvation:

"In the old days our fathers said, 'Give your heart to God. Believe and you shall be saved.' We are not so sure of the likeness of God's image, perhaps, but we are sure of the supreme greatness of goodness, which is the essence of God. Give your heart to goodness, which is to give it to God, believe in that life which flows from such giving, and you are saved already. . . . It is true that we are so limited by weakness of body and of mind, by the very nature of our being, that we cannot even agree on what goodness is. We express our idea of goodness in vastly different ways, and what seems goodness to me is not goodness to another. Yet it seems to me this does not matter at all. What may be common is the desire of the soul to *be* at its best, and I believe this desire *is* in every soul—its best in a personal sense, that is to live and believe so as to have a sense of rightness with the universe and with other souls, to be of use, to find life full and complete."

This article by Mrs. Buck would, perhaps, call for no special comment in these pages were it not for the fact that until recently she was a missionary under the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church and would, it seems, be a missionary under that Board today if she had not insisted that her resignation be accepted. There is no reason to suppose that Mrs. Buck has recently changed her views and yet as

recently as May 1st, last, the following action was recorded in the Minutes of the Board of Foreign Missions:

"A letter was presented from Mrs. J. Lossing Buck, of the Kiangnan Mission, requesting to be released from responsible relationship to the Board. The Board *had hoped* that this step might be avoided but in view of all the considerations involved and *with deep regret* it voted to acquiesce in her request. The Board expressed to Mrs. Buck its *sincere appreciation* of the service which she has rendered during the past sixteen years and its *earnest prayer* that her unusual abilities *may continue to be richly used* in behalf of the people in China" (italics ours).

"PREACH THE GOSPEL OR LIVE THE GOSPEL?"



SOME weeks ago *The Banner* (Grand Rapids) printed an interesting article by the Rev. John C. DeKorne of China that dealt with the modern tendency to minimize the importance of preaching and to exaggerate the importance of living the Gospel to such a degree as to make it appear that if we do the latter we need not concern ourselves about the former.

Mr. DeKorne made perfectly clear that his unfavorable judgment of this tendency is not rooted in any degree in an antinomian complex. He says flatly: "He who would only preach the gospel and would not make an honest attempt to live it, or, as we usually say, to live according to the gospel, is a low-down hypocrite who deserves no further consideration."

After presenting proof of the prevalence of this tendency from missionary and modernist literature with special reference to the Oxford Group Movement, the Laymen's Inquiry Report and Mrs. Pearl S. Buck, Mr. DeKorne asks, "What shall we say of this new emphasis?" This is his reply:

"To the extent that it demands a life to be lived in accordance with the gospel, who could withhold a hearty endorsement? Certainly a man's life counts more than his words. It is vastly harder and vastly more important to live a good life than to speak good words. Nothing is so cheap and utterly contemptible as the mouthing of lofty thoughts without a complement of holy living. If the issue were between a sordid life plus fervent preaching on the one hand and a radiant victorious life without preaching on the other hand, every honest Christian would choose for the latter. But is that the issue? No, it is not. Both the old emphasis and the new emphasis insist upon a life lived in accordance with the gospel. The issue is whether the witnessing to which the Church is committed can be accomplished by merely living a Christian life without preaching or whether a vigorous propaganda program must be carried out as an implicit obligation of that Christian life. Thus stated, we take the latter position definitely."

Mr. DeKorne points out that no life, however good, is a substitute for the gospel, that advocacy of this emphasis is in effect a confession that we have no gospel to proclaim, that it makes a travesty of the Great Commission as well as of all congregational preaching, and that it ignores the fact that in the history of the Church every great religious awakening has been introduced by fervent preaching. In our judgment he could have gone even further and maintained that it is only as men know and embrace the gospel that it is possible for them to live a Christian life. The slogan, "Christianity is life, not doctrine," is folly and unbelief. Christianity is a life based upon a message. Apart from that message there is no Christian living. It was because Paul preached the gospel that he was used to open the eyes of the Gentiles and to turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God so that they received the forgiveness of sins and an inheritance among them which are sanctified through faith in Christ. Otherwise all his efforts would have been in vain.

PACIFISM RAMPANT



THE October issue of *The Moslem World*, edited by Dr. Samuel M. Zwemer of Princeton Seminary, has as its leading editorial an article by Dr. Duncan B. Macdonald of Hartford Seminary entitled "The Christian Message is Peace," that ought to be a matter of considerable concern to those interested in missionary efforts in Moslem lands.

In its opening paragraph it indicates the chaos that exists today in the world of Islam with the resulting "black fear that has become the dominant emotion in the Moslem mind." It indicates further that in the mind of Islam "the enemy is not simply the present Western world and its worldly civilization, but the Christendom which knew itself as Christendom in our Middle Ages." As a result, we are told, for the Moslem "the supreme enemy is the Christian Church as Islam envisages that Church, and the Christian missionary represents for Islam the militant phase of that Church." "The Moslem still lives in the world of the Crusades," we are told further, "but the Crusaders now are not warriors but, far more insidiously and destructively, are preachers, teachers and physicians."

Having described the situation, Dr. Macdonald proceeds to indicate the duty of the missionary as he faces it. His opening words are fitted to assure: "First and always, he must be explicitly and exactly Christian in his attitude and confession in every sense—theological, moral, social—of that much used and abused word 'Christian.' The more explicit he is that he accepts the exact Christian faith, the better the Moslem will understand him and the more he will respect him. This, the Moslem will say, is an honest and faithful enemy; no crypto-Moslem, but a theologian who knows and confesses his own faith."

The hopes engendered by these words are, however, soon dashed to pieces. For immediately the missionary is told that he need not be an enemy of Islam. "The time of anathemas against heresies is past," we read, "and theologians now seek to fit them into their place in the constructive history of the Church." Dr. Macdonald refrains from saying that it is possible to canonize Mohammed but he does say that "it may be possible to treat him as the Church treats Origen or Arius or even the Abbot Joachim" and adds that "the weaknesses of his private life can be passed over as the Church most singularly has managed to pass over those of David." In fact, we are told that the missionary should be so little militant in his attitude toward Islam that he will "carefully avoid" words and metaphors suggestive of war and fighting. "His positive teaching," the missionary is told, "must be full of the spirit of peace and brotherhood." Avoiding "arid and useless discussions of the nature of the Trinity," the missionary should seek out and emphasize the points in common held by Christian and Moslem, laboring especially to express the meaning for mankind of the Incarnation and "thus solve the paradox of the Moslem mystic and show that Allah is not a God afar off." "And so," we read with astonished eyes in the magazine which Dr. Zwemer edits, "he will bring out what the Song of the Angels meant, with Peace on earth from God and marvelous good-will and saving love towards men, and what that basal teaching of Christ means, that Hate is swallowed up in Love; that *the true Christian does not hate anything, either the sinner or the sin*—his sympathies are too true and his understanding is too full; that *all men are children of God and brothers one with another*" (italics ours).

Comment is hardly necessary. Where Dr. Macdonald got his notion that the Christian message is such a message of peace we do not profess to know. Certainly he did not obtain it from prophets or apostles or from the Christ himself who said that He "came not to send peace but a sword" and of whom it is written that He "loved righteousness and hated iniquity." It is needless to add that his doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is not that of the New Testament.

"The Never Failing Light":

A Study in Mission-Book Modernism

By the Rev. Wilbur M. Smith, D.D.

Minister, the Presbyterian Church, Coatesville, Pa.; Editor of "Peloubet's Notes"

[The Editors feel that they are performing an unusual and valuable service to the whole Church in bringing to their readers this article by Dr. Smith, embodying the substance of his speech before the recent notable meeting at the Forks of Brandywine Presbyterian Church. An account of this meeting appears in the news pages. Italics in this article are Dr. Smith's.]



FEW days ago one of the most active young women of our church, and one who is unusually well taught in the truths of our faith, brought me a book which she had sent for, expecting to use it as a text-book in one of our missionary groups. The book is called "*The Never Failing Light*," and is by Dr. James Hall Franklin, who, since 1912, has been Foreign Secretary of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society. The young woman who brought the book to me said she had read it through, that many of its statements appeared to her as contradicting the teaching of the Scriptures, and asked me if I would read it. I have done so. I find it difficult to express my reactions in carefully studying it, page by page. The book is a frightful perversion of evangelical Christian truth, to put it mildly. May I point out three assertions of this book, chosen from among a number, that are absolutely dangerous.

On page ten occurs this sentence: "Truly the light was shining in dense spiritual darkness when Jesus began teaching men of all races, of all religions and all classes to look up to the Unseen as their Father and to practice love and brotherhood as the *sum total of his requirements of his children*." I do not have to argue that the teaching of our Lord was definitely, directly opposite to this. When the people asked him, "What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?" he answered at once, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent" (John 6:28, 29). The whole New Testament contradicts Dr. Franklin's statement. If he is right, there is no need for any such a thing as the free gift of God's grace for our salvation. On page thirty-four he restates the same error: "He bade men try the experiment of living *as if they were sons* of God and brothers one of another." He would have us believe that a man can make himself a child of God, by trying to live as one of God's children ought to live; the Gospel of John opens with a statement by the Holy Spirit the very opposite of such destructive untruth: "As many as received him, *to them* gave he power to become the sons of God, even to *them that believe on his name*" (John 1:12). The Apostle John reiterates this fundamental principle of Christian truth: "*Whosoever believeth* that Jesus is the Christ is born of God: and every one that loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him" (I John 5:1). Paul powerfully declares that,

"that we might receive the adoption of sons," God "sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law" (Gal. 4:4, 5). Dr. Franklin makes our sonship rest upon the life we live, upon our own efforts; the New Testament founds it squarely on the redemption that Christ accomplished for us, and our faith in him. Between these two diametrically opposed views there is no possible reconciliation.

On page thirty-seven Dr. Franklin, without remarks, and certainly with fullest approval, concludes a paragraph with a quotation from Richard Wightman (a writer, I regret to say, of whom I have never heard). The sentence is almost too blasphemous to copy. "What was the cross to him? *Naught but an incident* in the life which he had already laid down for his kind." Leaving out of all consideration the deliberate misinterpretation of our Lord's words, recorded in the tenth chapter of John, concerning the laying down of his life for the sheep, which all evangelical commentators agree is a figure of speech referring to his death, we need only to consider the terrible phrase by which he refers to the Cross—"Naught but an incident." Now I do not want to quibble about words, but when one comes upon the noun "incident," or, more particularly, upon such a phrase as, "naught but an incident," he at once judges that that which is so characterized is *not* fundamental, and *not* of primary importance. Webster's dictionary clearly defines the noun "incident," as, "that which happens aside from the main design; an accidental or subordinate action or event!" If the Cross was "*naught but an incident*," it certainly was *not* of primary, preeminent importance. To say that the Cross is "naught but an incident," is to say that the death of Christ is "naught but an incident." To speak thus of the Cross is to say that the blood of Christ is only incidental. Not so did our Lord consider His death. He said the purpose of His advent was "to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28). The cup was the new covenant in his blood, shed for the remission of sins (Matt. 26:28). Except we "eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood," we have no life in us (John 6:53). Upon the Cross our redemption rests. By the blood of that Cross our sins are forgiven. By His death on the cross we have eternal life. How can that Cross be "naught but an incident?"

Continued on Page 10

Freedom in the Presbyterian Church: Dr. Machen's Protest in the Presbytery of New Brunswick

[The following is the text of the protest offered by Dr. J. Gresham Machen concerning the action of the Presbytery of New Brunswick in amending its rules providing for the examination of ministers and candidates as to their willingness to support the Board of Foreign Missions. An account of the meeting is found in the news pages.]

PROTEST



DESIRE, very respectfully, to record my dissent from and protest against the action of the Presbytery of New Brunswick in inserting the following additional paragraphs in the rules of Presbytery:

In Article 7—Ministers:

"A member of another Presbytery, or a minister from any other ecclesiastical body, seeking membership in the Presbytery, shall be examined as to his willingness to support the regularly authorized Boards and Agencies of the Presby-

terian Church, U. S. A., particularly the Board of Foreign Missions. A record of this examination shall be made in the Minutes of Presbytery."

In Article 8—Candidates:

"All candidates seeking licensure or ordination shall be examined as to their willingness to support the regularly authorized Boards and Agencies of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., particularly the Board of Foreign Missions. A record of this examination shall be made in the Minutes of Presbytery."

My reasons for making this protest are, in part, as follows:

1. In requiring that candidates for licensure, ordination or transfer shall be examined not merely as to their fitness for their ministerial function but as to their willingness to perform certain future acts, and in requiring that this examination shall be recorded, this action of Presbytery requires of candidates for licensure, ordination or transfer a pledge additional to the pledges required in the "Constitutional Questions" contained in the Form of Government. It is thus to all intents and purposes adding another question to those Constitutional Questions. Such addition can lawfully be made only by an amendment to the Form of Government, passed by a majority of all the presbyteries in the regular way.

2. The Form of Government, Chapter XIV, amended in 1932, sets forth subjects in which candidates are to be examined. Those subjects concern the candidate's fitness, but they do not include any examination regarding his willingness to perform future acts. The omission is clearly significant. It shows that the only pledges regarding future acts to be required of candidates for the ministry are those that are found in the Constitutional Questions. The addition of another pledge is not justified, therefore, by the sections on examinations any more than it is justified by the section containing the Constitutional Questions.

3. In requiring of candidates for licensure, ordination or transfer an examination as to their willingness to support the Boards and Agencies of the Church, particularly the Board of Foreign Missions, this action is practically making support of the Boards to be a tax necessarily involved in loyal membership in the Church or at least in this Presbytery. But as a matter of fact support of the Boards is, according to Presbyterian law, not a tax but purely a freewill offering. That appears in several ways.

(a) There is nothing in the Constitution of the Church requiring support of the official Boards and Agencies on the part of the ministers. Since there is no such requirement in the Constitution, the establishment of such a requirement by the Presbytery of New Brunswick is plainly unconstitutional.

(b) Certain positive pronouncements of the General Assembly confirm this conclusion. While these pronouncements have merely informatory and not strictly legal force, their informatory force, especially because of the occasion on which two of them at least were made, is very great.

(1) When the Board of Foreign Missions was established as the Board of the combined church at the time of the union between the Old School and New School bodies, a concurrent resolution of the two Assemblies expressly stated that while the churches should be encouraged to sustain the one set of Boards for Home and Foreign Missions and other religious enterprises of the Church they were free to cast their contributions into other channels if they desired to do so (DIGEST, 1930, Vol. ii, p. 38).

(2) In the report of the Joint Committee on Foreign Missions, approved by the Assemblies of 1869, reporting to the united Assembly of 1870, which report was adopted by the Assembly and is found on pp. 44-46, Minutes of 1870, it is said:

"Equally free and responsible directly to Christ are all Christian people, in deciding through what agencies they will do their share of work for Missions."

Also in the Minutes for the year 1870, page 39 in the Report of the Committee on Conference with the American Board, it is said:

"That the time has now come when an effort should be made, *as far as may be consistent with the fullest liberty of individuals and churches*, to concentrate the counsels, the energies and contributions of the whole united Church in the work about to be carried on by our Foreign Mission Board" (italics ours).

(3) The General Assembly has held that there is no such thing as an obligatory assessment in the Presbyterian Church, even regarding a thing like mileage for Commissioners to the General Assembly (DIGEST, 1930, Vol. i, pp. 477-479, No. 3, No. 4). All giving is voluntary. But if a minister sustains this examination required by the Presbytery of New Brunswick his giving to the Boards is no longer voluntary. In order, therefore, that he may enter into this Presbytery he will have been required to assume a radically different attitude toward the whole nature of the support of the Boards from that which is prescribed in the Constitution of the Church.

(4) Persons who declare their willingness to support the Boards and Agencies of the Presbyterian Church, in accordance with the plain intent of this action of Presbytery, are binding themselves either to conduct which is contrary to common honesty or to conduct which is an evasion of the responsibilities of a minister in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. If a minister who has obtained his entrance into the Presbytery of New Brunswick by declaring his willingness to support the Boards and Agencies becomes convinced that the Boards and Agencies are unfaithful to their trust, two courses of action are open to him. In the first place, he may continue to support the Boards and Agencies in accordance with the pledge which has been exacted of him by Presbytery, despite the fact that he knows those Boards and Agencies to be unfaithful. That course of action is contrary to common honesty. Or, in the second place, being no longer able conscientiously to support the Boards and Agencies, he may withdraw from the ministry. That course

Continued on Page 8.

Registration of Schools in China

By L. Nelson Bell, M.D.

[The Editors are glad to publish this informing article by Dr. Bell, of the Staff of the Tsingkiangsu, China, General Hospital. This is part of the work of the Southern Presbyterian Mission.]



At the recent meeting of the North Kiangsu Mission a committee from the Kiang Peh Presbytery presented a request to the Mission, asking that the Mission lend or rent the school property at Suchowfu to the Presbytery for the conduct of a registered school. They also requested the services of the missionaries now engaged in educational work in that station.

To the average member of the home church this would seem a reasonable request and some explanation might be expected as to why the Mission by an overwhelming majority declined to accede, deeming it wiser to close all educational work rather than carry on said work under present restrictions, entailed in a registered school.

There may have been additional reasons why some others voted not to agree to this request. My own reasons were the following:

1. *Registration of a school necessitates the elimination of the name of Christ, or Christian from all official papers of the school.* This was startlingly illustrated by the papers this Presbytery's committee had in hand. They had already taken steps to register these schools after the Mission closed them and the original papers included the word "Christian" in the application. The educational authorities sent back these papers and demanded that "Christian" be deleted from them. As one member of the Mission truly said, "Complying with this stipulation of the educational authorities means that I haul down the banner of Jesus Christ as the aim and motive of my work and this I refuse to do."

2. *Registration of a school necessitates the removal of the Bible from its rightful place in the curriculum, and requires the teaching of the San Ming Tsu I, a book full of misleading statements.* The Bible cannot be taught to any pupils except in the Senior High School and there only as the students themselves elect to study it. But, all must study this other book. If the Word of God cannot be taught to little children and can only be taken by the older ones as their whim may dictate, what justification is there for the use of funds of the Home Church? Our Southern Presbyterian Church is under no obligation to give secular education to the Chinese and the only justification for educational work on the mission field is that it shall be Christian education. In Ephesians we are told that the Word of God is the Sword of the Spirit. The Sword is an agent of active warfare. In a registered school, not only cannot this sword be put to the fore, where it can be successfully used in Christian warfare, it must be put behind, and not only behind, but *it must be hidden from sight.* A mission hospital in which operating equipment and medicines were prohibited except as the patients chose to use

them would be no greater travesty than a mission school registered under present conditions.

3. *In registered schools the local political party requires that each Monday morning a memorial service be held for a dead man and that those present stand bowed in silence for three minutes before this man's picture.* With the idolatrous background of China, this to many Chinese Christians is idolatry and an abomination. The above mentioned service is required by the local political party but the worship of God and His Son, our Saviour, is banned. One Chinese pastor told me, "I had rather my son never learned to read a character than that he should participate in this idolatrous practice, if he does that he will do any thing."

4. *Registering a school places it under the control of a government which has repeatedly been anti-Christian and which claims the right to change the conditions under which registered schools operate at any time.* This fact is illustrated in our own school at Kashing. When this school registered voluntary Bible teaching was permitted in the Junior High School. Last year the Government banned even voluntary Bible teaching from the Junior High. First hand evidence was also given that the Government had complained of a certain university in China which many of us feel has almost completely left the Christian basis on which it was founded, that this university "is too religious." There is no guarantee that any registered school will not have even all voluntary Christian teaching banned at any time, and it would then be impossible for us to close out schools for when granting registration the Government reserves the right to confiscate the property of any school which closes its doors.

5. *Registration under present restrictions entails a yielding to present world tendencies away from God and His Word and my conscience will not permit me to agree even to the loan or rent of our mission property for the purpose.* Because an agency other than the Mission proposes to run such a school does not lessen my responsibility when the use of our property is involved. I have no right to permit others to use things for which I share a moral responsibility when I am unwilling to so use them myself.

6. Church history proves that each age brings its own peculiar method of testing and it is my conviction that *the present problem of registration of schools in China is one of these testing points.* "You brethren," (all of the above points were brought out in discussion with the Chinese representatives of Presbytery), "You brethren have all admitted that registration is most dangerous, that you do not know the outcome, that the future is dark, that the service to Sun Yat-sen is most undesirable, and your only justification is that 'There is nothing else to do.' I admit the need for education for your children and we all sym-

Continued on Page 9

Sunday School Lessons for November

(International Uniform Series)

Lesson for November 5, 1933

PAUL IN JERUSALEM

(Lesson Text—Acts 15:1, 2, 6, 22-31. Golden Text—II Cor. 3:17.)

THE early church, *very* early in its life, was confronted with the problem of false teaching. Certain men came to Antioch from Judea, saying that no convert ever became a *real* Christian unless he were circumcized and obeyed the ceremonial law of Moses. Doubtless these men sincerely believed what they taught, but they were wrong just the same. They probably were personally, believers in "the uniqueness of Jesus Christ," and would have been able to descant for hours about His person and work. But—they *added* to the Gospel. And what they added was not good news at all. They said that salvation is what God does *plus* what man does, and that the former is of none effect, unless a man can add required obedience to it that will be pleasing in the sight of God.

The whole future of the Gospel was at stake. Had the early church yielded to the desire to eliminate the "offence of the Cross" by admitting that, after all, it was in man to earn his salvation, we should, humanly speaking, never have heard of Christianity. But this was not to be in the eternal purpose of God. Yet, over him God dealt with it in that eternal purpose. He did not lead the faithful to sit back and say, "Well, I'll preach the Gospel where I am, but I won't do anything about these false teachers—after all, truth is mighty, and God will take care that they will not win out." Ah, no! He put it in the hearts of His faithful ones *to do something* about it. So the conference was held, the truth stated, the menace lifted from the Church in Antioch, and souls saved. God's way, from the beginning of the race on, has never been the way of evasion, compromise and neutrality. Would that a few *modern* church councils could take their stand, as did this one, on the finished Work of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Lesson for November 12, 1933

PAUL IN MACEDONIA

(Lesson Text—Acts 16:9-15, 25-31. Golden Text—Acts 16:31.)

The invasion of Europe! How an astonished world would awaken if it suddenly saw headlines in the papers: "EUROPE INVADDED. CONQUERORS LAND IN MACEDONIA!" Nearly nineteen hundred years ago there were no papers, and if there had been they would not have taken much if any notice of the arrival of Paul and Silas. Europe has seen many invasions—

the invasions of the Persians, the Turks, the Pitiless hordes of Tamerlane. Yet here was beginning the greatest invasion of all—and the world did not know that the Conqueror had come. The King of Love, the Lord of Glory was setting up his banners in the Western World, by the act of his Field Marshal Paul. He did not come to lay his credentials before the eyes of the mighty—he went to the humble, and to a woman. But she opened her heart, her house, and the conquest of Europe was begun. Nor were the captains of the King of Kings lodged in palaces, after having been banqueted and entertained. Their entertainment consisted of violence and scourging. Their "palace" was a prison. And in the night, with backs torn and bleeding, aching with pain, came the time to be gloomy, came the time for them to look the facts in the fact, and see what utter folly it was for two men to attempt a continent. But fortunately for posterity, Paul and Silas lacked the quality that *some* people call "common sense." They didn't *know* that what they were trying to be was impossible. They were simple enough to believe that God could do it. And so, in His strength, these poor simpletons *went on and did it*. Therefore no gloomy gouching in the night; only songs of praise, for God's Goodness, for His mercy in Christ, for the promise of His care. Nothing can beat men like that—would there were more of them today. And when the opportunity to witness came, they preferred to risk more jail than to escape—without the soul of the jailor.

Lesson for November 19, 1933

PAUL IN ATHENS

(Lesson Text—Acts 17:22-34. Also study Acts 17:16-21; John 4:19-26; I Cor. 15:12-20. Golden Text—Acts 17:28.)

The marshal of the Lord had now arrived at the intellectual and cultural capital of the world. Physically, Athens was only a shell of what it once had been. It was far outshone by other cities, by Alexandria, Antioch, Rome. Yet Athens still preserved its name as the great city of philosophy. Now had Paul been like-minded with the members of a certain "Appraisal Commission," for example, he would certainly have made a very different approach to Athens. He would have come as an humble learner, to find the best in Athenian religion and thought, to let that ferment in his mind, until it was joined to whatever of permanent value in Christianity he had left by

that time. Then he would have poured out this eclectic amalgam in the molds of the thought of his day. Athens would have listened respectfully to a *very* popular man named Paul, and a good time would have been enjoyed by all.

But, again, Paul evidently didn't see what a real opportunity he was letting slip by. Instead, he offered them the whole Gospel. True, with fine courtesy and understanding he commenced by referring to the altar they had erected to the unknown god. But before Paul was done with them that unknown god was a very much known God. Paul did not mince matters or tone his message to the ears of the sophisticated. God, he told them, was not merely a philosophical concept—He was the living, the Just, the Holy. And they had sinned. But God had sent a redeemer, who had risen from the dead.

There is something familiar about this sermon of Paul's—something strangely familiar. Yes—that is it: it was simply the Gospel. The simple Gospel; the grand Gospel; the Gospel for the weak and for the mighty; the Gospel for the unlettered and the philosopher; the Gospel that is always "foolishness to men," yet ever the deep wisdom of God. Paul knew no other message. Bless God for Paul!

Lesson for November 26, 1933

PAUL IN CORINTH

(Lesson Text—I Cor. 1:10-18; 2:1-5. Also study I Cor. 1-4. Golden Text—I Cor. 2:2.)

The Lesson Text was written at Ephesus, to the Church in Corinth. Paul had been there, now was compelled to write because of divisions among them. Let us note carefully what those divisions were. They were not "organizational" divisions. There was only one church organization in Corinth. The divisions were deeper. They related, really, to their doctrine. The unity he sought was that they should be of "the same mind and the same judgment." No unity is truly possible in the Christian Church unless people are at one in the Christ of the Bible. Paul was given of the Spirit to see this clearly, and to rebuke the Corinthian Christians for their foolishness. He warned them that there is only one foundation: only on the rock Christ will the soul be safe. If they thought they could build for eternity on Paul or Apollos, they erred, they missed the whole point of the Gospel. The Lesson Text here is rich and will repay direct study. It shows what the ministry of Paul in Corinth had been like. He preached only the everlasting blessed Gospel, and he preached it all. There was not a bone of cowardly compromise in Paul's body or soul. Therefore, because he was faithful, their faith stood, not in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God.

This Changing World

By
"Calvinist"

ONE of the tender parting injunctions of our Lord to His disciples is recorded by St. John in these words: "this is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you." Spoken originally to the little apostolic group on the night in which He was betrayed, these are yet words that ought to be binding to the Christian heart of every generation. Sadly, the professed people of Jesus Christ have ever fallen far short of obedience to His command. We have not loved each other as we ought, and in each true Christian soul abides a sense of incompleteness and shame.

Especially in times of controversy it is imperative that the words of our Lord be not forgotten. Hatred between Christian men is inexcusable—doubly inexcusable when it is thought to be for the sake of the One who, loving us, died upon the cross.

The love of Christians for each other is based upon, and is a reflection of, the mutual love of Christ and His redeemed children. We love each other because we love Him, we find closeness with fellow-Christians when by faith we stand together beneath His cross.

No man is infallible, and every Christian makes mistakes. Sometimes in the history of Christ's church those mistakes, vouched for by good men, have plunged the church into tragic periods of recession and decline. Many a measure brought forth by men who will stand nearer the throne than we will ever stand, has carried ruin and havoc in its train. Well-meaning Christian men may in good faith sponsor, and have sponsored in the past, measures incalculably pernicious to the cause of the Gospel.

In such a case, what must Christian men and women do, who see such events repeating themselves in the church? Surely they ought to love their fellow Christians always, and be loyal to the obligations of Christian friendship. But there is another loyalty whose obligations ought to be supreme to Christian men—love and loyalty to the truth as it is in Jesus. No man is ever justified in allowing personal love or friendship to deter him from speaking the brave, perhaps lonely, word for his Lord. He must speak out against error and for the truth. God has never set His seal upon compromise. We must speak in love, but we ought never to forget that what we speak must be the Truth of God, or else all our "love" will be a mockery. We should pray that God's grace will keep us from all rancor, personalities and bitterness. We ought always to speak in love. But our love for the truth should be greater than our desire not to give offense. Christians are under an obli-

gation to speak the truth, whatever the cost, whenever it needs to be spoken, and if the truth spoken in love offends and disturbs, they should not be afraid of the responsibility. True Christian contention is always against wrong measures and against those who promote them, not as individuals, but as representing movements destructive of the real peace of the Church. If they at times must mention names, it will not mean that they have any desire to enter into personalities. Those whom they oppose may possibly at times be among their dearest friends. But no Christian dares let his loyalty to the Truth as God has given it become dependent upon the claims of friendship. The claims of truth impose a duty no real lover of God or man can escape.

Yet, rightly understood, the claims of truth and friendship ought never to conflict. May we not remember that it is our God who hates the sin but who loves the sinner? And may we not, *must* we not, love the man to whose views we object while at the same time opposing those views with all our strength? Indeed, any other attitude would lead to a confession that it is impossible to hate error without also hating the person who is mistaken, a view which must be emphatically repudiated as contrary to the whole spirit of the gospel. One may contend with all his might against the error which another teaches, and against the things he does, while at the same moment loving that one with all his heart.

Further, it is an *obligation* of true friendship to express a difference if one honestly believes it to be a matter of great moment. A true friend does not allow another to tread the pathway that leads that one or others to disaster, without giving some warning. A person who keeps silence as to a matter of principle "for friendship's sake" is really no friend at all. Were one to be mute regarding issues vital to the church because of personal friendship, or because of the risk of misunderstanding, that one would be no true lover of his fellow-men, of Christ's church, or of the church's only Head and King.

It needs also to be noted that Modernists have no monopoly on Christian love. I am persuaded that, while Modernism is not Christianity, there may be Modernists who do not consistently carry their principles into their lives, and who, in spite of apostasy, possess a saving relation to Christ formed in days of younger, stronger faith. For this we all rejoice. But it is the common fashion of Modernists and others to

imply that militant conservatives all lack the virtue of Christian love, which is represented as being an exclusive possession of those more "liberally inclined." From this view I also dissent, and call twenty centuries of Christian history to witness to the fact that it is only those who hold to the historic Christ who long retain those graces of the gospel that sweeten and purify human conduct. None of us can naturally have Christian love for his fellows. Such love is the result of the regenerative grace of the Holy Spirit, is contrary to the natural man, and cannot be experienced apart from the historic, only, Christ.

Speaking the truth in love, then, should be our aim. Doubtless, being human, we all will at times fall below it. And in any contention into which we may be led, we will always hope for the turning again of any and all who have forsaken the gospel, or its defense, to the allegiance of other years. Even as we oppose them, it will be with the prayer that they may turn to stand firmly for the gospel, whether for the first time, or after a period of doubt, struggle and indecision. They will be received in Christian love as brothers in the Lord by those who feel an inescapable obligation to contend for the faith in days when it is being attacked and thousands are being led astray as never before. Let us speak in love, then, guarding our heart with all diligence, but let us not forget that to speak the saving truth of the Gospel sincerely, diligently and without stain of compromise is in itself the most loving act that one human can do for another.

Freedom in the Presbyterian Church—Continued

of action is evasion of his responsibility as a minister in the Presbyterian Church, since it is perfectly clear that disagreement with the policy of an administrative agency support of which according to the Constitution is voluntary is no sufficient reason for relinquishment of the great trust involved in ordination.

(5) This action of Presbytery is degrading to the Boards and Agencies. The Boards and Agencies will never in the long run prosper, even from the worldly point of view and still more clearly in the sight of God, if they depend for their support upon compulsion; they will truly prosper only if they are able to show themselves worthy of the free-will offerings of the people of God.

The Comfort of the Scriptures

A Devotional Meditation

By the Rev. David Freeman, Th.M.

"Curse ye Meroz . . . because they came not to the help of the Lord against the mighty." (Judges 5:23.)

THE truly devotional life—the life that is hid with Christ in God—is the life that does not shirk at the call of duty.

The passive life is by no means the spiritual life. To live close to God is to witness for Him. Not to obey is to render the sacrifice, no matter how great, worthless.

To love God and to do His commandments go hand in hand. Let no one think that communion with God may be had apart from the willingness to serve the Lord in the heat of the day.

Because the people of Meroz came not to the help of the Lord in a time of conflict with the enemies of God they were under His curse.

Could people like that pray? Could they hold fellowship with a God of righteousness and truth? They did nothing while others carried the banner of the Lord into the enemy's camp. What pretense if they claimed fellowship with the Lord! What mockery their exercises of religion! They came not to the help of the Lord and could they yet claim His blessing?

It is impossible to find favor in God's sight if His cause is not our cause. To love Him is to be identified with all that concerns Him. We are not our own. We have been bought with a price. We have not a life of our own to live. God's life must be ours. "Whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it," said the Lord Jesus.

Say not, "The days are evil. Who's to blame?
And fold the hands and acquiesce—oh, shame!
Stand up, speak out, and bravely in God's name."

What is it that makes us stand idly by while others enter into the conflict of the Lord of Hosts? Have we forgotten the word of the Lord? To heed the word and wisdom of man is not to have fellowship with the Father.

Have we become indifferent to God's cause? Only the losing of self in Him can bring us out of this state.

God can use the weakest vessel. Has He not "chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty"?

The valiant for truth live in the Spirit.

"Go, labor on: spend, and be spent,
Thy joy to do the Father's will;
It is the way the Master went;
Should not the servant tread it still?"

A Recent Missionary Gathering

The issue of *The Presbyterian* for September 28, 1933, contains an account of a meeting recently held in the "Old Brandywine Manor Church," by which is evidently meant the Forks of Brandywine Church. The reporter was not in sympathy with the object of the gathering, since his account reveals a design to belittle the occasion. Nor is his report free from inaccuracy.

If Israel were numbered at the time, it must have been by the anonymous scribe. But that the afternoon attendance was "about one hundred" is clearly an understatement. To those who know approximately the seating capacity of this church, it is incredible that three hundred and fifty persons could have been added to the number present without the most serious overcrowding. It may be that there was a majority of women present. If so, it is a matter for rejoicing; for when "elect ladies" are moved to come many miles to such a meeting, it were well to take heed. Something is moving.

Yet there were plenty of men—men whose names are known throughout the Church as presbyters and elders who are openly and wholly faithful to their covenant vows—men who know well the present situation, and who are prepared to meet its issues with a resolution not unworthy of those fathers whose fidelity to truth has made them examples to all generations.

The evening service was, as our reporter admits, more largely attended than that of the afternoon. In this service was sounded the only discordant note. A lady and a gentleman arose to defend the Board of Foreign Missions. In the course of her remarks the former declared with heat that her "interpretation" of the doctrines of Scripture was "none of anybody's business." But it would seem that when a person represents a creedal Church (as these speakers appear to have done), it is very much the business of that Church to see that its standards of doctrine are interpreted aright. Great fear was expressed lest the world learn that the Church is divided. The writer can imagine the attitude of these solicitous souls, had their lot been cast in the sixteenth century. How keen would have been their regret that Martin Luther refused to agree with Cardinal Cajetan! How terrible it would be should the Mohammedans learn that there was a warm difference of opinion between the German Reformers and the Pope! Why, O why could not we have a united Christendom?

The addresses, delivered by the Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., the Rev. Wilbur M. Smith, D.D., the Rev. Robert S. Marsden, and Elder Peter Stam, were of a very high order; and the whole spirit of the meeting was calculated to give much encouragement and comfort to those who feel that the present-day tendencies in our Church must be checked, and that some of the outstand-

ing actions and utterances of the Board of Foreign Missions should receive stern and uncompromising rebuke.

H. H. KURTZ,
Pastor, Forks of Brandywine Church.

Registration of Schools —Continued

pathize from the bottom of our hearts in this present crisis but expediency can never justify us in taking a step we feel to be morally wrong, and this is how we regard it."

7. *There is no precedent in the Word of God for a compromise on a matter of vital principle.* On the basis of the arguments used for the registration of schools Daniel would have at least gone home and closed his windows before praying; Daniel's three friends would at least have made the outward compromise which would have saved them from the fiery furnace; Abraham would certainly have never raised his hand to slay Isaac.

8. *What is the alternative?* I frankly do not know, nor do I believe God will reveal what His plan is until we agree to throw it all on Him. Then, and only then, He will show us the "ram in the bushes," then, and only then, He will show the way He has prepared for His own in this land to receive an education. China would yet be in total darkness had not our ancestors stood firm and refused to compromise.

In conclusion, let me quote from a recent address by Mr. D. E. Hoste, director of the great China Inland Mission. He said, "The fact that our schools are not registered of course precludes those attending from the recognition and higher educational and other advantages open to others. Whilst recognizing the value of secular education itself, we do not feel able, as a Mission, to divert to it either workers or funds from the fulfillment of the vocation given us and the special object for which funds have been entrusted to us by the Christian public in Western countries, namely the propagation and establishing of the Christian faith in the interior."

It will be interesting to many to know that after this frank discussion with our Chinese brethren and after we had by an overwhelming majority declined to agree to their proposal, there was not the slightest evidence of misunderstanding or hard feeling, only two or three who have been the most active in the proposed plans being inclined to question our action or its motives. These may continue active in their agitation for a while. I am convinced that the North Kiangsu Mission has borne a testimony which will not only be a blessing to us and our brethren in the Presbytery, but also to other missions and Chinese groups. This is said, not in pride, but in the humble belief that this action came as the result of almost unending prayer by missionaries and Chinese Christians for guidance in this most important matter.

"The Never Failing Light"

—Continued

The preaching of the Cross is the power of God (I Cor. 1:18). His death on the Cross is the divine purpose of the Incarnation (Phil. 2:8). We are reconciled to God by the death of his Son (Rom. 5:10; Col. 1:22). For our sins Christ died (I Cor. 15:3). By his blood we are redeemed (Eph. 1:7); by his blood we are justified (Rom. 5:9); by his blood we are forgiven (Col. 1:14); by his blood we obtain peace (Col. 1:20). The great Apostle confessed, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Gal. 6:14). I would say that when any one, within the boundary of the Christian Church, speaks of the Cross, and the death there offered, as "naught but an incident," he is an "enemy of the cross of Christ" (Phil. 3:19).

I am well aware of the author's other references to the Cross, but I cannot see that they contradict the judgment he passes upon this experience of Christ in speaking of it as "naught but an incident." In the preface he writes of "the power of Christ and his cross." On page nineteen he says that "men and women are emerging who have a holy discontent with conventional Christianity. They see that the cross is a program of life and not merely the center of theology." The slur here is only thinly veiled. This statement, on page ninety-six, speaks for itself: "He would tell us again that the cross must be at the center of all redemptive efforts; but self-denial is still essential for all who would join him in lifting men into a higher life." In these and other passages, there is much talk about the cross, but there is nothing to show that Dr. Franklin believes that on the Cross of Calvary the Son of God offered himself as a sacrifice for our sins, which he bore in his body on the tree, dying that we might be delivered from the wrath of God.

To make sure that I had not misunderstood the author, I wrote Dr. Franklin a letter (dated September 22, 1933), in which I asked him this question: "Do you believe that there is any such thing as salvation, by which I mean deliverance from the power and penalty of sin, and the receiving of eternal life, do you think there is any such a thing as salvation, in the New Testament conception, available for any man outside of the atoning work of the Lord Jesus in his vicarious death on the cross? In other words, do you believe that if a man tries to love God, and love his fellowmen, that this is the equivalent of salvation?"

The answer of Dr. Franklin (dated October 5, 1933) is as follows (and no other line of his letter has to do with this question): "Of course, I accept the New Testament teaching as to the necessity for personal salvation, and I see no hope for mankind apart from Christ. I believe men

'must be born again.'" It is unnecessary to point out how Dr. Franklin has completely and, of course, deliberately avoided my question. He does not speak of the death of Christ, the Cross of Christ, the blood of Christ. His letter only confirms the conclusions which his book forces upon us, namely, that the Cross upon which God's Son died for our sins, was "naught but an incident."

Passing over many other passages in Dr. Franklin's book which are so totally at variance with the clear teaching of the New Testament, let me refer to just one more particular passage. On the last two pages of this volume (200, 201) the walk of the two disciples, with the risen Lord, on the road to Emmaus, is pictured, and a monstrously wicked interpretation is given to it. Here are his final sentences: "To the stranger they offered their roof for the night, and doubtless a sleeping mat on their humble floor. They placed before him their bread, which may have been their only food. And as the stranger-guest accepted it and blessed and broke it, even as on another evening, their eyes were opened and they knew him. Their hearts had been warmed as the stranger opened to them great spiritual truths along the way. They knew him and felt the presence of the Divine when they shared with an apparent stranger their roof, their bed, their bread and their very souls." We will not here speak of the many purely imaginative details here given, for which the New Testament record offers no foundation whatever. The great theme of Luke's entire chapter is the joy that supplanted sorrow in the hearts of these two men when they at last were persuaded that the one who walked with them was Christ risen from the dead. They did not "feel the presence of the Divine" because they took pity on a poor man, but they did return to Jerusalem the same hour, quivering with joy at what they had had revealed to them, namely, that the Lord was risen from the dead.

I did not, however, wish to misjudge Dr. Franklin in this strange interpretation, so I wrote him (in the letter referred to above), asking him this question: "Do you believe that the third party, the stranger, who met the two disciples going to Emmaus, was actually the risen Christ appearing in a physical body such as he had when he was placed in the tomb, though, of course, changed in its resurrection state? In other words, was this stranger, in your mind, the God-man, Christ Jesus, risen from the dead, manifesting himself in a body of flesh?"

To this question Dr. Franklin makes the following reply: "The conclusion of the little book, to which portion you refer, is based on a deep conviction that humanity's greatest need is for a fresh sense of the presence and nearness of God, and I used the inspired account of the manifestation of the Christ to the two disciples at Emmaus in illustration. That story is very

precious to me as an account of a revitalizing experience on the part of two disciples with the Eternal Christ who had triumphed over death, having himself risen from the dead. The New Testament account of the manifestation of their Lord to the two disciples at Emmaus strengthens my conviction that it is still possible for men to enjoy a consciousness of the presence and nearness of God if they surrender their hearts and lives to Christ and practice His teachings." It is unnecessary to remark that again my question has been deliberately avoided.

Here is a book marked from the first page to the last with nothing less than pure modernism. It ignores the fundamental truth of salvation as revealed in the New Testament, namely, that we are not saved by trying to love our fellow-men, but by justification, not by our own righteousness, for we have none, but by the righteousness of God which is revealed to us and freely offered to us in Jesus Christ His Son. The entire volume deliberately ignores and denies that on the Cross our Lord made atonement for sin in dying for us, a vicarious sacrifice. The book is all the more guilty of this sin, because while frequently speaking of the Cross, it never gives to the Cross the only interpretation which the New Testament allows—the only act by which our sins can ever be forgiven. It misinterprets and minimizes the foundation fact of our faith, that Christ "arose from the dead with the same body in which he suffered" (*Confession of Faith*, Chap. VIII, Sec. IV). A book that is wrong in these cardinal matters cannot possibly be depended upon in its interpretation of the mind of Christ. What is the use of talking about missions, and the proclaiming of a Gospel to the lost, when there is no Cross by which alone our salvation is procured?

Probably nowhere in this volume does Dr. Franklin reveal his total misconception of the work Christ came to do in redeeming men more clearly than in asking and answering the question, "Why then should we, heirs of progress and wisdom, turn back nearly two millenniums to a prophet in Galilee?" He answers his own question thus: "We turn back to the Man of Galilee because as a teacher of truths for life's guidance he towers above all others in his history; because no other man ever spoke like this man; because he continues to be the miracle of the ages." (Page five.)

And why do I write at such length about this particular book? Because it is the first book, the principal book suggested as a text-book for the foreign missionary groups in our Church this year, 1933-1934. It is the book our own denomination is recommending! In the "Catalogue of Promotional Literature, Lantern Slides, and Motion Pictures, of the Board of National Missions, Board of Foreign Missions, etc., etc.," published by the Central Distributing Depart-

Continued on Page 12

Important Meeting of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions

Charles J. Woodbridge Elected General Secretary

By a Correspondent



THE Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions held its second meeting in the Drake Hotel, Philadelphia, on October 17th. At the first meeting, on June 27th, as reported in the July number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY, temporary officers were elected to serve during the summer, and steps were taken looking toward the permanent organization of the Board. At this second meeting regular officers were elected and a vigorous prosecution of the work of the Board was decided upon.

The Board authorized the issuance of the following statement for the press regarding the meeting:

The Board's Statement

"At today's meeting of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, which was organized after the refusal of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. last May to institute a reform of the existing official Board, it was determined to secure a General Secretary and enter upon a vigorous prosecution of the work of the new Board, which is to promote truly Biblical and truly Presbyterian foreign missions in clear opposition to Modernism. It was decided to invite the Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge, now a missionary in the French Cameroun, West Africa, to serve as General Secretary.

"Meanwhile the Board is inviting at once the earnest support of Bible-believing Christians in the Presbyterian Church. While it does not desire to discourage in the slightest the continuance by individuals and churches of designated gifts through the old Board to orthodox missionaries serving under that Board, it does believe that there are great resources of missionary zeal which are being left unused because of the justified distrust which Bible-believing Christians feel toward a Board that has so compromised with Modernism as has the official Board of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Those unused resources it hopes with the blessing of God to set free for the carrying of the gospel to the ends of the earth.

"The following officers were elected: President, the Rev. J. Gresham Machen; Vice-President, the Rev. Merrill T. MacPherson; Secretary, the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths; Treasurer, Murray F. Thompson, Esq. These officers are to form the Executive Committee, together with the following additional members: the Rev. Wilbur M. Smith, D.D., the Rev. Paul Woolley, Mr. Peter Stam, Jr., Miss Mary W. Stewart. For the sake of efficiency, the officers and other members of the Executive Committee are residents of Philadelphia and vicinity; but the membership of the Board itself is representative of the entire area of the Presbyterian Church, including the Pacific Coast. The temporary office of the Board will be at 501 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia."

The Executive Committee

The Executive Committee thus formed includes the pastors of two important churches. The Rev. Merrill T. MacPherson is the pastor of the Central North Broad Street Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, whose Sunday night services, attended by large congregations and broadcasted over Station WIP, are a very important part of the work of the Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia. Dr. Wilbur M. Smith is pastor of the Coatesville Presbyterian Church, which, with over 1600 members, is one of the two largest churches in Chester Presbytery. He is engaged in the preparation of the 1935 volume of *Peloubet's Notes*. Murray F. Thompson, Esq., of the Philadelphia Bar, is associated with the firm of Saul, Ewing, Remick and Saul. Mr. Peter Stam, Jr., is connected with the Religious Press Association. Together with the Rev. Robert S. Marsden he brought in the minority report from the Assembly's Committee on Foreign Missions last May.

The Board elected as a new member, in addition to Mr. Thompson, who is to serve as Treasurer, the Rev. Harold S. Laird, pastor of the First and Central Presbyterian Church of Wilmington, Delaware.

The temporary office of the Board is at 501 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, and communications regarding the Board should be sent to the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths at that address. Contributions should be sent to the Treasurer, Murray F. Thompson, Esq., 2301 Packard Building, Philadelphia.

The Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge

Mr. Woodbridge, whose acceptance of the position of General Secretary has just been received as CHRISTIANITY TODAY goes to press, was born at Chinkiang, China, in 1902. He is the descendant of a family which shows a remarkable record of service in the ministry. For over four hundred years his ancestors have been ministers. His father was the Rev. Samuel J. Woodbridge, who was for forty-two years a missionary in China of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (the Presbyterian Church South); and he himself lived in China for the first sixteen years of his life. He was graduated with Phi Beta Kappa honors from Princeton University in 1923. After graduation he was a teacher in China for a year, and then entered

Princeton Theological Seminary, graduating in 1927. Especially during his senior year at the Seminary he took a powerful stand in favor of the League of Evangelical Students, which had the support of the majority of the Faculty and the majority of the student body but was opposed by the minority forces which were finally put in control of the Seminary by the re-organization in 1929. Winning the George S. Green Fellowship in Old Testament Literature, he spent his fellowship year as a student in the universities of Berlin and Marburg in Germany. Then he became pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Flushing, Long Island, New York. During the four years of his pastorate the membership of the church increased from 174 to 426. Then he went as a missionary to the French Cameroun.

What no statistics, and no mere bald record of Mr. Woodbridge's life, can ever possibly convey is a really adequate impression of his wonderful power as a winner of souls. Certainly his work as General Secretary will not be any mere serving of tables, important though the administrative functions of the office will be and admirably equipped though Mr. Woodbridge will be to discharge those administrative functions. What he may especially be expected to do, with the favor of God so plainly resting upon him, will be to stir the latent fires of missionary and evangelistic zeal and be the instrument in bringing real blessing to the Church. If God uses him as He has hitherto used him, it may earnestly be hoped that many a soul will be led to Christ by the preaching of this true minister of the gospel. There is an intimate connection between true religion here at home and the spread of the gospel in foreign lands, and Mr. Woodbridge will be able to show what that connection is. God is calling us to new and more joyous service: and it is with that in view that the prayers of the people of God are asked for this preacher and evangelist and missionary upon whom God seems so plainly to have laid His hand.

In his cablegram of acceptance, Mr. Woodbridge says that he is delayed by certain pressing matters for about two months, but will sail from Africa about January 1st. He may, therefore, be expected to assume the duties of his new office at about the beginning of February.

His coming will seem to many earnest people in the Presbyterian Church to be a signal answer to prayer. We have been living in a strangely confused situation. Those who believe the Bible to be truly the Word of God have longed to have their part in obeying the Great Commission of our Lord, but have been confused and discouraged by the increasingly evident unfaithfulness of the official foreign mission agency of our



The Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge

Church. Such confusion and discouragement should now be over, since at last we have a distinctly Presbyterian mission agency that is really committed to a wholehearted proclamation of the gospel of Christ, in clear distinction both from blatant unbelief and from an indifferentism which is just as bad. There are many Presbyterians who feel that the time for mere words is over and that the time for deeds has come.

Certainly the founding of the new Board is in accord with the principles of liberty that are at the very heart of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church. This action is right no matter what God has in store for the existing organization of our Church. If it is God's will that the present organization should remain unfaithful to the Bible, as it is at present, and that, for example, that unfaithfulness should be expressed in a form of church union that breaks down the clear testimony of the Church so that there will have to be a continuing and truly faithful Presbyterian Church separate from the apostate majority, then this Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions will be ready to serve that faithful Church. If, on the other hand, the existing official Foreign Board can be brought back to the Word of God, that can only be done by the object lesson provided by the Independent Board. In either case, the founding of the new Board is a step quite necessary to the peace of the Presbyterian Church—that true peace which can only be found when the Church in all its agencies is joyfully obedient to God's Word.

"The Never Failing Light" —Continued

ment, of the General Council of our Church, on page thirty-one, is a list of three books on Foreign Missions for adult study-classes. One of them is a small paper-covered manual, listed third, not intended to be the principal book for the year; the second one is a volume with the title "Eastern Women Today and Tomorrow," which is advertised here as "a study of the tremendous changes taking place in the life of the women of the East. An unusual book with a stirring challenge." But the first book here listed, the book that is certainly meant to be the principal study-book for Foreign Missions in our Church this year, is this very volume by Dr. Franklin, which is saturated with a modernistic interpretation of the New Testament and which repudiates the deep fundamental truths of our faith! And when one considers what the notice of this book in this catalogue of our General Council says—"The author has shown in this book the power of the everlasting Gospel to meet the problems of an ever-changing world"—one is the more amazed, rather, horrified.

I find the same book listed *first* (with only one other mentioned), as a text-book for adults studying Foreign Missions, in *The Presbyterian Plan Book, 1933-1934*. (p. 42).

Either one of two things must be true. Either this book was not read by our missionary leaders, which is hardly believable; or, it was read by them, and approved. In either case the hundreds of thousands of people who look to our Board of Foreign Missions for guidance have been betrayed. If the interpretations presented in Dr. Franklin's book should ever become the convictions of the Church as a whole, we would have no Gospel to preach, no cleansing of our sins, nothing of the grace of God—we would have left to us the shell of a Christian ethic, without power, and the torn fragments of a mutilated message of eternal life and hope, which has come to us from God through his Son Jesus Christ.

Thousands and thousands of women in our Church will take the errors of this book for the truth, and when that happens our Church has in it the germs of death. A book like this must be an abomination to our God, who revealed His love for hopeless men by sending His own Son to die for them, that they might have eternal life. Once let the subtle perversions of divine truth stated in this book become accepted convictions in the hearts of great multitudes of our beloved people, as they are convictions with Dr. Franklin, and a paralysis creeps upon the body of our Church which must terminate in dead indifference to the grace of God, and to the precious blood of His dear Son.

News of the Church

Presbytery of New Brunswick Votes Board Loyalty Test

THE "iron hand in the velvet glove" made its appearance in the Presbytery of New Brunswick, dominated by the re-organized Princeton Seminary, at its meeting on September 26th, in the Hopewell Presbyterian Church, Hopewell, N. J. Notice had been given at a previous meeting of certain changes in the rules of Presbytery. At 2 P. M., the hour set, the Rev. Sargent Bush, Pastor of the Flemington Church, who with the Rev. Professor Frederick W. Loetscher, Ph.D., D.D., formed a Committee of Presbytery which at the June meeting advocated the resolution,

"That vacant churches which desire student supplies shall select such students only as are taking a regular theological course in a Seminary directly under the supervision of our General Assembly or under the supervision of other Presbyterian and Reformed Synods or Assemblies,"

moved that the resolution be laid on the table. This motion was passed and carried by a *viva voce* vote, J. Gresham Machen, D.D., voting against it. His negative vote, it is understood, was due to his feeling that adequate notice had already been given to the resolution and that the principle involved in it ought to be adopted or rejected without further delay.

The Rev. Sargent Bush thereupon introduced a resolution exactly the same in principle as the resolution which had been tabled, but merely providing that only supply of pulpits for more than four Sundays should be subject to the restriction which the resolution provides! This "revision" will come up for discussion and vote at the next regular meeting of Presbytery in January. It is generally regarded as highly significant that thus Dr. Loetscher, a professor at Princeton Seminary, openly advocated a measure which makes Princeton Seminary practically monopolistic in the Presbytery which is controlled by its professors and their friends.

"Board Test" for Licentiates and Ministers Debated.

Discussion was then begun of the resolution adding paragraphs to the Manual of Presbytery requiring of candidates for licensure, ordination, or transfer from other presbyteries or ecclesiastical bodies an examination as to their willingness to support the regularly organized Boards and Agencies of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., particularly the Board of Foreign Missions, and requiring that a record of

this examination should be made in the minutes of Presbytery.

This resolution had been introduced at the June meeting by the Rev. D. Wilson Hollinger. At this (September 26th) meeting he was the first speaker in favor of his resolution. He requested leave to close the debate. Thus he spoke first and also last. Other speakers in favor of the resolution were:

For: the Rev. D. Wilson Hollinger, Pastor of the Bethany Church of Trenton; the Rev. William T. Hanzsche, D.D., Pastor of the Prospect Street Church of Trenton (an Auburn Affirmationist); the Rev. John McNab, D.D., Pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church of Trenton (an Auburn Affirmationist); the Rev. Edward A. Morris, D.D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Trenton; the Rev. Guy A. Bensinger, Pastor of the Dutch Neck Church.

Against: the Rev. Professor Caspar Wistar Hodge, Ph.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary; the Rev. Professor J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia; the Rev. Sylvester W. Beach, D.D., Pastor Emeritus of the First Church of Princeton; the Rev. David B. Tomkins, Ph.D., Pastor of the Second Church of Princeton; Mr. A. R. Baxter, an elder in the Second Presbyterian Church of Trenton.

Dr. Hollinger pointed out that no penalty is attached by the resolution to a refusal to express willingness to support the Boards, but he also made it abundantly plain that the whole purpose of the resolution was to see to it that only such ministers should be admitted to the Presbytery as were willing to support the Boards. He even brought the new requirement into connection with the existing constitutional questions. If those questions may be asked of candidates, why not this one? The resolution does not indeed require that this question shall be made formally a part of an ordination or installation service, but many questions are asked in examinations of candidates which are not asked in the formal service. Why then should not this question be asked? If a man is rejected by Presbytery because of his unsatisfactory answer to this question, he has the right of appeal to the higher courts. The Presbytery surely had a right to see to it that men who come into it should be "loyal to the Church." There is a group that is seeking to set up a separate government within the Church. That is wrong. The Presbytery has a right to see to it that men who come into it shall not "poison the minds" of the Church against one of the Boards. Dr. Machen is right in holding that this resolu-

tion does involve a pledge as to future acts. But candidates are pledged now as to future acts. If they cease to hold the doctrines that they held at ordination, they should go out of the Church. Similarly they should go out if they cannot continue to support the Boards. [That was the whole tenor of Mr. Hollinger's speech, even if it was not put in so many words. It was also the whole tenor of the entire case of the speakers for the resolution. "Support the Boards or get out"—that, very definitely, was the program advocated.] Are men who will not agree to support the Boards the kind of men that we want in the ministry? Surely one important qualification for Presbyterian ministers is loyalty to the General Assembly, concluded Mr. Hollinger.

Dr. Hodge said that loyalty to the Assembly should yield if it conflicted with loyalty to Christ.

Dr. Hanzsche, during the course of a rather personal attack on Dr. Machen, said that Dr. Machen should bring charges of heresy in the courts of the Church against the Boards if he thought that the Boards were wrong. This brought some amusement to observers who had hardly imagined that Dr. Hanzsche was quite so innocent of Presbyterian law as to suppose that a Board of the Church could be haled before a Presbytery!

Dr. Machen, in arising to speak, said that he would resist two temptations placed before him by Dr. Hanzsche's speech. In the first place, he would resist the temptation to answer the personal strictures of Dr. Hanzsche against him. Those surely were beside the point. In the second place, he would resist the more serious temptation to argue over again the question which was presented to the Presbytery by his overture at the April meeting, the overture in which he asked for reform of the Board of Foreign Missions. That was an exceedingly important question, and a question about which he had strong convictions. But it was not the question now at issue. A man might think that the Board of Foreign Missions was now in the most splendid condition, and yet might be opposed with all his might to Mr. Hollinger's resolution. That resolution seeks to bind men for the indefinite future; it seeks to get men to promise to support the Boards whether the Boards are faithful or not. (Dr. Machen's arguments will be found in summary in his protest, which is printed in full on another page of this paper.)

Dr. Beach said that the resolution of Mr. Hollinger was really divisive in its effect.

While Dr. Tomkins was trying to speak, Dr. McNab introduced a motion bringing debate at once to a close—that is, to use par-

liamentary language, he moved, or meant to move, the previous question. This motion was put to a vote, and a considerable number voted for it; but it was lost. **Dr. Tomkins** then proceeded. He said that he was not in favor of the establishment just now of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions but that the men who were instrumental in establishing it were true to their convictions, and that his hat was off to men who were true to their convictions. By adopting this resolution the Presbytery would be setting the Boards up "on a pedestal" where they could not be touched. That was a mistake. The Board of Foreign Missions was wrong, for example, in the way it dealt with **Mrs. Buck**. It was dangerous to put such an agency where it could not be criticized. What are you doing to a candidate if this resolution is passed? "You are putting a mortgage on his future; you are tying his tongue." You are pledging him to "keep mum" when he becomes convinced that the Boards are not faithful to the Church.

The time limit for debate was then fixed for four o'clock.

The **Rev. Guy A. Bensinger** said that we should abide by the rule of the majority. We have, indeed, a right to make constructive criticisms of the Boards, but we must submit to the decisions of the General Assembly about them. Why should a man come into the Presbyterian Church if he cannot support the Board of Foreign Missions—if, thus, he comes into the Church to disseminate division? Surely the question whether he would support the Boards was a question as to his fitness. No man is fit who has not the courage to say that he will not support the Boards (if that is his attitude) when he comes into the Presbytery. Then if he says that he will not support the Boards, the Presbytery can judge as to his fitness in the light of his answer.

Elder Baxter said that **Dr. Culp** [a signer of the Auburn Affirmation, who favored the resolution] had said at the morning session that if certain money did not continue to come from a Board of the Church he would act in accordance with his constitutional rights in advising his session to give the money directly to the work which would otherwise be neglected. Such an attitude of **Dr. Culp** would seem to be contrary to the resolution which **Dr. Culp** was now advocating. Moreover the proposed action was unconstitutional. If Presbytery desired to change the constitution of the Presbyterian Church it could lawfully do so only in the constitutional manner.

Dr. Morris said that he had been brought up as a Presbyterian. Then the Congregationalists had borrowed him for ten years and he had held high office in the Congregational Church, but he had always been Presbyterian, heart and soul. He knew thoroughly both the Congregational and the Presbyterian form of government, and he wanted to testify on the basis of this thorough knowledge that **Dr. Machen's** attitude

was Congregational and not Presbyterian! In the Presbyterian Church the General Assembly is the final authority to pronounce on soundness, and a Presbyterian should be willing to trust the General Assembly. **Dr. Machen** says that every individual can pronounce on soundness. That is Congregationalism, not Presbyterianism. "If I," said the speaker [to quote approximately], "could not keep step with the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly, I would get out and be in a church with which I could. If I disagreed with the Assembly, I could still be free to criticize the Boards in Presbytery, but I could not enter into meaningless tirades in the pulpit." [Did **Dr. Morris** seriously mean to say, in limiting criticism to the Presbytery, that ministers should say one thing to the Presbytery and another thing when advocating giving to the Boards?]

Mr. Arendt, speaking against the resolution, said that the logic of the proposed action was that every minister ought to come up front and take the pledge which was to be required of candidates. After this, **Mr. Hollinger**, according to his request, closed the debate on his resolution, as he had begun it.

The resolution was passed by a standing vote of 40 to 19. In addition to the speakers named above, the **Rev. Paul Martin**, former Registrar of Princeton Seminary and one of the most active advocates of the reorganization of the Seminary which took place in 1929, voted in favor of the resolution. (It is reported that the **Rev. Professor Andrew W. Blackwood, D.D.**, Professor of Homiletics at Princeton Seminary, also voted in favor of the resolution, but we are not certain whether that was the case.) **Dr. Loetscher** had been present at the morning session but was apparently not present when this vote was taken. We are not sure whether **Dr. Kuizenga** and **Dr. Zwemer** were present at the time of the vote. **Dr. Erdman**, President of the Board of Foreign Missions, was prevented by illness from being present. Notwithstanding, the leaders in the Faculty of the new Princeton Seminary and in the Board of Foreign Missions residing at Princeton cannot fairly be acquitted of responsibility for this action. If they, or the Boards, had opposed this effort to secure support for the Boards by force, and had not given it the tacit support of benevolent silence, it is unthinkable that the action would have been taken. It was thoroughly announced in the distributed docket of Presbytery and was well known in other ways.

Already reactions from this action indicate a strong tide of indignation in the Church against it, even on the part of many not yet announced as supporting the new Independent Mission Board. Presbyterians do not naturally "take" to being coerced.

Dr. Hodge then asked that his vote be recorded in the negative. **Dr. Machen** then read the Dissent and Protest which is printed on another page of this paper. The Dissent and Protest was made a part of

the record of Presbytery. The **Rev. T. E. Montgomery** asked permission to append his name to the Dissent and Protest. This was done.

In addition to the speakers mentioned above, and among others, the resolution was voted against by the **Rev. Parke Richards, D.D.**, of Lawrenceville; the **Rev. Samuel G. Craig, D.D.**, Editor of *CHRISTIANITY TODAY*; the **Rev. T. E. Montgomery**, and Ruling Elder **Jasper Brearly**, of Lawrenceville. Others not listed also voted against the resolution.

Canadian Presbytery Overtures Assembly on College Orthodoxy

AT Grande Prairie and within Forbes Presbyterian Church there on Tuesday, the fifth day of September, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-three, the Presbytery of Peace River met and was duly constituted with prayer by the Moderator. . . .

Inter alia—It was moved by **Mr. Simpson**, seconded by **Mr. Fraser**, and, after discussion in which **Mr. Wright** spoke in favor of the motion, voted unanimously to overture the General Assembly as follows:

"Whereas, this is a period of widespread apostasy from the 'faith once delivered to the saints' and of revolt against all the historic creeds of Christendom.

"And whereas during this period one cannot well err in being awake and vigilant.

"And whereas the condition of the Theological Seminaries is a matter of grave concern to all loyal Presbyterians.

"And whereas it seems fitting and proper that Presbyterian theological seminaries should teach Presbyterian theology.

"Therefore, be it resolved that Presbytery of Peace River respectfully overture the General Assembly through the Synod of Alberta to take steps to see that teaching in the theological seminaries is in entire agreement with the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and with the teachings of the Reformed Faith or of Calvinism as set forth in Westminster Standards. And that steps be taken to insure the appointment only of men to the teaching staffs of said theological seminaries who can unhesitatingly subscribe to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as BEING the very Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice and to the Westminster Standards as containing the system of doctrine set forth in the Scriptures. And that steps be taken to insure the fact that all who are now members of the teaching staffs of the said institution can take the above subscription."

During the discussion the fact was brought out, in response to questions by **Elder Grant**, that the overture had in mind the purpose of having all theological seminaries of the Presbyterian Church in Canada take a stand similar to that taken by Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Penna.

Chester Battlefield

(By a Staff Correspondent)

CHESTER Presbytery, whose area stretches west and south of the city of Philadelphia, including much of the "metropolitan area" has long been looked upon as conservative, although containing some members generally regarded as liberal. In September and October it appeared that the Presbytery and its constituency might become one of the chief battlegrounds in the conflict over Foreign Missions.

Forks of Brandywine Meeting

On September 20th the historic Forks of Brandywine Presbyterian Church, of which the Rev. H. H. Kurtz is pastor, was the scene of an unusual meeting. The conservative group in the Presbytery of Chester, organized as such, evidently quite unashamed of it, had sponsored a gathering called for the purpose of discussing the whole missionary situation in the Church. Present was a large representation of ministers of the Presbytery and at least six other presbyteries, ruling elders and women of the various Churches.

First speaker at the afternoon session was the Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D. In a powerful address, he carried his almost breathless audience with him over the events of the last few years, showing the world crisis in the professing Church, and the relationship of events in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. to the world-wide battle between truth and unbelief. Statesmanlike, he portrayed the present situation, with its difficulties, enormous and complex problems. Indicating some of the lines on which the new independent mission board might proceed, he declared that loyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ must outweigh every possible consideration of expediency, and that it was unthinkable, no matter how difficult problems were, that Christians should be held by mere circumstances in compromising and shameful relationships. "There is, there *must be* a way out," he cried. The address ended in a high spiritual note in which he called the whole group to renewed loyalty and love for Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

Dr. Machen was followed, after a hymn had been sung, by the Rev. Wilbur M. Smith, D.D., Minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Coatesville, Pa., newly-elected editor of *Peloubet's Notes*, famed Sunday-school annual. Dr. Smith began by paying tribute to "the great address of Dr. Machen," declared that he could sincerely say that the speaker had drawn him closer to his Lord. Dr. Smith then introduced a veritable bombshell into the meeting,—an analysis of one of the new mission study books approved by the official Board

of Foreign Missions. Extracts he read brought shock after shock to a well-nigh incredulous audience. As he spoke incredulity gave way to indignation. The substance of Dr. Smith's speech is found on page 4 of this issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

Peter Stam, Jr., the member of the Assembly's Standing Committee on Foreign Missions who made the Minority Report, then gave an account of the hearings of the Standing Committee (insofar as he was able to do this under the restrictions of certain executive sessions of the Committee) and the subsequent happenings on the floor of the Assembly. He reminded the gathering that while the Committee did conduct a hearing at which Dr. Machen and three others were given opportunity to speak, all debate on the floor of the Assembly was voted down, so that except for his own and Mr. Marsden's brief remarks in presenting and seconding the Minority Report, there was no consideration whatever of the merits of the case before the Assembly proper. He further explained that the Commissioners to the Assembly had no opportunity for an examination of the Minority Report in printed form before voting (as was the usual procedure with Committee reports), inasmuch as the Chairman of the Standing Committee, on the advice of a Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions, had stated that the Minority Report had no standing as an official report and therefore could not be printed.

Mr. Stam felt that one of the gravest criticisms to which the Board of Foreign Missions continued to lay itself open, concerned the Missionary Study Books, in the preparation of which books Secretaries of the Board participate and which the Board continually recommends in its printed literature. These study books are in the nature of educational material going out to thousands of our women and young people all over the land, giving them totally inadequate and wrong ideas of the nature of the Christian missionary enterprise, and, in fact, subtly leading them into Modernism.

Thus, while last year's list included such a book as Hodgkin's "Living Issues in China" with its toleration of and sympathetic approach to Buddhism and other heathen religions, several of this year's texts, after even the briefest examination, quickly show equally alarming modernist tendencies.

For example, in "So This Is Missions," one of the study booklets listed for both Foreign and National Missions, recommended especially for young people, and intended to explain to them just what is meant by Missions, there is a very unsatisfactory presentation of the Gospel mes-

sage and the missionary enterprise, and much that is positively harmful. The first book recommended for reference in this booklet, is the discredited "Re-Thinking Missions" and there are frequent quotations from the Laymen's Missionary Report.

[A typical quotation from the booklet itself: "Jesus has been called a prophet, evangelist, missionary, teacher. He was all of these and more. He tried to win men to a loyalty to God which would change their daily lives. As a prophet He had to be a missionary: every missionary must speak against the social evils of his time" (page 27)—Ed.]

Mr. Stam also called attention to "Today's Youth and Tomorrow's World," a study book recommended for Seniors in both the Foreign and National Missions courses. The author is Stanley High, well-known for his liberal beliefs and connections. (In a recent radio address released to the press, he had stated, "It is hard for me to believe that Christianity could send to China a better example of the best it can produce than Mrs. Pearl Buck.") A quotation from his book reveals the typical modernist admiration of Jesus as leader and inspiration: "Almost subconsciously you will make the personality of Jesus your yardstick. The good and evil in men, their greatness or their smallness, you judge—when you stop to think about it—in terms of the way in which they measure up to him. And you will conclude that the time element can not enter into the case at all—that, whether Jesus lived two thousand years ago or twenty years ago, he deserves to stand by himself until someone else arises who can stand with him.

"This doubtless explains why mankind, which so easily forgets most things, has not been able to forget Jesus Christ. His personality looms too large to be missed" (page 19).

The evening session was even better attended than that of the afternoon. An interesting discussion hour was prolonged beyond its scheduled time, due to the interest of those present in the new Independent Board of Foreign Missions and problems connected therewith. Representatives of the new Board were questioned closely, and it was plain that the sentiment of those asking was, in the great majority of cases, actively sympathetic with the new movement. One returned missionary defended the Board, as did her non-missionary husband, but the effect of her assertion that all was well at 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, was somewhat shattered when she declared that her own "interpretation" of Scripture was "none of anybody's business" but was "between her and her God." Her husband urged unity of missionary witness, so that those in missionary lands would not become confused, presumably placing a greater emphasis upon *agreement to teach the same things*, whatever they might be, than on *the truth of the thing taught*.

After discussion had proceeded for some time, a resolution was offered by the Rev. A. L. Lathem, D.D., Minister of the great Third Presbyterian Church of Chester.

After some discussion it was adopted by an overwhelming vote (this correspondent saw only four hands raised voting against). It recited the delinquencies of the Board, and expressed the opinion that, with the exception of gifts designated to sound missionaries, monies be withheld from the Board until there had taken place a real reformation of the Board.

The meeting was addressed, in conclusion, by the Rev. Robert S. Marsden, of Middletown, Pa., one of the signers of the Columbus minority report, who preached an able gospel sermon.

Presbytery Meets

The Presbytery of Chester meeting on September 26th, listened to a report from its committee on Foreign Missions "white-washing" the official Board, and to a minority report. Final result was the adoption of a "compromise resolution," voted for by almost everybody, pleasing, it is imagined, to almost nobody, regarded by few observers as the final action this Presbytery would take. The resolution:

"We recommend that our churches and ministers continue their support of our Board of Foreign Missions, and that they be encouraged to pray and work for the restoration of the confidence of the many earnest Presbyterians who are distressed by certain of the present tendencies in the administration of our Board."

During the debate after the Rev. Henry Woll, of the Great Valley Presbyterian Church, had spoken concerning the Board and his church's withdrawal of funds, the Rev. John McDowell, D.D., Moderator of the last Assembly, rose to his feet and asked for the floor. He said that if a citizen of this country were to take an attitude against the Constitution of the country he would be expelled from the country, and similarly if a man in the church did not support the constitution he should get out. He also said that if any charges that could be proved were brought against any Board member, that he, John McDowell, as Moderator of the General Assembly, would see that the case was dealt with!

[Dr. McDowell seems to confuse opposition to the present administration in the Church as disloyalty to the Church's constitution. On the contrary, those who oppose those in office do so because they are loyal to the constitution, and believe that the "powers that be" are continually flouting it—both in letter and spirit.]

Dr. Speer to the Rescue

Evidently perturbed by the obvious state-of-mind of many in the Chester area, a counter-rally to the Forks of Brandywine meeting was held by pro-organizationists in the First Presbyterian Church of Media, Pa., on the evening of October 6th. There, to a large audience Dr. Robert E. Speer, Senior Secretary of the official Board, delivered what had been previously adver-

tised as a "defense of the Board." The speech was conspicuously notable for the omission of all such defense or even particular reference to the situation confronting the Presbyterian Church. Instead, Dr. Speer contented himself with a general eulogy of "the missionary enterprise." It was *right*, he thundered,—more nearly right than any other human enterprise of which he knew. It was right in its basis, right in its aim, right in its methods, right in its results, and right in its spirit. Dr. Speer defended evangelistic missions, medical missions, educational missions, native Christian converts,—in short, almost everything that nobody had attacked. But he made no reference whatever to the definite charges against the Board. Whether the uninformed in the audience gained the impression that the official Board had been under fire because of supposed supreme devotion to "the missionary enterprise" would be hard to say, but Dr. Speer's address was certainly, in the judgment of many hearers, likely to give that impression, without his actually having said so. He used the names of literally dozens of the great of the Church universal from Paul to Francis Makemie, implying that "the missionary enterprise" was following in their train. Recognizing that there "were defects" in the "missionary enterprise" as in everything in the world, he yet concluded by thundering again "I say to you, deliberately and conscientiously, the missionary enterprise is RIGHT!!" Significant excerpts: Speaking of Karl Heim, Professor in Tübingen, Germany, a right-wing modernist, "this little, simple, evangelical German Christian . . ." Referring to the "Jerusalem Conference," dominated by modernists who, to avoid a split, accepted a resolution drawn up by this same Karl Heim, he declared "It was on that same rock that the whole conference stood together." Concerning the North China Theological Seminary, long a thorn in the side of the official Board, but for which now the Board seems to desire to take credit. "Containing within its bounds [The Shantung Mission] the most beneficent institution for the training of an evangelical ministry in China." [Dr. Speer did *not* mention that this independent seminary had to be begun in China because Board-supported institutions were all too modernistic.] Discussing motives of giving, he spoke one startling sentence—that is, startling as coming from the Senior Secretary of the official Presbyterian Board: "No doubt much giving is from inferior motives, —out of mere church loyalty . . ."

Letter from Melbourne, Australia

By Rev. H. T. Rush, Secretary Bible Union of Victoria

PROF. ANGUS of Sydney has published a booklet entitled "Christianity and Dogma." It is the address given by him at the Presbyterian Assembly in Sydney. In its published form it is addressed to his

critics. There are matters in it which belong to the Presbyterian Assembly of Australia which meets in Melbourne in September. There are other matters of general interest as forming part of a world-wide controversy. Prof. Angus is anxious to show that "the issue and conflict are only over matters of interpretation." Some leading Modernist writers have made manifest in regard to much the same matters that they are essential things; and that in the world today there are two utterly differing kinds of Christianity.

The key to Prof. Angus' position is found in his statement, "The idea of evolution has coloured all our thought." Evidently it has coloured all his thought, but the unproved theory of evolution seems an uncertain foundation on which to build a new religious system.

Dr. Angus depreciates "dogmas," particularly those that have come to us through the Christian ages and enshrine the "faith which was once delivered unto the saints." He does not depreciate them absolutely. He himself is a teacher and presumably his thoughts are not nebulous, chaotic, indefinite. Indeed, evolution seems a "dogma" to him. Besides, he has a creed. What value it may be in view of the fact that he says, "No formula should ever be accepted as final," is not quite clear.

Naturally, we are not surprised that he says, "I am compelled to go on because I believe in a progressive revelation of truth by the Spirit of Truth." Prof. Machen's words in the mid-May issue may be remembered here. Dr. Angus would launch us on an unknown sea with no certain chart or compass, and no definite port in view. Like other Modernists he does not like things static. "Revelation is not a fixed quantum; it is a continuous process in which every generation writes its Bible of testimony."

He raises a number of questions about "propitiation," none of which seems to be new. His view of the Cross is that it teaches "self-sacrifice," "love for others." We can give unstinted admiration to his beautiful words, phrases, rhetoric in stressing these things and "the programme of Christ," "His simple and luminous way," but are these and the "character building" of which he speaks the whole or the heart of the Gospel? Millions have found in the Cross, pardon, peace, new life; a power which ransomed broken lives and transformed them. Multitudes are finding these things still, and among them are many young men and women of Melbourne in a remarkable movement which is going on.

Dr. Angus says that "Jesus had nothing to say of virgin births and trinities, unitarianism and propitiation; the authority even of the supreme standard, and the fallen nature of man." It is only possible to say here that many fine students of the Bible have found in the words of Jesus much about some of the things for which these words stand.

He deprecates "disputations about the

Person of Christ." He himself has a Christology, if it can be called so. "When in the knowledge of God we cannot assert that the Divine Father differs from us in kind, we cannot be asked to say that Jesus our Lord differs from us in kind." Further on he says, "He in whose Divine humanity we have recognised the incarnation of the Father Himself is not ashamed to call us brothers." But enough has been written to show the trend of the teaching of Prof. Angus and the issues at stake.

The annual meeting of the Bible Union of Victoria was recently held in the Baptist Church, Collins St., Melbourne. Outside the streets were rain-drenched and cheerless. Inside a large audience gathered. Part of it consisted of young men and women who had been interested in the evangelistic missions of Mr. John Ridley, and it was good to note the close interest with which they followed his address. Most of his matter, including arguments and illustrations, came from the Old Book. To those who desired to find their authority in Christ apart from the Word—and there are not a few in Australia who occupy that position—he said, "Where do we get our Christ? What do we know of Him apart from His Word?" The written Word and the living Word stand together. Of course, Bunyan's noted character in Pilgrim's Progress was referred to. So also were men like Augustine, Wesley, McChesney, C. H. Spurgeon and many others in their loyalty to the Scriptures.

Rev. Robert Kelly presided. He has been recently elected to the position of the Union. Himself "valiant for the truth," he follows in a fine succession of men like Rev. C. H. Nash, M.A., Principal Main, Dr. Fitchett, Professor J. Gillies M.A.B.D., and Dr. A. Law. During the ten years of its existence the Union has steadily increased in numbers, influence, and usefulness. In the course of last year by lectures, distribution of magazines, etc., about 30,000 people were reached with our witness to the infallible Bible, and the great doctrines of the faith.

By letter from Mr. G. E. Ardill of The Christian Worker's Depot, and from references by Rev. J. Ward Harrison in "Glad Tidings," the writer has been informed of a splendid piece of news which will rejoice the hearts of those who are faithful. The Fraternal Union for Bible Testimony in New South Wales has received a bequest of £8,000. The Union mentioned is on the same lines as the Bible Unions of Victoria, South Australia, West Australia, and regard themselves as affiliated with them in the great work of the defence of the faith. The Chairman is Mr. J. B. Nicholson. On the committee are Rev. G. H. Morling, B.A., Principal of the Baptist College in Sydney; Rev. J. H. McGowan, ex-Moderator of the Presbyterian Assembly, and who opposed Dr. Angus in the last Assembly; Rev. A. J. Carter; Canon H. S. Begbie; Rev. A. E. Morris; F. S. Kellet, M.A. (Anglicans); Rev. T. J. Harper, Congregationalist; Mr. H. M. Arrowsmith, Evangelist; Davis

H. G. Harvard (Church of Christ); Mr. Alfred Mace, Mr. R. Hickson, H. Alexander, W. Porter (Brethren). A big public demonstration is being projected, and visions there are of still greater work and witness.

China Letter

By the Rev. Albert B. Dodd, D.D.

IT probably would be difficult to find an unbroken Presbyterian Mission territory containing a larger population than that which stretches from the eastern end of this province to Kiangsu on the south, across Kiangsu to Anhwei, and then across the northern end of Anhwei. Tenshien is twenty hours by train from the eastern limit of this territory and nine hours by train and then from two to four days by bus or launch from the southwestern end. For this vast and thickly-populated region, containing probably as many as thirty million souls, Presbyterian missions with a constituency of about thirty thousand church members have the main and, for the greater part of it, the exclusive responsibility. With the exception of sections of the northern Presbyterian mission fields at the eastern extremity of Shantung and in Anhwei whose constituencies have been drawn into the inclusive union known as the Church of Christ in China, the churches connected with Presbyterian mission work throughout this entire extent of territory have remained Presbyterian, and all but the C. I. M. Presbyterians in Anhwei belong to the Chinese Presbyterian General Assembly.

Three Presbyterian Stations of the China Inland Mission in northern Anhwei with a fourth soon to be opened further north occupy the western frontier of this huge unbroken Presbyterian territory. It was recently the privilege of the writer in company with his wife and son Stephen to make a fifteen-day visit in the largest of these Stations—that of Yingchowfu, otherwise known as Fowyang. We were five days on the road without ever being out of Presbyterian station fields. We passed the Southern Presbyterian Station of Hsuechowfu and the Northern Presbyterian Stations of Nansuechow and Hwaiyuan, at the latter of which we spent the first night and had a delightful little visit with the missionaries and a number of our North China Theological graduates who gave us a warm welcome. Leaving Hwaiyuan, we sailed by a launch-towed houseboat up the Hwai River, noted for its famine-producing floods, past the outstation of Fengtai and near the substation of Showchow to a point in view of the C. I. M. Presbyterian Station of Chenyangkwan, where last year the senior missionary, Mr. H. S. Ferguson, while engaged in famine relief, was taken by communistic bandits and is reported to have died at their hands after a long captivity and noble witness for his Lord.

Thence we ascended the Sha River to Yingchowfu where we received a hearty wel-

come from our daughter Katharine, her four fine station colleagues and the church leaders, who forthwith invited the writer to conduct special meetings. The people were unusually responsive and we received a blessing during the days spent together. This Church of 500 attracts congregations of twice that number. It is strange in China to see women so greatly in the majority and occupying the body of the Church while the men have to go to the gallery. Among the latter, one sees many young men. Strong work is being done for students in the government schools, a number of whom are being saved. The day we arrived, Miss P'eng Mei Fang, another of our Tenshien graduates, took advantage of an invitation to speak at a government high school commencement to give an earnest Christian message which was roundly applauded. This strong Church voted while we were there to enter the League of Christian Churches and is considering the matter of uniting with the Chinese Presbyterian General Assembly. It is gratifying to have true-blue Presbyterianism represented in so virile a form on the frontier.

Due to the prevailing anti-Christian atmosphere in government schools and the destructive "modernistic" views taught in many union and registered mission schools, students from Christian homes all too frequently make shipwreck of their faith and life. Those in these schools who, away from home influences and in this adverse environment, are heroically struggling to retain their early evangelical faith are deserving of all the sympathy and aid that can be given them. Realizing this, the League of Christian Churches, at its triennial meeting in June, 1932, resolved to promote the establishment in China of the League of Evangelical Students, a movement which is being so powerfully used of God in America. This idea has met with cordial response in a number of schools in this and other provinces, and, on July 27th, crystallized in the actual organization of this league by official representatives of groups in seven educational institutions from high school grade up and unofficial representatives of four other such groups. These representatives came from two universities, a theological seminary and its affiliated women's Bible seminary, two higher Bible schools, four mission high schools and a government high school. We are glad to report that the entire student bodies of the Tenshien Christian schools of required grade have voted themselves into the movement by the stipulated three-fourths majority. In fact, there were no opposing votes. The newly organized League has adopted in toto the thoroughly evangelical aim and doctrinal standard of the movement in America, whose constitution it has closely followed in most other respects as well. The chief departure from this model is the recognition of chapters in senior high schools as regular, and of those in junior high schools as auxiliary units. The justification of ex-

tending the scope of the League to high schools is that the average high school student in China is more mature in years than in America and that the great majority of them are away from home. It is interesting to note in this connection that two high school girls connected with the chapter of the League in the Mateer Memorial Institute at this place were the only two women to win prizes offered by the Religious Tract Society this year for compositions on assigned subjects. One of these girls carried off the first prize for a tract commending Christianity to atheists.

As a pure venture of faith, the new League invited Mr. Jonathan Hsu, a graduate of the North China Theological Seminary and for two years a graduate student in Westminster Seminary of Philadelphia, to become their Executive Secretary at a salary not one cent of which they were able to guarantee but which they promised to do their best to raise up to the present equivalent of \$20.00 U. S. A. currency per month, and he accepted the invitation equally on faith and is going right to work for the League. We bespeak your earnest prayers for this sound, cultured and consecrated young Secretary and the League he serves.

Another plan, which is sponsored by the inclusive Church of Christ in China, to organize Christian students on a much broader doctrinal basis is on foot and will very soon be consummated. In the nature of things, it is likely to attract a wider constituency than the League of Evangelical Students. The quality of its leadership will be a matter of crucial importance and demands our prayers. In some future letter you may expect to hear more about this movement.

TENGHSIEN, SHANTUNG, CHINA

Korea Letter

By the Rev. Bruce F. Hunt

THE Japan Advertiser, a leading English newspaper in Japan, carried the following headlines on September 2nd: "Education Ministry Denies Permit for Missionary Church"; "Dispute Arises When Christian Students Are Expelled for Avoiding Shinto Rite"; "Anti-Christianity Denied"; "Education Ministry Points to Law Making Ancestor Worship Part of Education."

Christians in Korea cannot but be concerned, especially with the two underlined statements, for it appears that from now on churches like schools must have a permit to run, and on the other hand, in a time when it is so difficult to get a permit to run a private school in which the teachers would be free to preach Christ, the Education Ministry makes it appear that Ancestor worship will be compulsory in Public Schools. Where then can Christians who conscientiously cannot worship the dead (in spite of the Department's declaration that "State Ancestor Worship is a philosophy instead of a religious belief") receive an edu-

cation? Thanks be to God who has said, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."

The Executive Committee of the Northern Presbyterian Mission passed a motion calling the various Stations to set aside Friday, September 29th, as a Day of Retreat for Fasting and Prayer. The day to be spent in heart-searching, confession and rededication of themselves to God and in seeking His special guidance in view of the difficult questions before the Mission here and the critical situation before the Church and the Board of Foreign Missions in America.

The conservative element in Korea is somewhat alarmed over the proposed union of Chosen Christian College and Severance Union Medical College. Chosen Christian College is a Union Institution, which was founded by a minority in the Presbyterian Mission, in union with the two Methodist Missions, after the Methodists had withdrawn from Union Christian College in Pyongyang. The Board was very much in favor of the union and urged the Mission's concurring in the action of the minority which was finally done, but the color of the institution was fixed from the beginning. The fact that under protest, both of individuals and of the Presbyterian Mission, an avowedly extreme liberal is still continued on the faculty is an indication of this color. There is a movement on foot now to unite Severance Union Medical College, a union institution of similar color, with Chosen Christian College, thus strengthening both institutions and making one strong "Christian" University, right in the centre of Korea, which has on its faculty those who preach "another gospel." Ehwa College, the only women's college in Korea, a Methodist institution, is moving their plant to grounds in close proximity to the location of this proposed new university, and is in the process of putting up three fine new buildings, thus adding further to the making of a large educational centre which includes in its make-up certain definite liberal factors and in which our Presbyterian Mission and Board have a part.

A conference that was described in the Korean church paper as a new page in the progress of God's Kingdom in Korea, took place on the campus of the above-mentioned Chosen Christian College in Seoul, beginning on the 21st and going through the 23rd of July. It is epoch-making in that it is a case of liberalism lifting its head in high places. Your correspondent has not been able to discover as yet who sponsored this conference, but it dealt with one of the most important things connected with Mission and Christian school work in Korea, namely, the religious life of the schools. Those in charge of the Bible Courses and Religious Activities of Christian academies and colleges were invited as delegates. A questionnaire had been circulated before the con-

ference to which 29 answers were received. Out of 48 Christian Academies and Colleges in Korea, 27 were represented at the conference. The discussions and actions adopted are very illuminating.

A motion that a standard Bible Course for all schools should be adopted, was carried. Sixteen schools voted to have this course cover only the New Testament; of these only three were for the *whole* New Testament, the rest wishing to limit the study to either the Gospels or the Life of Christ. Five schools asked for the Old Testament and seven asked for the *whole* Bible. There were two distinct opinions in the conference, and the writer feels that the liberal element had the majority vote. In discussing the use of the New Testament, as against the O. T. or the whole Bible, it was said that the purpose of these courses on the Life of Christ was to acquaint the students with God the Father whom Christ had revealed through his personality. Those wishing to teach the Old Testament or the whole Bible felt that the purpose of this course should be to show through a study of the history of man in the Bible the eternal plan of God which created the New Testament and sent Christ to earth.

The conference appointed a committee of seven to draw up the suggested course, and at least one of the members appointed on the committee makes no secret of his liberalism.

Discussing the text-book of a Bible course, the statement was made, according to the Korean paper, that "The teacher's character is the text-book." "Religion," it went on to say, "is not dogma, reason, history, tradition or grammatical exactness; what is stronger than these is the teacher's life, faith, love, zeal, and interest in seeking to win the hearts of the students before him."

Much discussion seems to have taken place over the question as to whether to make the course "Bible centered" or "student centered," and the conference finally passed a motion saying, "Each school shall be given liberty to make their Bible courses 'Bible centered' or 'student centered,' according to local conditions, but for the most part it is recommended that the courses be 'student centered.'" The conference seems to have forgotten the Word of God through Paul, which says, "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine." The "religious leaders" of our schools seem to have given up leading to become *followers* of their pupils by laying down as a policy that they are going to provide teachers for those having itching ears after their lusts (II Tim. 4:2, 3).

Your correspondent is glad to report that neither the Presbyterian Schools in Pyongyang, Taiku or Syenchun were represented at the conference.

CHUNGJU, KOREA

Conscientious Objection

By Pastor A. Cruvillier of the Eglise réformée évangélique

THE courts of France have recently sentenced two theological graduates to one year each in prison (the maximum penalty) for having refused to undertake their prescribed military service. They stated that their consciences prevented them from breaking the commandment of the law of God, "Thou shalt not kill."

The question of conscientious objection to military service is thus the order of the day for discussion in the political and religious press. In general, conscientious objectors are strongly disapproved. Although one may render homage to the spirit of sacrifice which usually animates them, one must nevertheless declare their position indefensible from every point of view—social, moral and religious. One has no right to enjoy the benefits of the social order without undertaking its obligations. Christ never demanded of the soldiers who believed in Him that they should throw away their arms, and He proclaimed the right of self-defense and the right of defending others, if necessary by force, when he said, "If the master of the house [or of the country which is the enlarged "house"] had known in what watch the thief was coming, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken through" (Matt. 24:43). In accordance with the Master's injunction, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's," the inspired apostles in their turn taught submission to the higher authorities (Rom. 13:1). But it is obvious that arguments drawn from Holy Scripture, and the Scripture alone can give a trustworthy interpretation of the decalogue, have no value unless one recognizes at the start the sovereign authority of the Word of God. Modernism has so compromised this authority that it is at its door, in the last analysis, that one must lay the blame for the attitude of Christian conscientious objectors.

The National Synod of the Reformed Evangelical Churches declared unanimously at Paris-Auteuil (June, 1933) that propaganda in favor of conscientious objection to military service is incompatible with the exercise of the pastoral office. Although recognizing, and justly so, that the considerations by which the synodical order of the day are supported "are weak, in many respects contestable, and perhaps in some other respects aggravating," *La Vie Nouvelle* rejoices in the barrage which the National Synod has directed against conscientious objection. But this journal is disturbed (August 18, 1933) by the question of how and by whom this decision is to be enforced: "There no longer exists in our churches an executive body which is sufficiently strong to make the decisions of the sovereign authority of the National Synods respected. This body exists at the

top but there are agents neither of execution or of surveillance at the base."

The question of conscientious objection brings us back to the question of the Biblical faith and of ecclesiastical discipline, the restoration of which is imperative for the safety of our French churches.

VAUVERT, GARD., FRANCE

Netherlands Letter

By the Rev. Prof. F. W. Grosheide, D.D., of the Free University, Amsterdam

AUGUST and September are the months in which the Dutch General Assemblies, or, as they are called in the Netherlands, the General Synods, are meeting. That is to say, the General Synod of the great Dutch Reformed Church assembles every year, whilst that of the Reformed Churches and that of the Christian Reformed Church meet only once every three years. The last named churches, however, have their extraordinary synods, if there are extraordinary matters to be treated. This was the year for the Reformed Churches, and as Christian Reformed Church had a doctrinal case, three Synods met this year.

The Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church was the first in time. It was, as always, held at the Hague, where the Synod has its own building. This year the deliberations were affected by the Spiritual and the financial crisis. Especially the greater towns had the attentions of the Synod. It resolved that congregations with more than one minister should be obliged to divide their territory into districts. Further, there was a resolution which obliged the consistories to prescribe the manner of pastoral work, religious education and also, that abuses might be done away, the holidays of the ministers. As to finances, there was a resolution to advance the salaries of the ministers. Finally, I mention a proposal to alter the studies of the future ministers and another to organize the church government. Both were delayed.

The General Synod of the Reformed Churches assembles yearly in different provincial capitals. This year it was held in the town of Middleburg, the old beautiful capital of the province Zeeland. In one of my former letters I mentioned that there was a proposal to introduce hymns. Indeed a small number of hymns was introduced. Measures were taken to make contact with other churches, who—as the Reformed—hold to the old standards. This mission, which is purely ecclesiastical, in the Reformed Churches, had much attention. A resolution was made concerning cooperation with others in the work of evangelism. The commemoration of the hundredth anniversary of the session of 1834 was prepared. Among other things there shall be a collection for poor congregations which are suffering in the present crisis.

The Synod of the Christian Reformed

Church, an extraordinary one, assembled at Zwolle, the capital of the province Overijssel. It had to treat the case of the Rev. Berkhoff, a minister at Sneek, Friesland, who propagates chiliastic errors. His teachings were condemned, but he refused to retract and quitted his church.

AMSTERDAM

News Letter from Eastern Europe

By the Rev. H. J. Ockenga

SINCE your correspondent has been unable to give news from Western Pennsylvania for the last three months, it may be acceptable for him to report a few things that are taking place in Eastern Europe. I was four weeks in Germany, two weeks in Poland, three weeks in Russia, and one week in Finland, Esthonia, and Latvia. Over three weeks of this time was taken up with evangelistic preaching. Thus my observations naturally concerned themselves with the Church. With this personal explanation in mind let us look at the Church of Eastern Europe.

Russia is godless. No man can be a member of the ruling party, the Communist Party, who believes in God. The churches for the most part are closed. In Moscow there were over one thousand churches before 1914. Now there are less than forty. In Kharkov, the capital of the Ukraine, there are only six churches open. Most of the remnants are Greek Orthodox, although I did see several Lutheran, one Baptist, and several Roman Catholic churches. The Militant Atheist Society has organized groups in factories, farms, schools, and clubs where intense propaganda is carried on against the belief in God. This society is under the leadership of members of the party. The formerly great cathedrals of Russia have been turned into anti-religious museums. Notable is it that in each of these the propaganda against the belief in God begins with graphic illustrations of the theory of evolution and the nebular hypothesis. Both are taught as facts and the evolutionary theory used by them is as old-fashioned as pure Darwinism. It is pathetic to listen to a personal guide attempt to show one how this proves that there is no God. The young generation of Russia laughs at the idea of God, conducts its life on the theory that religion is the opiate of the people, and actively persecutes believers. In one church of protestant believers with whom I worshipped I counted twenty-two windows which were broken by rocks hurled by these atheists. Yet in the midst of all this opposition Christians are worshipping the Lord Jesus and holding firmly to their faith. The best way to understand the Church in Russia is to compare it to the Church of the first few centuries of the Christian era when Christianity was a proscribed illegal religion. Worship services have to be held secretly, but converts to pure, unadulterated

Christianity are being made. Often Christians seal their faith and testimony with their blood. When a minister becomes too popular he is banished to the work camps of Siberia. Many Christians are accused of counter-revolution and then shot.

Greek Orthodoxy in Russia was corrupt for centuries. It permitted no religious freedom. It bled the people of their money, kept them in ignorance, propagated superstition, and sided with the forces which oppressed the people. In Russia "judgment began with the house of God." One cannot blame those who have reacted so radically against the Church when Russian history is studied. Now the anti-religionists are just as intolerant. When will Russia, the land of 180,000,000 people, have its day of visitation? Let us pray with the Christians of Russia that God will rend the heavens and that the very mountains will melt at His presence. Such a visitation alone can help Christianity in the nation that has forgotten God.

Poland may be congratulated for permitting freedom of worship. The state Church of Poland is Roman Catholic, but other churches are tolerated. The Greek Orthodox flourishes in some sections in a purified condition. The Bishop of Warsaw, Savva, teaches the Bible and urges his people to read it. Other groups such as the Evangelical Christians, the Baptists and the Methodists carry on evangelical work. Two particularly fine works attracted my interest. One was the Mariavite Reform within the Roman Catholic Church. Here one can behold a beautiful communal life of a group of people who fought their way clear of many errors of Rome, but who still cling to the worship of Mary. Education, Bible knowledge, personal holiness, and conscious good works are deeply stressed. Any lover of Bible Christianity feels a kindred relationship with the Mariavites. The other work is that of the British-American mission for Russians under the leadership of Pastor William Fetler. At close range I observed this movement and found it thoroughly sound and truly evangelistic. The deep piety and enthusiastic endeavor of the workers of this group, combined with a knowledge of the Word, make it one of God's chosen instruments.

But with all this free endeavor in Poland for Christ the country labors under the usual curse of a Romanist State Church. The taxes support the Church. The people are terribly poor and are deprived of educational and cultural facilities while great cathedrals tower over towns and villages. Poland's Church history is a repetition of that of Mexico and Spain. One wonders when the yoke of a corrupt church will be broken here. The bigotry and intolerance of the priests against protestant workers is especially shown along the Bolshevik border where they stir up riots. Five of them transformed a theatre meeting which we were holding into a madhouse where the

wild people were ready to do almost anything. Once more judgment may begin at the house of God.

Germany is laboring in the grip of a new struggle and this time it is not theological. The Church has not been able to stay out. The Hitlerite government is attempting to nationalize the Church, to make it an instrument of the New Germany. The people are so much taken with the Hitler propaganda that they have voted 80 per cent. for the program. Against this movement stands the prominent theologian, Karl Barth. He is emphasizing the spiritual freedom of the Church and is becoming unpopular because of it. The struggle against the Jews is being brought into the Church and Martin Luther is heralded as a great German Nationalist. The four hundred and fiftieth anniversary of his birth is used by Germany for furthering nationalism in the Church.

I would like to write of these smaller states but lest this report be too lengthy shall just mention them. Methodism started the celebration of its twenty-fifth anniversary in Estonia on September 6th. There are about forty Methodist pastors in Estonia, thirty in Finland, and twenty in Sweden. The work for the most part has been evangelical, according to the report of one of their leading clergymen. The Lutheran Church is strongest in these countries with a work of Rome, Constantinople, and Boston intermingled. Eddyism has found its way into many remote corners.

Eastern Europe possesses some choice souls—rare persons, who have been redeemed by the Blood of the Lamb and who are conscious of the fact. Evangelistic work in fellowship with these saints of God has been one of the rare privileges of my life.

RIGA, LATVIA

The Presbyterian Church in Canada

By T. G. M. B.

THE Presbyterians of Embro, Ontario, at last have a new church and manse, a large home in the village having been bought and transformed for that dual purpose. The church auditorium seating one hundred and eighty was not large enough to hold the crowds at the opening services, in which the Rev. E. C. McCullagh, Dr. James MacKay and Dr. J. W. MacNamara took part. It was from Embro that thirty-eight men went into the ministry during the Rev. Donald MacKenzie's thirty-eight years there, including the Rev. George Leslie MacKay of Formosa. Knox Church, Embro, went into union in 1925 because many of the old Highlanders which were its best supporters were not members and had no vote, while many children who had joined shortly before could vote. The minister was a unionist.

The executive of the General Board of Missions, meeting on September 19th, voted

money for the completion of the Boys' Hostel at Jhansi, India, and appointed the Rev. Malcomb Ross Mackay, B.A., of Grand Falls, Newfoundland, to the Korean Mission, Kobe, Japan. Mr. Mackay is the first graduate of Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia, to go to a foreign mission field of the Canadian Church. He is a son of the Rev. D. O. Mackay of Elmsdale, N. S., a Princeton graduate and a member of the Board of Missions. To work among the immigrants from India in British Guiana, the Rev. and Mrs. David Marshall of Richmond Hill, Ont., have been appointed. Mr. Marshall spent seven years ministering to the Scottish and coloured population of that colony. He is now in good health again, and is going back to reorganize the Canadian Mission, which has had a very small staff recently.

There have been lost by death the Rev. Donald McLean, retired at Charlottetown, P. E. I.; the Rev. D. B. Marsh, Sc.D., F.R.A.S., late of Norwich, Ont., an astronomer as well as pastor; Judge Allan McLennan, esteemed elder at Fort Frances, Ont.; Judge R. D. Ponton, Lindsay, Ont.; and Mr. Justice W. A. Logie of Toronto. Among new judges appointed are two Presbyterians, Hon. J. A. Hope of Perth, Ont., and Hon. Norman S. MacDonnell, son of the late Rev. D. J. MacDonnell of St. Andrew's Church, Toronto.

The Rev. John Service, late of New Glasgow, N. S., has been inducted at Miller Memorial United Free Church (Continuing), Maryhill, Glasgow. On September 6th the Rev. C. S. Oke, B.A., was inducted at Knox Church, Stratford, and the Rev. W. E. Kelley, B.D., at Trenton, Ont. The former is a Knox '14 graduate. Dr. L. B. Gibson, Halifax '04, has resigned from Cooke's Church, Toronto.

TORONTO

Dr. I. M. Haldeman Dies

THE REV. ISAAC M. HALDEMAN, D.D., nearly fifty years pastor of the First Baptist Church, of New York City, died on September 27th, in his eighty-ninth year. He had served sixty-five years in the ministry and was known the world over as a staunch advocate and defender of the faith once for all delivered unto the saints. He was the author of many books and tracts.

The funeral services were held on September 30th, in the evening, in the church in which he had so long ministered. Presiding was Dr. Cortland Myers, who is supplying the pulpit of the church. The sermon was preached by the Rev. Curtis Lee Laws, D.D., editor of *The Watchman-Examiner*. The church was packed, and after the benediction more than a thousand of Dr. Haldeman's sorrowing friends passed by the casket, looking for the last time on the still form whose hand rested upon an open Bible.

Washington-Oregon-Idaho Notes

By the Rev. Roy Talmage Brumbaugh, D.D.

THE fall meeting of the Presbytery of Olympia (Wn.) was held in the Bethany Presbyterian Church, Tacoma, Washington. The overture to reduce the Assembly was answered in the affirmative. The Presbytery voted "no action" on the others.

At the popular evening meeting, conducted by the Elders, Mr. Frank T. Hickcox of the First Church of Tacoma, delivered a stirring address on "The Present Crisis in the Presbyterian Church." Middle-of-the-roads and modernists did not approve of it, but it was enthusiastically received by the Bible believers in the audience. To prevent repetition of this, the Presbytery, the next morning, passed a resolution taking the evening meetings of Presbytery out of the hands of the elders. Board representatives and their bond-slaves thus act together to muzzle, as far as possible, all voices raised against the present inclusive policy of the denominational machine. The General Assembly, the Synod and the Presbytery by recent action have declared themselves against the rights of any minority and against free discussion of any vital matter. We are headed toward Revelation thirteen, but, in the meantime, we continue to contend for the faith.

The Rev. Mr. Mackenzie of Buckley, a commissioner to the General Assembly, reported and highly commended the actions of the last General Assembly. Elder Elliott, who was also a commissioner to the Assembly, constructively criticized the "steamroller" methods of the Assembly.

It is quite noticeable that the blind devotees of the machine are highly rewarded for their services. Patronage is not limited to civil politics; neither is intimidation a weapon of the state alone. The denominational oligarchy also has its blacklist. Intoxicated with power, praise, technical victories and the homage of men, the autocracy goes merrily on—to sure retribution.

Ministers of the church recently received a booklet from the Division of Evangelism entitled, "Is there room for the Preacher Today?" We read in the foreword that the leaflet "is published in the hope and with the prayer that it will stimulate the preacher in his joy of preaching." We wonder what joy any Bible believing pastor could get out of the leaflet. The author seems to have an unknown God whom he calls "Another" (pages 7 to 10). The author denies the omniscience of the Lord Jesus Christ and, of course, does not accept the fact of His deity (pages 23 and 26). Does the author not also deny the inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible (pages 18 and 24)? The author seems to teach salvation without regeneration (page 10). The Gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation to everyone who believes, is omitted. The author seems to represent the naturalistic ministry. Is the Division of Evangelism also

going the way of current denominationalism? And yet how few voices are raised in protest!

The following young men and women of the First Church of Tacoma are preparing for full-time Christian service: Robert Churchill, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia; Willard Aldrich, Evangelical Theological College, Dallas, Texas; Genevieve Easton, Bible Institute of Los Angeles; Merold Westphal and Philip Stutsman, Wheaton College, Illinois; Alferetta Cassiday and Margaret Collins, Tacoma General Hospital, Tacoma, Wn.

THE policy of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A., was discussed at a meeting of the Session of the First Presbyterian Church of Tacoma, Washington, August 1, 1933, after Mr. R. I. Elliott, a commissioner to the General Assembly held at Columbus, Ohio, and Mr. William J. Love, a commissioner to the Synod of Washington, had reported.

At this meeting Mr. Frank Hickcox was requested to present to the Session at the September meeting a resolution covering the sentiment of the Session. The following resolution, prepared by Mr. Frank T. Hickcox, was presented to the Session of the First Presbyterian Church of Tacoma by Mr. William J. Love (Mr. Hickcox was absent because of illness) on September 5, 1933. After a thorough discussion it was unanimously adopted. It was made clear that this resolution repudiated the present policy of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. This was one of the most unanimous and enthusiastic meetings ever held by the Session of this Church.

The Resolution:

Tacoma, Washington, Sept. 5, 1933.

WHEREAS, the Foreign Missionary program of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., since its inception has been primarily based upon the New Testament commission; restated and confirmed in our Confession of Faith and generally followed by the great majority of our members;

WHEREAS, it has been brought to the attention of the Session of the First Presbyterian Church of Tacoma, Washington, that our Board of Foreign Missions has departed from the standards of Presbyterian doctrine and has violated the trust of dispensing members' contributions only to those missionaries true to the historic faith of soul-saving evangelism;

WHEREAS, the Board of Foreign Missions has solicited, accepted and appropriated material support from members of the denomination, the rank and file of whom, we believe, are true to a faith based upon historic New Testament doctrines, and has spent much of that trust money to further a liberal and modernistic program, in evidence of which we submit proof.

First. The Board has for years recommended and circulated unevangelistic or modernistic study books to Church and Presbyterian mission classes. What is omitted in these books is usually as vital as the untruth that is put in.

Second. A Secretary of the Board, without any objection or protest from that body, has countenanced distribution of Modernistic literature in Latin America, pointing to it as an outstanding achievement.

Third. The Board has allowed the candidate department to recommend and circulate modernistic literature to young people who have manifested a desire to prepare for the work.

Fourth. The Board has adopted the policy of sending conservative and modernistic candidates to the same field.

Fifth. The Board failed vigorously and militantly to repudiate the findings and recommendations of the Laymen's Missionary Appraisal Commission. One of the Directors of the "Inquiry" which sent out the Appraisal Commission, who is also Chairman of its "Presbyterian Committee" is a Vice-President of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions! This Vice-President of the Board also is the author of a published article in which he states that there is no real conflict between the Presbyterian position and that of the Appraisal Commission!

Sixth. The Board accepted "with deep regret," and only after great pressure had been brought to bear upon it, the resignation of Mrs. Pearl Buck, a former missionary in good standing with the Board in China, who so ardently championed the Appraisal Commission's report and who subtly and blasphemously wrote, "And what if He never lived? What of that? Whether Christ had a body or not, whether He had a time to be born in history and a time to die as other men have, is of no matter now, perhaps it never was of any matter!"

Seventh. The Board, through its members, jointly with a liberalistic majority of official and unofficial Church leaders, did everything in its power at the meeting of our last General Assembly to suppress and repudiate a minority report which exposed the above facts, and pleaded for a replacement of the outgoing Modernist and so-called "middle of the road" members by a list of new members of known conservative and historic convictions. The majority report, which commended the "loyalty" of the Board was concurred in by a member of the Standing Committee on Foreign Missions who was a member of the Appraisal Commission itself, and therefore the "loyalty" of the Board is of such a character that it can be recommended by one of the authors of the radically Modernist "Re-Thinking-Missions"!

Eighth. The Board, through its district representatives and adherents, is systematically combating efforts of the conservatives to rediscover and re-establish the bulwarks of historic Presbyterianism, which is a gov-

ernment of the people, by the people, and for the people, but which has been prostituted to government of oligarchy and dictatorship. The Board's apparent motive is to discourage a Presbyterianism which seeks to perpetuate the memory of a hundred thousand martyrs who gave their lives for a Confession of Faith that faithfully restates the principal doctrines of the inspired Word of God.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Foreign Mission contributions of this church be diverted from the Board of Foreign Missions until such time as it shall be shown that the Board has returned to the fundamental doctrines and program of historic Presbyterianism.

TACOMA, WASHINGTON

Items from Kansas

By the Rev. Jay C. Everett, D.D.

THIS fall marks the beginning of the thirteenth year of the Clergy Club organized by the Presbyterian ministers of Kansas. Its semi-annual meeting for intensive book-reviewing and devotion is to be held, as usual, at the College of Emporia on October 30 and 31, 1933, under the leadership of its faithful president, the Rev. Prof. R. Norris Miller, Litt.D., of the faculty. . . . The Rev. Alva M. Reitzel, D.D., of Hiawatha, is preaching every two weeks in connection with the organized Sabbath school on the Iowa Point Indian Reservation near White Cloud, Kansas, and with great acceptance. The Rev. Charles S. Rafter, recently ordained to the gospel ministry as a son of the Fort Scott Presbyterian Church, is to supply the important Spearville pulpit in the Presbytery of Larned, since the Rev. William J. Bonner is giving up the work on account of permanent ill health. Also, to take charge of the combination field composed of Tribune and Leoti has come to the help of the Lord in the person of the Rev. David Tallman of St. Paul. . . . The Third Presbyterian Church of Topeka, which has been vacant since April 1st by reason of the death of its former pastor, has called and the Presbytery has recently installed the Rev. Jesse E. Bartholomew, formerly of the Oberlin, Kansas, field. . . . A great loss has been sustained locally and throughout the Synod in the sudden death this summer of the Rev. Dr. George Edwards Newell, pastor of the First Church of Wichita. He was ill only about a month. He was a sound counsellor and a faithful preacher of the pure gospel; and withal held deep in admiration and much beloved by those who came to know him best as a minister of his Lord and Saviour. His work abides among us.

MINNEAPOLIS, KANSAS

Session Supports Independent Board

THE following resolution was unanimously passed by the Session of the Bethel Presbyterian Church of Detroit, Michigan, on July 10th:

"Bethel Presbyterian Church Session, dis-

tressed by alarming conditions and practices prevailing in our Board of Foreign Missions, in the organization and conduct of the work committed to it, hereby unanimously declares its approval of the organization of the New Board, recently effected, and expresses its intention of co-operating, so far as convenient, with this Board in the distribution of its benevolences (necessarily small, as yet)."

Attest:

CHAS. G. STERLING, Moderator.

CHAS. W. TURK, Clerk.

DETROIT, MICHIGAN

New York and New England

By the Rev. Luther Craig Long

THE Calvin Presbyterian Church of New Haven has announced four new extension department advances. (a) The services of Mr. Charles Burkett, graduate of Moody Bible Institute and a well known evangelistic song leader, have been secured to assist the minister in his preaching throughout New England. (b) Sunday afternoon "Radio-Vesper" Services have been inaugurated in the ball-room of the Barnum Hotel in Bridgeport, Conn., with the new song leader and the minister of the Calvin Church in charge. Crowds of over four hundred have attended each service thus far. (c) The Third Annual Eastern Young People's Bible Conference to be held in New England is to be held during the first week of December, closing on December 3d with a Sunday afternoon service in Bridgeport (in connection with the Radio-Vesper Services), and on Sunday evening in New Haven, with both messages delivered by Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., of Wheaton College, Ill. (d) The columns of CHRISTIANITY TODAY have been the means of arousing interest in New England Christian work to the extent of making possible, through the generous gift of Mr. Archibald McKinlay of Wayne, Pa., a series of Monday evening Christian Doctrine Lectures on the Yale University Campus. The gift was to be used in whatever way the minister in New Haven believed to be most important and after much prayer and consultation it has been made possible to have Dr. J. Gresham Machen open a series of lectures on the Yale Campus on Monday evening, October 30th. Dr. Machen will introduce Dr. Cornelius VanTil of Westminster Seminary, who will give a long series of Monday evening lectures throughout the winter months. This work deserves the prayers of God's people everywhere; it is to be one of the greatest Christian testimonies introduced to Yale students who number seven thousand from all parts of the world. The Rev. L. Craig Long has transferred his Letter to the Presbytery of Pittsburgh where he was ordained and where he finds it convenient to be a Presbyter.

Dr. Phillips Packer Elliott is preaching a series of Old Testament Character Studies at the Wednesday evening services in the

First Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn during October. Mr. Arthur Billings Hunt, the well-known radio hymn singer and director of music in the Spencer Memorial Church of Brooklyn (of which Dr. Frank E. Simmons is minister), received the Degree of Doctor of Music from University of Tennessee during the past summer. The "Central Visitor" of the Central Presbyterian Church of Buffalo, of which Dr. L. V. Buschman is the minister, reveals the following interesting statement: "Because our Church employs more than three persons in the conduct of its work it was asked to sign the blanket code of the N. R. A. program."

If the N. R. A. were thoroughly enforced it might possibly force some of our churches to join the Restaurant Union and sign the blanket code for restaurant workers! Dr. George E. Davies, Stated Clerk of the Cayuga Presbytery, submits the following information: At the meeting of this Presbytery held in the First Presbyterian Church of Union Springs, New York, a memorial was adopted with reference to the death of the late Rev. Edward Lloyd Jones who was for more than twelve years the Stated Clerk of Presbytery. The Rev. C. R. Gregory is Moderator of this Presbytery. The Rev. F. L. Gosnell, D.D., was appointed to draw up plans for a "spiritual advance crusade." The Presbytery concurred in an overture from the Presbytery of Denver to the General Assembly suggesting a plan for reducing the size of this yearly gathering of the denomination. The following men were elected to be Commissioners to the Synod meeting at Glens Falls, October 16th: The Rev. H. L. Reed, D.D., of Auburn Seminary; the Rev. H. A. Moran, Student Pastor of Cornell University, and Dr. F. L. Gosnell of Auburn. Also the following Elders: Mr. W. J. Davis of Ithaca, Mr. Frank E. Swift of Auburn, and Mr. James S. Morse of Levanna. Dr. M. L. MacPhail of Auburn led the Presbytery in a devotional service. Dr. J. Gresham Machen's New York and New England speaking appointments include December 3rd in Rochester and October 15th in New Haven in the farewell services for Rev. James Rohrbaugh, who sails for Africa from the Calvin Church. Mr. Reginald Voorhees, a graduate of Maryville College with both a Bachelor and a Master degree, has gone from the Connecticut Valley Presbytery to Westminster Seminary. Mr. Voorhees is an Elder in the Westminster Presbyterian Church of Bridgeport, of which the Rev. Robert Barbor is the minister. The Moody Bible Institute of Chicago conducted a Bible Conference in the Park Street Congregational Church of Boston, Dr. A. Z. Conrad, minister, during the last week of September. Great crowds attended the meetings. In closing, we ask Christians to remember to pray for the spreading of the Gospel above the Unitarian divide. New England is dry and ready for the Gospel.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

News Notes from the Southeast

By Prof. Wm. C. Robinson, Ph.D.

Social Questions Faced by Synods

AT the last General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church an effort was made to secure the appointment of a Permanent Committee on Social and Moral Reform. This plan was blocked by the vigorous opposition of Judge Wilson of Lexington, Ky., in deference to the historic position of the Southern Church.

However, The Synod of Virginia had appointed such a committee before the matter was discussed in the Assembly. The 1933 meeting of the Synod of Virginia seems to have been largely given to reports from this Committee. Synod adopted recommendations declaring that the Christian message is a message not only of personal regeneration, but of social redemption. Resolutions were adopted on the church and the social order, Christianity and crime, inter-racial relations, war and peace, and temperance. The last-named subject was the only matter of pressing issue. Virginia voted October 3rd on the question of the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment and of the State enforcement law. Synod's resolutions favored temperance, avowing a desire to discover and operate a better method of control, to "join any honorable attempt to improve the situation." The speech published with the resolution follows the Christian Century in describing the Eighteenth Amendment as "a tactical error." The net effect of the initial Southern Presbyterian venture with a social reform committee would seem to have been to lend encouragement of Mr. Shouse's repeal efforts.

On the other hand the Synod of North Carolina urged its members as Christian citizens to oppose any form of legalizing the traffic in intoxicating beverages. This Synod also opposed the making of military training compulsory at Davidson College.

The Synod of South Carolina is reported as deciding by a close vote to walk in the old paths. On motion of Dr. Wm. M. McPheeters the Synod adjourned as a synod to allow its members who so desired, as citizens, to hear Dr. C. E. Burts, the leader of the dry or anti-repeal forces.

The Atlanta Presbyterian Ministers' Association has resumed its regular Monday meetings after the Summer vacation. On September 25th Dr. P. H. Carmichael presented to the group an outline of the courses in English Bible and Religious Education he is teaching at Columbia Theological Seminary. Dr. J. McD. Richard, President of the Seminary, was elected president of the Association for the ensuing term.

DECATUR, GA.

Denver and Vicinity

By the Rev. H. Clare Welker

THE Synod of Colorado met in regular session in the First Presbyterian Church of Boulder, the Rev. Norman P. Nygard,

pastor, October 3rd-5th. The Rev. J. S. Dapp, Sunday School Missionary of Denver Presbytery, was elected Moderator. The Rev. George R. Edmundson of Westminster and the Rev. Wm. Gordon Kierey of Penrose were re-elected stated and permanent clerks, respectively. The Synodical Missionary Society, Mrs. A. W. McCammon of Denver, president, met at the same time and place. By request of the retiring Moderator, the Rev. James R. Burchfield, D.D., of Florence, the opening sermon was preached by Dr. John McDowell, Moderator of the last General Assembly. Following the celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Dr. McDowell again addressed a joint session of the Synod and the Synodical. During this address he took occasion to threaten very severely certain people in the church whom he did not name but whom he charged with "spreading suspicion by innuendo" and "making charges not supported by facts." Dr. McDowell seemed entirely oblivious to the fact that his own conduct in this particular bordered dangerously close upon the very thing he was condemning in others. He also emphasized the time-worn platitude that "any minister, elder or congregation has the right to get out of the church any time it wants to." If this course were followed by any considerable number it might relieve the embarrassment of some folks in the church as regards the matter of criticism, but it certainly would not help the financial situation.

The members of the Synod listened to the Moderator's remarks in respectful silence as, it is the observation of the writer, members of synods and presbyteries usually make a practice of doing. The writer made no attempt to discover what were the specific reactions to the Moderator's address. He is of the opinion personally, however, that if the Moderator of the General Assembly or any other man thinks he can threaten the membership of the Presbyterian Church as a whole into "subordinating their personal convictions," as the Moderator insisted must be done, he is destined to eventual and probably early disillusionment.

The General Council was represented by Dr. Murdock McLeod of New York, the Board of Christian Education by Dr. Wm. L. Young of Philadelphia, the Board of Pensions by Dr. John C. E. Fry of Los Angeles and the Board of Foreign Missions by Dr. Frank W. Bible of Chicago. The appearance of Dr. Bible as representative of the Board of Foreign Missions was looked forward to with great interest on the part of the members both of the Synod and the Synodical. While the writer could not endorse all that Dr. Bible said, he could most heartily endorse the spirit which he manifested. It was not the privilege of the writer to hear Mrs. James Allen of Africa but everywhere he heard her most highly spoken of.

On the whole, the meeting of the Synod was a very satisfactory one. Lack of space

forbids mention of many other excellent features both of the Synod and the Synodical. BRIGHTON, COLORADO

Eastern Pennsylvania Letter

By the Rev. John Burton Thwing, Th.D.

THE Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths has resigned the pastorate of the Holland Memorial Church of Philadelphia, over the protest of the congregation. The Bridgeport Church also protested the departure of its pastor, the Rev. William C. Perez, to take up child safety work in New Jersey. He had been the church's pastor for fourteen years.

The Rev. E. Lansing Bennett, of Altoona, Pa., has accepted the call of the First Church of Merchantville, N. J.; the Rev. John M. De Chant of the Cedar Park Church of Germantown, that of Manassas Junction, Washington City Presbytery, and the Rev. William O. Rhoad of Philadelphia, a call to Prince Edward Island, in the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

An interesting exchange of pastorates has taken place between the Rev. A. M. Centanni of Philadelphia and the Rev. Saverio Scalera of Pittston, both pastors of Italian churches.

Licentiate Robert Jones was ordained September 28th in the Grace Church of Jenkintown. He will accept a two-point field in Alabama. Candidate John N. Skilton was ordained September 19th, and will accept the call of the Second Parish Church of Portland, Maine. Licentiate Carl R. Wall will leave for the Soudan.

Three new candidates were received under the care of Philadelphia Presbytery, September 18th: W. J. Dobby, of Blairsville; Franklin W. Meyers, of the Fourth Church, Philadelphia, and John J. Andujar, a medical student, the son of a missionary in South America. The Rev. John M. Hubbard was appointed Moderator and Stated Supply of the West Park Church, Philadelphia. PHILADELPHIA

Carl McIntire, Westminster Graduate, Installed in Collingswood Church

THE REV. CARL McINTIRE, a graduate of Westminster Seminary in the class of 1931, was installed as pastor of the large and flourishing Collingswood, N. J., Presbyterian Church, on September 28th. Although still a young man, Mr. McIntire had made a brilliant record at the Chelsea Presbyterian Church of Atlantic City. A large delegation from the latter church came to see their former pastor installed in Collingswood. The installation was by the West Jersey Presbytery. The sermon was preached by the Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.

The service was held in the presence of a great gathering of enthusiastic people, and was described by visitors as being an altogether unusual installation service.

News Notes from Westminster Seminary

THE outstanding event of the opening days of the new year at Westminster Seminary is the return to its classrooms of the Rev. R. B. Kuiper, A.M., B.D., as Professor-elect of Practical Theology.

After completing his graduate studies in Princeton Theological Seminary, Professor Kuiper entered upon a busy and fruitful ministry as a pastor. He was continuously engaged in pastoral work until, in the fall of 1929, he came to Westminster as professor of Systematic Theology and, for the first year of the institution's life, most effectively filled that chair. He came to be greatly beloved both by faculty and students and his work in the classroom provided the men of that year with a firm foundation in theology.

In the summer of 1930 Professor Kuiper accepted a call to the presidency of Calvin College, where he remained until a few weeks ago. Westminster has always been anxious to have Professor Kuiper back as a member of its faculty and it was with great joy that the announcement was greeted that he had accepted the call to the chair of Practical Theology. The work of this department is now entirely in charge of Professor Kuiper and he will conduct all of the work in the department himself with the exception of that in missions.

An interesting editorial concerning Dr. Kuiper appeared in the Grand Rapids Press for June 5th, and is as follows:

Kuiper Leaves Calvin

The Rev. R. B. Kuiper leaves the presidency of Calvin College after three years of distinguished service to the local school to rejoin the faculty of Westminster Seminary at Philadelphia, responding to repeated pleas from the Eastern institution. His administration has been remarkable for continued progress in spite of adverse economic circumstances.

Taking over the guidance of the college in 1930 at the beginning of a period that has proved extremely trying for all privately supported institutions, President Kuiper has kept Calvin holding its own. Under him the enrollment has reached the highest point in history and Calvin's reputation for scholarship and high educational standards has been maintained. Facing a threatening financial situation he succeeded in cutting costs almost in half—an example to public as well as private education.

Previous to his role as Educator, in his many years as preacher here, Dr. Kuiper became known as a brilliant forceful speaker and popular leader. His invigorating personality, shown in both official and personal contacts, has won him the lasting confidence and respect of his colleagues on the faculty, the student body, the supporters of the school and the public at large. Calvin



THE REV. R. B. KUIPER

College has been fortunate in having a head so competent to deal with the difficult administrative problems of the past few years and one who leaves the school in a condition decidedly better for his having been there.

As in the past, the course in Missions is to be given this year by visiting lecturers.

The Seminary has announced that for the current year it will be given by the Rev. Robert Hall Glover, M.D., F.R.G.S., and by the Rev. Floyd E. Hamilton, B.D., Th.M. This will be the fourth year in which Dr. Glover has ably presented the lectures on the biblical basis of missions. He also gives a short survey of the history of the missionary enterprise. Professor Hamilton, who is usually busy in the great college at Pyeng-

Yang, Korea, is this year home on furlough and Westminster is delighted to have the privilege of his assistance in the classroom. He is well-known to a great circle of Christian people through his books: "The Basis of Christian Faith" and "The Basis of Evolutionary Faith."

Preliminary figures are available for the enrollment for the year and are as follows:

Graduates	6
Seniors	22
Middlers	31
Juniors	23
Partial Students	6

88

This is an increase of twelve over the number listed in last year's catalogue.

New elective courses have been added to the curriculum in three different departments and constant advance in all directions is the aim of the institution. Dr. Machen has undertaken two new courses in exegesis: one in Colossians, Philemon and Ephesians, and another in the Gospel by St. John. Dr. Van Til is offering an unusual course in "The Relation of Modern Psychology to Christianity." Dr. Stonehouse has announced two new courses: one in the exegesis of the Epistle to the Hebrews, one of Studies in the New Testament Canon. The increased enrollment has resulted in such crowded conditions in the building that during the periods between classes some have suggested that the staircases resemble the football fields of "olden days," when rush football was the vogue!

Several valuable gifts have been made to the Seminary Library in recent months, in addition to accessions by purchase. One is an excellent copy of the first edition of the great work of De Rossi on the Old Testament, published in Parma, 1784-1798.

Overture on Union Presented to Presbytery of Philadelphia

At a meeting of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, held on October 2nd, the following overture concerning Church Union was presented on behalf of the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths. It will be considered by the Presbytery at its next meeting on November 6th:

"The Presbytery of Philadelphia respectfully overtures the 146th General Assembly not to approve or send down to the Presbyteries any basis of union with any church which would

(1) By including a "shorter creed" or by appending such creed to the basis of union as an "historical interpretative statement," or

(2) By making any change whatsoever in the present formula of subscription for ministers and licentiates,

weaken the witness of the Church to the system of doctrine of the Confession of Faith, or destroy the historic doctrinal continuity of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A."

IN THIS ISSUE:

The Coming of the Kingdom	1
The Plan of Union	1
Godless Christianity	2
Preach the Gospel or Live It?	3
Pacifism Rampant	3
EDITORIALS	
"The Never Failing Light": A Study in Mission Book Modernism	4
WILBUR M. SMITH	
Freedom in the Presbyterian Church: Protest in New Brunswick Presbytery	5
J. GRESHAM MACHEN	
Registration of Schools in China	6
L. NELSON BELL, M.D.	
Important Meeting of Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions	11