

13C79
PA
QUARRYVILLE
RD 2
MAY 1934-R
S DYRNES

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., Inc.
501 Witherspoon Bldg., Phila., Pa.

MID-MARCH, 1934
Vol. 4 No. 11

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

Editorial Notes and Comments

AN UN-OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN



THE opening issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY stated that it "will not only be free of all ecclesiastical control but its editors will be free to determine its character and policy according to their convictions." There has been no change in the situation since the statement, just cited, was printed. We mention this because apparently there are those who have gotten the impression that we are more or less of an official spokesman for Westminster Theological Seminary and the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Such is not the case. Neither of these organizations are in any wise responsible for what appears in our columns. It is true that Westminster Seminary has our whole-hearted support and that we view hopefully the newly organized Board for Foreign Missions. But that does not mean that we exist to further their interests. We are just as free to criticize them as we are to criticize any other organizations—and will not hesitate to do so if the occasion, in our judgment, requires it. It should be remembered, moreover, that approval or disapproval of one of these organizations would not necessarily involve approval or disapproval of the other. As we understand the matter Westminster Seminary sustains no closer relations to the Independent Board for Foreign Missions than Princeton Seminary does to the official Board of Foreign Missions. Be that as it may, CHRISTIANITY TODAY is a publication that sustains no official relations with any other organization.

A NEW PRESBYTERIAN WEEKLY?



THE PRESBYTERIAN ADVANCE of February 22nd gives publicity to the fact that "definite and earnest movement is on to establish a new Presbyterian weekly." The occasion of this otherwise premature publicity is the fact, frankly stated by its editor, that *The Presbyterian Advance* is itself facing discontinuance because its income from subscriptions and contribution is no longer sufficient to meet the costs of publication. It had been tentatively decided to discontinue *The Advance*, we are told, at the end of February, but when it was learned that an effort was being made "to start a new paper, somewhat different, but standing for the same principles and spirit which *The Advance* has sought to manifest" it was decided to continue *The Advance* "until the outcome of the new effort is definitely known." In case the effort is successful *The Advance* "stands ready to turn over to it its list and 'good will'." We are told that most of the sponsors of this proposed new paper

are in New York and Philadelphia but apart from that we are left in ignorance as to their identity.

We cannot say that we share the eagerness of the editor of *The Advance* to have the new paper established but that is only because this new paper, if established, will be modernistic in character. In our judgment there is no legitimate place for such a paper in a Church that is definitely committed to the Bible and the Westminster Standards as is the Presbyterian Church. No doubt, if the new paper is established, it is planned to make it an even more effective organ of Presbyterian modernism than *The Advance* has been. This means, it seems to us, that those who still hold in all earnestness and sincerity that the Bible is the Word of God, and as such the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and who think that the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechism contain the best summary of its teachings yet penned by man, should redouble their efforts to maintain our heritage and to pass it on undiminished to those who shall come after us. CHRISTIANITY TODAY stands ready to be used more fully for the furtherance of this end. In order that it may do so, however, additional funds must be supplied us. We are in no immediate danger of being forced to discontinue but we lack funds for anything like adequate promotion work. CHRISTIANITY TODAY is not operated for private profit; in fact, is so organized that it cannot be. We have no hesitation, therefore, in urging those who are in sympathy with our efforts to aid us by special contributions, in as far as they are able, and in any case to do what they can to bring the attention of the paper to others. What we want more than money is more subscribers. In fact, we want more money mainly because it will help us to get more subscribers. We are confident there are many thousands who would appreciate CHRISTIANITY TODAY who as yet are ignorant of its very existence. Extra copies will be sent free to those willing to place them in the hands of possible subscribers. Please help us to lengthen our cords and strengthen our stakes (Isaiah 54:2).

THE PROPOSED MERGER WITH THE UNITED PRESBYTERIANS



IT is with mingled emotions that we view the proposed merger of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and the United Presbyterian Church of North America. We hold the United Presbyterians in high esteem. In our opinion, as a group they are more soundly Evangelical and probably more soundly Calvinistic than those who constitute the more common variety of Presbyterians. We believe, therefore, that the merging of these two churches would result in a single church in which there would be a somewhat larger proportion of truly Bible-believing Christians than exists in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. at the present time. Hence we could well wish that the pro-

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

posed Plan of Union was such that we could give it our hearty endorsement. Being what it is, however, we are constrained to oppose it.

It should be said, however, that while we believe that the united church would have at first a somewhat larger proportion of really faithful Presbyterians than the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. yet the change in proportion would not be sufficient to give such Presbyterians anything like a majority in the new church. And that because the really faithful Presbyterians are such a minority in said church that the addition of the United Presbyterians to their ranks—even if they were 100 per cent. sound—would not change their minority into a majority. If the conservatives and the liberals were somewhat evenly divided in the Presbyterian Church a 10 per cent. addition of conservatives might turn the scales, but as matters are it would make no appreciable difference. Unless we are mistaken in our opinion of the United Presbyterians, as stated above, they as a body ought certainly to “stop, look and listen” before they cast in their lot with a church that is dominated by modernism to such an extent as is the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. It may sound well to say as Dr. Baldinger does in the *United Presbyterian* (January 25th) that the Plan of Union “precludes the idea that either Church would be absorbed by, or lose its identity in the other” but as a matter of fact the United Presbyterians would have about as much to say about the policy of the new church as a stockholder who holds only 10 per cent. of the stock of a corporation has to say about the policy of the corporation as over against a stockholder who holds 75 per cent. It does not seem to us, therefore, that any truly evangelical and truly Calvinistic United Presbyterians should favor the proposed merger.

The writer, however, is a Presbyterian, not a United Presbyterian. As a Presbyterian his paramount reason for opposing the proposed merger is that, in his judgment, it involves a serious lowering of the doctrinal standards of the Church. Even if the merger was proposed on the basis of the Westminster Standards in the form in which they are now received in the Presbyterian Church, we would feel it our duty to warn the United Presbyterians of the sacrifice that such a merger would involve on their part (the article, “Why Church Union,” by Dr. A. Gordon MacLennan, in *The Presbyterian* for February 8th may profitably be read in this connection), because these Standards are, we fear, more honored in the breach than in the observance. The gist of our main objection was stated by Dr. Machen in our January issue. It lies in the fact that the Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith approved by the Assembly of 1902 and the Confessional Statement of the United Presbyterian Church have been made of part of the Plan of Union as “historical interpretative statements of the United Church.” There is no occasion for us to repeat what Dr. Machen has said so well. We want to direct attention, however, to the fact that Drs. McNaugher and McCulloch of the United Presbyterian Church have in effect set the seal of their approval on Dr. Machen’s understanding of the place that these two far-from-adequate statements are intended to have in the United Church. Speaking of the Confessional Statement, Dr. McNaugher says, “Its clear recognition as having interpretative character scarcely lessens its potential value as an exponent of the Reformed theology” (*United Presbyterian* of Jan. 11th) while with both statements in mind Dr. McCulloch speaks of them as “authorized interpretations” of the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms (*United Presbyterian*, Feb. 1st). It is true that there are those who maintain that there can be no ground for doctrinal objection to the Union on account of the Confessional Statement. Dr. Robert E. Speer, for instance, in *The Presbyterian* for March 1st, points to the fact that the Southern Presbyterian Church approved it as a basis of union in 1929 as proof of this. Again Dr. McCulloch in the *United Presbyterian* for February 1st says that as an orthodox statement it “should pass muster even with the strait-

est sect of our religion.” But since it is demonstrable that the Confessional Statement is far from orthodox, such representations can only raise questions as to the intelligence or orthodoxy of those who make them.

It may seem that in admitting that the United Presbyterians as a group may be sounder, theologically speaking, than the Presbyterians and at the same time alleging that their doctrinal standards are decidedly inferior, we are in effect belittling the importance of pure doctrine. Such is not the case. In as far as the Presbyterians are less soundly evangelical the explanation is to be found, in our opinion, in its neglect of rather than its practice of its creed; and in as far as the United Presbyterians are superior in this respect we would explain it partly by the fact that they have not to the same degree substituted Modernism for Calvinism as the creed by which they live and partly by the fact that their inferior creed was only adopted about nine years ago and has not as yet had time to work out its full effects in the lives of its professors.

A somewhat minor but not unimportant reason for opposing the Plan of Union is, not to mention others at this time, the method proposed for amending the standards of the United Church. Amendments will be adopted or rejected by a majority of the votes cast in the various presbyteries. This means that results will be determined by the large city presbyteries where modernism is usually most rampant. Once this method is adopted it will be much easier further to modernize the standards than at present. This point has not as yet received the attention it deserves.

As intimated in our last issue (p. 13) we do not anticipate that the majority of the ministers (few of the elders will have an opportunity to express themselves) of the Presbyterian Church will be greatly influenced by the considerations that determine our attitude toward this proposed merger. Our more immediate interest, therefore, is not so much in such discussion of the Plan of Union as is taking place in our own Church as we are in the discussion that may take place in the United Presbyterian Church. With its issue of March 1st the *United Presbyterian* concluded the series of explanatory articles by members of the Committee on Organic Union. Its editor has announced that its pages will now “be open impartially to articles, either in favor of or opposed to the Union.” We will watch these articles with much interest, as we think that the fate of the Plan of Union is most likely to hinge upon the question whether the United Presbyterians are willing to be swallowed by a Church that is so largely dominated by modernistic influences. If the event proves that an informed United Presbyterian Church is so swallowed up, we will have to admit that we were mistaken in our opinion of their soundness. Dr. A. Gordon MacLennan, formerly pastor of the Bethany Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia and now pastor of the Shadyside United Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh—a man therefore who has first-hand knowledge of both churches—has already expressed his opposition (*The Presbyterian* of February 8th). It remains to be seen to what extent he speaks for the United Presbyterians as a body.

But while we are of the opinion that the fate of this proposed merger will be determined by the United Presbyterians, we are emphatically not of the opinion that loyal and intelligent Presbyterians should adopt a “do nothing” policy. We believe that, irrespective of what the United Presbyterians may do, they should do everything possible to keep our own General Assembly from sending the Plan of Union to the presbyteries and, if that is done, to do everything possible to keep the presbyteries from approving it. As it will require a two-thirds vote of the presbyteries to sanction the merger we are by no means without confidence that it can be defeated. But even if we were not we would favor the attempt as we are not among those who believe in fighting only when victory seems sure. In the meantime we should make clear that while we hold the United Presbyterians in high esteem and would approve of a merger

with them on the basis of the Westminster Standards, pure and simple, we don't want them on the terms and conditions proposed in the Plan of Union and that their coming under such conditions might lead to a disruption of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

ANTI-CHRISTIAN MINISTERS



WIDESPREAD publicity has been given to the answers given by Chicago ministers to a questionnaire sent out by the School of Education of Northwestern University. These questions were prepared in the first place for submission to children of junior high school age and afterwards sent to the 1039 ministers listed in the directory of the Chicago Church Federation with the request that they answer them as they "would desire children of junior high school age to answer them." Four hundred and eighty, or approximately one-half of the ministers, did as they were asked. The summary of the replies, given to the press, tells us not only what percentage of these 480 ministers expressed themselves affirmatively, negatively or uncertainly concerning the questions put, but what percentage of the Baptist, Methodist, Lutheran, Episcopal, Congregational, Evangelical, and Presbyterian ministers who answered the questionnaire gave affirmative, negative or uncertain replies. The replies revealed no marked difference of opinion among the ministers of these denominations.

Some of the questions asked seem to us unimportant, some highly ambiguous, but others are both clear and significant. For instance, 88 per cent. of the Presbyterians (we are not told just how many) answered "yes" to the question, "Is God still 'speaking' to us today as He did in Bible times?" and 74 per cent. of them answered "no" to the question, "Did everything the Bible tells about really happen just the way it is told?"—answers that make abundantly clear that they neither regard the Bible as infallible or the only rule of faith and practice. Again 25 per cent. of them answered "no" to the question, "Is Jesus God?" and 38 per cent. "yes" to the question, "Are we sons of God just as much as Jesus was?"—answers that make clear that there are Presbyterian ministers to whom Jesus is not an object of worship. Yet again 65 per cent. of them indicated that either they do not believe or that they are uncertain that the devil is "an actual being or person" and 58 per cent.

of them that they either do not believe or are uncertain as to whether there is a coming Judgment Day. Finally, not to mention other things, 86 per cent. of them answered "yes" to the question, "Is it a good definition to say, A Christian is a person who tries to live as Jesus would live?"—a definition that completely ignores the fact that Jesus is primarily a Saviour from the guilt and power of sin.

When it is remembered that approximately the same percentage of ministers in the six other denominations mentioned gave the same replies, it becomes only too clear that many of those occupying Christian pulpits are busily engaged in anti-Christian propaganda. Assuming that these ministers teach the children of their congregations in accordance with their own answers, it would seem as though they were bringing on themselves the woe pronounced by our Lord himself: "It is impossible but that offences will come; but woe unto him, through whom they come! It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones."

DR. MACKENZIE REPLIES TO DR. VAN TIL



OUR February issue contained a searching yet, in our judgment, altogether courteous review of Professor Donald Mackenzie's recent book, "Christianity—The Paradox of God," by Professor Cornelius Van Til. We asked Professor Van Til to review this book because of what we considered his special qualifications for the task. In this issue it is our privilege to print Professor Mackenzie's reply to that review. We are somewhat afraid that the editor of the *United Presbyterian* will judge that

Dr. Mackenzie's reply affords additional proof of what he had in mind when in his issue of January 11th (p. 9) he wrote: "It is unfortunate that some cannot express themselves on a controversial subject without losing their temper, using abusive language, attributing unworthy motives to those who differ with them." Be that as it be, we consider that Dr. Mackenzie is fully entitled to make such reply in our columns as he sees fit to anything that may be said about him or his writings. In our next issue, Dr. Van Til will have opportunity to present a rejoinder, should he so desire. A limited number of copies of our February issue, containing the review of which Dr. Mackenzie complains are still available (ten cents per copy).

Starting a Summer Bible School on Faith: A Testimony

By the Rev. Henry Shepard Atkinson
Minister, First Presbyterian Church, Wildwood, N. J.

[From an address delivered before the Eleventh Annual Summer Bible School Conference at Chester, Pa., on January 26, 1934.]



R. R. B. KUIPER dropped a remark by way of a definition of Christianity the other day in class at Westminster Seminary that is so simple, and yet so profoundly true, that it is worthy of note:

"Christianity is, first, a story; second, a doctrine; third, a life."

A study of what the Scripture regards as its own message shows the accuracy of this order. "Jesus died," is a story, a historical fact—"for our sins," is a doctrine, the meaning of the story. "Christ arose," is a story—"for our justification," is the doctrine.

Then comes the life, and it is based on these. If you know the story, and its meaning, and accept and believe

it, then the Holy Spirit may on this basis bring about the miracle of new birth. After that, His guiding and feeding of that life is still on the basis of that story and its doctrine.

But if one undertakes to arouse a newness of life, as if it were innate in the soul, through some kind of esthetic experience or contagion of personality, then one is not only trying to produce and decorate a roof with no foundation or supporting walls, but one is more accurately trying to bring forth "fruits without roots." Now, man-made fruits that did not grow laboriously on a tree, nourished by life from well-grounded roots, are, be they ever so pretty, made of wax. And they prove neither succulent nor nourishing.

The roots are the story and the doctrine, the content of the Bible, while the life is the fruit.

If, then, we are to undertake the stupendous task of bringing young people into a knowledge of God and preparing them for eternity, we cannot but follow this Scriptural order, for it can easily be proved to be *the* Scriptural order.

It is in this very characteristic that Dr. Lathem's system of Summer Bible School study stands out in glorious contrast to most of the popular methods of "religious education." He provides a curriculum covering the actual content of the Bible. His children know the story in detail and can set forth, in the words of either Scripture itself or the Westminster Shorter Catechism, the clear doctrine. And to some extent they can also defend and explain it. They are fortified for life against the superficiality of human opinions, with the sword of the Word itself. With their equipment of accurate and extensive quotation from memory, they can meet the adversary with the authoritative "Thus saith the Lord," or "It is written."

This training stands forth in striking contrast to the superficial pedagogical fads of the day, so aptly described by Dr. J. Gresham Machen as "trying to make children think with empty heads," such as show themselves in the current trend to substitute all manner of things more "interesting" in our Sunday Schools, in the conduct of young people's conferences by "discussion groups" where adolescents express *themselves* (for lack of something better) on ethical and social problems with "I think" or "It seems to me." Such schemes are generally marked with the absence of real knowledge, conviction, or the note of authority that God supplies in His Word. They try to "hold" the young by the fancied appeal of the sugar-coating of human ingenuity, with such an avoidance of real work on the Bible as to amount in effect to no more than sugar pills in the treatment of the devastating disease of sin.

Dr. Lathem's system, requiring hard work and great quantities of memorizing, provides a return to good, healthy, old-fashioned "horsework" which is the only highway to real knowledge—the only effective antidote to present day shallowness in religious thought and knowledge.

One may indeed well ask how such a school can possibly hope to hold interest and attendance. The answer is that there is another psychological characteristic in children, which is just as basic as the craving for entertainment or the inclination to laziness, to which appeal may be made even more effectively than to them.

This is the exhilaration of achievement, or the thrill of accomplishment. When parents shy at a long term of Summer School because their children have worked "so hard" all winter, I ask them if they would be willing to send them for three days. The chances are that within that time they will earn a star, purely a mark of attainment, and will then keep on coming of their own accord.

This system is so hard and so full that it takes a professional school teacher to teach it. Anything short of the standard of public school teachers on salary, no matter how

devout and earnest others may be, is a weakness. It sets up such a standard of work and achievement that it demands all the special training and skill that the teaching of secular knowledge requires in day-school. That is one reason why it is more nearly worthy of the seriousness and importance of the study of Scripture.

Many a minister, instead of setting out after money for the Lord's work in dead earnest, fills his school with unprofessional teachers without pay. These naturally find a long, five-week grind on memorizing beyond them, and insist on a padding of the curriculum with less strenuous activity, with the plea that this work is "too much and too hard." I personally view such action as a compromise with the general laxity and slipshod habits of a generation pampered on every side by softness, and therefore a temptation to be resisted, rather than the justifiable criticism it so often appears to be.

But what has all this to do with starting a new Bible School on Faith? Everything, in that it presents the prerequisite of all "faith" work, that it be the Lord's will, done in the Lord's way. There is a great temptation among the most devout Christians to superficiality in faith itself. Too often we get an idea about Christian work, and, lacking funds, proclaim the project to be on a "faith basis," only to see the whole thing fail. Usually the reason lies in the light assumption that anything that fires our fancy is bound to be honored by the Lord because it is done in His name.

Yet it may well be that it is not done in His way. I have seen many wonderful blessings follow a "faith" work, yet I would not dare embark upon it until I had become certain that it was both the Lord's will and His way. God is not bound to serve us and bless our works. But if it is God's work, and we proceed only on orders, then we have every right confidently to expect His blessing.

So my first problem in thinking of starting a Bible School was to find some system of study that itself followed as closely as possible Scripture's own method as well as its teaching. The Bible claims to be worthy of the most industrious searching. It is to be hid in the heart. It is to be *studied*. The details of its story and doctrine are to be learned, and on that knowledge the Holy Spirit will found and foster "life."

Dr. Lathem's system came as near to following these precepts and to presenting the whole Gospel in its own proper doctrinal focus as any I could find. Evidence of God's previous blessing of it are abundant in the conversions and Christian conviction and certainty that follow in the wake of the study of it by some 200,000 children each Summer.

Having found a system and method which, by reason of its conformity to His Word, it seemed that God could honor, the next step was to narrow down the problem to the local situation. That is, does God want *me* to start a school in our town?

The need is obvious. If it takes nine months a year of daily study to gain knowledge for this life, how paltry is the half-hour a week of somewhat hap-hazard Sunday

School work in preparing the young for both this life and the next?

The ability of the Summer Bible School to do much toward meeting this need is apparent. Aside from the advantages of continuous and intensive, systematic study, one Session of the Summer Bible School is fully equivalent to five years of Sunday School work. The two should go together, for the Sunday School has the advantage of long continued contacts.

But the question is, does the Lord want *me* to do it here and now? The first way to attack that problem is the second step in a "faith" undertaking.

If the thing itself is God's work approached in His way, I must now turn to the instrument—myself—with serious heart-searching. Why do I want to do it? To be doing something? To build up my Church? To court man's praise for a courageous undertaking? Or is it because I am a bond-servant of Jesus Christ? Is it because I love Him and His little ones and cannot sleep while they are living and dying out of Christ and His redemption unless I am exerting myself to the utmost? Is it because He has commanded me to go out into the highways and hedges and compel them to come in, and the only way I can bring them in is through the avenue of a clear knowledge of the message of the Bible in its own content? No one should dare set out on the Lord's work with mixed motives in His own heart. If no need is felt for a real struggle with self, then I wonder if the real issue has been faced. Are we willing to do something for Him in His work in the face of persecution, misunderstanding and criticism, in humility, forgetting the glamour of doing something, and of doing it on a "faith basis"?

Only when the objective character of the undertaking has been minutely scrutinized in the light of the Word, and the subjective motives purged in prayer, are we ready to face the immediate problems.

After these two are settled, if there is still some doubt as to God's specific leading in the particular case, as there was with me, then it has always seemed to me legitimate to ask for a concrete sign, like Gideon's fleece. I do not mean asking God to rend the heavens to work a miracle or to drop the sign in one's lap. Yet I mean a little more than the necessary and mystic conviction and urge one feels when at prayer.

With me last year, one of the array of obstacles provided the occasion for the sign. If there is an obstacle insuperable by one's own efforts, and the Lord removes it, it is usually a pretty good green light.

With us it was a building. Our own equipment was hopelessly inadequate. I believe it to be the Scriptural teaching to go ahead as far as we can, trusting the Lord to open the way. I first followed up one lead into a stone wall. Then somebody suggested that I try to get a municipal school. It seemed audacious. Yet I would never find out without asking. So I wrote the City School Board asking if it would be permissible for us to request a building, *if* we should decide to try a Bible School. They took no action for seven weeks. But it was God's work, and I had

to learn a little of the meaning of "Be still and know that I am God."

Then a letter came: "Your request for the Andrews Avenue School Building for five weeks this Summer has been granted."—"Exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think!"

This then was definite. It *was* God's will from every point of view. If God had undertaken, what were circumstantial obstacles? What was the apathy or the scepticism of people? They were not as bad as Moses faced. What were the financial problems or the problem of securing real teachers who were true Christians?

It is true that none of these were surmounted on the wave of joy over the certain knowledge of God's guidance that came with the building. All the cares, responsibilities and work of the Christian's usual contact with the world must be born. All the planning and organizing usual to such an undertaking must be met, but the knowledge of God's approval is a solid rock to stand on in any storm. One may be quite certain of God's will if the project is to further His Kingdom, in His way, as revealed in the Scriptures.

It could not be done at a resort. Local people are too busy earning a living in the short season, and visitors too busy having a good time, etc., ad infinitum. But where and when aren't people "too busy" with the world, whether the particular excuse have the salt air twang or not?

I had in mind some sources of money and some prospective teachers from the beginning. These thoughts kept up my courage by making it all seem possible. But God had to teach me that it was *His* work.

We needed \$500, and all those prospective sources, save one man, netted just \$15.00. None of the rest was solicited, and I now feel a little bit ashamed of asking for that \$15, in view of the fact that in the Fall we refused to accept gifts amounting to considerably more than that because all bills were paid. (Some \$470).

On graduation night, I was a little cross that so many notebooks and report cards were left over undelivered. But later I saw the hand of God, when at nearly every home to which I delivered these cards I was given some hard-earned gift, usually \$5.00.

Of the teachers I had in mind, only one accepted, and we needed six. (We finally used 9.) But the Lord chose them, some at the very last minute, and they were an extraordinarily hard-working and efficient corps—from the practical point of view, the secret of our success.

As to children, we did some advertising and calling, but could only await the opening to see. We prepared for 100 with no little misgiving. The first day opened with a terrible storm but exactly 100 came to school. We had 294 altogether, with about 170 taking the full course, and just over 100 perfect in attendance.

And work was done. The work was thorough and the memorizing revealed at graduation the smoothness of perfect knowledge. One class memorized 183 verses and catechism questions. 1065 were learned by the School, besides

(Continued on Page 7)

Walter Duncan Buchanan: Champion of the Faith



ON December 4, 1933, members of the Presbyterian League of Faith gathered for their regular meeting in the parlors of the Broadway Church in New York. In the chair, as always, sat the President of the League, and pastor of the host church, the Rev. Walter Duncan Buchanan, D.D., LL.D. Still vigorous, in spite of the weight of his seventy-four years, he presided over the meeting with his own characteristic dispatch and humor. The meeting over, he walked here and there among the members, greeting them and saying good-bye. None of us who were present then realized that for some, at least, it was a last earthly leave we were taking of one of God's true noblemen.

On February 22, 1934, many of us again gathered in the Broadway Church, this time not in the parlor but in the stately sanctuary. The pulpit and pulpit platform were a mass of flowers. Amid their perfume, and in the peculiar hush that only the presence of death can evoke, sat a broken-hearted people, mourning the under-shepherd of Christ who, during more than a generation, had been their friend. For under the pulpit from which he had preached the fadeless Gospel for so many years, lay the mortal part of a man who had richly earned the proud title of "Mr. Valiant-for-Truth."

The final service was simple, as he had wished and directed. There was no sermon, only the soft playing of the organ, the two hymns he had loved and chosen, the reverent reading of the Word, and intercession before the throne of Grace. Yet in the reading of the Scriptures and in the prayers that were offered, mingled the notes of sad farewell and triumph-in-Christ. One could hardly tell whether his heart were more torn by sorrow or made glad by the glory of that Gospel which alone can abolish the terror of death and wipe all tears away. One thing is certain: that in death as in life Dr. Buchanan's desire was that men should think not of *him*, but of the Christ he loved and wished that men should love.

Upon the platform was a group of quiet men—his true friends all: James Palmer, Albert Dale Gantz, William H. Matthews, Mebane Ramsay, J. M. Robertson, Walter W. Hammond and J. Gresham Machen. Most of them took part in the service, Dr. Machen both reading from the Scriptures and offering prayer.



The REV. W. D. BUCHANAN, D.D., LL.D.

Before the pulpit sat many members of the liberal Presbytery of New York, a Presbytery in which he had for years led a militant and undismayed minority in testifying for the Faith. He had been a member of that Presbytery longer than any other member. And though the modernist majority might vote him down with machine-like regularity, yet there was not a man in the Presbytery who did not respect him. And in the church were also many other ministers who had been proud to call him their friend—from other cities and towns—men of the League of Faith, Westminster Seminary, CHRISTIANITY TODAY and the Independent Board—projects all into which Dr. Buchanan had thrown himself with enthusiasm and zeal.

The two hymns were, "Lead Kindly Light" and "Rock of Ages," sung reverently and simply by the Quartette-Choir, as Dr. Buchanan had wished. And at the end, when the service was done, when the casket was carried out between the standing throngs of sorrowing people the organ played softly "Ten Thousand Times Ten Thousand," and then swelled into the triumphant strains of "The Son of God Goes Forth to War," truly significant of the life, the ministry and the victorious home-going of this servant of God.

The only variation in the funeral service was in the reading of a poem written by one of his two daughters, Mrs. A. H. Sherwood, of Garden City, Long Island, who has been ill and could not attend the service. Dr. Buchanan's other daughter, Mrs. J. M. Lawrence, of Scarsdale, N. Y., was present. His wife, the former Miss Grace Mortimer, died in 1908.

Dr. Buchanan was born in 1859, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. He graduated from the New York University in 1881, receiving his degree as Master of Arts in 1884. Meanwhile, he had graduated from the Union Theological Seminary, in New York, in 1883. In those days Union Seminary was considered by many as a bulwark of orthodoxy, but during the years that followed Dr. Buchanan witnessed its surrender to modernism and was forced by conviction steadfastly to oppose its influence and teachings in the church.

After his ordination in 1884 Dr. Buchanan became pastor of the Seventh Avenue Mission of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, in which work he continued until 1889. For the next three years he was pastor of the Chalmers

Church, which he left to accept a call to the Thirteenth Street Church, now the Greenwich Church. In 1899 he was called to the Fourth Avenue Church. This was the church which grew into the Broadway Church, the location being moved from Fourth Avenue and Twenty-second Street to Broadway and 113th Street, in the shadow of Columbia University. Much of the cost of furnishing and equipping of the new edifice was borne by its pastor. He even presented the church with a set of bells in the tower, and the fact that he was the donor did not come out until some time following. In his church Dr. Buchanan was a faithful and efficient pastor, as well as a gospel preacher of note and power. Every year he occupied his pulpit during the summer session of Columbia University, that he might reach the students who came from so many varied places. On mid-summer Sundays his church was always filled—something unusual in New York or in any large Eastern city. The Broadway Church is one of the largest in New York City, with a membership of 1,748—a living monument to his faithfulness and labors.

In the doctrinal battles that accompanied or followed the rise of Modernism in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Dr. Buchanan was always valiantly in the forefront. Steadily he voted against licensure and ordination of young men without certain convictions in regard to essentials of the Christian Faith, and regularly he complained to Synod and General Assembly when illegal ordinations were ordered. When the case of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick arose, Dr. Buchanan was, as always, clear in his stand. Before the reorganization of Princeton Seminary, Dr. Buchanan stood shoulder to shoulder with those who wanted to preserve the old Princeton, and when at last the deadly "reorganization" was decreed, this Valiant-for-Truth joined with those others who "went out into the wilderness" to organize Westminster Seminary. He was a trustee of Westminster. He was one of the founders and the first and only President of the League of Faith, organized in 1931 as a protest against the Auburn Affirmation and the drift of the times in the Church. He was from the beginning a true supporter and helper of Dr. Samuel G. Craig when he was summarily relieved as editor of *The Presbyterian* for refusing to suppress what he believed to be the truth about the new Princeton. As such he aided CHRISTIANITY TODAY from its inception. When creation of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions was under advisement, and when, in Columbus, Ohio, the present writer wired to various persons when the final decision had to be taken, the reply of Dr. Buchanan was instantaneous and characteristic, a telegram of just three words, "COUNT ON ME." How few syllables to say so

much! And in recent days the writer has been privileged to receive many letters from Dr. Buchanan, which will be cherished now as never before, all of them filled with the warmth of his own kind friendship and breathing loyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ.

The homegoing of this Valiant-for-Truth was unexpected. On Monday, February 19th, he was preparing to conduct a wedding. As he leaned over a table to sign a paper, he was seized with a heart attack. Those present helped him to a chair, and sent for a physician. But by the time the physician arrived Dr. Buchanan had left his earthly tabernacle, and departed to be with Christ.

There are many of us who feel a sense of personal loss and deprivation of a stalwart in the battle so great that it is entirely impossible to compress it into mere words. Yet we are glad, too—glad for our friend and fellow-laborer who has gone to lay down his trophies at his Master's feet. As it was said of the wayfarer when at last he reached the City of God in the "Pilgrims' Progress," so indeed and rightfully may it be said of Dr. Buchanan, that when he crossed the river of death, sure in the merit and blood of Christ, that "all the trumpets sounded on the other side." The words engraved upon his casket are an epitome of his noble life: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

H. McA. G.

Starting a Summer Bible School on Faith—Concluded

the stories, history and geography. A class of 35 adults (some of whom had to get up at 4 to get their work done, few of whom had had much of any education, and two of whom were great-grandmothers) at first said they could not learn, and then at graduation recited Isaiah 53 and the Prologue to John, with such unhesitating certainty as to bring tears of pride and joy to many eyes.

Our Church has seen such a manifestation of God's working that it is undeniable, and we have received a spiritual stimulus that has scarcely left a soul unaffected.

We praise God, whose eyes still "run to and fro through the whole earth to show Himself strong in the behalf of them whose hearts are perfect toward Him"—perfect by reason of being "washed and made clean in the blood of the Lamb."

And we praise the Lord for a system of Summer Bible School work that actually teaches the rich content of the Bible, and that does it in the serious Scriptural way which is honoring to God.

God can overcome circumstances. But He who muzzled the winds and the demons also commands *you and me*, with the same authority, to "Go . . . and teach . . . and, lo, *I am with you.*"

Dr. Mackenzie Replies: An Open Letter to Dr. Van Til

Dear Dr. Van Til:



YOU have paid me a compliment by reviewing my book — Christianity the Paradox of God — at such length. But, in spite of the care with which you apparently have studied it, you seem to cherish grave misconceptions, indeed perversions, of my position, which, in the interests of truth, should be removed.

(1). First you point out the danger in using the word “paradox” of Christianity. I agree. But then the danger is no reason against using “paradox,” provided the necessary safeguards are forthcoming—as they abundantly are in my case.

I suppose you would agree that Dr. Benjamin B. Warfield was tolerably orthodox, and yet he says that the title “The Lord Jesus Christ” is most “paradoxical,” and he applies the same designation also to our Lord’s death. And when he mentions these paradoxes he does not feel it necessary to explain that he is neither an evolutionist nor an irrationalist. He trusted his readers’ good sense and judgment in the matter, for his general theological position was well known. So did I, though mistakenly in your case.

And yet the very nerve of my book is just to overcome the false paradoxes of a godless universe and an unbelieving rationalism, by the paradoxes of grace through a divine atonement, guaranteed to us by faith in the revelation of God in His Word.

In my first chapter I tried to show that our scientific knowledge itself was based on principles that transcended our intelligence, and that this left the door open to the scientist for faith. Do you object to that? If so, let me remind you of the saying of another Princeton Father, Dr. A. A. Hodge:

“All knowledge is ultimately faith in the unintelligible. This is true of so ordinary a thing, for instance, as the assimilation of food.”

Are you so foolish as to bring the charge of modern irrationalism or agnosticism against Dr. Hodge, or to tilt with your critical lances of straw against Dr. Warfield? And yet is that not what you are in danger of doing in this count against me? Beware lest in fancying yourself an Athanasius-*contra-mundum*, you turn out to be a Don Quixote, and cover yourself with inextinguishable laughter.

But then, (2) you say I use the word “chance.” With a latitude of inference which does credit to your imagination, however, it may reflect upon your intelligence and candidness; you accuse me, for this reason, of denying the providence and omniscience of God the Creator. Have you ever read Calvin or have you forgotten him? Do you not know that he also admitted that “to us” events often appear fortuitous or fated, and yet these are inadequate

notions which are corrected by our experience of grace? “What seems to us contingency, faith will recognise as the secret impulse of God.” Is not that exactly the meaning of my statement that “Chance evangelised becomes grace, and grace is the paradox of God”? A man’s conversion, for example, may appear to him at first fortuitous, but as he ponders over it, he knows it was not so. In paragraph after paragraph I have elaborated this; but you will not see it.

Again, does not Dr. Archibald Hodge also use “chance,” correcting it later in the light of God’s activity in grace, just as I have tried to do?

Our Lord took men as He found them with their crude notions, and corrected their false views of chance and fate and other things, until, after the bestowal of His grace, they came to see that the very hairs of their heads were numbered.

Your dubiety in this present case, as far as it has any mental foundation, is due to your confusing of two magnitudes, viz. God’s knowledge of Himself and of His ways, and our knowledge of Him. Because I believe that both you and I are not omniscient, is that to assert that God is not so?

Why do you object to my saying, “Above all, He changed *for man* the Unchangeable God, so that what sages would have died to learn is now known to cottage dames”? Is that not true? Did not our Lord Jesus change “for man” the Unchangeable God, *i. e.*, our natural conception of Him? Do you honestly believe, or can you honestly infer, that I, either intentionally or unintentionally, tried to maintain the doctrine of an essentially changing God? Is not your criticism here in danger of being unworthily captious? Such was not the old Princeton way of reviewing. They delighted not in sniping logomachies, but in honorable argument.

Your controversy on this point is not with me, but with Paul. He, for instance, speaks of Christ being formed in us. Did that mean that Paul was guilty of the ineptitude of a growing Christ? Would you brand Paul as a heretic for that? Or St. John for saying that the Holy Spirit was not yet until the full revelation of the Trinity was given? Even if St. John or St. Paul were Princeton professors, would you on that account father on them the doctrine of a growing Christ or an evolving Holy Ghost? And yet, on your puerile argumentation they would fall under your flail as easily as I do and for the same reasons.

Again (3) you read into my sayings on miracles a theory which puts me into the ranks of the Auburn Affirmationists—a monstrous crew in your opinion, which seems to haunt you like a nightmare—as if I had said that a miracle was what did not happen, whereas my position is that an event,

however startling, in which we do not see God at work and which does not call from us praise, is just a meaningless marvel. Did I not in plain words denounce Loisy's position as the very evaporation of Christianity? Do I not say that "a paradox in Scripture is an exhibition in works of power and mercy of God's saving and redeeming purpose"?

You object to my saying that miracles are not to be explained physically or historically, but theologically and redemptively. Why? Do you mean to say that miracles are explained by purely physical or historical laws without God, or do you not agree with me that only the operation of God in such events alone explains? What you affirm on this point I also affirm.

Then (4) you object to my statement that "the day may come when the scientific view of natural selection and the New Testament view of an election of grace may be seen to be, both, sides of God's activity"; and in so objecting you say that a man cannot maintain "natural selection" and the New Testament doctrine of grace. Indeed! Dr. A. Hodge maintained both, for he says: "There is no doubt that the laws pointed to by Darwin and Wallace exist and are at work with beneficial results everywhere. They are divinely appointed laws and they explain very clearly the variations of species." Have you become so orthodox that Dr. Hodge is anathema to you? Do you not lay yourself open to the charge not only of heterodoxy but of dishonoring the fathers?

And (5) lastly, you find fault with me for pointing out the common danger and defect of Augustinianism and Calvinism as held by many more Calvinistic than Calvin himself. But listen again to Dr. Hodge: "I am afraid of

Calvinism when it is alone. A mere Calvinist who is not a man and a Christian had better be shut up in Bedlam. But if he is human and Christian, then his Calvinism is a good thing. In this day we require perhaps to emphasize man's free-will rather than God's sovereignty. At the same time we must not lose sight of the latter or allow our theological system to centre wrongly."

What would you do with Dr. Archibald A. Hodge? I think I know what he would be tempted to do with you. Was he an opponent of Reformed theology as you affirm of me, for asserting in some sense free-will? Would you call him an Arminian for doing this? Would you doubt his evangelical position and exclude him from the congregation of the people of God as, in your inquisitorial fury, you would exclude me? If you did, then he might well relegate you to the category of "objectionable orthodoxy."

You see then into what a plight you have brought yourself in your Jehu-like zeal against your own ungrounded inferences regarding me. You are in danger of making plain men suspicious that Westminster is a nest of illogical heretics in the guise of orthodoxy—heretics in the very truth—and that your only test of orthodoxy is the ululatus which utters at each and every turn only one cry, viz: "Princeton delenda est."

There is a more excellent way than that—the prophetic way of working for the coming of the day when Ephraim shall not envy Judah or Judah shall vex Ephraim.

I am,

Yours in all courtesy and charity,

DONALD MACKENZIE,

Princeton Theological Seminary.

Dr. Thornwell Jacobs' New Religion: A Book Review

By the Rev. Samuel G. Craig, D.D.



UNDER the title "Not Knowing Whither He Went," Dr. Thornwell Jacobs has written and the Oglethorpe University Press has published a book of more than passing interest. Dr. Jacobs is a minister of the Southern Presbyterian Church as well as President of Oglethorpe University. He is distinguished not only as an educator but as an author in the fields of science, religion, poetry and fiction. He also has the questionable distinction of having been a classmate of the writer in Princeton Theological Seminary some thirty years ago. The copy of the book that lies before the writer has on its fly-leaf, in the handwriting of its author, the words: "To my classmate and friend, Samuel G. Craig, with the compliments and admiration of the author." The writer could well wish, therefore, that its contents were such that he could commend it without reserve to the attention of his readers. Since he is unable to do this, he is glad to find justification for his comments in the fact that Dr. Jacobs describes the hero of his book as one who taught that "perfect candor is perfect kindness" (p. 20). While there may be cases when this is not altogether true, it does not seem that this is one of them.

While this book is a novel in form, its aim is not primarily to please and entertain. It is a novel with a purpose. It has been

written not so much for the sake of the story that supplies its framework—interesting as that is in itself—as for the thoughts about religion, the church, the radio, the press, the schools and the movies—especially the thoughts about religion—that are attached to this framework. If we mistake not, the book is largely autobiographical in nature. The Dr. John Roderick of the story, in as far as he has been drawn from life, is, we are disposed to believe, the Dr. Thornwell Jacobs of actual life.

The plot of this book—it is the second novel Dr. Jacobs has written—is simple. Dr. John Roderick, pastor of the leading church of Atlanta, Ga., and an outstanding figure in the Southern Presbyterian Church, influenced (1) by the words and acts of a young man, trained to reinterpret "the faith once delivered to the saints" at a New York seminary, when he sought licensure at the hands of Atlanta Presbytery; (2) by "the glow of a woman's eyes" and the "power of a woman's words" in a cinema play, and (3) by a radio sermon by a preacher who talked very much like Harry Emerson Fosdick, is led to realize that he is no longer in sympathy—either in mind or heart—with the orthodoxy in which he had been reared and of which for some thirty years he had been a conspicuous and trusted advocate and that his place must henceforth be with the religious liberals whom previously he had not even regarded as Christians. Dr. Roderick's conversion to religious liberalism, while

in a sense sudden, had long been pending. For years he, great church leader though he was, had been in a desperate struggle with himself (p. 78). "A storm that had long been brewing, broke suddenly upon the Gennesaret of his soul, sweeping down from the great mountain tops of his philosophy, his sociology and his science. An April storm delayed since his adolescence, was flashing its lightning in the autumn of his life" (p. 29).

Dr. Roderick's first step was to go to Hollywood to thank the actress who had been the more immediate occasion of his conversion. This not only brought him into contact with some of the leading characters of Hollywood but resulted in the conversion of this movie star to the view of religion and life that he had embraced. Thenceforth the story deals with what befell Dr. Roderick at the hands (1) of his church, (2) of a radio station controlled by an elder of the church, (3) of a newspaper, (4) of a college and seminary, and (5) of the cinema when co-starring with the actress, referred to above, he devotes himself to giving world-wide influence and popularity to his "new gospel." It will be seen that the story has been so ordered as to afford Dr. Jacobs a convenient series of pegs upon which to hang his views of things in general—especially of religion.

We are particularly interested in the religious significance of this book. In confining ourselves more or less closely to this phase of the book—the limits of our space forbids our doing more—we are dealing with what Dr. Jacobs himself regards as of central importance. Speaking through Dr. Roderick, he says: "The most vital need in American public life is a new religion, stripped of creeds and theologies; the kind Jesus had, modernized; the kind that will affix the Golden Rule to every entry of every bookkeeper in the United States and infuse it into every word from every pulpit, newspaper, radio, teacher and actor in our country. With such a religion universally practiced any government would work well; in fact, no government at all would be necessary. Without it any government is merely the accepted code of social warfare and economic cannibalism" (pp. 214-215).

The passage just cited tells us three things about the religion that the world needs according to Dr. Roderick. It needs (1) a creedless religion, (2) a religion of the kind Jesus had, and (3) a religion that is essentially a manner of life. Other passages in the book tell us the same things but we cannot take space to cite them. Still other passages tell us, not to mention other matters, that the world needs (4) a religion that teaches that man is his own saviour, (5) a religion that is a product of the evolutionary process, (6) a religion in which the object of faith, God, is man-made, and (7) a religion the test of whose validity is its practical results.

That man is his own saviour is indicated, for instance, on page 105 where we read: "There is nothing more tractable than the human soul. It needs but to will, and the thing is done; the soul is set upon the right path: on the contrary it needs but to nod over the task and all is lost. For ruin and recovery alike are from within."

That religion is a product of evolution, not of revelation, is indicated by such passages as: "My religion began when life began hundreds of millions of years ago" (p. 128) and "All the world needs or has needed—yesterday, today and forever—is for its citizens to find and live by the Will of God, which is the Will of the Universe, which is the directional evolution of mankind, which is progress, which is religion" (pp. 137-138).

That the God of this religion is a man-made object is made clear by such passages as these: "Even 'time-space' and 'God' we may find to be literally anthropomorphic, existing in our brains only" (p. 94) and "I have, of course, created Him in my own mental image just as truly as my ancestors created him in the image of bull or hawk or ibis and later in that of the animal man. He is my best and greatest, my highest, my widest, my deepest" (pp. 129-130).

That practical results are made the one and all-sufficient test of a religion's validity appears in such passages as these:

"If when and as religion works, it is so" (p. 95) and "Pragmatism is of the essence of religion. A religion that does not work is not a religion; it is a superstition" (132).

Some comments in which further exposition is combined with criticism follow. We begin with the second of those mentioned above.

The kind of religion Dr. Roderick commends is "the kind Jesus had." Since Jesus lived some 1900 years ago it seems clear that when Dr. Roderick speaks of his religion as "new" he merely means to contrast it with the religion he had professed and taught as a Presbyterian minister. Be that as it may, the religion he commends is that religion of Jesus in distinction from the religion about Jesus that enjoyed such a vogue two or three decades ago. If Dr. Jacobs really thinks that this "religion of Jesus" is "new" in the sense that it is the latest and most-up-to-date kind of religion that passes under the name of Christianity, it must be that the South is more theologically belated than we had supposed. And that because this "religion of Jesus" is already regarded as out-of-date in the intellectual centers of Europe and America (Cf. *The Theology of Crisis*, by Walter Lowrie, p. 54). If Dr. Jacobs had come out for Radicalism or Barthianism there might be some warrant for calling his religion "new" in this sense but that is hardly the case in view of the fact that what he commends is little more than the moribund Liberalism of the late Adolph Harnack (for instance) and of such living preachers as Harry Emerson Fosdick.

Of course the "religion of Jesus" advocates have never alleged that their religion was absolutely new since its underlying historical assumption, is that "the gospel about Christ has for centuries obscured the gospel of Christ" (p. 138). What they have alleged is that almost immediately after his death the religion of Jesus was transformed, refashioned, made over under the influence (1) of the beliefs of his earliest followers and (2) of the theological constructions of Paul (derived in large part from the mystery-religions) with the result that the religion about Jesus—Paulinism rather than primitive Christianity—prevailed in the Church until original Christianity was re-discovered by the Liberals, dug up as it were out of the debris that had covered it for nearly nineteen centuries. A sounder scholarship has shown, however, that there is no such cleavage between Paul and the first Christians or between the first Christians and Jesus, as the Liberals had maintained; and that as a matter of fact not only in the mind of Paul but in the minds of the first Christians, and not only in the minds of the first Christians but in the mind of Christ himself, the religion that He established was a religion that centered in His own person as the God-man and in Him as crucified.

It is perfectly obvious, at any rate, that the "religion of Jesus" which this book advocates is something altogether different from Christianity as it was all but universally understood until the spread of Modernism within the last fifty or seventy-five years. Jesus himself occupies no essential place in this "religion of Jesus." He is at most the first to teach and practice it. He is not an object of worship or one to whom men look for salvation from the guilt and power of sin. He himself might be forgotten and the religion He taught and exemplified thrive (p. 133). And so we find a Christian defined by one of the characters of this book as "one who accepts the way of life taught by Christ to be his way of life; one who practices his teachings, enjoys his hopes and trusts his faith" (p. 21)—a definition that completely obliterates the distinction the Lord and His disciples, between the Saviour and those He saves. Here the words of Herman Bavinck are much to the point: "Jesus was not the first Christian; he was and is the Christ. Christianity is not the religion of Jesus, still less Jesus-worship (*i. e.* worship of him as merely human) but Christ-religion. Christianity is now as dependent on him, from moment to moment, as when he trod the earth. For he is not a person who lived and worked only in the past, but he lives and works still,

is still Prophet, Priest and King, and himself upholds the church, which he established, from age to age" (Philosophy of Revelation, p. 227).

In full harmony with his advocacy of the "religion of Jesus," Dr. Roderick advocates a religion that is essentially a mode of life and in which man is his own saviour. According to the "religion of Jesus" advocates, the faith that saves is a faith like Jesus had, not a faith in and on Jesus. They know nothing of faith in Jesus Christ as a saving grace, whereby we receive and rest upon Him alone for salvation, as He is offered to us in the gospel (*Shorter Catechism*, Q. 86). For them Jesus is at most a teacher and example. Believe as Jesus believed and act as Jesus acted and we will be saved is the sort of gospel they preach. Such a gospel would have pleased Pelagius and Socinus but it would have been abhorrent to Augustine and Luther and Calvin and the Westminster fathers. It may be a source of temporary comfort to the pharisee but it leaves the publican in despair.

Of Dr. Roderick's reiterated assertion that religion needs to be "stripped of creeds and theologies" it may be said, in the first place, that it is grounded in a mistaken notion of the relation between religion and theology. There is as a matter of fact no such things as a creedless or non-theological religion. No doubt some religions have a minimum of creed and theology but in none are they wholly lacking. It could not be otherwise since "religion and theology are parallel and interactive products of the same body of facts" which being interpreted means that religion is the effect which the facts concerning God and His relation to the universe produce in the individual and collective life of man, while theology is the effect which these same facts produce in the sphere of human thought. To say, therefore, that we can have religion without theology is to say that we can have religion where there is no knowledge concerning God and His relations with His creatures which, working in the hearts and lives of men, produces what is called religion. The difference between religions at this point is not that some have theologies and some have none, but that some have more or less true theologies and some more or less false theologies. Dr. Roderick himself has a theology in its true sense as the science that has God as its object. He even says "my religion consists of what I think about God, how I feel about God and what I do about God" (p. 130), but as his conception of God and of God's relation to the universe, including man, is false his theology is also false. Like all those who decry creeds and theologies, he has a creed and theology of his own. In this connection it may be said, in the second place, that even if it could be shown in the abstract that there can be religion without theology, it would still be true that this is not the case as regards the concrete religion known as Christianity. For religion according to Christianity is not merely a manner of life, but a manner of life that is based upon a message about God, particularly about Jesus Christ conceived as a divine being who voluntarily came into this world on an errand of mercy to sinful men. It is absolutely certain therefore that any religion that is "stripped of creeds and theologies" is a religion other than the Christian religion. Since Christianity is a religion that is grounded in facts (events that happened) and doctrines are the explanations of these facts, a non-doctrinal Christianity is just no Christianity at all.

Little need be said about Dr. Roderick's allegation that religion is the product of an evolutionary process and that pragmatism is of its essence. These two are closely related. If the one is true, the other is probably true also. We think that both are false and that both are products of inadequate knowledge. We have no space to argue the matter, however, and would content ourselves with barely mentioning them were it not for the fact that Dr. Roderick's apostasy from the faith of his fathers apparently had its roots in his acceptance of the theory of evolution as an adequate explanation of things. Telling the actress of his conversion to the "new" religion he tells her that

he does not know just when or how long ago his dissatisfaction with the faith of his fathers began, but adds: "I know it had begun after I read my first book on evolution" (p. 78). It does not seem strange to us that a man who accepts a thorough-going theory of evolution (p. 150) should reject Christianity. We would not be understood as saying that the theory of evolution is wholly devoid of truth. For aught we know it deals with one of the most important factors that must be taken into consideration in any attempt to give a satisfactory explanation of things as they now are. But we would be understood as saying that a thorough-going theory of evolution—that is one that represents it as setting forth the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth—precludes belief in Christianity. And that because it denies in principle the reality of those great redemptive acts that God has wrought for the salvation of His people—acts which culminate in the supernatural birth, atoning death and triumphant resurrection of the God-man—apart from which there is and could be no such religion as Christianity. No doubt there are multitudes who tell us that, if this is the case, Christianity can no longer be held by intelligent men. In our opinion, however, that is only because they have been over-hasty in thinking that the theory of evolution affords an adequate explanation of things. For proof of this we refer our readers to Mr. Van Dusen's article, "The Great Delusion," in the January issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. At any rate, it ought to be as clear as day to all that no *thinking* person can be at the same time a "thorough-going" evolutionist and a Christian. A "thorough-going" theory of evolution allows no place for the supernatural in the form of the miraculous. Such a de-supernaturalized Christianity, however, is Christianity extinct.

Little need be said about Dr. Roderick's assertion that God is a man-made object. He here appears in the role not so much of a religionist as of an irreligionist or at any rate of an idolater. He takes his place among those who worship and serve the creature rather than the Creator (Romans 1:26). He who worships such a God as Dr. Roderick commends is as much of an idolater as those who worship stocks and stones. It is basic to all true religion that man is a creature of God and as such dependent upon Him for life and breath and all things.

More might be said in exposition and explication of Dr. Roderick's religion. It might be pointed out, for instance, that it attaches no unique significance to the Bible seeing that he not only classes it with the Golden Sayings of Epictetus and the Meditations of Marcus Aurelius as "means of grace" (p. 93), but as the "Word of God" names it along with books on astronomy, geology, biology, mathematics, history, psychology, together with the poets and the lives of saints and criminals (p. 135). Enough has been said, however—more than enough, we suspect—to make clear that it both lacks everything distinctive of the Christian religion and is positively hostile to all that makes the Christian religion a source of hope and consolation to men and women conscious of their sin and guilt in the presence of the God of reality as He has made Himself known through prophets and apostles and especially through His Son.

We do not expect Dr. Jacobs to agree with the judgment expressed in the last sentence of the paragraph above. He claims in fact that *Not Knowing Whither He Went* is the story of the conversion of an old-fashioned Southern Presbyterian minister and of an outstanding Hollywood movie star to primitive Christianity. If what they were converted to was Buchmanism as Dr. Jacobs also alleges, that can only mean, in our opinion, that Buchmanism itself can not be regarded as a Christian movement. Dr. Jacobs himself certainly thinks that his views are quite in harmony with those of the "Oxford Groups." Not only are we told on the jacket of the book that his contact with these groups in England was influential in determining its contents, and not only in the book itself is Frank Buchman classed with St. Francis of Assisi, Calvin, Luther, and John Wesley (p. 131), but the movie star is repre-

sented as having obtained a "sense of well-being," of having become "clean" through confessing her sins to those she had wronged (pp. 120-121) with no mention of the cross of Christ or the regenerating activity of the Holy Spirit. We do not know as that any members of the "Oxford Groups" have expressed approval of this book, but unless they condemn it as in effect a libel of their teachings it seems to us that it confirms the judgment expressed by Dr. N. B. Stonehouse in his article entitled "Buchmanism and the Gospel" in the January issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY to the effect that the gospel of Buchmanism is other than the Gospel of Christ.

Perhaps something should be said about the charge of intolerance that this book makes against the Southern Presbyterian Church for not permitting men like Dr. Roderick to occupy its pulpits. If what we have said about the book is even approximately true, this means that its author holds that a church established for the worship of Almighty God and instruction in the Christian religion according to the Westminster Standards is sinfully intolerant if it does not allow individual ministers to preach their own gospel (p. 94) even though their gospel be quite other than that taught in said Standards. The mere statement of such a position is its sufficient refutation. Suppose a paid lecturer of the Association for the Advancement of Atheism should be converted to historic Christianity. Is it supposable for a moment that this Association could be justly chargeable with unwarranted intolerance if it refused to permit this paid lecturer to preach such Christianity under its auspices? To talk about suppression of free thought in this connection (p. 164) is merely an attempt to confuse the issue. The Church makes no attempt to prevent a man speaking "the truth as he sees it" (p. 171), but in as far as it is loyal to its Great Head it will not allow a "gospel which is not another" preached under its auspices. Men are as free to preach what they regard as truth as the winds are to blow, but why they should think that their liberty is curtailed because they are not permitted to be paid for preaching it under any and all auspices, we are quite at a loss to understand. Liberty of speech is gained at too great a cost if gained at the price of honesty.

It is natural, no doubt, that Dr. Jacobs should picture his heroes as superior in courage, honesty and intelligence to those who believe that the Bible is the Word of God and that the system of doctrine taught in the Bible finds its best expression in the Westminster Standards. The former may be the equals of the latter as far as courage and honesty are concerned *if*—but only *if*—they forsake the Presbyterian Church in all its branches. If, however, such men as the Dr. Roderick of this story remain, or even attempt to remain, in the Presbyterian Church, we think they are conspicuously lacking in both courage and honesty. That as a class they are intellectually the superiors or even the equals of orthodox Presbyterians we do not admit. The Dr. Roderick of this story does not impress us as a man of great intelligence or as one who is intellectually alive in any marked degree. Had he been, he would hardly have said after having passed his fiftieth year, "I have never really believed in anything, in anybody, or in myself" (p. 80). Not only that, but he would not, under the influence of a callow theological student, a movie actress and a superficial popular preacher, have embraced as "new" a type of religion that is no longer honored by leaders of religious thought. Men like Dr. Roderick to the contrary notwithstanding, the orthodoxy they condemn is and, we are sure, will continue to be a vital factor in the religious life of mankind long after the "religion of Jesus" they commend has only an historical interest. Be that as it may, it is our contention that the greater our knowledge and the stronger our powers of thought the more probable it becomes that we will accept the Bible as the Word of God and the Westminster Confession of Faith as setting forth the system of doctrine taught in God's Word. It is, in our opinion, little more than buncombe to allege that the fact that men

reject the Reformed Faith is evidence that they are "brilliant thinkers, well educated; in fact, too well educated" (p. 99).

It is Dr. Jacobs' contention that "the movie can be made the most powerful agency for good on earth" (p. 236). Clearly this statement as understood by Dr. Jacobs includes the notion that the movie can be made the main agency in spreading true religion since he regards religion as the world's most vital need (pp. 214-215). The measure of our agreement with this notion will be determined by the measure of our agreement with his notion of what the essence of the Christian religion is. If the Christian religion is essentially a way or manner of life and if all that man needs is noble ideas and ideals, it is conceivable that the movie offers the best means of commending these ideas and ideals to the world of which we have any knowledge. But if the Christian religion be not merely a manner of life but a life based on a message—a message that has to do with Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour in the New Testament meaning of those words—and man needs in addition to ideas and ideals relief from the guilt and power of sin in and through the God-man, it is utterly impossible to commend what is most essential to this religion by means of the movie, that, in fact, it cannot even be attempted without sacrilege. This is not to say that the movie may not be made a potent factor in shaping the culture and civilization of the future, but it is to say that it can never become a real substitute for the Bible and a witnessing Church. Here as elsewhere our basic difference with Dr. Jacobs has to do with the question, What is Christianity? What he regards as Christianity is something diametrically different from what we call Christianity. If what he calls Christianity is true, what we call Christianity is false.

We regret the necessity—provided we were to write about this book at all—of writing as we have written. Sufficient justification would seem to be afforded if it be true, as we think it is in a case like this, that "perfect candor is perfect kindness" (p. 20). Dr. Jacobs was the youngest as well as one of the most brilliant of his class. He is therefore still a relatively young man. This encourages us to hope that further thought will lead him to come to himself, that long before reaching the end of the road he will be found feeding his soul not on the husks of Liberalism, but on the fatted calf of evangelical Christianity.

An Important Archaeological Discovery

By the Rev. Prof. Oswald T. Allis, Ph.D., D.D.



AT Khorsabad, in the vicinity of ancient Ninevah, a discovery has recently been made which is of great interest to Bible students. It is a cuneiform tablet which contains the names of the ninety-five kings of Assyria whose combined reigns cover a period of about fifteen hundred years (cir. 2300-750 B. C.). The special value of this tablet lies in the fact that it is perfectly preserved and gives the length of the reigns of these kings as well as their names. It should therefore furnish the material for an exact chronology of this long period which begins several centuries before the time of Abraham and extends to the birth of Hezekiah. A good deal is already known about the chronology of this period from other sources. But the material hitherto discovered has been both fragmentary and incomplete. Just how far the new tablet will confirm the more or less tentative conclusions which have been already arrived at with regard to the chronology of the early period and to what extent it may necessitate the revision of some of them will not be known

until the tablet has been carefully studied. In any event this discovery is one of the most important that have been made in the field of ancient chronology since Rawlinson published the Eponym Canon in 1866. Chronology is the backbone of history; Assyrian chronology is the backbone of the history of Western Asia. Its importance for the Old Testament is obvious. Since this discovery was made by the expedition of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, it was a fitting and gracious act on the part of the Iraq Government to permit Professor Breasted to bring it to this country temporarily. It is to be hoped that its publication will take place in the near future.

Cooperation with the Boards and Agencies of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

By the Rev. Roy L. Aldrich

Minister, Central Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Michigan



UCH emphasis is being placed these days upon the duty of loyal Presbyterians to support the official boards and agencies of the denomination. As a loyal Presbyterian minister, I desire to point out why such support is not forthcoming from me or from the church that I serve.

My ordination vows were taken without mental reservation. I "believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice." I promised sincerely "to be zealous and faithful in maintaining the truths of the gospel, and the purity and peace of the Church; whatever persecution or opposition may arise on that account."

The Word of God teaches that Christians are not to be unequally yoked together with unbelievers. It teaches further that we are to have no official fellowship with the man who denies the doctrine of Christ.—II John 9-11. In other words the Bible teaches that to support either morally or financially, any organization, institution, or individual not believing the gospel, is a betrayal of Christ. I have tried to observe this principle and I have tried to co-operate with the boards and agencies of my denomination and behold the result. I am now an ecclesiastical anarchist.

The General Assembly continues to recommend that a certain small per cent of benevolences go to the Federal Council of Churches of Christ of America. The church I serve cannot comply with that recommendation because of the definitely modernistic personnel and program of the Federal Council.

A few years ago our Christian education money was given through the Board of Christian Education to a small Presbyterian college. The president of that college visited our church and supplied the pulpit for a Sunday. His messages were typically modernistic, and so the session immediately voted to withdraw support from that college. Now our Christian Education money goes to the Evangelical Theological College of Dallas, Texas, and to Westminster Seminary of Philadelphia—both institutions that stand clearly for evangelical truth.

The Board of Christian Education recommends certain graded lesson materials for the Sunday School. Our Sunday School cannot use these helps (?) because they are either liberal in the theology or lacking in any positive evangelical teaching. Our Sunday School has been forced to go outside of the denomination to find suitable lesson helps.

For the past two years our Women's missionary study groups have had to find their mission study books outside of the lists

recommended by the boards. The books recommended have been either definitely modernistic or lacking in the positive missionary message.

The church I serve has been a generous contributor to National Missions through the Board of National Missions. A large part of this money is spent in the local presbytery to help pay the salaries of a number of mission pastors. One of these mission pastors recently wrote me a letter containing his modernistic confession of faith. Now we shall have to make some other disposition of our national mission money, because we do not have five cents to give to the salary of a man who preaches a different gospel.

Dr. J. Gresham Machen, in his brief, "Modernism and the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.," has exposed the modernist activities of that Board. As far as I am aware, the specific criticisms in Dr. Machen's brief have never been answered by any official or representative of the Board of Foreign Missions. Dr. Cleland B. McAfee in his booklet, "The Major Christian Enterprise" in giving suggestions as to how to deal with criticisms of the missionary enterprise, writes on page 18—"Some (criticisms) can be definitely denied. Some things alleged against missionaries and missionary administrative agencies are not true." This statement by the noted secretary would lead one to believe that criticisms so widely circulated as those of Dr. Machen, would be immediately answered if not true. The fact that they have not been answered or specifically denied seems to prove that they are true.

How can wholehearted support be given to the Board of Foreign Missions when part of its work seems to be the promoting of modernism in foreign lands? How can the missionary enterprise even be supported in prayer under these conditions? The Year Book of Prayer suggests that prayer be offered for certain missionaries each day of the year. The list one day may contain the names of true gospel missionaries, but perhaps the next day we are asked to pray for some Christ-rejecting missionary like Mrs. Pearl Buck. To co-operate with the Board we must pray for the Lord's servant one day and for the Devil's servant the next day. The fact that Mrs. Buck has resigned does not alter the situation, as we have no assurance that other missionaries do not hold her views.

The General Council of the General Assembly recently sent a booklet to all pastors containing "A Plan for the Quickening and Enrichment of the Spiritual Life of the Church." Surely, it would seem, all could unite in supporting such a program. However, when we examine the list of books and pamphlets recommended as being helpful "in making the spiritual emphasis more vivid," it is soon discovered that the spiritual advance contemplated is different from anything recommended in the Word of God. The books are written either by modernists or men with no positive Christian message. For example, the book on "Evangelistic Preaching" is written by Dr. H. S. Coffin, a man who doesn't believe in evangelistic preaching as it is taught in the New Testament. Under the heading, "Leadership Training," we find a bulletin recommended which is published by the International Council of Religious Education, a notoriously modernistic organization. A study course called "Our Presbyterian Church" is written by the well known modernist and signer of the Auburn affirmation, Dr. W. T. Hanzsche. To any Bible-believing church or pastor it is evident at once that this plan for spiritual advance is not worth the paper upon which it is printed.

In the face of this continuous and ever-increasing modernistic program of our denomination, we are asked to co-operate with all the boards and agencies. *Is it not about time to ask our boards and agencies to begin to co-operate with the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church?* Either this must happen or the long delayed division in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. will be the only solution of the present complex and unsatisfactory situation.

Sunday School Lessons for April

(International Uniform Series)

Lesson for April 1, 1934

CONFESSING AND FOLLOWING CHRIST

(Lesson Text—Matt. 16:13 to 17:27. Also study Mark 8:27-29; Luke 9:18-20. Golden Text—Matt. 16:16.)

THIS lesson begins the second half of a six months' course on "The Gospel of the Kingdom." The lesson text is one of those passages of Scripture which have exerted a profound effect upon the Christian Church in every age. Christ calls upon the disciples to enlarge their own horizons of understanding of Himself. It is hard to know exactly what they have consciously thought of Him up until now. But at this moment He chooses to evoke from them what the Holy Spirit has been quietly teaching them. To Peter the impulsive the questions came: Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am? Whom say ye that I am? And Peter's reply was a recognition of Jesus as the Messiah, the Anointed One of God, the Christ. Let us note particularly here that our Lord did not deprecate being recognized as the Messiah. On the contrary, He warmly commended Peter—telling him actually that the truth of the Person of his Master had been revealed to him (Peter) by God the Father Himself!

The words "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church" have been a great source of dispute in all ages. I will not attempt to do more here than to remark that only a strange misapprehension of the whole point of this passage will cause any one to think that poor wobbling Peter is the "rock." What a rebuke Peter received only a few moments later! St. Augustine, the greatest theologian of the ancient Church, understood the rock to be, not the Papacy, but *the fact Peter confessed*, namely the Messiahship, the Deity of Christ. The Church of which Christ is the head certainly receives supernatural life flowing from His own fountain of being. In this sense it will be seen that the truth of Christ's person is a necessary fact to the very existence of a living Church. The Church is founded upon *Him as He is*, very God of very God, very man of man.

The twenty-sixth verse of the sixteenth chapter poses the inescapable, ultimate question which man hearing the Gospel must decide. And he must decide whether or not he will gain the world and lose his own soul with *self*, or lose what soon passes away in dust and ashes while he gains eternal life with Christ. What, oh *what*, shall a man give in exchange for his soul?

Lesson for April 8, 1934

THE CHILD AND THE KINGDOM

(Lesson Text—Matt. 18:1-14; 19:13-15. Also study Matt. 17:22-27; Mark 9:33-50; Luke 9:46-48; 17:1, 2; 18:4. Golden Text—Matt. 19:14.)

The tenderness of our Lord as He dealt with or about little children has made an ineffaceable portrait in the memory of man. Even those who have failed to grasp the meaning of the incarnation and the Cross have paused in reverence before Christ and the children.

Some people have taken the lesson-text as meaning that our Lord considered man as "naturally good." That this is not so is amply plain from other discourses of our Lord. His teaching that the heart of man is corrupt and in need of regeneration if it is to be made good, is clear. One cannot set up a strained interpretation of one incident against the whole tenor of our Lord's teaching.

What then was it, in childhood, that made our Lord say to His hearers "except ye . . . become as little children"? His own answer is given in the very next verse: "Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child . . ." It was the *humility* of the child, the readiness of the child to *believe*, to receive the Word of Christ without human pride or argument, that our Lord was emphasizing. If the adult, he said, were to come to God with implicit trust and humility (that is with true, unquestioning faith in God), he would by faith become a child of God.

No doubt some of the adults who were listening to the words of Christ resented them. In their hearts they said, "*We* are mature. It is better to be as we are—as these children will be when they grow up, when we have had a chance to rub off that childlike credulity of theirs." Thus they attempted to justify themselves in their own minds, and in doing so looked forward with satisfaction to the time when these children should be by their example as hardened as they. Against them, against the cynical hardness that is the offspring of sin in so many of the "wise" of this world, the flaming sword of our Lord leaped out like a destroying and revealing fire: "Who-so shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." Some people think that false teaching is merely an "academic issue." Our Lord did not consider it as such—but as a terrible sin, which, bringing destruction to His little ones, will meet with an awful and merited punishment. Why then, if we love those same little ones, are we so complacent about it?

Lesson for April 15, 1934

JESUS TEACHES FORGIVENESS

(Lesson Text—Matt. 18:15-35. Also study I Cor. 13:1-8. Golden Text—Matt. 6:12.)

Forgiveness of others is a grace much praised in speeches and much avoided in

practice. Yet it is true that the emphasis given by our Lord to this forgiveness is very great. It is not hard to see the reason for this, if we will but consider the relation of *man to God* before we think of the relation between *man and man*.

When facing God, man comes as a sinner. If he is to have any part at all in a life of fellowship with God, his sin must be removed—not his sin only as viewed as pollution, but the guilt arising from it. That means that man must receive forgiveness from God. And the forgiveness he asks for is bound to be an unmerited favor. He has no *right* to forgiveness. It is of God's free grace.

The man who seeks forgiveness of his sin must be repentant for that sin. But hatred and unforgiveness toward others is sin. It is sin even if the ones unforgiven do not deserve forgiveness. It is psychologically impossible for a man truly to ask unmerited forgiveness from God for his sin, while at the same time refusing to forgive his brother man. In such a case the repentance is not sincere.

But there are those who say: it is *hard* to forgive. Perhaps it is—sometimes desperately hard. But if one seeks forgiveness he must be ready to accord it. And if he is not ready to accord it to man he is not yet really in the place where he desires it of God.

Sometimes people confuse hatred of some sin with forgiveness of the sinner. God's hatred of sin has never changed, nor will it—yet in Christ He has provided for the forgiveness of those who have sinned against Him. We need not condone the sin in order to forgive some personal injury. A hard, unfeeling heart, that refuses to forgive a wrong while yet professing to be forgiven by Christ is a travesty upon the name of "Christian."

How can we gain a forgiving heart? Only by going to the Cross, and there seeing how much our Lord has forgiven us, and at what a cost. Then we shall see that the utmost we are called upon to forgive, compared with *what we have been forgiven*, is a very little thing.

Lesson for April 22, 1934

OUR ALL FOR THE KINGDOM

(Lesson Text—Matt. 19:1-30. Also study Mark 10:17-27; Luke 18:18-30; Psalm 50:7-15. Golden Text—Acts 20:35.)

The young man who came to Jesus was the possessor of many virtues. But these virtues were not enough to save him. Nor would his having sold all his possessions have saved him, for salvation does not come that way. The significance of his going away sorrowfully because he had great possessions, lies in the fact that he thus showed that he put the value of what he owned as greater than the value of eternal life. And if he had obeyed the request of our Lord to sell his goods and follow Him, the young man would have had ample instruction con-

cerning his own salvation from the perfect teacher.

How then is man saved? Our Lord spoke of the eye of a needle. So much empty effort has been wasted in order to show that this refers to some gate in Jerusalem through which a camel *might* squeeze. Those who follow such fantastic suppositions have missed the point of the saying—a point that is perhaps so clear that people overlook it in the search for something subtle.

A rich man cannot, says our Lord, *as such* (as a rich man) enter the Kingdom of heaven, any more than a camel, as such, can get through the eye of a needle. But do not therefore jump to the conclusion that it cannot happen (we paraphrase our Lord) because God is all-powerful, and it is possible with him that a rich man can get into heaven or a camel through the eye of a needle. How? Why, by a miracle. It is possible for God by a miracle to put the camel through that small opening that is naturally impossible to such a beast. So is it possible for God to bring a rich man into the kingdom of heaven: by a miracle of grace, namely, regeneration. In either case natural processes and results are set aside by the immediate power of God. Our Lord was showing them that salvation could not be earned, attained or achieved by man at all—that only through the power of God can the soul be regenerated and the person inscribed upon the roll of the redeemed.

Lesson for April 29, 1934

CHRIST'S STANDARD OF GREATNESS

(Lesson Text—Matt. 19:1-30. Also study Matt. 19:20-27; Mark 10:32-45; Luke 22:24-30; Heb. 1:8-12. Golden Text—Matt. 20:28.)

In the midst, or at the end, of a discourse to His disciples, warning them that He was to be betrayed and killed, our Lord was approached by a woman who "worshipped and wanted." Perhaps she worshipped only because she wanted—as many do. She wanted her children, the two sons of Zebedee (James and John) to have the foremost places in the Kingdom. Perhaps she thought it was an earthly kingdom. This scrambling for place and precedent was no new thing among the apostolic company, and although the rest of the disciples were incensed, most of them had probably been guilty of the same sort of thing.

The answer of our Lord was at once sorrowful and stern: "Ye know not what ye ask." Were they ready to endure the fate He had just predicted for Himself, to be baptized with *that* baptism, to drink of *that* cup? How glibly they replied: of course, we are ready! (Time showed how ready they were!) Yes, resumed our Lord, you *shall* endure these things that even now you fail to comprehend, but to sit beside me is not for me to give . . .

Years later the apostle wrote, "Let this mind be in you . . ." (Phil. 2:1-11). Those

words written to the Philippians were an inspired echo of what Jesus said to His disciples then: "And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."

Look to the cross, oh Christian harried by ambition: for if you remain there by faith you will learn from Christ crucified the worth of all ambition, the essence of all greatness!

The Comfort of the Scriptures

A Devotional Meditation

By the Rev. David Freeman, Th.M.

"God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." 2 Cor. 5:19.

WE do not do God any credit when we take away from Him the possibility of anger. It is only to detract from Him when we divest Him of wrath against the sinner.

Would we call a man righteous who does not know what it is to hate wrong? Is that man good whose soul does not abhor all wickedness? No. The god that men dream of, with no enmity against the sinner and all unrighteousness, is not worthy to hold in his hand the welfare and final destiny of men. Much less is he worthy of love and obedience.

The God of the Bible, who is the God of heaven and earth is One who is angry with the wicked every day; whose face is "against them that do evil," whose favor is hid from us because of our iniquities, and whose wrath "is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men."

We are glad that such is God's nature. And why do we rejoice in this knowledge of Him? Because, since it is true that we are sinners, we know that He is righteous and true. He is therefore worthy of the confidence and honor of men. There is no god that men can wish for that can com-

pare in greatness and glory with the God who has shown Himself to man in Scripture. "There is no God else beside me; a just God and a Savior; there is none beside me."

It is this character of God which makes the redeeming work of Christ so wonderful. Indeed without a proper acknowledgment of our sinfulness and God's wrath upon us, the death the Savior died can have no meaning. For it was to remove that wrath which we justly incurred that the Lord from heaven died. He can truly praise God who can say, "though Thou wast angry with me, Thine anger is turned away."

God has been pleased to provide a means of reconciliation. God urges us to adopt the reconciliation which He has Himself provided in the death of His dear Son. His mercy has provided satisfaction for us.

The reconciliation declared to us and offered to us so freely is a fact because we have been "justified by His blood." To be justified is to be restored to God's favor altogether apart from anything we have done. We have been pardoned and accepted as righteous "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Not holding anything against us, the price of sin having been paid for, He reconciles us unto Himself.

Where would be the grace of God in Christ if God's taking us into His favor as His dear children, depended upon something in us, be it inherent or acquired? It cannot be our attitude toward Him that caused Him to draw us to Himself, but rather the turning away of His anger through the blood of Christ that has brought us nigh. How can God be said to be gracious otherwise? For what could we praise Him, if He did not reconcile us? It is for this reason that we "joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Yes, this is the old way of thinking about Christ's redeeming work. Will man be able to devise a better way of salvation than what God has revealed? What better news can there be for sinners in the hands of God who is a "consuming fire" than this: "And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled." Let us rejoice in the "word of reconciliation."

Letters to the Editor

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

The Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

Sir: This is a time when all loyal Presbyterians need to stand by and encourage each other. The religious times are as much out of joint as are present economic conditions, and within our Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., there has developed what

might be called a renaissance of that frequently discredited but ever popular Humanism which either soft-pedals or ignores the supernatural element in humanity's redemption in order to give glory to the more tasty pills and potions of sociology and such like modern nostrums.

Naturally, therefore, there is no little indignation created by the militant loyalty of the group represented by your clientele and the supporters of the Westminster Theological Seminary, a loyalty to the Bible and the old Standards which fearlessly indicts and denounces these worshippers of present new-old gods, and one notes occasionally, *e. g.*, in the columns of the Nashville *Advance* and in Presbyterian gatherings evidences of that intolerance among the professedly tolerant which would deny to others the right to "obey God rather than men"!

I feel that it is only right then for me to write you this word of encouragement and congratulation on your stand! Also on your definite activities on behalf of a definite Divine Message, a message of authority and power! My conviction is that the hysteria for uniformity today, one of the pleasing fads which appropriately companies with such others as that of a Peaceful World—apart from Righteousness!—is merely an effort, thoroughly in harmony with an age that prefers regimentation to sturdy individualism, to escape from the pains, the responsibilities, and the testimony of those personal choices and tasks which play so large a part in the divinely revealed method of re-making mankind.

Thus, while I regret the possibility of schism in religious bodies, and have as much appreciation of a unified Christianity as any of my brethren, my studies in history, church and secular, show clearly that when Truth as we see it is in danger of being smothered, or so adulterated as to mislead souls, it may not only be permissible but absolutely wise and heroic to leave the flesh-pots of an ecclesiastical Egypt and seek communion with God in what worldly wiseacres may consider but a dreary wilderness.

As a child and youthful member of the Free Kirk of Scotland I was proud of an ancestry that fearlessly and sacrificially left a dead Erastian establishment, and so gave their country a new adventure in evangelical faith, and while the present unity of Presbyterianism in Scotland may suggest a triumph of the principles then fought for it is still an open question in my mind whether or not this outward unity may not prove as much or more of a spiritual soporific as of a stimulant.

So when my brethren in Presbytery rise to emphasize the disloyalty of those who seek to give the Old Gospel to the heathen, instead of feeding them on the water and sugar of modernist laboratories, I feel like reminding them that mere loyalty to an organization or to a majority may be a tenet altogether too costly to that basic religious attitude, loyalty to what a man holds is the truth of God. The Voice of the People is very seldom, if ever, the Voice of God, and certainly the history of Protestant missions, considering the huge investments of men and money in the last hun-

dred years, in spite of some rich returns, is not such but that the efficacy of the methods used may well be questioned.

And, besides these more general considerations, it has been my privilege for a number of years to note how, on this coast, in the large cities, to note the differences so obvious between results gained by preaching the faith of our fathers and that esthetic, sociologized substitute so freely dished out nowadays from leading pulpits. That there is a "famine of the word" in many such churches is shown by diminishing attendance, in spite of the emphasis on the esthetic, popular features, *e. g.*, dramas, candlelight services, question boxes, etc., and by the growing tide of attendance on old-fashioned Gospel Tabernacles. In San Diego I found that it was to such places, neither built for ease nor beauty, that the common people flock, and in this Bay region the same fact is equally evident. Thus I do not know of a single Presbyterian Church or that of any other leading denomination in this Gospel-needy section which attracts anything like a full congregation at night services, yet in such a plain structure as the Gospel Temple, in an undesirable neighborhood, one finds an overflowing congregation! The Gospel as preached there is of the primitive type, that some might list as an uncultured presentation, but it is dynamic, it brings results, it produces a spiritual ferment which carries on every day and night in the year, and so proves itself to be vastly more soul-satisfying than the medicated matter served in temples much more attractive outwardly and in worship forms.

"Facts are chieftains that winna ding" is a good Scotch saying, and these facts prove—not suggest!—that our "modern gospel" has lost its salty savour—and that the people know it! Also that the Bible Salvation, when preached with fire and evident conviction, even if culture and calmness be wanting, has a drawing and holding power for folks who have felt the power of Sin and realize the need of a Greater Power.

So while I have considerable respect for the learning and good intentions of our modernist leaders—I received my two degrees from what might be called an up-to-date modernist Seminary in Berkeley—their obvious trend towards Humanism, their lack of faith in God's Word, and their lack of success in having a sturdy stirring message for these tragic days, prove to me only too well that "the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God" and utterly fails to put the strength or character into men's hearts, a lack which has assuredly greatly contributed to the confusion and defeatism so evident today in our political and religious circles.

So I wish you and the Seminary God-

speed; follow the Light, and with a good conscience towards God and men, carry on!

Yours for The Truth,

ROBERT C. MCADIE, B.D., S.T.M.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

P. S.—I should say also that my first two years in Seminary were spent in Princeton—where Greene and Warfield dispensed solid Presbyterianism.—R. C. M.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY,

Sir: In your December issue, page 15, column 2, second paragraph, we read "I did not say absolutely impossible—but impossible to the 'natural man.' It is *not* impossible to the redeemed man who, born again, lives in the grace of God by the power of the Spirit."

Of course, no work of MAN is absolutely perfect, but if you will set forth that degree to which it is possible to attain in our appropriating this life "in the grace of God by the power of his Spirit," and what we may expect to arrive at in this day and age in our sonship to God, it should be a help to many of your readers, and an incentive to some who may be content to live on a very low plane.

Yours truly,

THOS. F. CUMMINGS.

WHITE PLAINS, N. Y.

To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

Sir: I cannot refrain from writing and expressing my deep appreciation and admiration of your magazine and your unswerving fidelity to "the Truth as it is in Christ Jesus." I look forward to receiving my copy each month and only wish it were possible for me to place it in the hands of many more.

I graduated from Princeton in '29 just before the flood—of "pink" Modernism and inclusive policy methods began through the merging of the boards. As with many others I was sick at heart to see such a bulwark of the Faith taken over bag and baggage by those who "have a form of godliness but deny the power thereof."

But I rejoice to learn through your paper of the splendid progress being made by Westminster Theological Seminary, begun by that scholarly giant and truly Christian gentleman, Dr. J. Gresham Machen. I heartily concur with your belief that there is not another seminary in the country that outranks Westminster in scholarship, for I have had the privilege of sitting under such men of God as Drs. Wilson, Machen, Allis and Van Til and none can surpass them in their intellectual attainments. But withal they have that God-given faith that is so surely needed in a faithless church today.

It warms my heart to note the way in which you expose the fallacious reasoning and shallow thinking of those who struggle desperately to carry water on both shoulders. I was present at Trenton last spring

when Dr. Machen and Dr. Speer spoke. The latter appealed again and again to the General Assembly as his authority while the former kept reiterating the truth "The Bible says this" and appealed to the authority of the Scriptures again and again. If I read my church history aright I learn that one of the false dogmas fought and denied by the Reformers was the doctrine of "papal infallibility." Luther before the prelates of the church went beyond any and all edicts of councils or assemblies or popes and rested his case on the Scriptures themselves. Clearly does it seem to be a case of "reversion to type" these days!

Coming events are casting their shadows before not only in your denomination but others. The policies of "hush-hush," "mid-

dle-of-the-road" "peace-at-any-price" will not be tolerated very much longer by the thinking Christian layman. The wool has been pulled over his eyes once too often, and if the Lord tarries in these dark days, there will be other groups of Covenanters similar to those of Scotland in days gone by who will band themselves together in total and utter repudiation of the lukewarm, Laodicean church of the day who is selling her Lord all over again for thirty pieces of silver.

Yours for the "Faith once for all delivered to the saints."

DAVID OTIS FULLER,
Pastor Chelsea Baptist Church,
Atlantic City.

I John 5:20; Rev. 1:5, 7.

News of the Church

Correspondence, General

Denver and Vicinity

By the Rev. H. Claire Welker, Th.M.

A LARGE proportion of our churches observed Christian Endeavor week in some appropriate manner. Most of those observing the week held special young people's services on Sunday evening, February 4th.

Under the auspices of the Denver Goodwill Committee, a Jewish rabbi, a Roman Catholic priest and a Protestant minister "joined hands" in leading the monthly discussion before the Denver Ministerial Alliance on February 5th. The discussion was in the interest of "greater understanding and amity" among the respective faiths. The Rev. E. J. Hendrix of our Capitol Heights Church, Denver, represented Protestantism. Unfortunately we still labor under the delusion that there is some way of attaining unto peace and good-will among men other than that announced by the angels to the shepherds of Bethlehem.

The Rev. Steele D. Goodale, pastor of the Yuma (Col.) Church, recently conducted a two weeks' series of special evangelistic services in the South Broadway Church, Denver, the Rev. G. Henry Green, pastor.

Dr. Martin E. Anderson recently celebrated the completion of his seventh year as pastor of Denver Central. During this pastorate over 2,600 names have been added to the church roll and approximately \$275,000 has been contributed by the congregation to Missionary and benevolent causes.

Montview Church, Denver, the Rev. Wm. L. Barrett, D.D., pastor, is preparing for its annual "membership rally" to be held on March 11th. Bishop Irving P. Johnson of the Protestant Episcopal Church, diocese of Colorado, is to be the guest speaker.

The Rev. Perry V. Jenness, D.D., stalwart defender of the faith and one of the most accomplished Bible expositors and teachers of this whole region, presented a review of

"Re-Thinking Missions" before the Women's Service League of the Twenty-third Avenue Church, Dr. Robert Karr, pastor, on March 1st. Incidentally, the writer would like to add that he has heard very enthusiastic reports of the way in which Dr. Jenness wrought confusion among the "Re-Thinkers" who recently visited Denver under the auspices of the "National Committee for the Presentation of the Foreign Missions Inquiry"—a committee which, according to Dr. J. F. Shepherd, includes the names of one member of our Board of National Missions, two of our Board of Christian Education and one of our Board of *Foreign Missions*.

BRIGHTON, COLO.

Minnesota and Wisconsin Letter

By the Rev. H. Warren Allen

ONE of the outstanding events of the past month was the visit of Dr. J. Gresham Machen to Minneapolis, under the auspices of the Minnesota chapter of the League of Evangelical Students. Speaking a number of times on the campus and three times on Sunday, Bethany Church in the morning, the First Presbyterian Church in the evening and at First Baptist in the evening, Dr. Machen was at his best. The writer was especially impressed with his message on Sunday afternoon, speaking on, "He that is not for me is against me." No one could hear his message and be true to the Word of God and any longer sit on the fence.

The Moderator, Dr. John McDowell, spoke at the Westminster Presbyterian Church under the auspices of the Presbyterian Union. The trend of his message was that "The Church must make it clear that the Christianity of Christ is a way of life for the individual and a law of life for Society."

The Glen Lake Church of Minnesota have called the Rev. C. J. Auerbach of the South

Church of Chicago. The installation of the Rev. Leonard Wittles at the Coleraine Bovey Church, Minn., took place on February 7th. Dr. George Dowey who directed the Loyalty Crusade in Minnesota and was conducting a similar one in Omaha, Neb., is now in the hospital at Chicago undergoing an operation. The Duluth Presbytery passed a resolution of confidence in the Foreign Missionary Board. Rabbi Minda supplied the pulpit of the Rev. Morris Robinson of Grace Church, Minneapolis, during his two weeks' illness. The Rev. Daniel Kerr has recovered from a very serious illness. He is located at East Grand Forks. The House of Hope Church of St. Paul held a farewell social for the Rev. and Mrs. Frederick Mills, who have been supplying the Church in the absence of a regular pastor.

The Presbytery of Minneapolis met at Calvary Presbyterian Church on February 5th and 6th. A memorial service was held for the Rev. Stanley Roberts, the Rev. T. Ross Paden and the Rev. D. Edward Evans. A report of the Christian Education Committee revealed that seven out of thirteen churches did not use Presbyterian publications in the Sunday School in the senior and adult departments. An offering was taken for needy ministers in South Dakota. The standing rules of the Presbytery are being revised. The appointing of the executive secretary of the extension board on every committee aroused considerable discussion and was finally changed. Many pastors are rejoicing in the fact that Christian Endeavor is in the hands of conservative leaders in the State of Minnesota and conversions are being reported in many churches throughout the State.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

News from Detroit and Vicinity

By the Rev. Roy L. Aldrich,
Minister Central Presbyterian Church

DR. J. GRESHAM MACHEN preached at the Central Presbyterian Church Sunday, February 11th. Sunday afternoon Dr. Machen's topic was: "The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions: Why It Exists and What It Is Endeavoring to Do." The message was well received by an audience representing several Presbyterian churches of Detroit. Monday at a luncheon Dr. Machen met with a group of pastors and church officers to discuss the independent Board and to answer questions. Several of the modernist brethren were present and sought to embarrass Dr. Machen with questions, but as someone commented after the meeting, "Dr. Machen was too many for them."

Dr. Joseph Vance, pastor of the First Church, is the speaker this week for the pre-Easter noon hour services promoted by the Detroit Council of Churches.

The Central Presbyterian Church, the Rev. Roy L. Aldrich pastor, recently closed a very successful Bible conference under

the leadership of **Dr. Thomas M. Chalmers**, director of the New York Jewish Evangelization Society.

DETROIT

Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky

By the Rev. Gerard H. Snell

Cincinnati Presbytery

ONE hundred and sixty trustees representing more than forty churches in this Presbytery met Sunday afternoon, February 4th, with the **Rev. Herman C. Weber** of New York, Director of the Every Member Canvass Department of the Presbyterian Church, to discuss church finances and more particularly the every member canvass. A summary of the conclusions of the conference would be that the canvass should be less of a business proposition and more of an act of worship. Practical suggestions made were that pledge cards ought to be worded into non-legal and more spiritual terms; that publicity ought to present the items in a church's budget as spiritual program items rather than bills payable or obligations due; that canvassers should go out not to beg or solicit but to boost and create enthusiasm for the program of the church.

Among other methods for the obtaining of pledges it was noted that some churches made the pledging part of a communion service; and that others have experimented with processions to the chancel or communion table to deposit pledges with the use of musical features.

Ways of preparation for this service were discussed. A friendly visitation during the preceding week, a telephone campaign on Friday and Saturday, arrangements for the transportation of those who could not otherwise come, were among the suggestions.

Cincinnati Presbytery has gone on record as opposing the plan of the "Goodwin Corporation." At its January meeting it also reaffirmed the resolutions of the Cincinnati Federation of Churches concerning this project for money-raising. Because of the widespread discussion on this subject the resolutions are of considerable interest. They are as follows:

"The Committee of three of the Federation of Churches, after a careful study of the Goodwin Plan as presented in the literature of the Corporation, the analyses of several leading religious journals, and the official actions of numerous groups of clergymen and laymen composing church and social service units, presents the following report:

"1. The Goodwin Corporation proposes to enlist church organizations, which are not organized or maintained for profit, in the promotion of a commercial enterprise organized for private profit.

"2. The Goodwin Corporation employs church organizations to promote the sale of arbitrarily selected merchandise in unjust

discrimination against other equally meritorious merchandise.

"3. The plan promotes trade monopoly that favors rich and powerful corporations as opposed to the interests of smaller local enterprises.

"4. The Goodwin creed of social justice falls short of established governmental standards and accepted Christian social ideals, as, for example, in omitting the principle of collective bargaining.

"5. Cincinnati's experience already has shown the danger of adopting for a price the brands listed by the Goodwin Corporation at the cost of alienating churchmen and fellow-citizens whose brands are not listed.

"Church women's organizations which accepted the Goodwin Plan before its full implications were realized will understand that their first obligation is to uphold the honor of their churches and the fair dealing of Christian people with all men against the commercialization of religion.

"The historic Christian method of supporting churches is by the willing gifts and labors of Christian people. When civil government and public education are supported by a free people voluntarily taxing themselves, the churches are not wise to lose faith in the adequate voluntary support of religious people so far as to follow lower financial ideals than state and school rely upon for support."

CINCINNATI, OHIO

Western Pennsylvania Letter

By the Rev. H. J. Ockenga

A GREAT servant of the church, **Dr. W. A. Jones**, pastor for twenty-six years of the Knoxville Presbyterian Church and associate pastor for eighteen years of the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, has been seriously ill for some time. The prayers of his friends have been offered in his behalf. The Presbytery of Pittsburgh would not be the same without **Dr. Jones**. He has served it ably as clerk for a long time. A former moderator of the synod and a staunch evangelical, it is our hope that God will spare him to exert his splendid influence over a long period.

The much loved and honored treasurer of the Presbytery, **Mr. George D. Edwards**, a true descendant of **Jonathan Edwards**, passed away January 22d. His place is to be occupied by **Mr. Peter S. Space** of the First Church. Due to the decease of **Thomas S. Brown, Esq.**, **Mr. Hallock C. Sherrard** of Shadyside Church was elected Attorney for the Board of Trustees.

A new church called the Paul Presbyterian has been organized in Pittsburgh. It has been a mission for some time, but now with a roll of one hundred and seventy charter members has been placed on the roster of churches of the Presbytery. In a day when some churches are closing their doors this is encouraging.

Every year the Young People's organizations of the Pittsburgh churches and the Y. M. C. A. unite to hold an enormous sunrise service on Flagstaff Hill Easter morning. The first year seven thousand attended; the second year ten thousand; and the third year in a driving rain three thousand gathered in a neighboring church. This year over fifteen thousand are expected. **Dr. Schuyler E. Garth** will speak. Like the sunrise service of Atlantic City it adds a wholesome touch to the city life.

Throughout the country a series of Roman Catholic Conferences of Industrial Problems are rousing interest. Certainly it is an admirable move on the part of that church to place the knowledge of the best informed economists, educators, manufacturers, and clergymen at the service of the people. In the opinion of the writer it is increasingly incumbent upon the church to assist the troubled laymen in this hour. The light of the eternal Gospel and its ethics must be thrown upon our economic and political situation. Without such preaching and teaching the foundations of democracy, already badly cracked, will be utterly destroyed. I am convinced that the church was partly to blame in making possible a Russian revolution. Today it must sound the note of warning and of reformation in ethics as well as doctrine or it will lose more of its influence and our country will move toward absolutism as have other nations.

William R. Newell, the author of a helpful study on Romans and formerly assistant superintendent of the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago, has been conducting Bible Exposition Campaigns in and around Pittsburgh. His messages are able, sound, and inspirational. Western Seminary trustees have invited the **Rev. R. Birch Hoyle** of Great Britain to fill the vacancy left by **Dr. D. MacKenzie**, who went to Princeton. He will take up his work in the fall.

PITTSBURGH

Eastern Pennsylvania Letter

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

MR. CHARLES J. WOODBRIDGE, secretary of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, created great enthusiasm by his address on February 28th in the Beacon Church, Philadelphia. Born in China, a former teacher on the faculty of Nanking University, **Dr. Woodbridge** recently returned from his work in Africa to assume the secretaryship of the new Board. His splendid abilities as a speaker are combined with a first-hand knowledge of the facts and a sincere devotion to the truth.

Philadelphia Presbytery on March 6th admitted the **Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.**, from the Presbytery of New Brunswick, by a roll-call vote of 78 to 45. A determined attempt to exclude him was made by a group of presbyters, but since

his call was in perfect order and his theological position impeccable, they could muster comparatively few votes. A motion to make the vote unanimous offered by **Dr. Alex. MacColl**, liberal leader, was tabled at **Dr. Machen's** own request in order to avoid embarrassment to any of his opponents who might be conscientiously opposed to it. Others admitted were the **Rev. Fred S. Piper**, who accepted a call to the West Park Church, Philadelphia; the **Rev. W. Van Dusen**, from China, and the **Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge**, from Corisco Presbytery, West Africa. Arrangements were made to ordain **J. Charles McKerachan**, of the Tioga Church, now supplying at Ashland, N. J., on March 15th, and **William F. LeSeour**, of Calvin Church, on March 7th. Dismissals from the presbytery included the **Rev. George Kane**, of McDowell Memorial Church to West Jersey Presbytery; the **Rev. J. William Smith** to Philadelphia North, and the **Rev. Charles E. Wideman** to New Brunswick. **Hobart Childs** of Tenth Church, and **Jack Zandstra** of Hollond Memorial were taken under the care of presbytery, while **William Edgar** of Union Tabernacle was licensed to preach. The **Rev. Joseph A. Hamilton** at his request was discontinued as Stated Supply of Tennent Church, Philadelphia, and **Dr. William P. Fulton** appointed Moderator.

Of the five items of the docket announced on the call, only two were reached. Postponed items include the presentation of pensions, a report on unemployed ministers, and the "Griffiths overture" on church union, as well as the annual report of the Trustees of Presbytery. A resolution offered by **Dr. Littell**, whitewashing the Board of Foreign Missions, and deprecating the forming of "any new board," was laid on the table until the April meeting, which should be a busy one. Since Philadelphia sent up an overture complaining of the Board just a year ago, 57 to 16, it is unlikely that the resolution will be adopted. The **Rev. A. H. Simpson** preached the dedicatory sermon at the dedication of the new building of the Newtown Church on March 4th. The **Rev. Jacob A. Long**, the church's pastor, presided at the ceremony.

PHILADELPHIA

Delaware-Maryland Notes

By the *Rev. Henry G. Welbon*

THE Rev. Charles H. Bohner, pastor of Hanover Presbyterian Church, Wilmington, has had to take a leave of absence from his field for nine months on account of his ill health. The **Rev. Colin C. Weir** has been made the stated supply during the pastor's absence.

A number of churches in the Presbytery have been holding special meetings. The First Presbyterian Church of Newark, the **Rev. H. Everett Hallman**, pastor, and the Presbyterian Church of Delaware City, the **Rev. Franklin Stevens**, pastor, were among

those that observed the Week of Prayer. Other churches are preparing for evangelistic meetings to precede the Easter season.

At the West Presbyterian Church, Wilmington, a missionary rally was held on February 28th. **Dr. Robert E. Speer**, Senior Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions, was the speaker. He spoke on "The Missionary Trust of the Presbyterian Church." The gist of the first part of the message was that the missionaries of the past were faithful and courageous workers. They were said to have seen no difference in the alleged humanitarian and supernatural gospels of today. Our fathers built up a great work on the foreign fields. What are we going to do with these instruments? They are our trust. It was said the Board is facing the most tragic situation in the history of missions. The last part of the message dealt with the four things which could be done to prevent further deficits and the one thing which must be done, referred to by the correspondent of Western Pennsylvania in the December issue of this paper. It was disappointing that no reference was made to the faithfulness of the present missionary force to that trust which was so wisely and faithfully built up by those of the past. Nor was any evidence presented to show that the Board was keeping its great trust by refusing to be, "unequally yoked with unbelievers." There is a danger in this section, as well as in others, of worshipping past glories, and bygone achievements. The motto on the book-plate of William Penn is to the point here, "While I hold to glory, let me hold to right."

In view of the clear presentation of the false teachings of Buchmanism in *The Sunday School Times* and in this paper, it was with some degree of surprise that this writer read a certain item in an official sheet from the Board of Foreign Missions entitled, "Christians At Work In Other Lands." This item begins, "A young Chinese in Chefoo, after reading, 'For Sinners Only,' surrendered his life to the Lord. He rises every morning at six o'clock for his quiet time and is radiantly living in the joy and strength that come to him in the early hours." It is strange indeed that anyone on our Board would say that this book by one of the leaders of Buchman was the means by which a person was brought to Christ. In former days it was considered that only by the preaching or reading of the Word were sinners saved. To present such items when our Board is under fire for its modernism shows to us that the Board is without fear, but *not* without reproach.

The blind radio singer and evangelist, the **Rev. Robert Frazer** spoke at the Presbyterian Church in Elkton, Maryland. The **Rev. W. W. Thompson** is the pastor.

NEWARK, DEL.

The Presbyterian Church in Canada

By *T. G. M. B.*

SAULT STE. MARIE, a city of about 23,000 in Northern Ontario, had two Presbyterian churches in 1925 despite the large Roman Catholic population. St. Andrew's, near the business centre, voted 399 to 329 to enter the United Church, and the minority built a new church, Westminster, which now has 532 members and a debt of only twenty-five thousand dollars. St. Paul's Church a mile away is burdened with almost as heavy a debt on the property which they retained by a vote of 169 to 143 in 1925. There are now 335 members at St. Paul's and 57 at West Korah, a rural church in the charge. Recently a fire made a new organ and redecoration necessary at St. Paul's, but under the ministry of the **Rev. Chas. G. Boyd**, ordained last year after graduation from Knox College, brighter days ahead may be expected. The **Rev. E. B. Horne, D.D.**, the minister at Westminster, is an able preacher who was many years minister in Renfrew.

The minister at Ailsa Craig in London Presbytery, the **Rev. James D. Smart, Ph.D.** (Toronto), contributed "A New Approach to the 'Ebed Yahweh Problem'" to the January number of "Expository Times" of Edinburgh. **Dr. Smart** graduated from Knox College in 1929 and then studied Semitic languages in Marburg, Berlin and Toronto Universities. The enrollment at The Presbyterian College, Montreal, is 51; 28 in theology and 23 in arts. The graduating class includes **J. Cathcart, W. L. Detlor, M.A., F. D. Douglas, B.A., J. W. Foote, G. L. Fulford, B.A., W. L. MacLellan, B.A., J. H. Patterson, B.A., and Ronald Rowat, B.A.**

The **Rev. John D. Anderson, D.D.**, St. Edward's Church, Beauharnois, Que.; the **Rev. H. B. Ketchen, D.D.**, MacNab Church, Hamilton; the **Rev. S. B. Nelson, D.D.**, Knox Church, Hamilton, and the **Rev. W. H. Andrews, D.D.**, Queen East, Toronto, have held these pastorates since 1897, 1905, 1906 and 1907, respectively. The **Rev. E. D. McLaren, D.D.**, Vancouver, was ordained in 1873, and is a Queen's graduate. Other retired ministers ordained more than fifty years are **Dr. Hugh McKellar**, the **Revs. R. J. Craig, A. F. MacGregor, H. Cameron, A. S. Stewart, G. D. Bayne, W. G. Hanna, James Ross** and **D. G. Cameron**. The **Rev. S. C. Graeb**, 1883, is minister at Grand Valley, Ont.

Mr. William Thomas, M.A., second year man at Montreal College, has been invited to Cooke's Church, Toronto, from Kydd Memorial Church, Montreal. He is an outstanding Evangelical preacher. **Dr. Thomas Eakin** of Knox College received a unanimous invitation to supply Rosedale Church, Toronto, recently. The **Rev. W. J. Pellow** has accepted a call to Parkview Church, Saskatoon, and **Dr. A. A. Murray**, a New Zealander, has been inducted at Sydney, N. S. TORONTO

Scottish Letter

*By the Rev. Prof. Donald Maclean, D.D.,
Free Church College, Edinburgh*

A STRICTER observance of the Lord's Day is seriously needed in Scotland at the present time. Modern methods of locomotion on land, sea and in the air have not been consecrated to the glory of God. The sanctity of the Day of Rest has been invaded by these products of man's inventive skill so deeply that not even the remotest village in Scotland is free from their devastating influence on the Christian necessities of Rest and Worship. The general community has been so led by a spacious toleration, which was characteristic of the theologies of yesterday, that an oppressive apathy has been warping itself round the conscience of the people.

But, as the Rev. R. J. Drummond, D.D. (ex-Moderator of the Church of Scotland) said yesterday, "there was a rising tide of protest against Sabbath desecration in all its forms gathering throughout the land."

The Lord's Day Observance Association, which was a few years ago reconstructed from the surviving remains of similar old societies, has been educating and stirring the consciences of the Christian people of Scotland.

One of its first efforts at restrictive legislation is now framed into a bill which asks for the closing of trading shops on the Lord's Day. This bill has been sponsored by a number of Scottish members of Parliament, the most active of whom are Mr. D. M. Mason, P.P., and Mr. J. C. M. Guy, M.P., representing Edinburgh constituencies. The bill has the hearty and unanimous approval of Scottish Presbyterianism. The bill is to be read the second time in the House of Commons on the 9th March.

A magnificent meeting attended by over 2,000 people was held in the Usher Hall, Edinburgh, on Friday evening, 16th February, to encourage the Scottish representatives in the House of Commons in their support of the bill. The chairman of the meeting was the Rev. Daniel Lamont, D.D., Professor of Apologetics in the New College, Edinburgh. His remarks had a refreshing ring of conviction, and they were delivered with sustained ability. "They were there," he said, "as citizens who knew their own minds, and who had a deep concern, without any ulterior motive, financial or otherwise, for the welfare of the Scottish people. They were aiming at preventing a situation arising in which it would be harder than ever for people to call their souls their own. Scottish public opinion," he continued, "was overwhelmingly in favour of a wise and fair legislative restriction of Sunday trading. Whatever it might be elsewhere, Scotland desired that Sunday should be singled out from the other days of the week as the day of rest. If it could not be that for every one—and it could not be—

they could yet try to secure that the community as a whole were not robbed of it. The old Scottish law against Sunday trading still stood upon the Statute Book. It had never been repealed. It was not a dead letter except in the sense that the authorities were shy of enforcing it under present conditions. They admitted that the old law needed amendment so that it might assume a form in which it would be honoured by public opinion and enforced as every law should be enforced."

The other speakers were equally emphatic. One of the M. P.'s shot a retort to an interrupter, "No retreat from this bill"—which crisply expressed the intention of the meeting.

EDINBURGH

Irish Letter

By S. W. Murray

A FEW Groupers visited Belfast and Londonderry the last week in January. Frank Raynor with "Peter" Fletcher and others addressed a few meetings in connection with the Methodist Church. While there was a "stirring-up" at the time, it is doubtful that the movement will have any very widespread influence in the North of Ireland. From all appearances it looks as if many of the present generation of Methodists regard it as a substitute for the old Methodist class meeting.

Close on the heels of the Groupers followed the Young People's Convention in the Wellington Hall, Belfast (February 3-9). This is an Interdenominational and Evangelical Convention organized by a committee most of whose members are under 30 years of age. The speakers at the convention were Mr. Montague Goodman (London), the Rev. T. Christie Innes, M.A. (London), Mr. T. B. Rees (Children's Special Service Mission), and Capt. Reginald Wallis. The convention services were well attended, the proportion of young people being very high. On the closing night which was in every way the high water-mark of the Convention, about 1500 people were present. Mr. Goodman gave a series of afternoon Bible readings on "The Sermon on the Mount." During the Convention week the Rev. T. Christie Innes addressed meetings of students in Queen's University Assembly's College and Edgehill Theological College (Methodist). On Friday, February 9th, in Ravenhill Presbyterian Church, the Rev. Mr. Innes married Miss Anna H. Grant, M.A., also a graduate of Aberdeen University. She is a former president of the Aberdeen University Evangelical Union.

At the February meetings of the Presbyteries the Rev. T. M. Johnstone, B.A., Newington Church, Belfast, was nominated for the Moderatorship of the Irish Presbyterian Church. Twenty-four Presbyteries out of 33 nominated Mr. Johnstone, this being the

largest vote of recent years for any candidate for this office. A significant feature of the vote was that Mr. Johnstone was the "unofficial candidate," his election being secured in face of a strong official "pull." T. M.—to use his popular title is the energetic Convenor of the Assembly's Committee on Temperance.

News received from the Rev. James McCameron, M.A., of the Irish Presbyterian Mission, Newchwang, Manchuria, tells of much progress in spite of great difficulties. Baptisms during the year in the Newchwang District exceeded 400. The Newchwang Bible Training School which trains Chinese pastors and evangelists has had a very successful fourth year. The school is interdenominational and strongly Evangelical. More than 60 per cent of the subscriptions for the School comes from Chinese supporters, and a high spiritual tone is evident in the student body which now exceeds 90. The student life is characterized by a deep prayerfulness and a keen evangelistic spirit. The principalship of the school is at present vacant.

There has been widespread regret at the death on February 25th of Dr. James Hunter Gillespie of Belfast following a motor accident near London. Dr. Gillespie, who was only 27 years of age, had a brilliant academic career, graduating M.B. (Honours) in 1930, B.Sc. (Honours) and M.D. (with Gold Medal) in 1933. He was a former President of the Queen's University Bible Union and took an active part in Christian work. Dr. Gillespie is the son of Dr. J. R. Gillespie and a nephew of the Rev. James Hutton, M.A., both of Belfast. He was a member of Knock Evangelical Church, Belfast.

BELFAST, IRELAND

Netherlands Letter

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

THE execution of Marius van der Lubbe, the incendiary of the building of the parliament at Berlin, has excited much indignation in the Netherlands, that is to say, everybody assents that the crime was a great one, and therefore a severe punishment was quite righteous. But van der Lubbe was condemned according to a law, which did not yet exist at the moment of his crime. Moreover he was half blind, sick, and psychopathic. The Dutch people is embittered that the petition of its government to investigate the punishment and—after the execution—to deliver the corpse to the family was refused by the German minister. I should not speak about this political and international affair here, if it had not a theological side. Capital punishment has long since been abolished in Holland. One of the arguments against it was always that it might be applied to a person

who does not deserve it, and then the injustice cannot be remedied. Christian people on the contrary, always pleaded for the restoration, because it is a claim of the law of God. And they will not agree with their adversaries, that the case of *van der Lubbe* clearly demonstrates that things must remain as they are.

The 17th of January was a great day in the history of the theological school of the Reformed Churches at Kampen. The professor of Dogmatics, **Dr. A. L. Honig**, who has been a professor since 1903, in retiring delivered an address on the treatment of the canons of Dort in the latter part of the 18th and the first part of the 19th century. He stopped at the new edition of the Canons given by **Hendirk de Cock**, the father of the great secession of 1834, the centenary of which will be celebrated this very year. **Professor Honig** is much beloved by the reformed people in consequence of his loyalty to the Word of God and his amiability. He has instructed many generations of students and has written works concerning the Scriptures and against modern German theology.

His successor is the well-known **Dr. K. Schilder**, who entered upon his office on the same day by giving an address upon the theology of existentiality [i. e. Barthian theology] and the theology of the Word accepted by faith. We had also on this day the inaugural address of **Dr. G. A. den Hartogh** (the successor of **N. H. Bouman**, professor of ecclesiastical history and law, who died in 1933), on the law of government as a fundamental of ecclesiastical law. The theological school has now again a complete number of professors.

I should not omit mentioning that **Prof. H. H. Kuyper**, who occupies the chair of ecclesiastical history and law at the Free University at Amsterdam has been seriously ill during a long period. But now he is recovered and has resumed both his lectures and the editorship of his famous journal, "De Heraut." Nevertheless, **Prof. Kuyper**, who is about seventy years old, has tendered his resignation to take effect in October of this year. So, Holland now wants three professors of ecclesiastical history. In one of my former letters I commemorated the death of **Prof. Eckhof**, of Leiden. **Prof. Cramer** at Utrecht will also be seventy years old this year. In Leiden the government has not yet appointed a successor to **Prof. Eckhof**. People suppose that it is the intention of the government to unite the chairs at Leiden and Utrecht as a measure of economy? I am not able to say whether this rumor is true. Soon time will make it known. At any rate the Free University needs a new, reformed professor of ecclesiastical history.

AMSTERDAM

"Fillers"

have no place in the columns of *Christianity Today*. The whole paper is devoted to getting to Christian people the facts concerning the progress of the Gospel today and to upbuilding them in their most holy faith. Where can you get so much in a Christian paper for a dollar a year? Or for twice that amount? We challenge comparison. Renew today, subscribe if you are not yet on our growing list, tell your friends!

Letter from Melbourne, Australia

By *Rev. H. T. Rush (Secretary Bible Union of Victoria)*.

THE confusion that exists in much of the religious thought of Australia, has been manifest in the controversy over the teachings of **Prof. Angus**—outside the arena of debate as well as within it. A popular Methodist missionary of Melbourne quotes largely from the book, "Jesus in the Lives of Men," by **Dr. Angus**. Apparently he endorses the opinions of the book. He also echoes a gibe at the intolerance of evangelicals. There is little new in the book. We are told that Jesus "has pitted insight against tradition, spiritual penetration against external authority, and eternal principles against rules of ethics." Much might be said but only one or two things can be noted here. If by external authority is meant the Bible and the Christ of the Bible, then over against the authority of the Holy Spirit in His Word, attested by type, prophecy, the harmony of Scripture, the accumulated experience of believers in every age; a weight of other evidence manifold in its nature, added to greatly in this age and that has satisfied many of the world's finest intellects and of which apparently the Modernist knows little, we have a "spiritual penetration" which has given to us "another Jesus"—a confused and elusive concept, the product of a fast and loose treatment of the Word of God, but largely subjective in its nature. Bearing in mind that there are certain words and phrases that frequently recur in Modernism it seems to have authority, but it is only one among many classes in the medley of religious opinions today.

Besides, the Modernist repudiates the "static," hence we do not know if he will ever arrive at anything stable enough to build upon. This is shown by another writer to a religious paper who says that "truth will ever continue to be one thing to one generation and another thing to another."

Still another describes the memorable debate in the Presbyterian General Assembly, Melbourne, as "the wholesome friction of the Assembly!"

On the other side is a fine pamphlet by the **Rev. F. Hagenaeur** Presbyterian minister of Melbourne in which he shows that the friends of **Dr. Angus** have no supreme standard, an able sermon by the **Rev. W. D. Jackson** of Collin's St. Baptist Church, Melbourne; a third deliverance by the **Rev. W. D. McEwen** of Taree, N. S. Wales, and an article in the Church of Christ organ. In all these the issues are clearly stated.

The Bible Union of W. Australia is doing work. The **Rev. G. Tulloch** is the enthusiastic president and is well supported by the **Rev. C. Urquhart** and others. **Pastor Raymond** is secretary.

MELBOURNE

Korea Letter

By *the Rev. Bruce F. Hunt*

SEVERAL actions, which strengthen one's confidence in the self-propagating Korean church, were taken at the recent meeting of the West Pyëngyang An Presbytery, one of the stronger presbyteries of the church: (1) It was voted to appoint a committee to confer with missionaries in regard to the problem which is arising due to the pressure from the government upon Christians to attend ceremonies where sacrifices are made to the spirits of dead soldiers; (2) They voted to continue the support of a home missionary doing work among the Koreans in Manchuria; (3) They voted that the members of the boards of directors of all schools under the jurisdiction of churches in the Presbytery be baptized members of the church and in good standing.

The placing of a copy of the translation of *John Greenfield's* devotional book, "Power from On High," into every one of the 3,700 churches of Korea has been made possible by a gift to the Christian Literature Society from an unnamed donor.

Two hundred and eighty-five men are enrolled in the *Chairyung Bible Institute* this winter.

Vol. 1, No. 1, of "Pyeng Yang News," a very interesting and inspiring four-page missionary news bulletin, "published by the Pyeng Yang Station of the Chosen Mission of the Presbyterian church," December, 1933, has just come to your correspondent's desk and he would like to tell the world. The largest number of missionaries of any one denomination working in one place are said to be found in Pyeng Yang Station.

Over sixty young women were enrolled in the *Junior Bible Institute for women*, held in *Taiku* this past fall. **Mrs. Lloyd Henderson** has been appointed dean of the institute; and classes were held in the fine new Women's Bible Institute plant which was completed last summer.

CHUNGJU, KOREA

China Letter

By the Rev. Albert B. Dodd

IT is a pleasure to announce the opening of the Real Faith Press at Nanking by Mr. Jonathan Hsu and his three brothers. In these unsettled times, it certainly calls for "real faith" to enter upon such a project. With so much rank theological poison being poured out upon the Church under the name of Christian literature, dangerously mixed with much that is wholesome, many of the evangelical leaders in the Chinese Church, as Mr. Hsu states, have been "determined to have a press owned and controlled by those who are true to the Word." "We felt," he continues, "that the condition of our Christian literature was far from satisfactory." Much of it was "indefinite and indifferent to the Holy Scriptures," being "either socialistic or modernistic, removing the offense of the cross" and summoning "all men to a common cause of social justice, world brotherhood, and political reforms, instead of 'to repent and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and be saved'." "So we have decided," he says, "to have a press of our own. We named it the Real Faith Press. We will not publish any anti-Christian or modernistic books or papers, sinful kinds of advertising, or anything which may be a hindrance to the faith. We will strive to do the things that please God. . . . Our aim is to glorify Jesus Christ."

This press should fill a real need in the Church, a need which was so keenly felt by the Executive Committee of the Presbyterian Church in China that, in addition to approving of certain modest requests of their Theological Seminary for grants from the Special Literature Fund of the Northern Presbyterian Mission, they confined themselves to a single plea for a small sum with which to start such a press. Though the China Council of the Mission did not see its way clear to grant this request, the Lord seems to have moved upon the hearts of these four Christian brothers to come forward and provide this very useful press. May God bless and guide this undertaking in behalf of His Truth!

TENGHSIEN, SHANTUNG PROVINCE, CHINA

Introductory News Letter from Abyssinia

By the Rev. James L. Rohrbaugh

ABYSSINIA, the only independent empire in Africa, is situated high in the mountains west of the Red Sea and just north of the equator. It has an area of 350,000 square miles, has an average elevation of 7000 feet and has an estimated population of over four million. Its people are Semitic and Hamitic, most of them being a mixture of both. The official religion is Coptic Christianity badly gone to seed. As of old the Church believes officially in the single Divine nature of Christ and many true Scriptural doctrines in addition, but for all prac-

tical purposes the Church is as dead as the traditional door nail and derives its strength from an elaborate system of heathen ritual and superstition. There is also a strong Mohammedan element in the country and dozens of pagan tribes that are still primitive fetish worshippers. It is among the latter that most missionary work is being done at the present time.

There are three main evangelical missionary bodies active in the country at present. The United Presbyterians have a strong and orthodox mission that flourishes in the western part of the nation. I have met a number of their missionaries and find them devout Bible-believing persons who are doing a good work for the glory of God. The second main mission is Swedish and is supported by a mission board that was founded in the middle of the past century and operates in the national Swedish Church in the same way that our new Independent Board proposes to operate. They report that the official Swedish Lutheran Church likes them about as much as a cat likes the rain; but for three-quarters of a century they have been thriving and the Lord is using them wonderfully. They have a School here in Addis Ababa that operates as a mission school should. A large number of their students are converted while in school and go forth from the school to bear witness to the saving grace of God. The third Mission is that of the Sudan Interior Mission. It has over sixty active Missionaries on the field and has extensive work among the pagan tribes of the southland. The mission contemplates a continued program of expansion until the entire nation is dotted with mission stations. A large number of our missionaries are Presbyterians of the CHRISTIANITY TODAY variety and these look forward eagerly to the coming of each new issue.

The Abyssinians are a haughty race with an intense national pride, a lethargic disposition, and many of them possess an ability to lie out of any situation. They are most friendly and have an abundant sense of humor that is a bit childish in character. They are inconceivably bound by prejudice and superstition and though they think they are Christians, they know not their Master's voice. There is great need and great opportunity here in this mediaeval empire and it is worthy of your interest and prayers. In the letters that follow I shall do my best to depict as vividly as possible in the brief space allotted, both the joys and the sorrows, the successes and disappointments, the things humorous and things pathetic that one finds in Missionary life and work.

ADDIS ABABA, ABYSSINIA

Schism in the Barthian Movement

THOSE who have followed the Barthian movement have seen for some time that its unity was threatened. Latest develop-

ments of the situation in Germany have accentuated the existing theological conflict and in a recent number of the magazine of the movement, "Zwischen den Zeiten," Karl Barth and Eduard Thurneysen sever definitely their ties with the other members of this group, and give up their co-editorship in the famous magazine.

According to Adolf Keller, writing in the *British Weekly*, "With Gogarten's entering the party of the German Christians and Brunner's activity within the Oxford group movement, it became obvious for Karl Barth that to maintain relationship and collaboration with these heretics would mean a lack of sincerity, and that a compromise for the sake of peace would be a sacrifice of truth. The former friendly criticism in the *Dogmatics* became herewith an anathema against any adherent of a conscious or unconscious natural theology, against any theologian adoring a 'Menschgott,' a God made by men, instead of the transcendent God preached by Jesus Christ. This is thoroughly consistent with his conception of the transcendence of God resolutely opposed to the theology of the German Christians finding God in history or a theology of mere spectators who combine, in their indifference, what can never be reconciled. Barth finds an analogy to this intolerance in the story of the Apostle John, who, happening to meet the gnostic Cerinthus in a bathing establishment, left it at once in order not to come under the wrath of God."

"In the article taking leave from this group he announces that he and Thurneysen will in the future publish a series of tracts for the time, of which three brochures have already appeared.

"This new schism in the most influential theological movement of today will leave many friends of the movement with some serious questions. When his first brochure appeared, of which 30,000 copies have now been sold, everyone could see that Barth has not that 'genius of compromise' which would accept the new official State-Theology in Germany. His courage and intrepidity were no doubt an inspiration for the protestation movement which is gaining ground from day to day. But the questions do not only concern an actual conflict.

"We hear many Christians ask whether these theologians cannot hold peace together, whether theology as an intellectual expression of God's message is as such not a source of eternal controversies, and whether we have therefore not to seek more spiritual and peaceful methods of Christian manifestations. The combating instinct is certainly very pronounced within the whole group, and the wrath of God is more easily at their disposal than the love of Christ, who let St. Paul tolerate various forms of message provided that Christ would be preached.

"Karl Barth would reject such questions as betraying an attitude of mere spectators

whom he holds in particular contempt. He would rather see us confronted with other questions: Is this not a time when the question of truth is more important than the question of peace? Is not theology always a fight for God's truth, the watchdog barking at the entrance of the Sanctuary against foreign intruders? This seems an undeniable fact when it became manifest in the German controversy that the actual religious problem cannot be solved by decrees from State commissioners, nor by party resolutions of a majority, nor by ecclesiastical pressure, but only by an answer to the question: What is evangelical truth? Therefore by clearer and deeper theological thinking. . . ."

Victorious Conference at Moody Bible Institute

THE ends of the earth met at the twenty-eighth Founder's Week Conference at the Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, February 4th to 8th. The nearly four thousand registered guests represented thirty-five states of the Union, and ten foreign lands. Attendance at the numerous services, including the overflow meetings linked by electrical amplifiers with the main auditorium, was far in excess of any previous record.

Among themes and speakers presented were: Christ's Second Coming, **Dr. James M. Gray** and **Paul W. Rood**; Christian Apologetics, **Professor Oswald T. Allis, Ph.D.**, of Westminster Theological Seminary; Prophetic Interpretation, **Dr. H. A. Ironside**; Psalm Exposition, **Mr. Max I. Reich**; Evangelistic Emphasis, the **Rev. Gustaf F. Johnson**. Home and Foreign Mission interests were richly emphasized, leading addresses being made by the **Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge**, recently of Africa, now Secretary of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions; the **Rev. Russell H. Glazier**, of China, and the **Rev. Raphael C. Thomas, M.D.**, of the Philippines.

Intercession was directed by the **Rev. C. P. Meeker** in two great services. Sacred praise rose to exalted heights in the spiritual messages of the Institute choir of one hundred voices, and the contribution of congregational song led by different members of the Music Faculty. Most of the daytime programs were broadcast over Station WMBI.

Dr. Gray, president of the Institute, announced the launching of plans to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Institute, and the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of the honored founder, **D. L. Moody**. The extended celebration will include three periods of expression, beginning in September of 1936, and concluding in June of 1937. Early announcement is made because of the world-wide significance of the occasion.

Philadelphia Modernist Attempt Fails

Dr. Machen Received by Presbytery

AT the stated meeting of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, held on March 5, 1934, a strong Modernist indifferentist attempt to block the reception of the **Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.**, as a member of Presbytery, was blocked by a decisive vote.

MODERNIST TARGET



The **REV. J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D.**
"Support of boards . . . is . . . of free will."

Dr. Machen who was transferring his letter from the Presbytery of New Brunswick to Philadelphia, where he now resides, had been regularly recommended for reception on the basis of his presbyterial certificate, by the appropriate committee of the Presbytery.

When the committee recommendation was moved and seconded as in the case of any other minister coming into the Presbytery, an attempt was made to question **Dr. Machen** concerning (1) his approval of the official Board of Foreign Missions, (2) his taking part in the organization of the Independent Board. On it being objected that these questions were irrelevant and that **Dr. Machen** could not be put in the position of answering them as a prerequisite to admission, the Moderator, the **Rev. Hilko de Beer**, ruled the objection correct, declaring that **Dr. Machen** did not have to answer those questions. The moderator's ruling was not appealed from, even the asker of the questions, the **Rev. Wm. R. Craig, D.D.**, declaring from the floor that of course **Dr. Machen** was not compelled to answer the questions if he did not wish to do so.

Attempted Surprise

The "Liberal" element of the Presbytery had, it is said, carefully prepared for the meeting in the hope of surprising the conservatives and voting down the reception both of **Dr. Machen** and the **Rev. C. J. Woodbridge**, newly-elected Secretary of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. To that end the Presbytery witnessed the largest outpouring of Modernists and their church-machine allies in years. The Conservatives, however, taking no risks, were also there in considerable force, though not at the peak of their strength.

Roll Call Vote

Vote being demanded by roll-call, the request was granted, and after considerable discussion, the ayes and nays were counted by a calling of the roll. The ministers voted 52 to 35 to receive **Dr. Machen**. The elders' vote was 27 to 13 for reception. Every Auburn Affirmationist member of Presbytery cast his vote against **Dr. Machen's** reception. The total vote was 79 to 48 in favor of reception.

After the vote was announced, the **Rev. Alexander MacColl, D.D.**, outstanding intellectual among the Philadelphia liberals, moved, as a matter of courtesy, to make the reception of **Dr. Machen** unanimous. **Dr. Machen** at this point said that he felt that it was unfair to people who were conscientiously opposed to him to ask them to choose between their principles and seeming to be discourteous to him. He said that he thoroughly appreciated the spirit in which **Dr. MacColl's** suggestion was offered, and thanked him for it. It was also pointed out by others that some who had voted had already left the meeting. After some discussion the motion was felt to involve so many problems that it was laid upon the table.

Complaint Projected

After the meeting the Philadelphia papers reported that the liberals had announced that a complaint, signed by more than one-third of those present when the decision was taken, would be filed with the Synod, in an attempt to stay **Dr. Machen's** membership in the Presbytery, perhaps for two years. It was generally agreed by those familiar with the law of the Church that there were no proper grounds for complaint, that such a move, if made, would only be a first blow at freedom in the Presbyterian Church, selecting **Dr. Machen** as its target.

After these reports had become public, and when questioned on the report that he had "declined to answer questions," **Dr. Machen** issued the following statement:

Dr. Machen's Statement

"My reasons for being unable conscientiously to support the policy of the official Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. were presented to the Presbytery of New Brunswick last spring, both orally and in a printed argument which is still available to all who are interested. I have since made abundantly clear to that Presbytery that my attitude remains quite unchanged. Yet that Presbytery, at its last regular meeting, granted me by unanimous vote a letter commending me to the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

"If the Presbytery of Philadelphia had requested me yesterday to state and defend my convictions regarding the official Board of Foreign Missions, I should, of course, have welcomed the opportunity of doing so. But no doubt that Presbytery was right in holding, as apparently it did hold, that the question of my attitude toward the official board was irrelevant to the question whether I should be received as a member of the Presbytery. The constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. does not require a minister to regard any boards or agencies as monopolistic or to support them when he is convinced that they are unworthy of support. According to Presbyterian law support of boards and agencies is a matter not of compulsion but of free will. In the long run the boards themselves will prosper only if they and their friends respect that principle. A benevolent agency will not permanently enjoy confidence if its friends seek to gain support for it by compulsion or by the threat of any kind of ecclesiastical disability or penalties."

"Dr. Machen's Reasons"

Liberals intimated in the Philadelphia press that the reason why Dr. Machen sought to become a member of the local Presbytery was, that he might become a commissioner to the next Assembly, and its moderator. Anyone who knew the facts, however, was aware that this suggestion was untrue, even humorous. While the Presbytery and Assembly would doubtless honor themselves by such action, it was a line of effort that had not occurred to conservatives. Dr. Machen's transfer was obviously assignable to his now permanent residence in Philadelphia.

First Church, Berkeley, Active

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, Berkeley, Calif., held its annual School of Missions early in the winter with 485 enrolled. Beginning February 28th, and continuing for three Wednesdays, a church-

In Connection With

the meeting of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, to be held on April 10, 1934, in Philadelphia, there will be a dinner for interested friends at 6.30 P. M. on that day. It will be served in the rooms of the Central North Broad Street Presbyterian Church, Broad and Green Streets, Philadelphia. Mr. Woodbridge, Dr. Machen and others will speak. The number of places is limited to 150. The cost will be seventy-five cents per person. Reservations may be made by addressing the Rev. C. J. Woodbridge, General Secretary, 1531 Philadelphia Saving Fund Society Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

wide Institute was held, offering ten classes for study to the entire membership. All met for a fellowship supper at 6.00, classes at 7.00 and everybody at 8.00, when the pastor, Dr. Francis Shunk Downs, gave a course with discussion on "Winning Others to

Jesus Christ." The Young People's organizations of First Church, Berkeley, eight in number, four of which are Christian Endeavor Societies, united in their annual service in the church Sunday evening, February 4th. The entire program was carried out by representatives of these societies. The youth membership of these societies is about 420. Recent Father-and-Son, Mother-and-Daughter, Girl Scout, and Boy Scout banquets drew an attendance of nearly 600.

First Church, under the auspices of its Life Work Department, one of eighteen church-wide departments, with thirty men and women as hosts, gave a dinner to the youth of the congregation who have definitely given their lives to full-time Christian service or who are seriously considering such service. Forty-three young people gave their personal reasons for giving their lives to the service of Christ, twenty-six of whom are in definite training. In addition to these, First Church has seven of its members now studying in various theological seminaries with six others in Bible Schools. Dr. Francis Shunk Downs, the pastor, closed an unforgettable evening of spiritual fellowship and power by sharing with the young people the story of his conversion and his call to the ministry.

Presbyterian Colleges Increase Enrollment

ENROLLMENT at Presbyterian colleges, junior colleges and academies shows an increase for the first time in several years. Twenty-three out of the 49 schools reporting show enrollment increases over 1932-33, the four colleges showing the largest gains being Macalester, St. Paul, Minn., 145; Pikeville, Pikeville, Ky., 125; University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Okla., 84, and Buena Vista, Storm Lake, Iowa, 76.

The phenomenal growth of the little Kentucky mountain junior college of Pikeville during the past few years is particularly noted. In 1931 it more than doubled its enrollment; last year it reported another increase of more than one-fourth its total registration; and now it announces another gain of 36.9 per cent.

Death of Dr. Buchanan

THE Rev. Walter D. Buchanan, D.D., LL.D., for years minister of Broadway Presbyterian Church, New York City, died suddenly on February 19, 1934. A memoir of his life and work will be found on page 6 of this issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

IN THIS ISSUE:

Starting a Summer Bible School on Faith: A Testimony.....	3
HENRY SHEPARD ATKINSON	
Walter Duncan Buchanan: Champion of the Faith.....	6
Dr. Mackenzie Replies: An Open Letter to Dr. Van Til.....	8
DONALD MACKENZIE	
Dr. Thornwell Jacobs' New Religion: A Book Review.....	9
SAMUEL G. CRAIG	
An Important Archaeological Discovery.....	12
OSWALD T. ALLIS	
Cooperation with the Boards and Agencies of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.....	13
ROY L. ALDRICH	
Sunday School Lessons for April.....	14
The Comfort of the Scriptures.....	15
DAVID FREEMAN	
Letters to the Editor.....	15
News of the Church.....	17