

F. S. DYNNESS
MAY 1934-R
R. D. 2
QUARRYVILLE PA

Fourth Anniversary Number

CHRISTIANITY TODAY



||| A PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL DEVOTED TO STATING, DEFENDING
AND FURTHERING THE GOSPEL IN THE MODERN WORLD |||

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

Published monthly by
THE PRESBYTERIAN AND
REFORMED PUBLISHING CO., Inc.
501 Witherspoon Bldg., Phila., Pa.

MID-MAY, 1934
Vol. 5 No. 1

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

The Question of the Hour: An Editorial



MORE than once in the history of nations and churches, issues in themselves important have suddenly and dramatically given rise to other issues of such tremendous moment, that the new have come to overshadow the old. That is happening now in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. The issue concerning Foreign Missions is a great issue—let no mistake be made about that. Yet, it is the evident intention of the bureaucracy now dominating the machinery of the Church to compel support of the official Board of Foreign Missions and to use force against those who have established an Independent Board. Thus a new issue, that of Christian liberty, has arisen. And with it the Church must now answer a question which will determine her future.

The question is simply this: Who is to be the master of the conscience of the Christian man? God or men? When a minister stands up in the pulpit, whose minister is he to be—the minister of men or a minister of Christ? To whom does the minister go for his authority? The moment you make a man pledge to support a board or agency—any board or agency, no matter how good it is now—whatever its policies may become in the future (on the plea of loyalty or any other plea), that moment you have created a slave—a man who cannot call his soul his own. For this man's conscience has abdicated in favor of the consciences of other men. The ordination vows of a minister do not pledge support to the future policies of successive General Assemblies, much less the policies of the Boards, the creatures of those Assemblies. To ask a man who has sincerely taken his ordination vows, who is completely loyal to the Bible and the constitution of the Church, to pledge support to an agency that he himself believes not to be loyal to the Word of God, is to ask a fearful and a monstrous thing. This is true even if the man is mistaken. The instant that the Presbyterian Church (or any other church) decrees that the Christian conscience must be bound by boards, agencies, courts of the Church, or any thing beside the Word of God, then that Church ceases to be an abode of free men, ceases to be a truly Protestant Church. And no matter how vigorous or large such a church may seem now, if it sets up its own authority as binding on men's consciences in the place of the Word of God, it will surely die as a Church of Christ.

All these things ought to be recognized not only by those who do not have confidence in the Board of Foreign Missions, but also by those who do. They should see clearly, looking down the corridors of the years to be, that if they introduce the principle of compulsion in support and giving, in order to meet

the challenge of a temporary emergency, they will be cutting the very spinal cord of missionary and benevolent giving. The Presbyterian Church has behind it a great record as a truly liberal church. By whom was that record made? By slaves who toiled at the crack of the taskmaster's whip? No—it was made by the voluntary, free outpouring of gifts of the plain man and woman—men and women whose hearts were inflamed with love for Christ and those for whom He died. Nothing less than this motive will maintain a great volume of gifts over a period of years. And if Christian people do not believe that any particular agency will spend their money in the way they want it spent, the remedy is not to threaten and coerce these donors, but to see to it that the agency involved is so reformed and so administered that the question of confidence need never again be raised.

These are the counsels of prudence and foresightedness, which the General Assembly of 1934 would be well advised to consider. Doubtless other counsels will be urged upon the commissioners. They will be told that loyalty to the Church and its law demands the suppression of those who believe the whole policy of the Board of Foreign Missions to be not loyal to the Word of God, and who have, whether wisely or unwisely, yet clearly within their constitutional rights, established their own voluntary, independent agency. The commissioners should resolutely refuse to be stampeded by the excitement of the moment or by the misdirected zeal of those who think they do God's service in making support of the agencies of the Church a matter of compulsion and not of free will. If they are so stampeded in their anxiety to save a Board they may succeed in wrecking and disrupting a whole Church. For there are hosts of persons in the Church who, while they may not as yet be concerned about the Independent Board, will rise in indignation to fight for their liberties if short-sighted counsels prevail, if in the hysteria of an hour, the General Assembly sets itself up as an authority to bind men's consciences, coordinate with the Word of God. No Christian but wants Christ in His Word to be the master of his conscience; no Christian truly aware of what Christian liberty means, but will resist to the death any attempt to make the will of other men the master of his conscience. Let the commissioners ponder carefully the great pronouncement of the Westminster Divines as to liberty, and as they read, let them remember that these words, in Chapter XX of the Confession of Faith, and not Assembly deliverances, are the law of the Church: "God alone is lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in any thing contrary to His Word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines, or to obey

such commandments out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience, and the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also."

Is Jesus Christ still to be the only Head and King of this Presbyterian Church?

OUR FIFTH YEAR



WITH this issue CHRISTIANITY TODAY enters upon its fifth year. We have been grateful for the many expressions of appreciation we have received from our friends, though we have been conscious that they have often been more flattering than our merits warrant. We have also been greatly gratified by the fact that even our enemies have acknowledged that the paper is "ably edited" and that it manifests "great ability and vitality," though they have intimated at times that our zeal and ability might be better employed. We feel as strongly as we ever did that there is need of such a paper and we shall endeavor to make it more and more worthy of the cause it seeks to further. We always like to receive suggestions looking to its improvement, even though it is not always possible to adopt them. Indirectly, if not directly, they have done much to shape our course. A number have suggested that we renew our "Question and Answer" department. We would like to know whether others approve this suggestion. We are glad to be able to say that our list of subscribers has increased during the past year. This has been largely due to the fact that our subscribers have commended the paper to others. We trust they will continue to do so. For only as they do so can we hope to go from strength to strength.

CLERK AS JUDGE AND JURY



THE Form of Government makes it mandatory that each judicatory choose a clerk whose duty it shall also be to preserve the records carefully and to grant extracts from them whenever properly required (Chapter XX).

The clerk chosen by the General Assembly in accordance with that provision is apparently of the opinion that his duties are much more extensive than the Form of Government indicates. It would seem, in fact, that he thinks he has been authorized not only to record the "transactions" of the General Assembly but to interpret them—the word "transactions" being taken so broadly as to include the constitution of the Church as it is or as it may be altered or amended by the presbyteries. What is more, he seems to be of the opinion that it is his duty to speak with authority to ministers and elders as to their fiduciary obligations relative to any and all funds that may be collected in Presbyterian churches.

Evidence of the above is afforded by letters which the present clerk of the Assembly recently wrote to the members of the presbyteries of Baltimore and Lackawanna affirming that the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions is illegal and unconstitutional, that "any minister or ruling elder who gives his official sanction or support to this Board is disloyal to his ordination vows," that presbyteries should neither license or ordain students from Westminster Seminary "until they have given a written pledge that they will support the official agencies of the Church as a part of their pledge of loyalty to the government and discipline of the Church," and that it is a "diversion of funds" for any session or society connected with any church, Presbytery or Synod "to take offerings for or vote money to the so-called Independent Board."

It would be interesting to know just where or how DR. MUDGE got such a conception of his duties. Possibly he has been reading about HITLER and other modern dictators and has been led to conceive of his duties after their manner. Be that as it may, he has no more authority to interpret the Constitution

of the Church and the transactions of the General Assembly than has any other minister or any elder. Whether or no DR. MUDGE is aware of it, the parity of the ministry is a basic principle of the Presbyterian form of government. DR. MUDGE, of course, has the same right to his opinion as to the meaning and binding force of the Constitution and the deliverances of the General Assembly as any other minister, but no more *authority* attaches to his pronouncements than attaches to the opinion of the youngest or least known minister in the Church. DR. MUDGE is not lacking in ability as a clerk, but as judge and jury we see little about him to commend. We would suggest that he confine himself to the duties that have been assigned him by the Assembly.

THE CHRISTIAN ASSEMBLY



THE organization in Seattle, Washington, of the "Christian Assembly" by a group of earnest and able laymen is, in the estimation of the editors, exceedingly significant. Without prior consultation with conservative groups elsewhere, this band of believers has issued a trumpet blast for the faith. It will be found elsewhere in this issue. It is hoped that chapters of the Christian Assembly will be organized from coast to coast. Perhaps the ministers of the Church, who, as a body, have been ecclesiastically complacent in the face of growing unbelief, are about to find lay people assuming the leadership in the battle. The launching of the Christian Assembly is, we repeat, an encouraging and significant event.

MODERATORS



THE usual pre-Assembly maneuvering for position on the part of those with avowed or latent ambitions to be Moderator is under way. Just now two names are most prominently mentioned. DR. HERBERT BOOTH SMITH of Los Angeles has been reported as waging his own campaign personally, and with great vigor. DR. WILLIAM CHALMERS COVERT, retiring General Secretary of the Board of Christian Education, has been nominated by his Presbytery, Chicago, and would doubtless feel the honor to be a fitting one. Other commissioners to the Assembly will be waiting patiently to see if the call will come to them. DR. WILLIAM HIRAM FOULKES, of Newark, N. J., sometimes described as a hardy perennial among candidates, will be there, as well as RULING ELDER JOHN H. FINLEY of the *New York Times*, rumored as the possible nominee of the New York group. Others will no doubt be mentioned. There are plenty of strong, evangelical, faithful pastors who might be nominated, who would be entirely free from any connection with the Boards. It is about time for the Presbyterian Church to recognize the forgotten man and, in a practical way, reaffirm her belief in the parity of the clergy.

THE PLIGHT OF THE BOARDS



DMITTEDLY the Boards of the Church—at least apart from the Board of Pensions—are in a bad way. Naturally those more immediately responsible for their administration are ready with explanations of the existing situation. There is truth of course in the statement that shrinkage of gifts has been due to business conditions. That, however, is by no means the whole story. It is even more true, in our opinion, that the Boards themselves are to blame.

In the first place, the Boards have not confined themselves to the tasks assigned them. Instead of looking upon themselves as the servants of the Church they have sought to play the part of its masters. Take, for instance, the matter of the re-organization of Princeton Seminary when that matter was agitating the Church a few years ago. It will hardly be denied that the

Boards, indirectly if not directly, threw their influence in favor of the reorganization. In fact unless the Boards—men like ROBERT E. SPEER and JOHN MCDOWELL in the van—had thrown their influence in favor of the reorganization it is quite unlikely that it would have been put into effect. Naturally this was not fitted to make those who opposed the reorganization think well of the Boards. This is only an illustration of the manner in which the Boards have attempted, with no small success, to determine as well as carry out the policies of the Church.

It is more important to note that multitudes have lost confidence in the Boards because they have not shown themselves loyal to the doctrinal standards of the Church. It could hardly be expected that those who believe the Bible to be God's Word, and the system of doctrine set forth in the Confession of Faith to be the system of doctrine taught in that infallible Word, would feel that organizations run in a manner to meet the approval of Auburn Affirmationists were deserving of their support. As a result Presbyterian gifts have, in large part, been turned into other channels. What is more, the Boards—at least the Board of Foreign Missions—are doing nothing to lead any one to think that they have been misjudged. Witness the "Reply to the Board of Foreign Missions" by Chester Presbytery to be found in the April issue of this paper.

We believe, then, that the Boards themselves are largely responsible for their present plight. To raise a hue and cry about the Independent Board may be useful as a means of diverting attention from the Boards themselves but it will not be effective in restoring confidence in them. The Independent Board is a symptom, not a cause. Remove the cause and the Independent Board will disappear almost overnight. Destroy the Independent Board by ecclesiastical action, if that is possible, and the plight of the Boards will be made worse, not better. To condemn others because of their orthodoxy is not fitted to create the impression that you are orthodox yourself.

DR. SLOSSER'S REPLY TO DR. MACARTNEY



IN the *United Presbyterian* of April 26th, PROFESSOR GAIVUS JACKSON SLOSSER of Western Theological Seminary offers a reply to the article by DR. MACARTNEY against the proposed merger of our Church and the United Presbyterian, printed in the last issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY under the title "Thou Shalt Say, No!"

While PROFESSOR SLOSSER is not himself a signer of the Auburn Affirmation, his reply is in large part an eulogy of that document. Apparently he would have approved if the Committee on Organic Union had made it a part of the doctrinal basis of the proposed union. After citing copiously from it, he asks, "Do you not see clearly that both the Affirmation and its signers were and are absolutely loyal to the Scriptures and to their Church?"—and this notwithstanding the fact that it expressly states that the doctrine of the full truthfulness of the Scriptures is not only false but harmful!

PROFESSOR SLOSSER fails to mention the fact that the Auburn Affirmation was an attack on the deliverances of previous Assemblies relative to the so-called "five points." And yet that is absolutely essential to any real understanding of the meaning and significance of that document. In the light of that fact it appears to be a creed that represents the writers of the Bible as untrustworthy both as recorders of historical facts and as doctrinal guides, that is ambiguous in its assertion of the true deity and humanity of our Lord, that knows nothing of the death of Christ as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, and that refuses to assert that Jesus was virgin-born or that He rose from the dead in the same body with which He suffered. We submit that such a creed cannot be confessed by those who are intelligently loyal to the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church and earnest preachers of evangelical Christianity. PROFESSOR SLOSSER'S article is at least fitted to confirm what we have previously stated relative to the degree to which the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is permeated by Modernism.

PROFESSOR SLOSSER has the temerity to allege that the Confessional Statement of the United Presbyterian Church and the Auburn Affirmation are "equally condemned" by the "trouble-making group" that is opposing the merger. Such a statement is, of course, absurd as well as contrary to fact. While the Confessional Statement is regarded as inadequate and in serious respects faulty, no one, as far as we know, supposes that it is as bad as the Auburn Affirmation.

PROFESSOR SLOSSER repeatedly refers to those in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. who oppose the union as a "willful troublemaking minority." This is not the first time, however, that those most loyal to God and His truth have been called trouble-makers. The case of Ahab and Elijah will be recalled.

DR. MACKENZIE VS. DR. VAN TIL



THE correspondence between DR. MACKENZIE and DR. VAN TIL, occasioned by the latter's review of the former's book, carried on through these columns, is now closed (see page 13). We are sure our readers have found it interesting as well as highly informing. Without pronouncing any editorial judgment as to who should be judged the victor, we want to say that we think the event has shown that we made no mistake when we asked DR. VAN TIL to review DR. MACKENZIE'S book because of what we considered his special qualifications for the task.

In the covering letter that accompanied his final letter, DR. MACKENZIE advises us that our suggestion in our March issue that he lost his temper while writing his first letter was "thoroughly erroneous." We stand corrected. We may be pardoned, however, for expressing the hope that DR. MACKENZIE, if he ever does lose his temper, will not write for publication while in that state of mind. For if he writes that way when "cool," it is somewhat fearful to contemplate what he might write if he should get really mad. But even if DR. MACKENZIE has not been guilty of losing his temper, we think he has been guilty of "attributing unworthy motives" to his adversary. He seeks to convey the impression that DR. VAN TIL reviewed his book unfavorably because of his connection with Princeton Seminary.

"The head and front of my offending in your sight," he writes, "is that I am a modern Princetonianist—a new heresy unknown to the Westminster divines." Again he refers to "the new Westminster brand" of Calvinism. Here, we are sure, DR. MACKENZIE is "thoroughly erroneous." It is zeal for the Reformed Faith, not antagonism to Princeton Seminary, that animates DR. VAN TIL. Moreover there is no such thing as a "Westminster brand" of Calvinism. If the word "Westminster" is substituted for the word "Princeton" in the following statement of PROFESSOR CASPAR WISTAR HODGE, made in 1927—as is justified by the fact that Westminster Seminary was established to carry on and perpetuate the policies and traditions of Princeton as it existed before its reorganization in 1929—it will afford an admirable statement of the brand of Calvinism for which Westminster Seminary stands:

"It has sometimes been mistakenly supposed that there is a 'Princeton Theology.' DRS. ALEXANDER and CHARLES HODGE always repudiated this idea. Princeton Seminary has always taught and upheld the theology of the Westminster Confession—the majesty and sovereignty of Almighty God, the total inability of fallen man to save himself, and that the whole of salvation is to be ascribed to the power and grace of God. This is simply the pure and consistent form of evangelicalism which says with Paul, 'by grace have ye been saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is God's Gift.'

"This generic Calvinism has been taught in Princeton Seminary under the specific form of the Covenant Theology, and so richly developed in the Westminster Confession, and

(Concluded on Page 11)

Name-Calling in the Presbyterian Church

By Frank H. Stevenson



AMONG the penetrating observations with which Talleyrand indulged his taste for acid comment is his remark that statesmanship consists largely in the finding of new names for measures that under old names have lost their popularity. The proper application of names, he said, always will be the test of successful political administration. The theory is worth consideration.

If a perfect rose by any other name will smell as sweet, the Talleyrand formula induces an assurance that in the meadows of statesmanship a dubious rose, given the right name, will distil the perfumes of Araby. Let us see.

Talleyrand's own experience in applying helpful names certainly justified him in explaining at least his personal success thereby. He held exalted positions in France with four sovereigns—Louis XVI, Napoleon, Louis XVIII and Louis Philippe. Each of them was diametrically opposed to the others in character and object yet the resourcefulness of Talleyrand served them all. He produced favorable labels for unfavorable methods, measures and offices, and France usually accepted his word at face value. His earliest wish was the establishment of a constitutional monarchy similar to Great Britain's, and it must be said that after a devious career he ended by being instrumental in accomplishing it. Less ingenious politicians fell all around him during the forty years when he was the power behind the throne. Was it because he knew, as they did not, the magic of names? He thought so, and the conclusion is reasonable.

The idea has been tested in American politics also, if one may venture to discuss a development so close at hand. Every recent measure of recovery was tremendously helped by expert name-calling in Washington. Possibly the most valuable men in the present government are those who devised new titles for measures of national relief in the past year. Ask yourself what the fate of the bill for the abandonment of the gold standard would have been if the legislation had been called Repudiation. This is a forthright word and for generations it has expressed the meaning of a nation's refusal to pay bonds according to promise, unless the nation is bankrupt. But Repudiation carries with it such a frank admission of dishonesty that neither this name nor any similar to it was suggested as a heading for the enactment. When the government went off the gold

standard with vast reserves of gold in the treasury it was under the sanction of a title of virtue. Thereupon practically all opposition vanished.

Americans used to hate Pork Barrel projects. They might hate them now if they bore that description even from the lips of the minority party in Congress. Was it not at least partially because impressive initials like C. W. A. and many another "A." were attached to these projects that the Pork Barrel was suddenly lifted from degradation to dignity? Overnight the attitude of taxpayers was altered completely. Panic and despair had much to do with shifting sentiment during the first months of the incoming administration but cryptic symbols were a prominent factor in gaining universal approval for the expenditure of billions of dollars in public works.

So it is along other lines. We now are holding to a rather transparent delusion that Socialism is far from us at the very moment a government-planned and a government-regulated life is gaining a foothold in the United States which our cherished Individualism may never be able to recapture. Socialism is on the field and prepared to march in every direction, only we are calling it by other names. Under the emblems of The National Emergency the most conservative among us contributed to the erection of state-controlled business, state-controlled farming, state-controlled banking, state-

controlled charity, etc., singing praises as the granite foundations were laid.

A facile substitution of good names for bad quietly accomplished the miracle; revolution was not necessary. A shrewd government knew that we the people would not mind being fooled a part of the time notwithstanding their occasional acknowledgment that the joke was on us. With most of us a resounding name will transform sordid reality into a glorious ideal at any time, and although we are dimly aware of the trickery of the device our remonstrances usually can be depended upon to be excessively feeble. Candid politicians confess that the system is wrong but with them the end justifies the means.

Frequently the mechanism of name-calling is set in reverse. The Talleyrand technique is adaptable to circumstances and can be directed to the destruction of a cause men want to defeat just as effectively as to the bolstering up of a measure they want to promote. Names are benedictions; likewise they are weapons. When they operate



The Rev. Frank H. Stevenson, D.D.

as weapons they are devastating to the point of annihilation as plenty of incidents in the chronicle of human events abundantly prove. The potency of names is a startling phenomenon any way we take it. The fact is not flattering but it is beyond dispute.

And this brings us to our own territory, The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. One wonders if we are to go forever on in the Church itself, swayed to and fro in our decisions by the prejudices and recommendations attached to labels. The reign of Prince Talleyrand's maxim is unwholesome enough in the State; in the Church it is the sign of gross immorality, a sin against the light that guides men to the truth.

For twenty years Presbyterians have been moving not according to reason or logic but strictly in accord with names. God did not intend that the weapons of a Christian's warfare should be carnal but we have forgotten His commandments while we have dealt in epithets and invectives.

Presbyterian ministers wear emblems today which have been pinned upon them by unfriendly hands. Either they are Modernist, Liberal or Middle-of-the-Road preachers; or else they are Fundamentalist, Medievalist or Reactionary preachers. No minister escapes classification; each is corralled and branded as horses used to be at western round-ups. After that he is estimated by the mark. We may as well admit at once that few of us are guiltless of the procedure. For the sake of convenience and custom, if not for the sake of malice, we have sorted our colleagues into definite divisions where they are labelled indelibly for future reference.

But if all of us have shared in the name-calling the least guilty are far and away the principal sufferers. In the exchange of diatribe the Bible-believing ministry of the Presbyterian Church, the very strength of the Church, has been forced into a virtually untenable position until it is face to face with immediate and overwhelming disaster.

Possibly churchmen who are known as Modernists or Liberals or Middle-of-the-Roaders will have difficulty in appreciating this assertion, but that is because they themselves are neither injured nor disturbed by the names they bear. For one thing their titles are within the limits of exact truth. Rarely are they called Heretics or Apostates or Agnostics which probably a majority of them *could* be called without slightest exaggeration. Whatever else these non-doctrinal ministers may think of their orthodox brethren they must concede that their restraint is admirable, for they have spared them the denunciation that up to recent years might have destroyed their movement. They allowed it to develop when a direct appeal to crush Heresy conceivably would have aroused the Church to set its house in order and Liberalism might have returned to the places whence it came to the benefit of a unified, evangelical communion.

Now, of course, an actual benefit accrues to the Presbyterian minister who is a Liberal or who walks in the middle of the theological road. Thus pictured he has access to contemporary preferments that mean a great deal to him.

He does not object to the label. Not only does it have no painful sting of reproach; it is a substantial recommendation to every worldly circle he wishes to enter and is welcomed eagerly.

But turn to the company of ministers who are doing their best to defend the Bible. Ponder their lot and try to imagine how they ever will be able to rise above the names fastened upon them. Medievalist is the mildest and least damaging title thrust upon a zealous advocate of God's Word and even that may be taken as an indication of appalling indifference to current realities and as a hint of scarcely suppressed desires to apply the thumb-screw of the Spanish Inquisition. In its popular connotation Medievalist is a terrible designation.

Fundamentalist might be a satisfactory name in spite of the fact that it manages to convey the intimation of an eighth grade education and a generally arrested mentality. But a minister could accept this implication and survive, for the apostles with considerably less equipment than a grammar school provides "lifted empires off their hinges and changed the course of history." Moreover the term, when it stands alone, tells a story of loyalty and steadfastness in sharp contrast to the opportunism inherent in the more flattering term Modernist.

The trouble is, Fundamentalist is a name seldom permitted the privilege of independence. Almost always it is qualified with adjectives until in common speech it is practically inseparable from the words Bitter, Extreme, Contentious and Fanatical. A detached observer would consider it incredible that Christian men and women could be cruel enough to besmirch other Christians with an appellation like Bitter Fundamentalist. The writer has known many Fundamentalists who are kindly and he has yet to encounter one who is bitter, but conspicuous as a Scarlet Letter the ominous word accompanies hundreds of faithful ministers through life, limiting their influence and handicapping their endeavors. Call a man a Fundamentalist and notice how quickly the pulpits of university chapels are barred against him. The average president of a university would readily have a Communist preach to the students, but never a Fundamentalist.

Of all the ruin wrought by the habit of name-calling, and that ruin is immeasurable in the Presbyterian Church, the attack on the character of men who have undertaken to persuade the Church to hold fast to God's Word has been the most serious. It has gone beyond the ministers at whom the blow is aimed and has struck squarely at the cause they sponsor. Both the outside world and Christ's people inside the fold are bound to conclude that none but ignorant fanatics believe the Bible in its entirety, or care enough about it to go forth and champion its rights before the tribunal of public opinion. They cannot fail to discern that Bible-believing ministers are in disrepute in their own household of faith.

What chance has a Christian teacher who is roundly denounced as a Fighting, Bitter, Extreme Fundamentalist and who is submerged under the prejudice provoked by the constant repetition of the description by prominent

Church leaders—what chance has he to present the cause of the Bible adequately save to his immediate constituency of friends who know him? Small, indeed. He may speak with due humility and his appeal may be to the finest instincts of his audience; what he says may be supported by able scholarship and riches of learning, but he has been pictured to the public as a menace and that reputation does not die. He is beaten before he says a word, and his cause is beaten. The persistent application of an evil name has its expected result. Talleyrand's cynical maxim is vindicated in the very House of God.

The consequences are apparent. It is useless to hope for a peaceful or spiritual or advancing Church while a tyranny of epithets usurps the throne of reason. The Lord's cause and the Lord's people must suffer while the assault continues, and this may be a long time. Nor is it our right to discuss the motives behind the flood of calumny that is overwhelming the friends of the Bible. Possibly the accusers of Fundamentalists are simply misguided; their real motives will not be determined until every man shall presently appear before the judgment seat of Christ. If their victims are tempted to reprisals against them they must resist the temptation with the grace God gives.

One thing we can accomplish. We can defend the intellectual and moral worth of men who are the targets for ceaseless propaganda. The defense will have to be well informed and explicit, but it can be achieved. When an advocate of the Old Book and the Old Faith addresses a Presbytery or General Assembly or a company of college undergraduates or a public gathering, we who are able ought to anticipate the abuse that is the customary prelude and aftermath of such efforts. Gossip can be contradicted. Inspired condemnation in the press can be answered. The official attitude of the Church can be protested respectfully. We can see to it that men who take the side of the Bible have a fair opportunity to speak and be heard.

Their testimony is needed more than anything else in the world today. All mankind (see any newspaper or magazine) is drifting towards atheism and despair; the night of skepticism and pessimism is dark around us. Little is known of the deep and eternal things of God, and that little is a candle hid under a bushel. People are entitled to know if the commandments of the Bible are authoritative, and why. They have a right to learn if there is a hell and a heaven. Is the history recorded in the Bible dependable; are its promises sure? Our own country is slowly descending into the animalism of Russia because men do not know.

We shall not help them through the agency of the Presbyterian Church if we hoot at ministers who are competent to show that the Word of God is trustworthy and His judgments are true and righteous altogether. Suppose these same ministers do warn the Church that it is under obligation to maintain its corporate witness to the faith without

a single concession to unbelief. Suppose they are disquieting controversialists. Were Paul or Augustine or Athanasius or Calvin or Luther or Knox any less disquieting? Is it for this that we ridicule the testimony of Fundamentalists and try to exile them from human sympathy?

Ministers who have been leading the Church to peace with the world deserve no honors from Christians. They have their reward. But ministers whom God has raised up to be the advocates of His Word and who must confront a hostile civilization with the preaching of the Cross are worthy of every encouragement we can give. To stone them in order to win the approval of fashionable opinion is emphatically not the way to build the Church.

Call faithful ministers Fundamentalists if we must. But as long as names rule an extensive domain of human thought let us beware of applying the more fatal names to men Christ requires for the protection and projection of the Gospel. Five words in the Presbyterian vocabulary of name-calling should be exorcised forthwith: Bitter, Extreme, Contentious, Medieval and Fanatical. If they continue to flourish the Presbyterian Church will be committing a crime against itself that will bring an increasing punishment.

It will be interesting to watch the approaching General Assembly. Men will be there who represent a variety of beliefs, including some who believe that the Westminster Confession of Faith is true. These, unless the Assembly is different from any held in the last ten years, will be set apart promptly as a peculiar people. One of them may be nominated for Moderator, others may speak against the weakening of our doctrinal standards in the plan of merger with the United Presbyterians, still others may be bold enough to explain why the Board of Foreign Missions has lost their confidence. One or two, we hope, will preach in Cleveland churches on Sunday.

A blessing would come to the General Assembly if they are treated with a fraction of the respect shown to their opponents. If publicity managers for once would refrain from announcing in the press that "Dr. So-and-So who is the candidate of the Extreme Fundamentalists will run for Moderator" the effect would be refreshing spiritually. As a matter of fact the Reverend Harold S. Laird, who may be nominated,¹ is as far from being the unpleasant person that menacing description conjures up as could be found. He is a high-minded, hard-working pastor with a distinguished record and he is capable of serving the Church magnificently. He is entitled to fair play.

The debates on the floor of the Assembly surely would be improved by omitting aspersions upon men who are concerned about the security of the Church's own standards. Directing attention to the advertised sweetness and amiability of men who want to liberalize the standards and contrasting it with the equally advertised depravity of

¹ Dr. Laird will not be a commissioner at this Assembly.

men who feel that this would be the betrayal of a trust from God, is manifestly more becoming to Tammany Hall than to the Court of the Lord Jesus Christ. What a happy day would dawn if this well-worn subterfuge of politics were bowed out of the General Assembly forever! And if a zealous Fundamentalist preaches on Sunday is it too much to expect Monday's newspapers to have heard no

suggestions about heading the report of his sermon with blazing stream lines calculated to rob his words of dignity and caricaturing him as some frenzied bigot on the war-path?

Talleyrand's methods have brought irremediable loss to the Presbyterian Church. The hour of their departure is decidedly overdue.

A Missionary's Statement to the Home Constituency

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



AS THE writer, after much prayerful examination, knows his own heart, he has been constrained to make the statement which follows only by loyalty to Christ, to his ordination vows, to the sacred cause of Foreign Missions to which he has devoted his life, and to the highest interests of the Church and Board he serves. Keenly aware of the delicacy of the situation, he is determined to confine his disclosures to those which are not only true, but kind and necessary, in the earnest prayer that they may bring only good and no real harm to the cause he loves.

Through the sale of the Presbyterian Mission Press in Shanghai, there has come into the hands of our China Council a large sum of money which with Board approval has been constituted a Literature Fund to be dispensed for the promotion of the sale and distribution of existing, and the production of new Christian literature. Realizing the immense importance of the proper use of such a fund and the tragedy which might follow its misuse, the writer, in hearty cooperation with his Station, has tried his very best to persuade his Mission, the China Council, and the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America to approve grants from this fund only to such bodies or agencies as are willing to furnish guarantee as to their truly evangelical character. Since these efforts have proved futile and earnest warning has been disregarded, it becomes his plain duty, however painful and at whatever cost, to make to the supporters of our Foreign Mission work a frank statement of certain important facts of which he is cognizant and which they have a right to know.

1. The resolutions of the Tengersien Station adopted on April 15, 1933, by unanimous vote were rejected by both the Council and the Board, though abundant proof was presented to each of these bodies of the imperative need for these resolutions. The resolutions read as follows:

Inasmuch as certain cooperative bodies such as the National Christian Council of China and the Christian Literature Society, which draw their support in part from the Foreign Mission Board of the Presbyterian

Church in the United States of America, are producing and distributing literature some of which is distinctly inimical to those articles of faith which the General Assembly of our Church in America has repeatedly declared to be essential doctrines of the Word of God and the Standards of our Church; and, inasmuch as there is real and imminent danger of other large amounts of our Board's funds being used in the same way;

(1) We would request our Board of Foreign Missions to take such steps as would prevent the continuance of such abuse of the Church funds in its hands.

(2) We would protest to the China Council and the Board against making any new or additional grants from the proceeds of the sale of the Presbyterian Mission Press at Shanghai (such as that voted by the Ad Interim Committee of the China Council for a Rural Newspaper and held up only temporarily by the protest of one of the China Councillors, see C. C. 33193), or from any other funds under their control to bodies or agencies which are unwilling to offer a definite guarantee committing themselves and their literary output to loyalty to those doctrines which our General Assembly in America has declared to be essential.

While rejecting these very essential safeguards, the Board has substituted therefor a simple request that the China Council "be thoroughly assured that the literature produced and subsidized by this fund has a distinctly Christian and evangelical viewpoint and purpose and makes a direct and desired contribution to the work of the Presbyterian Missions and of the Churches with which they are formally cooperating." However, in view of the lack of care on the part of the Board as to the sort of literature they put before the study classes in the Church at home and recommend to their new missionaries, one scarcely sees how this request can prove an effective safeguard.

2. Although detailed proof was presented that a considerable amount of the output of the Christian Literature Society in China was distinctly destructive of faith in such essential doctrines as Christ's substitutionary atonement and the infallibility of His Word, and some of it even of faith in His deity (see evidence presented by the writer

to Dr. J. Gresham Machen at his request and incorporated by him in his "Modernism and the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A."), the full time of a missionary and a grant of 3,000 dollars Chinese for the year 1933-34 were given with Board consent to that society for the promotion of the sale of religious literature. This new and additional grant to the Society may be taken as their answer to our protest.

3. A grant of \$400 Chinese per month for one year was made to the North China Rural Service Union for the establishment and maintenance of a "Rural Christian Paper." Although this union, as the writer clearly pointed out to the China Council and the Board, contains a number of influential electing units whose doctrinal standpoint is radically at variance with that of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and although a number of the principal promoters of the paper are pronounced "modernists," no promises were demanded as to the doctrinal character of this paper. Word of the Board's approval of this grant also has recently come to hand and may be regarded as a further direct answer to our protest.

4. Although the Tenghsien Station confined their protest to the very acute situation arising from unguarded cooperation in the matter of religious literature, they and many other evangelical missionaries have long felt the serious menace to our cause involved in other forms of cooperation not secured by a definite doctrinal basis. It is widely known here in China and should be in America as well that the inevitable tendency among creedless union universities, theological seminaries and church federations, such as the National Christian Council, is toward a so-called "modernism" which is distinctly antagonistic to faith in God's Word and certain doctrines of that Word which our Church has ever held to be essential. What is actually happening in the case of certain institutions of that character in which our Missions and Board are cooperating may be seen from unchallenged testimony from China used in Dr. Machen's pamphlet which I have mentioned above. A number of years ago Dr. J. W. Lowrie, then Chairman of our China Council, claimed that insufficiently safeguarded union institutions of higher learning were much more of a liability than an asset to our cause, and, on the whole, things have by no means improved since then.

Such unguarded cooperation is being extended also in another dangerous direction. Regular station appropriations in many cases are being put under the control of local councils, boards of directors, and so forth, composed of representatives of Stations, Chinese church courts (some of which have left the Presbyterian fold and joined the inclusive Church of Christ in China which as a whole flatly refuses to profess its faith even in such vital doctrines as the substitutionary atonement), and others coopted or elected by other units. No definite requirement is made by the Board as to the faith of these representatives other than perhaps their membership in some "evangelical church" which, alas! may mean almost anything these days.

In the case of the local councils in Shantung, the Mission, China Council and Board have approved of a scheme of

their reorganization which, in spite of the consistently expressed desire of the North China Presbyterian Synod, the unanimous vote of every one of its representatives together with two missionaries in the reorganization committee, eliminates the requirement passed by the former Provincial Church Council that all local councillors answer in the affirmative the doctrinal questions propounded to church officers in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., or at least assent to the five truths repeatedly declared by the General Assembly of that Church to be essential doctrines of the Word of God and its standards. The protest of the writer against Board money being administered by such creedless bodies brought only the stipulation by the Board that the new constitution must be passed by a majority of the six Presbyteries concerned (three Presbyterian and three belonging to the Church of Christ in China) and that the requirement be added that the local councillors must be members of evangelical churches. It is only right that the Church at home should know that the above seems to be a deliberate policy of the Board for the administration of much of its funds. In view of the trend toward loose doctrine especially among graduates of union institutions who are obtaining employment in church and mission work, it seems very far from a sound policy.

It is true that the Board claims in defense of its general policy of creedless cooperation that it is the agent of the whole church rather than of the conservative element and that it is at least as conservative as a cross-section of that church. But are those who approve such cooperation entirely loyal to the Word of God (Rom. 16:17, II Cor. 6:14-15, II John 9-11) or the standards of our Church? Is the Board to be permitted to represent not only the loyal but the disloyal element as well? What answer will the Bible-believing Presbyterians, the spiritual descendants of those who willingly shed their blood in defense of the great truths now at stake—what answer will they make to this question? May the Holy Spirit lead them to make the right answer and to give themselves to prayer and do their utmost to lead the Board and the General Assembly to make that answer, too!

Then will our precious cause be saved from great and imminent disaster. Then can all true Presbyterians again unite with all their heart in the support of the old Board whose loyalty it will no longer be possible to doubt. Then will such a blessing come upon our work as we have not seen in many a day and untold multitudes of souls be saved. What will you do to bring this about? The writer would gladly give his life for that result.

Let us by no means give up the old Board with its blessed history, nor desert the hundreds of true missionaries now connected with it; but, at the same time, let loyal Presbyterians throughout the Church with all firmness and persistency demand its reform and rescue from those unevangelical and compromising influences which detract from its present and menace its future usefulness. Our Board has no truer friends than those who have tried to render it this service.

Servants of God or Servants of Men

Address to the Graduating Class at the Commencement of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Tuesday Evening, May 8, 1934

By J. Gresham Machen, Professor of New Testament



YOU will notice that I have written what I shall say to you upon these few sheets of paper that I hold in my hand. That does not mean that what I shall say does not come from the heart. It does not mean that when in deep affection I bid you Godspeed in my own name and in the name of my colleagues in the Faculty I desire to place any cold medium of a written page

between my heart and yours. But it means that I am conscious of standing here in a very great crisis in the history of the church to which many of us belong, the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. On such an occasion it is incumbent upon a man to weigh his words, and to keep precise record of what he says. I am speaking, indeed, without consultation of my colleagues. I alone am responsible for what I shall say. But I am aware of the momentous issues involved; and I want, therefore, to have a copy of this little address, insignificant though it be in itself, in case there should be any inquiry as to what it contains.

You are seeking entrance into the Christian ministry. At such a time it is proper for you to count the cost; it is proper for you to ask just what being a Christian minister means. There is just one thing that I want to say to you in answer to that question. The thing that I want to say to you is that you cannot be a Christian minister if you proclaim the word of man; you can be a Christian minister only if you proclaim, without fear or favor, the Word of God.

In the twenty-second chapter of the First Book of Kings we read how the messenger who was sent to call the prophet Micaiah the son of Imlah coached the prophet as to what he should say. "Behold now," he said, "the words of the prophets declare good unto the king with one mouth: let thy word, I pray thee, be like the word of one of them, and speak that which is good." But Micaiah said: "As the Lord liveth, what the Lord saith unto me, that will I speak."

You, my brethren, must be like Micaiah the son of Imlah; you, too, must say: "As the Lord liveth, what the Lord saith unto me that will I speak." The Lord does not, indeed, speak to you in the manner in which He spoke to

Micaiah. He does not speak to you by direct supernatural revelation. You are not prophets. But He speaks to you through the supernatural Book. It is only when you proclaim the words of that Book that you are a true minister of Jesus Christ. Only then can you say: "Thus saith the Lord."

The congregations for which you labor may, as the world looks upon them, be but insignificant groups of humble people. But never forget that those insignificant and humble groups are the Church of the living God, and that you as their ministers must proclaim to them the awful and holy and blessed Word.

If you obtain your message from any other authority than the Word of God, the Bible, if you obtain it from the pronouncements of presbyteries or General Assemblies, then you may wear the garb of ministers, but you are not ministers in the sight of God. You are then disloyal to the Lord Jesus Christ; you have betrayed a precious trust.

The temptation to you to be disloyal is coming to you in insistent fashion just at the present moment. It is coming to you through the words of cultured and well-meaning gentlemen, and it is coming to you through the unwarranted acts of ecclesiastical councils and courts. In the Presbytery of Baltimore, at a meeting on April 17, 1934, the temptation came through the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church

in the U. S. A. The following passage from a letter of the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly to the Stated Clerk of that Presbytery was read in open session:

If and when any students from Westminster Seminary come before your Presbytery, they should be informed that the Presbytery will neither license nor ordain them until they have given a written pledge that they will support the official agencies of the Church as a part of their pledge of loyalty to the government and discipline of the Church.

The Presbytery of New Brunswick, acting, earlier, on the same principle, and equally in contradiction to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., has placed in its manual, by an action taken September 26, 1933, a provision that no one shall be received into the Presbytery without being subjected to an examination as to his willingness to support the regularly appointed Boards and Agencies.



The Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.

I feel compelled to say to you, my brethren, with the utmost plainness, that if you sign the pledge demanded of you in that letter of Dr. Lewis S. Mudge and practically implied in that action of the Presbytery of New Brunswick, if you obtain your licensure or ordination in that way, then, quite irrespective of the question whether the Boards and Agencies are or are not worthy of trust at this moment or at any particular moment, you have become servants of men and are not in the high Biblical sense servants of the Lord Jesus Christ. If you promise to adapt your message to shifting majorities in church councils or to the mandates of church officials, if you promise to commend one kind of missions this year and an opposite kind next year, as the General Assembly, newly elected every year, may direct, if you thus take the Bible from your pulpits and place the Minutes of the General Assembly in its place, if you thus abandon the Reformation and do despite to all the blood and tears that it cost, if you thus abandon the high liberty guaranteed you by the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and if (as, alas, you do if you abandon that liberty) you abandon also your allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ by putting fallible men into the place of authority that belongs only to Him, then the ministry has become, as far as you are concerned, merely a profession, and rather a contemptible profession too. You may, by taking such a step, obtain high ecclesiastical preferment; but never can you be ministers of the New Covenant, never can you be ambassadors of God.

If, on the other hand, you choose, as indeed you have already shown very nobly that you have chosen, to obey God rather than men, then you may look to the future with unconquerable joy. If any one door be closed to you by the usurped authority of human councils or officials, be assured that some other and greater door will be opened to you

in God's own way. But, above all, remember that that Captain is worthy whose service you are thus preferring to the favor of men. He is worthy because of His infinite power and glory. But He is also worthy because of something else. There are other things besides the effulgence of His royal majesty which mark Him as our Lord:

Hath He marks to lead me to Him,
If He be my Guide?
"In His feet and hands are wound-prints,
And His side."

Is there diadem, as Monarch,
That His brow adorns?
"Yea, a crown, in very surety,
But of thorns."

If I find Him, if I follow,
What His guerdon here?
"Many a sorrow, many a labor,
Many a tear."

If I still hold closely to Him,
What hath He at last?
"Sorrow vanquished, labor ended,
Jordan passed."

If I ask Him to receive me,
Will He say me nay?
"Not till earth and not till heaven
Pass away."

Finding, following, keeping, struggling,
Is He sure to bless?
"Saints, apostles, phophets, martyrs,
Answer, 'Yes.'"

"Ye were bought with a price," my brethren; "be not ye the servants of men."

The Christian Assembly

A Christian Fellowship for "Continuing and Contending Christianity,
based on a Protestant Declaration and Purpose". (Seattle Chapter.)

WE BELIEVE:

1. That the only remedy for the present confused, distressed and changing world, is the Word of God, Scripture interpreted, believed, taught and lived.

2. That the threatened dissolution of our political, social, economic and Christian order is due to forces antagonistic to God, His Holy Word and our Lord Jesus Christ.

3. That these forces are headed toward anti-God communism; which, consciously or unconsciously, is supported by or allied with many schools of rationalistic thought, representing in varying degrees, forces antagonistic to God and the Lordship of Jesus Christ.

4. That the impact of these forces on the Christian Church has resulted:

(a) In the preaching and teaching of an impure and perverted Gospel, which has confused, perplexed, misled

and devitalized Christian testimony; discouraged sacrificial dedication, and has encouraged license rather than the service of love.

(b) In the questioning, disbelieving or declaring as an unnecessary doctrine, the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ, as God in the flesh.

(c) In the qualifying, doubting, and denying of the inspiration and authority of the Word of God.

(d) In the substituting of a legal, rational, ethical and non-supernatural Christianity, for Scripture interpreted Christianity, a substitution which the Apostle Paul declares as no Gospel at all.

WE BELIEVE:

1. That while the polity or government of the Presbyterian Church is mainly ministerial and declarative, its fun-

damental purpose is to maintain pure doctrine, a valid testimony, unity of action and peace among the brethren.

2. That the power delegated or lodged in the leadership of the church, particularly that represented in the General Assembly, has failed and is failing to maintain pure doctrine, which has resulted in an uncertain and conflicting testimony, destroyed unity of action and is threatening peace among the brethren.

3. That this failure is evidenced by:

(a) Failure to make an adequate declarative repudiation of the Auburn Affirmation.

(b) Failure to disapprove the action of Presbyteries and Boards of the Church in admitting to the ministry and the mission fields of the Church candidates who failed to concur in or accept the essential doctrines of our Confession of Faith, some of which were re-affirmed by the General Assembly of 1923.

(c) Failure to make an adequate declarative repudiation of the Laymen's Mission Appraisal and Report; to prohibit and protect against an outside organized and financed propaganda from using and exploiting our churches in the interest of putting into effect the Faith-destroying program proposed in "Re-thinking Missions."

(d) Failure to separate itself from the Federal Council of Churches, whose national radio broadcasts have belittled and ridiculed doctrines of our Confession of Faith.

(e) Failure to give, and in preventing from being given, adequate consideration to the charge of Modernism in the Board of Foreign Missions.

WE BELIEVE:

That the annual election of Moderator of the General Assembly is now looked upon as a measuring of the strength of the Modernistic and Evangelistic forces for leadership in the Church—a contest with political flavor, humiliating before the judgment of the world and destructive of true Christian testimony.

That each year has seen the wedge of Modernism driven deeper and deeper into the body of the Church, the doctrinal destination of which is now clearly revealed in the Laymen's Missionary Appraisal and Report, and which we believe to be a doctrine of men, intellectually conceived, ethical, cultural, man-powered, Christless, and not the vital and essential Gospel of the Grace of God.

BELIEVING:

That the above statements are symbolical of a generally known condition in the Church, which is grieving and distressing evangelical Christians, who are perforce made a party thereto:

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

That we, evangelical Christians, stand fast and "earnestly contend for the faith once for all delivered to the saints" (Jude 3); and believing that God's Word is "Forever, O Lord, settled in Heaven" (Psalm 118-89), and that "Man's chief end is to glorify God and enjoy Him" (Shorter Catechism); do hereby refuse to depart from the

Gospel of God's Grace; and to associate ourselves in a fellowship for the purpose of:

1. Seeking by prayer and the study of God's Word to obtain a better knowledge of the Will of God and His revelation concerning the Church.

2. Seeking the Lord's way as to how we can best contend for the Faith.

3. Seeking to know no authority above the Lord Jesus Christ, and to recognize no leadership above the Holy Spirit.

4. Informing ourselves as to the true and actual conditions within the Church.

5. Accumulating and disseminating true and clear information concerning these conditions.

6. Ceasing acquiescence and becoming protestant against Modernistic preaching, teaching, and leadership that is contrary to the Word of God.

7. Determining our individual and collective duty, relation and responsibility to and in the church, in view of these conditions.

In testimony thereto, we have attached our names:

Signed.....

The Christian Assembly is not an attempt to organize a new movement or promote any new doctrine, but is primarily intended as an organization to inform, unify and furnish a medium through which Bible-believing Christians may voice their protest against so-called Modernism in the Presbyterian Church.

The Leadership of the Church seem to be entangled in loyalties: to organizations, institutions, persons, financial supports and outside groups: which has all but closed our church courts for corrective action. The time has come when the laity must act, if the church is to continue as a witness for the truth, once for all delivered to the saints.

The Board of Directors

Mr. Albert S. Green, Mr. Walter H. Harrah, Mr. J. Forbes McBurney, Dr. Wilford M. Nelson, Mr. William R. Sibley, Mrs. Grace G. Bliss, Mrs. Margaret Bidlake, Mrs. Roxie L. Osborn, Dr. Georgia B. Sattler, Mrs. Carrie W. Talbott, W. R. Sibley (president).

For information, address Mrs. Grace G. Bliss, General Secretary, 1618 Ninth Street West, Seattle, Wash.



Editorial: MacKenzie v. Van Til

(Concluded from Page 3)

grounded in the Scripture statement, 'I will be your God, and ye shall be my people.'

"The newer modifications of Calvinism have passed away, and this pure and consistent form of Christian supernaturalism and evangelicalism alone stands as an impregnable barrier against the flood of naturalism which threatens to overwhelm all the Churches of Christendom. 'Soli deo gloria' may well be called the motto of Princeton Seminary, as it is of all true theology and religion."

Impressions of Philadelphia Presbytery

By An Observer



ON April 16th Philadelphia Presbytery adopted a resolution presented by the Rev. Wm. L. McCormick disapproving of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. The resolution did not ask for any approval of the Official Board, but was wholly condemnatory splenic, and denunciatory of the new Board. The feeling generated was altogether ungracious. The mover of the motion was vociferous in his intimidation of his fellow presbyters demanding a yea and nay vote, "so that it could be determined how every man stands," with dire consequences insinuated against dissenters.

But that is a sword that cuts two ways and no man will respect it. It was openly charged that the Independent Board was the result of personal spite. However, all indications of spite were on the other side, and were obvious in every advocate of the resolution except one. The friends of the Independent Board kept their temper and dignity and discussed the matter with becoming courtesy.

Attempt was made to show from the "Manual of Presbyterian Law" that the individual's liberty is curtailed by the organization, and that the local church must support the machine agencies willy nilly. The whole attempt revealed an effort at coercion which might do credit to Germany or Russia. But it might as well be realized that no American will stand for tyranny in Presbytery or General Assembly. Coercion awakes resentment. Persecution will raise up friends for the Independent Board. Every attempt, such as this was, votes money out of the treasuries of the denomination, and each Church will continue to dispose of its benevolence as it pleases. Some per-fervid appeals were made to excite sympathy for the missionaries—all well and good in its place; but no more the attitude of one side than the other. It was not the Independent Board that cast aspersion on the missionaries. The Laymen's Report did that, which some of the Official Board commend and circulate. The missionaries themselves are more in line with the principles of the Independent Board than with the old one, and would stand ten to one against the Modernism that has made the Official Board an object of suspicion.

Is This Hellphobia?

By Thomas M. Slater



THE word "Hellphobia" is not found in the dictionary, but was coined a generation ago by Professor William Shedd of Union Seminary, to designate that rebellious and impenitent fear felt by guilty and unforgiven sinners when they allow themselves, or are forced by an awakened conscience, to think of the future life and future retribution.

This is a word which, it seems to me, should be re-minted and put into circulation at the present time. True, it has to do with some very distressing things. The misery of lost souls, their behavior before death, and their ultimate destiny after death, are not pleasant subjects upon which to dwell. But we live in a world of stern realities, while the possible issues of a change of worlds have even greater solemnities and challenge serious consideration.

Dying of Thirst

Let us therefore recognize that hellphobia, like hydrophobia, is a malignant distemper, due to a deadly virus that has been introduced into the spiritual life of our race by a raging foe, and communicating to humanity a foretaste of the agony of Hell. In plain words, because "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23), and because "The wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6:23), the fear of retribution is native to us all. This is the "evil conscience" from which all hearts need cleansing (Heb. 10:22). It is the congenital fear on account of which all who have not availed themselves of the only cure in Jesus Christ are "All their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb. 2:15). Many, very many, in whom this principle is working are unaware of their true condition and would resent any suggestion of this. But since all have an inherited sinful nature, the latent germs of this innate malady are sure to incubate eventually, there is no self-cure, and without recourse to the only divinely appointed Remedy graciously provided in Christ's Redemption, the end is inevitable.

Refusing Help

A fatal element in this situation is that so many who are afflicted in this way resist and set themselves against the Physician and His cure. It may or may not be true that victims of hydrophobia cannot partake of water and, though dying for lack of it, have a morbid and unreasonable antagonism to that life-giving supply—according to an old tradition being thrown into convulsions at the sight, sound, or even the thought of something every normal person craves. But there is no uncertainty about the behavior of many Hell-deserving sinners toward the Lord Jesus Christ, who offers Himself to us as the "Water of Life" (Jno. 7:37). This attitude, so unreasonable and tragic, makes their fate, apart from our Saviour's miracle-working mercy, so hopeless. Then if they have abilities as teachers or leaders while still needing relief, their presence in society is a public menace. We summarily dispose of a mad dog and quarantine his victims; but what protection have we against those who, though seemingly well, in their innermost life are suffering under something infinitely worse than rabies, and whose placid madness is satisfied only when they are making other victims?

Attacking the Truth

The foregoing thoughts have been suggested by the hostility now shown in some quarters to everything the Bible has to say about the future retribution of the wicked. The doctrine of endless punishment has always been one of the most-hated truths of Christianity; but neither the Church, nor the Creed, nor the Ministry are responsible for its claims. It is an integral part of the Gospel, as fully revealed in God's Word as the Atonement of Christ and His way to Heaven, and has been given in charge by our Divine Lord to be believed and preached throughout the whole world (Mark 16:16).

Opposition to this truth has always been intense but more deadly and persistent at some times than others. Like other Bible truths it has had its days to be attacked and defended. History shows that such opposition is most bitter during ages of luxury, when men are devoted to pleasure and self-indulgence, and when the glory and power of natural forces and human intellect and effort are greatly exaggerated and vaunted. A day of special hostility to this part of the Gospel is with us now. Of this no thoughtful person can be ignorant, nor about it any friend of the truth be indifferent. The chief difference between the present outbreak and others seems to be that, while such hostility has always been shown by atheists or those who make no profession of religion, some of the worst foes of this doctrine are now found in the Church. Formerly it was people like Voltaire, Ingersoll and Paine who led in the attack. Now the assault is made by professed ministers, missionaries, university men and others who profess to be friends of Christ.

How About This?

The present writer is not here attempting to give a full account of the many vicious attacks of this kind he has recently noticed, neither is he as yet prepared to report his full conclusions concerning them. I merely call attention to their prevalence in the pulpit, press and elsewhere as others must have observed. I record my alarm concerning them, and resent the challenge which they throw in the face of all who know and still believe what the Bible has to say about Hell. I feel that God and His Angels are asking, "Has the Church no answer to these things?" And surely we should be asking ourselves if we shall be cowed into silence by the prominence, popularity, or professed piety of some who are making these utterances.

I was recently reading of the alarm with which the faithful physicians and nurses of our country recognized the first appearance of infantile paralysis some years ago, the vigilance with which they set themselves to study and combat this new menace,

the care with which they sought to isolate and analyze the germ-cell of this great foe of public health, the tireless search they made to discover its true antidote, the publicity they gave their findings, and the warnings we heard about this danger. I remember very gratefully our own family doctor's part in that battle with the case of one very dear to me. And shall these guardians of physical health, the physicians and hospitals, exhibit a greater degree of faithfulness than our ministers and churches who have in charge the eternal welfare of immortal souls?

Our great challenge right now, as it seems to me, is to isolate and analyze the germ-cell of all this present outcry against the Doctrine of Hell, rightly classify and deal with those who are carriers and distributors of an infection infinitely worse than rabies and for which the Atonement is the only cure; and so help with our Great Physician in His battle with a world malady.

Mackenzie v. Van Til

(Conclusion)

Dr. Mackenzie:

Dear Dr. Van Til.



OUR long rejoinder suggests (1) that brevity is commendable in writers of articles, and very grateful to their readers—in short, that "Brevity is the soul of wit."

Consider the state of the case. In March you used 2000 words to prove me a heretic, or rather a perfect colluvies of heresies—an irrationalist, an evolutionist, an agnostic, a tychist, an Auburnist, an Arminian, and, worst of all, a modern Princetonianist—a new heresy unknown to the old

Westminster divines, but the head and front of my offending in your sight.

In April you use 6000 words for the same purpose. At that rate of progression you will have to produce 18,000 words in May. This is not calculated to add to the gaiety of nations or the edification of the church. Do you wonder that the prospect of this labored loquacity fills the adamant souls of the editors of CHRISTIANITY TODAY with a canonical apprehension that this flood may carry us all away?

(2) It suggests also a great contrast between Warfield and Van Til.

My five articles in The Encyclopedia of Religion & Ethics you impale on the five points of Calvinism. These five points, really fabricated in the Arminian workshop, Calvinists transformed into the beautiful mnemonic tulip. You plait them into a crown of thorns with which to crucify my theology. You despaired of proving your case from my book alone, so you suborn the evidence of these articles. You have appealed to Caesar, then to Caesar let us go.

These articles were written from the philosophical standpoint, and not, save incidentally, from the theological. I was asked to do so because other writers had the handling of Calvinism, Arminianism, Predestination, etc. That explains the absence of direct theological reference which you find so ominous. You find in them nothing worthy of commendation. Would it have stained the ermine of your new orthodoxy to have noted in them any merit whatsoever?

Now contrast your cuttle-fish criticism with Dr. Warfield's methods. He also in his reviews of the Volumes of the Encyclopedia (reviews which are in The Princeton Review, Vols. 11 and 13), deals with some of these offending articles of mine. In a review of four pages of small print, covering a volume

of nearly one thousand pages—of which my article occupies only seven—he gives me one-fifth of his space, and the notice is on the whole most flattering and appreciative. He says it is "an oasis in which to rest our spirits," and he quotes from it approvingly. I refer to this reluctantly, but you compel me to do so.

Then another article of mine, in another Volume, he describes as "a bright discussion abounding in illuminating statements." He suggests that I give too much weight to Kant's dictum—"Every ought implies a can"—a suggestion with which I agree. You will notice that in my book, I myself (unconscious at the time of Warfield's suggestion), criticize this very sentence of Kant's even more drastically than he did. Again he devotes a considerable portion of his review to my article, which would indicate that he saw something good in it. Does not that suggest a great contrast between your method and his? Is there any tenet of Calvinism, even of the new Westminster brand, which compels one to look for scorpions under every Princeton stone? So much for your method; now for your matter.

AGNOSTICISM AND TYCHISM

You again reiterate the charge against me of Agnosticism and Tychism, as if I held that God Almighty was defective in knowledge and experimented in ignorance of results. To state the case is, for honest men, sufficient refutation of your poor calumny. There is no "chance" with the Eternal, nor darkness of ignorance in Him. What I am concerned with is our knowledge of Him and His ways—not His perfect knowledge of Himself and of our ways. This separates, by the whole diameter of being, my treatment from that of the agnostics and tychists you have in your brain.

"We are compelled," says Hilary, writing on the mystery of the Trinity (Bk. 2.2) "by the errors of heretics and blasphemers to handle unlawful matters, to scale difficult heights, to speak of ineffable things, and to tread on forbidden ground. And when by faith alone we ought to do the commandments of God, to adore the Father, and with Him to venerate the Son, and to abound in the Holy Ghost, we are constrained to stretch the inadequacy of our speech to the handling of things unutterable."

Forgive me, then, if I prefer to stand with all reverent writers in Scripture and in the Church, and not with those sequacious quasi-theologians who speak of the Eternal as if they knew in logical detail every jot and tittle of His decrees and purposes.

Spencer and James and others of that ilk move in a different universe of discourse from mine. For I believe in the Trans-

cent God who has in His Word revealed Himself for our redemption and our regulation. Why persist in covering me with the confusion which is in your own mind?

ANTINOMIES

Nor am I greatly perturbed by the charge of being a Kantian or Kierkegaardian antinomist. There are no antinomies for God—but there are for me, and for most men who hesitate to claim omniscience. Can *you* satisfactorily reconcile foreknowledge and freedom? If you can, you are the first man I've heard of who could do so, and you ought not to deny your fellow-mortals the benefits of your esoteric knowledge. If we believe only what we thoroughly know, our creed will be very short indeed.

"Beware of reasoning on Scripture statements, for logic in theology can effect anything. Its utter inapplicability is shown from this that we frequently believe in religion, what on admitted premises we can logically disprove, and on the other hand, refuse to believe what on admitted premises we can logically prove. The mind is not logic—truth streams into it through a thousand channels. And it is no proof in religion that you are in the wrong way if you see a precipice before you—you will be in the wrong way if you go over it. Reflect then that in the economy of providence no principles are carried to their full application, but there is an equipoise of forces." (A. B. Davidson.)

So much for antinomies. They are not applicable to God, even if Kierkegaard had said they are, which is doubtful, but to us. That brings me to your third charge, which I fancy you regard as the most serious of all, viz., my

ANTI-CALVINISM

(3) I am grateful to you for your effort to teach me Calvinism. I flatter myself, rightly or wrongly, that your attempt is like bringing owls to Athens, or enchantments to Egypt, or indulgences to Rome, or coals to Newcastle—a work of supererogation in which as a good Protestant I do not believe. But let me return the compliment without being guilty of supererogation.

The first principle of Calvinism is the supremacy of the Word of God—not of the word of John Calvin or of any Confession. And so Calvinism has corrected Calvin on some points, as on the relation between faith and assurance, and others, and there is no reason why it may not correct itself by the Word, if necessary. We must keep that in mind, otherwise we put a system between us and God.

Again while we hold that God's eternal purposes are known to Him and are His alone—yet the difficulty for us is the relation of these to events and to the nature of man. In the passage you quote, I state the dangers and defects of Calvinism against which it must ever guard—the spectre of Fatalism, as Dr. Hodge calls it. Every Calvinist knows it, and against that I warn, as all of us who are true Calvinists must do, for our enemies easily misrepresent us.

And yet you captiously, like the Arminians of old, raise against me the spectre of reprobation. You isolate it and raise this to the level of a main tenet of Calvinism which it is not. The doctrine of reprobation in any form is, as all Calvinists admit, not revealed in Scripture as the positive doctrine of the Election of believers is. It is an inferential, rather than an integral part of revelation, which some good Calvinists hesitate to draw, but which their opponents for the sake of obloquy insist that they do draw, and that they exclusively emphasise, to the neglect of the positive side of God's sovereign grace in salvation.

Now your method with me is the method of the Arminians at the Synod of Dort. I repudiate it, as it was then repudiated, nor do your copious quotations from the Confession substantiate it in the least.

My purpose in the obiter dictum you quote from my article was to make clear (I use the words of a famous Calvinist):

"that a decree of reprobation which will damn men though they should repent and believe, or will hinder any man from repenting and believing, or will cause and work any man's impenitency or unbelief," or any doctrine of election "which will save men whether they repent or not repent, believe or not believe, persevere or not persevere, is not Calvinism at all but its perversion"—an "error" and a "blasphemy"; and again to make clear, (I use the words of another Calvinist), that "election bars no man from blessedness . . . is not in any sense a doctrine of exclusion, its whole design is to be an instrument of security. Election shuts no one out; but it is so contrived that it shuts the elect effectually in."

That is the Calvinism in which I delight, and I refuse to be concussed by your inferences or overwhelmed by your irrelevant citations. I say with a great Calvinistic preacher "Election or no election, predestination or no predestination, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved", or with the Synod of Dort, "The death of the Son of God . . . is of infinite worth and value abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world. Moreover the promise of the gospel is that whosoever believeth in Christ Crucified shall not perish but have everlasting life. This promise together with the command to repent and believe ought to be declared and published to all nations and to all persons promiscuously and without distinction to whom God out of His mere good pleasure and wisdom sends the Gospel. And whereas many who are called by the Gospel do not repent and believe in Christ, but perish in unbelief, this is not owing to any defect or insufficiency in the sacrifice offered by Christ upon the cross, *but is wholly to be imputed to themselves* (Art. 3.5.6).

Therefore I say to you as Luther said, "If thou wilt needs dispute about predestination, then I truly advise thee to begin first at the wounds of Christ, and then all that disputation will cease" (Table Talk, p. 405).

Let us end our dispute there and refute the taunt that "party men always hate a slightly differing friend more than a downright enemy."

Yours in equanimity,

DONALD MACKENZIE,
Princeton Theological Seminary.

Dr. Van Til:



IN his second reply to me Dr. Mackenzie complains of the fact that I have gone to his article in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* in order to justify the criticism I had made on his book. It is difficult to see the justice of this complaint since Dr. Mackenzie himself appealed to what he called his well-known theological position in order to meet my charge against his book.

As to Dr. Mackenzie's reflections on my remarks with respect to Agnosticism, Antinomies and Calvinism little needs to be said. Dr. Mackenzie does not go to his articles in order to prove that my criticism of them was unfair or incorrect. He practically limits himself to stating what he now believes. Moreover, he does not give the references for the quotations he makes from theologians. The quotation from the articles of the Synod of Dort do not prove that Dr. Mackenzie believes in limited atonement. Dr. Mackenzie quotes from articles three, five and six of the "second head of doctrine." I will quote article eight. "For this was the sovereign counsel, and most gracious will and purpose of God the Father, that the quickening and saving efficacy of the most precious death of his Son should extend to all the elect, for bestowing upon them alone the gift of justifying faith, thereby to bring them infallibly to salvation: that is, it was the will of God,

that Christ by the blood of the cross, whereby he confirmed the new covenant, should effectually redeem out of every people, tribe, nation, and language, all those, and those only, who were from eternity chosen to salvation, and given to him by the Father, that he should confer upon them faith, which together with all the other saving gifts of the Holy Spirit, he purchased for them by his death; should purge them from all sin, both original and actual, whether committed before or after believing; and having faithfully preserved them even to the end, should at last bring them free from every spot and blemish to the enjoyment of glory in his own presence forever." Now I have in effect maintained that Dr. Mackenzie rejects article eight. He replies in effect by saying that he believes articles three, five and six. To be sure, he says he was seeking to defend Calvinism against misinterpretation, but this cannot be accomplished by rejecting the doctrine of limited atonement itself. Dr. Mackenzie has in the past definitely rejected limited atonement. Nor does he even now say that he believes in it.

WARFIELD'S CRITICISM

One more point remains to be noted. Dr. Mackenzie once again appeals to Dr. Warfield. He attempts to prove that Dr. Warfield's review of his articles has been much more favorable than mine. Now while it is true that Dr. Warfield makes some commendatory comments especially on matters of form, as I might also gladly make, the fact remains that Dr. Warfield's criticism is basically the same as mine. Even in the review which we are told, is "on the whole most flattering and appreciative," Dr. Warfield says that Dr. Mackenzie is "a bit uncertain" in his handling of the "really creative nature" of the operations of the Holy Spirit in relation to the activities of the human will (Princeton Theological Review, Vol. XI, page 495). This criticism, serious as it is, is made stronger still in another review. We quote at length. "Professor Mackenzie sees no outcome without the postulation of a truly creative power of the will; but so far as we can see he discovers no ground for such a postulation beyond the extreme desirability that a new and better world should somehow be created. 'Surely,' he exclaims, 'the real question is: Can the tree itself be made good? not, Can grapes grow on thorns?' He certainly

is on solid ground when he adds: 'If any libertarian holds that good fruit can come from a bad tree without changing the tree itself first, then libertarianism is a lingering chimera.' But as certainly he has lost his footing on the rock when he contends that libertarians must, in the nature of the case, therefore be able to point to a 'possibility of changing the bad character itself.' True enough, 'for Christianity at any rate, the possibility of new creatures and a new world is basal.' But it is equally basal for Christianity that this is a possibility for God (with whom 'all things are possible') and not for a man himself. It is therefore that Christianity is a religion of Salvation. It is a faulty exegesis which reads our Lord as exhorting us ourselves to make the tree good that the fruit may be good: and the Kantian doctrine that every 'ought' implies a 'can' is but an *obiter dictum*, which Kant himself confessed had to be taken on faith and could not be rationally justified. Creation is not such an easy thing that we can lightly assume that it lies in our daily, nay momentarily, power, because without it we cannot escape from our evil selves—except by an act of God. It were better to abide in the *obiter dictum* of a greater than Kant: 'Ye must be born again'" (Princeton Theological Review, Vol. XIII, page 283).

One could scarcely think of a more serious criticism than that contained in the quotation given. Warfield found it necessary to point out at length, in the little space at his disposal, that man cannot save himself. Warfield found that the theology of Dr. Mackenzie is of doubtful orthodoxy, not merely on questions of detail but on the most important point of the new birth. It is difficult to see how Dr. Mackenzie can think of this review of Warfield as on the whole very favorable. Has the matter of soundness on the question of the new birth become so insignificant that a most severe criticism of Warfield on that point can be lightly dismissed?

My criticisms were made without knowledge of Warfield's reviews. It now appears that Warfield's criticism was at least as serious as mine. I am very sorry that in all this discussion Dr. Mackenzie has not seen fit to go into the merits of the case. His replies have only convinced me more deeply of the justice of my criticism. That criticism was most serious and therefore not lightly made.

"He Was a Good Man"

[Funeral sermon for Joseph Lynde Day, of the Old Historic Church of Londonderry, N. H., the oldest ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. He died at the age of 103 years, 2 months and eleven days, on March 20, 1934.]

By the Rev. Alexander Marlowe, Ph.D., S.T.D.

"With long life will I satisfy him, and show him my salvation" (Ps. 91:16). "He was a good man" (Acts 11:24). "He shall receive the Crown of Life, which the Lord promised to them that love Him" (James 1:12).



HIS is not a day of grief and sorrow. We have come to this sanctuary to pay our respects to the memory of one of God's sweetest saints, Joseph Lynde Day, and to celebrate his heavenly coronation, which took place Tuesday morning, March 20th, at five o'clock, according to the time of earth.

"With long life will I satisfy him, and show him my salvation." These words contain two promises, and both were fulfilled in his case. When God makes a promise, you may definitely rely upon it.

Not one of His promises was ever broken. God satisfied His venerable servant with a long life. "The days of our life are three score years and ten, and if there be strength, four score years." That is the Holy Spirit's time-allowance for average humanity. But the Lord of Life allotted Joseph Day more years than that. He spent 103 years, two months and eleven days

under these earthly skies. Thus the Covenant-Jehovah according to promise, satisfied him with long life.

The second clause of the divine assurance was, "and show him my salvation." That, too, was abundantly fulfilled. Our revered brother, the other morning, when his Father's call came to him, entered into the fullness of his soul's salvation. Shortly before he left, two of us stood by his bedside, and I said: "Mrs. Livingston, I am not superstitious; but I am conscious of spiritual presences in this room, and it seems to me that they are smiling." She understood me, for she replied: "I have felt the same several times." Why not? Surely, the holy angels, those ministering spirits, sent forth by the Most High, were there, forming up an escort to conduct him home to the land where his well-beloved Master had prepared a place for him. But listen carefully. Joseph Day did not have to die to realize the salvation of God. That salvation had been a present possession of his for more than ninety years. He entered into covenant relationship with God through the shed blood of the Redeemer when he was only a young boy, and his Master kept him safe and steady in the Faith all through his long life

up to the very end. He relied upon the keeping power of God, and he was not disappointed.

The story of his long and well-spent life has been written many times, and is known throughout the land. He was born on January 9, 1831, in Melrose, Massachusetts. That was, as you will note, during the Presidency of General Andrew Jackson, "Old Hickory" himself. Reflect on that, and consider what under God's providence has happened in this country and in the world, since that far-off day. At the age of twenty-five he moved to Wakefield, Mass., where he married his first wife, Miss Laura Gould. She died in 1871, after which he married Miss Susan Gore, who died in 1912.

At the outbreak of the Civil War, Joseph Day enlisted in the Eighth Massachusetts Regiment of Volunteers, and served with distinction for the entire duration of the war, under Colonel Peach of Marblehead. He was the oldest Civil War veteran in New England, possibly in the United States, and also, as far as can be ascertained, the oldest Ruling Elder in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. It is a striking coincidence that the oldest Ruling Elder in the country served the oldest Presbyterian Church in New England, the Church of Londonderry, N. H., founded April 12, 1719, and reorganized in 1736.

On his return from the Civil War, Joseph Day moved to Londonderry, where shortly afterwards he was elected and ordained an elder of this Church which he has served with devoted faithfulness since 1867. He was a true lover of Christ; hence, also, a true lover of Christ's Church. It had his constant prayers, his undivided interest, and his utter devotion. After the death of his second wife, he retired from his farm, and for a number of years made his home with Elder and Mrs. Wilbur Barrett. It was an experience I have heard him speak of with appreciation. As Mr. and Mrs. Barrett, like Mr. Day himself, were quiet, unostentatious servants of the same Master, they spent the time together in a very congenial way, appreciating one another. During the last sixteen years of his life, he lived with Mr. and Mrs. William Livingston. If he had been their own father, they could not have loved him more, or given him a more devoted care during his declining years than they did. It has always been an inspiration to me to visit that home and note the beautiful Christian relationship that existed between those people.

A little more than three years ago, our congregation, the people of the town and members of various military organizations, met here to felicitate Mr. Day on his one hundredth birthday anniversary. Messages of congratulation from two great Presidents—the late Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover, as well as from other dignitaries of Church and State, were read. One striking incident from that occasion comes to mind. One of his aged comrades, the late Captain Pillsbury, presented him, on behalf of the members of the local Grand Army Post, with a walking cane. None of us who were there is likely to forget the impromptu response of Mr. Day. We can yet see the venerable form of that saintly century-old patriarch with the beautiful, silver-crowned head, standing before us, and we all marvelled at the graciousness of his speech and the keenness of his mind. Veterans of Foreign Wars and members of the American Legion, do you remember the striking, beautiful words, which, on that occasion he addressed to you? I do. These were his closing words: "And I hope you will all become the friends of the Saviour that I may meet you all up yonder in the blessed home of our heavenly Father." What about it, gentlemen? Will you keep that tryst with him? None of us would want to disappoint him.

Now, what lessons can we legitimately draw from the life of our saintly friend and brother, who has left us for a little while?

"He was a good man." What does that mean in a scriptural sense?

1. First it means a man who has surrendered to God, and lives his life by faith in Christ, trusting in Him only for salva-

tion, and for all other things. Joseph Day was such a man. He lived in Christ, and Christ in him, and that was the secret of his beautiful character.

2. Another trait of a good man, is his love for God and his fellow men. He loves God for what He is, and for what He does. He loves his fellow men as the creatures of God, and as standing in the same relation to God with himself; but most of all he loves those of the household of faith. This trait was abundantly in evidence in our brother's life.

3. The good man *loves the Word of God*. He loves the Bible as the infallible Word of God. He reads the Bible as the Word of God. He obeys it as the Word of God. He loves its doctrines. He rejoices in its promises. He follows its directions. He makes it his counsel and his guide of life. Joseph Day was a Bible lover, and studied it assiduously as long as he was able to read it—that is, up to about a year ago. When his eyesight failed, he would sit and quote aloud long portions of its contents to himself. He had stored away a large part of it in the chambers of his memory.

4. The good man *reverences the Sabbath Day*. He loves the sacred stillness of the holy morning. He loves its peaceful and quiet hours. He loves its sweet and delightful associations. He loves to lay aside worldly thoughts, cares and anxieties, and on the wings of faith and meditation to rise above the world that he may anticipate the glories of heaven. You, who knew Joseph Day, knew him as a consistent lover of the Lord's holy day.

5. The good man *delights in public worship*. With the saints of old he says: "How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord!" As long as he was able to come, up to about a year ago, Elder Day's seat in the House of God would be occupied by him. When he finally complained that his hearing had become impaired, I induced him to sit with me in the pulpit where he might be close enough to the preacher to be able to hear. He was a bit bashful about that arrangement; but I have never felt more deeply honored than when he consented to do so. His soul and spirit was in the worship of God.

6. A good man loves to hear *the Gospel preached faithfully*. He does not go to church to be entertained or diverted. He wants the full, unadulterated Gospel, with preaching that probes the conscience, insists on the conversion of the soul and the New Birth, searches the heart, stimulates the affections, and presses the motives to obedience. Joseph Day loved that kind of preaching, and would abide by it and support it.

7. The good man is *governed by Christian principles*. This is seen in all his relations. It influences all his conduct. He is a promoter of "whatsoever things are true, honest, just and pure." If all men were like Joseph Day you could safely discharge every policeman in the country and break down every jail. There would be no need of them.

8. A good man *is a man of prayer*. Joseph Day was a mighty man of prayer. He was at it early and late and in between. The first time I visited the Livingston home, more than eleven years ago, I heard him talking in his room for more than a half hour. I asked Mr. Livingston: "Is he talking to himself?" "Oh, no," he replied, "he is praying." And he added: "And he means every word of it." Just so. He did. Because he was a true man of prayer, I am prepared to state with full conviction, that even in his declining days he was probably more useful to the world than many a famous person of vast activity. The politicians and diplomats may lay their plans and form their schemes; but the mighty saint of prayer who has the ear of the King of Heaven, can go into his closet and upset their most cunning schemes of wrongdoing, because God will do what he asks. What the world needs today is praying people of the type of Joseph Day.

Of him we may confidently quote the last text: "He shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord promised to them that love Him." He is gone. But his holy influence remains,

and will continue to remain. In the Christian Church we have for nineteen hundred years had people who are symbolized by Mr. Appearance and Mr. Reality. Mr. Appearance is usually faithful in the sense in which the Pharisees were faithful. He is in the Church to make a show of himself. It is the stage on which he exhibits for possible admiration. He will advise and direct, and he will blow his own trumpet till your ear-drums shiver. Not so, Mr. Reality. He has the Lord in mind. He cooperates gently, and he prays and works and gives to the glory of God. Hence his influence is lasting. The sun in heaven does not blow a trumpet. It merely shines. The little flower does not make a noise to attract attention to itself. It merely blooms in beauty. But how wonderful the influence of sun and flower! Thus is the influence of Mr. Reality for good—quiet, potent, beautiful, but unostentatious. Joseph Day was Mr. Reality in his relations to God and man. Hence his influence is

abiding, and his memory shall be blessed. He shall be missed among us, for his seats in God's House and in his home are vacant. But a seat of splendor has been provided for him at his Father's table on high. He loved his Lord, and therefore he has received the promised Crown of Life. Well may it be said of him as of the great Apostle: "He has fought a good fight—he has finished his course—and henceforth there is laid up for him a crown of glory," which he has now gone to inherit. And so we salute him with those majestic words with which the Christian Church for seventeen centuries has committed her dying children into the arms of the Triune Jehovah, saying: "Depart in peace, thou ransomed soul! May God the Father, Almighty, who created thee; and Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, who redeemed thee; and the Holy Spirit who sanctified thee, preserve thy going out and thy coming in, from this time forth, even for evermore!" Amen.

This Changing World

By
"Calvinist"

IT has long been a popular device of fictionists to imagine the end of the world. It is a notable fact that such prophecies of doom gain greater currency in ages when mankind is disillusioned and tired than in more robust times when men see themselves so large that they fill the whole of the future's horizon. A few years ago the cult of progress had been erected into what amounted almost to a new and infallible religion—a religion, by the bye, that seemed well on its way to capture Protestant Christendom. The man who doubted progress as a never-ending upward spiral endured the twentieth century equivalent of burning at the stake—namely, the lifted eyebrow and the sadly shaken head. Poor fellow! He had simply fallen behind somehow in the race for intelligence.

Today it would be only a commonplace to say that critical opinion is very skeptical concerning this thing called "progress." Amusingly, the situation is now reversed, and the poor gentlemen who still vociferate about progress are themselves regarded as having fallen behind the times. It is in 1934 the fashion among intellectuals who know their contemporary fashions (and who are not merely content to adopt them twenty years late), to bow at the shrine of the German colossus Oswald Spengler. To Spengler, civilization is spinning straight down the precipice of ruin, and nothing can stop the process because that civilization bears within itself the seeds of its own destruction. And this view is buttressed by Spengler and his followers with an enormous amount of learning and historical insight. (I do not mean to be understood as adopting his thesis. I am only stating it.)

Spengler, of course, is concerned principally with the future of man in society. Most of us, I suppose, care far more about what happens to the human race than we do about the possible fate of the planet on which it lives. Yet even so, there is a peculiar fascination to a person of imagina-

tion, in any attempt to forecast the future of the globe. What is the fate of the world to be as it drifts with the rest of the solar system through the abyss of space? A new book called "Creation's Doom" by Desiderius Papp, an Austrian, has been making something of a stir. It represents a serious attempt to predict a probable future on the basis of forces now known to operate. (Here, as will appear, is the fatal flaw.) In his preface the author remarks.

"The future pictures of humanity and of the earth which the author sketches are based upon the law of probability; their claim to be regarded as the presentation of real events of the future is founded on the almost indisputable principle that the same forces which have shaped our past will also mold our future, that the natural laws which were operative in the processes of this planet millions of years ago, and are so today, will also retain their validity during all the aeons that are to come."

Herr Papp believes that earth is yet young, and intelligence is in its infancy. He believes also that man has before him a future of undreamed-of mental development and mastery of his environment. Yet, he believes that, after millions of millions of years to come of stupendous development and achievements, man will die. To the author the law of the death of species is fundamental. Man must go. What then?

Since nature never, according to him, repeats itself, the day of the vertebrates is done. After another period of millions of millions of years, the scepter of empire devolves upon—the ants! The sun is old. Its rays, no more yellow, but an ageing red, have given to the ants such an increase in brain power and in actual physical bulk that they erect a mighty civilization. It covers the earth. It is organized more highly than the civilization of man ever was. (This startling idea came to Herr Papp as the result of recent scientific exper-

iments with red rays.) But this order does not last forever. The sun cools off through more aeons. Organized life disappears in the great cold. Only unicellular plants and animals survive, with bacteria. At length only the last named remain, themselves to die in their turn as the cold even solidifies earth's atmosphere. At last the light of the sun flickers out and "like a ship of death, the black cold sun is drifting through the deserts of space with the mournful retinue of its barren planets." But there is an end—so far as anything may be said to end completely—when the sun, drifting crazily through space plunges into a great gaseous cloud. (Such an event happening to another star was observed in the heavens in February, 1901.) The engendered heat makes the sun explode, and one after the other the planets "are dissolved into electrons in the consuming power of the devouring sun-ball." The solar system is gone from the universe.

Now, just what is wrong with this picture? And what is wrong with Spengler's vast yet comparatively insignificant canvas? The clue, I think, lies in noting the flaw hinted at above. The man who prophecies upon the basis of known forces and laws operating in the universe must, if he is to be accurate, include *all* the forces in operation. If he omits even one major force, his "solution" is nothing better than a guess, and perhaps even worse, since it bears the similitude of scientific exactitude, without the accompanying reality. What have Spengler and Papp left out of their calculations? Much, perhaps, that we *do not* know, and at least one Fact that we *do* know. And the Fact we do know, is the most important fact of all! Papp envisages a universe without God in it, and that universe simply does not exist. The universe that does exist is the universe in which the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is Sovereign, and in which human history and destiny is the working into the fabric called time of His wise and glorious decrees. The man who does not understand the self-revelation of God as given in the Bible can understand neither himself nor the universe in which he lives. The man who grasps something of the cosmic, stu-

pendous meaning of the death of Christ and the power of the God-man's shed blood, will never envisage a world organized by ants, or a dying universe.

One last remark: a true understanding of the Word of God shows the folly of these two extremes. The Christian man will not be swayed by the enthusiast who cries

"progress, progress," dazzled by utopias of human construction. Nor will he surrender to the pessimism of the man who has no God, no Saviour. To him, the Christian, confidence for the future is placed in the Person of God Himself, and progress is the fuller understanding (eternal in possibility) of His revealed will.

Sunday School Lessons for June

(International Uniform Series)

By the Rev. Prof. N. B. Stonehouse, Th.D

Lesson for June 3, 1934

JESUS IN THE SHADOW OF THE CROSS

(Lesson Text—Matthew 26. Golden Text—Verse 39)

IF Christ's death were like the death of an ordinary man, this chapter would be one of the gloomiest recorded in history. It describes His utter rejection by His own people and betrayal at the hands of one of the inner circle of confidants. And, sadder still, His last days with the disciples—their lack of whole-hearted devotion, their misplaced self-confidence and their abandonment of Him in the hour of agony and crisis. But the shadow of the cross retreats in the light of Jesus' own reflection upon His death. What His friends and foes did and said gives the setting for what Jesus did and said as He went to the cross, and our great concern is with the meaning He gave to the cross.

Jesus had told His disciples that the very purpose of His coming into the world was that He might die, and from the very beginning of His ministry (Baptism, Temptation) had shown that the way He was to pursue was one of humiliation and suffering rather than that of the glory which belonged to Him as the Messiah. There had been early intimations of His approaching death (like Mark 2:19 ff.), but it was especially after Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi that Jesus insisted upon talking about His death.

But the disciples did not care to hear about it. Peter, so little, that Jesus tells him that he has become an instrument of Satan by making the Messianic program of suffering and death a stumbling block to Him (Mt. 16:23). And the twenty-sixth chapter records the sad prophecy that Peter and the rest will find the Shepherd who was about to be smitten a stumblingblock (31-35) and its fulfillment in the flight of the disciples and Peter's denial (56, 69-75).

But how glorious the transformation after Pentecost when, as true followers of Christ, they too insist upon talking about His death! They preached Christ and Him crucified, an offence and a stumblingblock to Jew and Greek, but God's wisdom and God's power to those who believe.

Then they proclaimed that back of the

treachery of Judas and the crucifixion at the hands of the rulers stood the eternal purpose of God (Acts 2:23; 4:28). Jesus had taught that. To go to the cross was simply to mind the things of God (Mt. 16:23). The Shepherd was smitten of God Himself (v. 31; Zech. 13:7). And this is the great lesson of the agony in the garden: the only reason that Jesus drank the bitter cup was that it had been given Him of His Father to drink (36-46; see Heb. 5:7 f.).

Then they proclaimed that salvation was possible only through the Crucified Christ, the Servant of Jehovah (Acts 4:10-12; 3:13; Is. 53). Jesus had taught, too, that His death was redemptive in character. It was a ransom for many. And in the institution of the Supper, He declared that His blood, the blood by which the New Covenant promised in Jer. 31:31-34 was to be inaugurated, was poured out for many unto the remission of sin (26-29).

And then they witnessed to the fact of His deliverance from death by the mighty power of God (Acts 2:24, 31, 36; 3:15). And Jesus had prepared them for that, also, when He had spoken of His death at Jerusalem (Mt. 16:21 ff.). Though they would be scattered at His death, there would be a reunion in Galilee (32). And even to those who rejected Him, Jesus disclosed the great truth that, although He had been humiliated and condemned and was facing the most debasing form of death, nevertheless, He remained the Son of God and the heavenly Son of Man, and the time was coming when the tables would be turned, when His judges would appear before Him to be judged, for the Son of Man would be seen sitting at the right hand of God and coming on the clouds of heaven (64).

Lesson for June 10, 1934

JESUS ON THE CROSS

(Lesson Text—Matthew 27. Golden Text—Hebrews 12:2)

Jesus had taught that He was to go to the cross to accomplish "for many" what they could not do for themselves. For the sins of many His blood was poured out—not for His own, for He was innocent of any wrong.

True, His arrest was obtained through information supplied by one who had been in intimate association with Him; His death was demanded by the rulers of His own nation and when His release might have been gained His own people counted it a greater favor that a notorious robber should be set free; "Roman justice" in the person of Pontius Pilate delivered Him over to execution.

But the remarkable testimony of this chapter is that the very persons who brought about His death confessed by word and deed that He had done nothing worthy of death. Judas, filled with remorse, confessed that he had been guilty of "innocent blood" (4). The rulers replied, "What is that to us?", and confirmed their indifference to truth and justice in the matter in other ways (see 26:59 ff.; 27:20). The people, asked what evil Jesus had done, answered that their only concern was that Jesus should be crucified (23). And Pilate, after he had been warned by his wife, agreed that Jesus had done nothing wrong, and tried to absolve himself of any complicity in the death of Jesus (19-24).

But the description of the death of Jesus in this chapter is more than that of an innocent man. We have here the death of a king—the King of Israel. There can be no doubt that Jesus was crucified because He claimed to be the Anointed of the Lord, the Messiah, the King of Israel. These claims before the Sanhedrin had brought the charge of blasphemy (26:63 ff.), and His confession before Pilate that He was King (27:11) was repeated as an accusation above the cross (37).

How ridiculous the claim seemed! He had been rejected by the Jews themselves, and then had remained silent in the face of their expressions of hate. The claim was taken up by hostile lips, and the mere utterance of "King" and "Son of God" appeared to offer a sufficient refutation of it. The soldiers made mock obeisance to Him (29 f.), and the people and rulers, having reminded him of his claims, asked Him why He did not save Himself from the cross (39-43).

But Jesus obviously claimed to be King in a different sense. His kingdom was to be realized through His own death and in those who recognized His right to make the claims He did. His endurance of the cross, and even the agony of separation from God expressed in His cry from the cross, were but a prelude to the joy and exaltation which were to follow. He suffered, He died, He was buried and a guard was set, but He remained the Son of God and King of Israel, and so He *must* rise according to His own word. But already before that great event, God answered Jesus' yielding up of His spirit by working stupendous miracles, so that even the soldiers could not help crying out, "Truly this was God's Son" (50-54).

Lesson for June 17, 1934

THE RISEN LORD AND THE
GREAT COMMISSION

(Lesson Text—Matthew 28. Golden Text—28:19, 20)

The Messiah had to go to the cross. It was God's will. But because He was the Anointed of the Lord, the Son of God, the cross could not be the end. And in setting His face towards Jerusalem where He was to die, Jesus also invited His disciples to look beyond to His resurrection. And in the accounts of the days that followed His death—in the Gospels, the Acts and I Cor. 15—we possess many proofs of the fulfillment of His prophecy.

There is, first of all, the fact of the empty tomb. Pilate had ordered that it be made as secure as possible. A guard had been set and the stone sealed. But just as God had spoken at the moment of Christ's death when His enemies seemed to have succeeded entirely in their plans, by earthquake and other wonders, so now God spoke again. There was another earthquake and an angel appeared to roll away the stone. As for the guards, they became so frightened that they could not move. But a little later they became witnesses of the empty tomb to the Jewish rulers. However, the rulers continued in their unbelief, and in their satanic purpose to destroy faith in the Messiah. All of the money available for this purpose had not been given to Judas, nor their zeal to persuade the people that He was a deceiver expended when they brought Him to the cross.

But the Stone of stumbling, rejected of the builders, who were about to be broken to pieces and scattered as dust, was to become the Head of the Corner. The death and resurrection of Jesus were an offence and a savor of death to unbelief, but, through the grace of God, the crucified and risen Saviour was believed on by His own. God did not leave the empty tomb to be discovered by the disciples, but caused His angelic messenger to lead the two Marys to the tomb, and command them to inform the rest. So God Himself brings forth faith in His children.

And there was more than the witness of the empty tomb to accomplish this work of God. For Christ Himself appeared to them time and again during a period of forty days, in Jerusalem and Galilee, actively witnessing to His own Resurrection, and so binding their minds and hearts to Him in a faith that never again wavered. He began a work which He was to continue after His Ascension when He poured out the Spirit from on High, so that His own no longer stumble at the Crucified Saviour but place their trust in Him for time and for eternity.

There was much that had to be told now after His death and resurrection had taken place, concerning the meaning of these great facts and the coming of His Kingdom. And included among them was the

Great Commission, the missionary text of the church (see also Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8). It sets forth the tremendous claims of Jesus as Lord and King as possessing absolute and universal authority; it demands obedience to His program and teachings; it teaches that all men must recognize Jesus as Lord and Saviour from sin by becoming His disciples; it gives the promise of His presence until the end. A missionary program that is true to Christ, the Head of the Church, must be true to His commission. Christ is Lord of all and His authority only is normative; His name is the only name whereby men must be saved; His Spirit must guide and make effective the whole missionary endeavor. But the note of authority in it all, its supernaturalism, its exclusiveness, its finality, its universalism, its intolerance, its offence have long since become unpalatable to the modern taste. The old missionary message and the old missionary motives must be rethought and restated, it is said, for they are obstacles in the way of promoting brotherhood and understanding in the earth. There are only two sides. The one is that of the disciples who, through divine grace, placed their confidence in the crucified and risen Saviour, and made Him their only message. The other preaches another gospel which is no gospel at all, which fails to declare the cross and resurrection as great redemptive acts of God which are to be believed because life depends on faith. The latter alternative makes Christ a deceiver and faith in His gospel deception. It is the side taken by the rulers of the Jewish people. On which side is the modern missionary program?

Lesson for June 24, 1934

REVIEW

These lesson studies themselves, if taken as a whole for the second quarter, will give suggestive review treatment. If readers do not have the March and April numbers in which the first lessons were treated, they will be furnished free upon request.

The Comfort of the
Scriptures

A Devotional Meditation

By the Rev. David Freeman, Th.M.

"Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition."—2 Thess. 2:3.

It is so easy to be deceived. Why? Because there is that in the human heart which loves not the truth. Think of the countless numbers who have forsaken the ways of the Lord and given themselves over to delusion. Our sinful nature is fertile soil for any wile of Satan to grow and flourish.

Even after the Thessalonians had heard

the gospel "to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ" they believed a lie. The Galatians were led astray which caused the Apostle to say, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?" How Christ struggled against deceivers and how He labored with the deceived.

The Church's history is one long story of the working of the "mystery of iniquity" "with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish." The lines are clearly drawn. The Prince of Darkness is at enmity with our God and His Christ.

In our day there are many who are deceived. Think of churches that were once true churches of God, where the gospel was heard in all its purity, now submitting to the errors of Satan and tolerating within them the deadly enemies of the cross.

There are all forms of deception. Satan has many weapons to dislodge men from the truth. We believe a lie before we know it so crafty is the Evil One. God's Word alone is truth. All else is delusion.

Even Christians may be deceived. Men rise up and say, "Lo, here is Christ, or there." Great signs and wonders are shown; "insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." This can only be when God's children do not hide His Word in their hearts.

In following men we lose sight of the Gospel message. Nothing pleases Satan more than when God's children are side-tracked from the message of salvation and follow something other than that salvation which is "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth."

Between the present and the glorious coming of Christ in the clouds of heaven we are exhorted to patience and endurance and struggle against Satan and his errors.

*"For still our ancient foe
Doth seek to work us woe;
His craft and power are great,
And, armed with cruel hate,
On earth is not his equal."*

sang Martin Luther. Let us not underestimate the deceiver's strength.

A falling away must needs come. The mystery of iniquity is now working and will culminate in the man of sin.

Should we be discouraged when we see these things? Did not our Lord and His Apostles tell us before that these things must be? Rather let us rejoice that our names are written in the Lamb's book of life.

Let us stand fast until He comes. Let us fight the good fight of faith. Let us endure. To those that trouble us God will recompense tribulation. But our patience and faith will only the more render us worthy of the Kingdom of God. Our endurance declares aloud that the seal and token of His love is upon us. Hereby we know that we are the children of God.

The reproach of Christ is "greater riches than the treasures in Egypt."

News of the Church

Foreign Missions—Freedom

MEETINGS of several Presbyteries in April and early May gave abundant evidence that the official party in the councils of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. were determined to make support of the official Church agencies compulsory, and that they were prepared to unlimber the "big stick" in an effort to crush opposition.

Philadelphia

The Presbytery of Philadelphia, generally considered one of the most consistently conservative in the Church, was chosen as the first battleground. At an adjourned meeting on April 16, the matter of Foreign Missions was the order of the day. Administration leader **Dr. William L. McCormick**, led his coalition of Modernists and middle of the roaders, augmented by a number of frightened conservatives to a 67 to 37 victory in a resolution "disapproving" the Independent Board. An analysis of the vote showed that **Dr. McCormick** was supported by the Modernist element in the Presbytery to a man. The usual number of doctrinal neutrals who vote consistently with the modernist party, also were out in full force. What then became of the usual conservative majority? Almost forty were there to battle to the end. Of the remainder, some were absent and others voted for **Dr. McCormick's** resolution not, it is supposed, because they were in favor of it, but because they were afraid not to vote for it. Great pressure had been brought to bear on some of the members; and threats of what would happen to those who voted against the resolution were publicly made even on the floor of Presbytery. The large number of absentees is generally credited to these threats. Under those circumstances, the wonder was not that the resolution was not defeated, but that thirty-seven members of Presbytery were willing to vote their convictions in the face of threats to their ecclesiastical lives.

As soon as **Dr. McCormick** had introduced his motion, making an impassioned speech in its support, in which he intimated that the backers of the Independent Board were promoting it because they had a grudge against certain members of the official board (a much repeated libel which has no foundation in fact), the **Rev. A. A. MacRae** introduced a substitute motion which read as follows:

1. The Presbytery of Philadelphia gives thanks to God for the work of the many true missionaries who are serving under the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and expresses its earnest hope that they may not be deprived of their support even in these difficult times.

2. The Presbytery is still convinced, as was indicated in the overture which it passed on May 1, 1933, that confidence of Bible-believing Christians in the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. can be restored only if the General Assembly elects to membership in the Board no persons except those who are "fully aware of the danger in which the Church stands and who are determined to insist upon such verities as the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth of our Lord, His substitutionary death as a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice, His bodily resurrection and His miracles, as being essential to the Word of God and our Standards and as being necessary to the message which every missionary under our Church shall proclaim."

3. In consonance with the great principle which was enunciated by the General Assembly of 1870, immediately after the union between the Old and New Schools, to the effect that "Equally free and responsible directly to Christ are all Christian people, in deciding through what agencies they will do their share of His work of Missions," the Presbytery holds to the historic position of the Church that it levies no taxes upon its members, that support of particular Boards or Agencies in the Presbyterian Church, including the official Board of Foreign Missions, is a matter purely of free will, and should not be enforced by any kind of ecclesiastical disability or penalties.

After the substitute was seconded, **Prof. MacRae** made abundantly clear *why* it was being offered. The Presbytery was being asked by **Dr. McCormick** to express itself upon a subject which did not properly concern it. The Independent Board had not asked for any endorsement. It had nothing to do, ecclesiastically, with the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Passing a resolution like that was going out of the way to pass judgment on an organization which was not before the Presbytery. Then, speaking to his own resolution, **Mr. MacRae** brilliantly marshalled the evidence that showed something to be radically wrong in the policy of the official Board of Foreign Missions. Others who spoke for the substitute resolution were, the **Rev. C. J. Woodbridge**, the **Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths** and ruling elder **Henry C. Albin**. **Mr. Albin** told the Presbytery in a vigorous and forthright manner that what he had heard was enough for him,—even if only a quarter of it was true. In a business establishment, persons who were not more faithful to their trust than the members of the official Board would be outside on the street in about five minutes, he said. **Messrs. Woodbridge** and **Griffiths** spent most of their time bringing facts about the official Foreign Board home to the Presbytery, many of them startling facts which had only come to light since the last Assembly, some even that had just come to

hand. It is significant that none of the speakers for **Dr. McCormick's** side tried to deny these facts. They were passed over in silence.

The most amusing moments of the afternoon, however, were when the **Rev. Vincent Dee Beery**, his voice quivering with emotion, read long extracts from the "Manual of Presbyterian Law." He prefaced his remarks by saying that he would not quote individual opinion. He would read them *the law of the Church!* And then he proceeded to read for about fifteen minutes *from a book of opinion*, reading not one sentence from the actual law of the Church! (The "Manual," of course, is not law, only a help to its understanding by lay people, written by **Drs. Mudge and Finney**.) The implication of what **Mr. Beery** read was to the effect that a good Presbyterian ought to do whatever the General Assembly says, no matter what it may command. To see Auburn Affirmationists, whose document began as a protest against what they considered as illegal usurpation of powers by the Assembly, voting against their own principle, and in favor of those who aim to make the Assembly lord of conscience, made more than one presbyter smile sadly.

The vote on the substitute was 65 to 38. Some who voted for the substitute voted for **Dr. McCormick's** motion later with visible reluctance. A roll call was ordered after it had been demanded by **Dr. McCormick** himself, who declared "We want to have a record of just how every man votes on this," uttered in a not-too-reassuring tone.

The motion as adopted was as follows:

WHEREAS in these days of financial stress it is very necessary that our Presbyterian Churches support the work of Foreign Missionaries we have already established if we are to avoid the recall of consecrated men and women who have gone forth in good faith and who were never more needed in the foreign field than today.

BE IT RESOLVED that we as a Presbytery disapprove of the establishment of a new Board of Foreign Missions in the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., and that we urge our people to support the work already established.

Baltimore

In the Presbytery of Baltimore at its spring meeting occurred another happening of unusual significance. Two young men, both of them seniors in Westminster Seminary, were to come up for licensure. They were informed by mail by the chairman of the examining committee a few days before appearance, that they must be prepared to state their attitude toward the boards and agencies of the Church. Before the committee they were quizzed at length. One of the students, **Mr. Calvin K. Cummings**, offered the following answer when asked if he would be "loyal" to the boards of the Church:

It is my firm intention to support the boards and agencies of the Presbyterian Church in the

U. S. A. in so far as they themselves in their whole policy are loyal to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A., and the Word of God. In so declaring I place myself under the protection of the Confession of Faith, Chapter XX, Section 2, which, as the law of the Presbyterian Church, declares that "God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in any thing contrary to his Word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commandments out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience, and the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also."

When asked if he considered the Board of Foreign Missions to be loyal *now* to the Constitution of the Church, he replied:

I wish that it were possible for me, in good conscience, to say that I believe the "Present Board of Foreign Missions" as now constituted to be loyal to the Constitution of the Church and the Word of God. With the evidence that I now have I cannot conscientiously affirm that I believe this Board to be loyal to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A., and the Word of God. My mind is open to receive any new facts. Should I become convinced that this Board is loyal to the Presbyterian Standards and the Word of God, I will give it my hearty and enthusiastic support. I take this matter, however, to be within the sphere of liberty allowed in the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. as set forth in the Confession of Faith, Chapter XX, Section 2. No man of honor could promise in advance to support a board regardless of what it might do in the future. My willingness to support this Board insofar as in its whole policy it is loyal to the Presbyterian Standards and the Word of God seems to me to be as far as any Christian man who values his word can honestly go.

The other student, **Mr. Irvin Morris**, made a statement of his own in which he would not promise unqualified future support of the boards.

Before the Presbytery the Stated Clerk, the **Rev. A. Brown Caldwell, D.D.**, read a portion of a letter from the **Rev. Lewis Seymour Mudge, D.D.**, Stated Clerk of the General Assembly. The letter had been written in response to one asking advice as to what action the Presbytery should take toward the Independent Board. The portion of the letter read to the Presbytery of Baltimore is as follows:

If and when any students from Westminster Seminary come before your Presbytery they should be informed that the Presbytery will neither license nor ordain them until they have given a written pledge that they will support the official agencies of the Church as a part of their pledge of loyalty to the government and discipline of the Church.

The time has come for kindly but forceful action, and when the law in the matter is so perfectly clear, relating as it does to fundamental principles of orderly government and procedure, I am sure that a Presbytery like that of Baltimore will act with definiteness and vigor.

But others were not so sure that the law was so delightfully clear and simple that at the nod of officeholder number one the

Officeholder Number One



The Rev. Lewis S. Mudge, D.D.

Students must give "a written pledge."

Presbyterian Church should hasten to reverse its whole historic attitude toward freedom of conscience. The fight in Presbytery was led for the young men by the **Rev. John H. McComb**, and the **Rev. T. Roland Philips**. They argued that to ask such a pledge of the students was unconstitutional; the only questions to be asked being found set down in black and white in the Form of Government. Nor did they feel that the question in the Form of Government referred to by **Dr. Mudge** could possibly be stretched to include a promise of board support, or even of what successive Assemblies might do, but that the question had to do with the candidates' belief that the government and discipline of the Church as set forth in the constitution was Scriptural—a very different thing.

The **Rev. R. G. Leetch** led the fight against licensure, being aided by the **Rev. Bruce McDonald** and **Thomas Guthrie Speers**, formerly associated with the First Church in New York during the time of **Dr. H. E. Fosdick's** presence there. **Dr. Speers** is an Auburn Affirmationist. Unexpected opposition to the official party, however, came from two other Auburn Affirmationists, who at least thus evidenced their consistency with the non-doctrinal portions of that document. The two were the **Rev. J. J. Coale**, of Annapolis, and the **Rev. Hugh Lenox Hodge, D.D.**, of the First Church, Baltimore. **Dr. Hodge**, who was later elected as Moderator of the Presbytery, declared that the law had been superseded by the gospel. The gospel dispensation was characterized by grace. These young men were ready and willing to

preach the gospel. What more should be asked of them? It appeared that they were not willing to pledge blanket loyalty to the Board of Foreign Missions. But who of them would be willing to make such a pledge? Was any Board infallible? If he should oppose the licensure of these properly qualified young men it would distress him all the rest of his life.

The Presbytery, according to custom, voted on the candidates separately. The vote on **Mr. Morris** was 40 for licensure, 25 against. Before the vote could be taken on **Mr. Cummings**, **Dr. Leetch** announced his intention of "appealing" the matter to the Synod and the Assembly, thus holding the matter up until 1935. In the ensuing discussion it was decided by the party favoring licensure to let the matter lie over until June, awaiting, among other things, some possible clarification from the Assembly. This action, was, of course, superfluous, for no "appeal" lay in such a case, which would have only been stayed by a complaint signed by more than one-third of the members of Presbytery present.

Some observers professed to see in the decisive vote for licensure a Presbyterian rebuke for **Dr. Mudge** in bringing his official influence to bear upon a matter that lay wholly within the province of the Presbytery.

Lackawanna

The **Rev. Henry W. Coray** is pastor of the flourishing Church in West Pittston, Pa. **Mr. Coray** is under appointment as the first male missionary of the Independent Board. The Church is in the Presbytery of Lackawanna. Early in March the **Rev. C. J. Woodbridge**, the Independent Board's magnetic young Secretary, preached in the church. A garbled account of the sermon was sent to **Dr. Mudge** by a person whose name has not been divulged. Thereupon, the next day **Dr. Mudge** wrote to the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Lackawanna, as follows:

A communicant member of the West Pittston Presbyterian Church who was present in said church last Sunday morning, March 11th, has, on his own motion, given me the enclosed account of the address then delivered by the **Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge**, the secretary of the so-called "Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions."

It is of great importance that the ministers and ruling elders of your Presbytery should be informed of the action taken by our last General Assembly after a full investigation of all matters relating to our Board of Foreign Missions to which **Dr. Woodbridge** refers. This action will be found in the 1933 Minutes, Part 1, page 158, seq.

In view of this investigation made under the auspices of the General Assembly, through its duly elected Standing Committee on Foreign Missions, it is unconstitutional for any congregation belonging in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. to give any support whatever to the so-called Board and any minister or ruling elder who gives his official sanction or support to this Board is disloyal to his ordination vows. Individuals are at liberty, of course, to dispose

of their money as they may individually choose, but no congregation or Session, under the jurisdiction of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., can legally take offerings for or vote money to the so-called Independent Board, nor can any society or organization under the auspices of a local church, Presbytery, or Synod so do. I suggest that you take prompt measures to make all this known to the pastor and Session of the West Pittston Church.

With fraternal regards, I am
Yours sincerely,

LEWIS S. MUDGE, *Stated Clerk.*

Notwithstanding the suggestion of Dr. Mudge in the last sentence of his letter, no effort was made to "make all this known" either to the pastor or the people of West Pittston. Instead, the letter was "sprung" on the Presbytery of Lackawanna at its April 17th meeting, in urging the adoption of a resolution against the Independent Board. Immediately after the reading of the correspondence Auburn Affirmationist the Rev. P. S. Heath, of Wilkes-Barre, offered a mild resolution exhorting the Churches of presbytery not to cooperate with the Independent Board. Then Dr. S. Turner Foster of Carbondale, reputed to be a conservative, threw a bombshell into the meeting by introducing a much more drastic resolution. Dr. Heath was so well satisfied with the substitute that he promptly withdrew his own resolution. The effect of this, together with the reading of the letter containing a garbled report of Mr. Woodbridge's sermon, was to secure the passage of the resolution by a large majority. Mr. Coray opposed the resolution on Constitutional grounds, and requested that his vote be recorded. The text of the resolution adopted is as follows:

According to the provisions of our Form of Government, Chapter 23, Sections 1, 2, 3 and 4, all special organizations collecting and distributing moneys in the churches of our denomination for benevolent work shall be subject to the power of oversight and direction vested by the Constitution in the session and in the higher judicatories.

Our Board of Foreign Missions, duly constituted by the General Assembly, has received and continues to enjoy the full approval and unqualified endorsement of the General Assembly after a most careful scrutiny of its policies and work. It is the accredited and official agency of our denomination for the receiving and administering of all funds contributed through our churches for Foreign Missions.

Without the consent or approval of any judicatory of our Church, a group of ministers and elders has undertaken to establish, in an unconstitutional manner, a so-called Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions, which is now appealing for financial support from Presbyterian Churches. This so-called Board is not "under the immediate direction, control and oversight of" any session, presbytery, synod or of the General Assembly, nor is it "subject to the power of oversight and direction vested by the Constitution in the session and in the higher judicatories." It is therefore operating contrary to the constitution of our church in soliciting funds from the churches of our denomination.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Presbytery of Lackawanna hereby enjoins its members and

the churches within its bounds from assisting this so-called Board either by financial contributions or by inviting or allowing its representatives to speak in the churches of this Presbytery.

And be it further resolved that the Stated Clerk be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to every Minister and Clerk of Session in the Presbytery, a copy to the Board of Foreign Missions and a copy to each of the Church papers.

Notice of complaint against this action was later filed by five members of the Presbytery. It is generally conceded that the terms of the resolution greatly exceed the powers possessed by the Presbytery, and are an unjust usurpation of the freedom of members and churches.

University Club Conference

Upon invitation of last Assembly-Moderator McDowell, an informal conference was held on Thursday, May 3, between representatives of the General Council and of the Independent Board. Present: For the General Council, Drs. McDowell, L. S. Mudge, and Raymon Kistler of Rochester, N. Y. For the Independent Board: Dr. J. G. Machen, the Rev. Prof. Paul Woolley, Murray Forst Thompson, Esq., and the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths. After luncheon in the University Club, the first named group provided their guests with a typewritten statement. During the discussion it was somewhat revised, and finally emerged in the following form:

We have asked you to meet with us at this time with the purpose in mind of bringing to your attention certain matters of vital interest to us all. These we shall set forth just as briefly and as kindly as we can.

You and others have associated yourselves in an organization known as "The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions," and have incorporated under the law of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. As representatives of the General Council of our General Assembly, and especially of its Administrative Committee, to which Committee our General Council has committed ad interim the problems involved, we wish to make known to you that after a most careful study the General Council is of the unanimous opinion that the following inferences may be drawn from its study:

(1) That "The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions" in its organization and operation, is contrary to fundamental principles of the Constitution of our Church.

(2) That you and your associates in this organization are violating your ordination or membership vows, or both.

We feel that it is our official as well as our Christian duty as your brethren to bring these facts in a friendly way to your attention and that of your associates. The General Council is most reluctant to bring these matters to the attention of the approaching General Assembly. It earnestly hopes that before the Assembly convenes it may have your assurance and that of your associates that you will discontinue the organization and operation of The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and that in your endeavors to advance the purposes and principles in which you believe, you will, as ministers or laymen in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, proceed in

accordance with the Constitution of the Church and the spiritual and moral obligations which bind all those who are in its fellowship.

The deliberations of the conference, unfortunately too long to report in full, abounded in illumination. When the official party representatives insisted politely that they "were not making charges," one of the conservatives replied, "No—you have done that to which charges are a mere preliminary. The General Council brought in a *verdict* not a mere charge!" Conservatives inquired by what authority the General Council assumed to judge the case, even reading conclusions. It developed that, while the statement said that "after a most careful study the General Council is of the unanimous opinion," etc., Dr. Kistler, a member of the Council had not even read Mr. M. F. Thompson's article in the legality of the Independent Board! It also appeared that the official party were sending out to the Assembly Commissioners an argument against the legality of the Independent Board, *too late for any possible reply before the Assembly*,—after having known of the Independent Board for almost a year. As an excuse it was offered by the official party "that the Independent Board had only recently been incorporated, hence prior information was all hearsay." This was met by the crushing rejoinder by Dr. Machen that "It is not our *incorporation* you object to, which is only a legal convenience. You object to our *existence*. And that was certainly definite for months before incorporation."

It also emerged during the discussion that the official party had an entirely erroneous conception of authority in the Presbyterian Church. Moderator McDowell urged that there *must* be, in the Presbyterian Church, *somewhere*, a final authority,—that could speak with supreme power. To this the Conservatives replied: "Of course there is such an authority in the Presbyterian Church! But it is *not* found in the General Assembly. The Presbyterian Church is a *Protestant* Church, and its supreme authority is in the Word of God." Then one of them said, "Dr. McDowell, the kind of authority you are looking for can be found only one place in the world,—and you know where that is." "No, I don't," replied Dr. McDowell, "where is it?" "In the Church of Rome" was the grim reply.

Later, Dr. McDowell said with great positiveness, "If you don't like the decisions of the General Assembly, there are two things you can do: you can either submit to the decision and obey, or you can withdraw from the Church." To which a conservative replied, "No, Dr. McDowell, there is another thing we can do. It is something clearly recognized in the report of the Assembly's Commission of Fifteen, in its 1926 report. We have a right to remain in the Church and work to have the decision reversed. Do we not have that right?"

Dr. McDowell: "Well, I suppose so."

Answer: "Then you see that we do *not* have to submit or get out, for how could we be working for a change if we did either?" (General laughter.)

One other point in the communication also caused some discussion: "that you and your associates . . . are violating . . . your *membership* vows." It is a well-known fact that the only membership vows in the Presbyterian Church are those by which one declares Christ to be his Saviour and Lord—a fact which the General Council in its "careful study" had somehow apparently overlooked.

The conferees parted in perfectly good spirit, but with each party apparently unshaken. The official party took with them some food for thought in the suggestion by one of the conservatives, that, instead of making accusations to the General Council or the General Assembly, they should make them to his presbytery, in accordance with the law of the Church and not to find him guilty in the General Council without bothering to ask him to appear.

Press Mention

Time, in its issue of April 23, told of the Independent Board and of its Secretary. Its story follows:

Missionaries Old-Style

Fundamentalists in the Presbyterian Church stoutly believe that the Virgin Birth, the Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Substitutionary Atonement, the Bodily Resurrection of Our Lord and the Historicity of His Miraculous Life are true, unique, not to be tampered with. Never tired of fighting for their beliefs, they were especially incensed last year when the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions failed to repudiate Author Pearl Buck who, as a missionary teacher in China, was decidedly a tamperer. Led by **Dr. John Gresham Machen**, who five years ago left Princeton Seminary because it was too liberal and helped found Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, the Fundamentalists took their fight to the Presbyterian General Assembly. They were soundly trounced (*Time*, June 5). Very well, said they. They would go home and found a missions board of their own, to get contributions from Fundamentalists and send out Fundamentalist missionaries to preach God's own Fundamentals to black, brown and yellow men in far corners of the earth. In Philadelphia last October they set up the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. And for its general secretary and most active worker they chose no grizzled Presbyterian die-hard but a keen, quick-smiling young missionary named **Charles J. Woodbridge**.

Princeton students, and especially soccer players, of a decade ago remember **Charley Woodbridge** well. They remember him carrying trays in Commons as he worked his way through. They remember his antic agility on the soccer field, where he more than held his own in the forward line against much heavier men. He had learned the game from the English at school in China, where he was born in 1901 in a family which counts 14 generations of ministers, back to 1493. They remember that, without being a "greasy grind," **Charley Woodbridge** was always near the head of his class in studies and that without ever being a meddle-

Breathing out threatenings . . .



The Rev. John McDowell, D.D.

"Submit . . . or withdraw . . ."

some "Christer" he was quietly, sincerely, and it seemed merrily, pious.

Charley Woodbridge emerged from Princeton Seminary untouched by its liberalism, studied at Berlin and Marburg, took a pastorate in Flushing, L. I., where he married a missionary's daughter. When he went as missionary to the French Cameroun in 1932 it was to replace a man who had been fatally stung by an insect. Studying the local dialect, **Missionary Woodbridge** evangelized for six months in the malaria-ridden jungle, then took charge of 110 evangelists covering 5,000 sq. mi. A firm Bible-believer, he learned to deplore the ways of the official Presbyterian Board, such as when a member on an inspection tour addressed 3,500 naked Cameroun heathens who had never heard of the Gospel, on the subject: "The Power of Personality." When informed of his election as secretary of the upstart Board, **Missionary Woodbridge** resigned his post, returned in January with his pretty wife and two daughters.

With another General Assembly meeting next month, the Fundamentalists last week were tightening their lines for a new battle. And **Secretary Woodbridge**, with his Independent Board incorporated and installed in a new office, was enthusiastic and confident. How much money was coming in he would not say. But 40 people have volunteered to serve as missionaries in Madagascar, India, China, Korea, Japan, the Sudan. At least four will be sent out in the next few months. Appointed last week were the first two, **Rev. and Mrs. Henry W. Coray** of Pittston, Pa., who will go to north China.

Announcing this from a church pulpit, **Secretary Woodbridge** cried: "This is a historic occasion! . . . This movement is the vanguard of a Reformation in the Presbyterian Church. . . . We stand four-square on the Word of God."

The Sunday School Times, perhaps the most influential evangelical periodical in the world, in its "Fundamentals Number" of May 5th, devoted its leading editorial to the Independent Board, entitling it "A New Mission Board for the Old Faith." Significant excerpts:

These were two of the amazing examples of Modernism in missions given by **Charles J. Woodbridge**, General Secretary of the newly formed Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, at the first public meeting of the Board held last month at the Central North Broad Street Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. This church has been standing like a lighthouse of Gospel truth and uncompromising testimony under the pastorate of **Merrill T. MacPherson**, who led the singing at this meeting with his usual contagious enthusiasm, and who himself is a member of the new Board. **Mr. Woodbridge** gave these facts among others in answer to the question, Why was it necessary to form the new Board? As he told of these things, expressions of surprise and gasps of astonishment were audible throughout the crowded auditorium. The illustrations of defection in the Presbyterian Church, given by **Mr. Woodbridge** and other speakers, were typical of what is happening in many denominations. In our own land and other countries the fog of Modernism has been settling upon the churches, damping the fires of evangelism, and dimming to a feeble light the church's testimony to the Lord Jesus Christ as the only Saviour and to the whole Bible as the infallible Word of God.

The Presbyterian meeting just held in Philadelphia was a public expression and demonstration of the deep conviction held by many in all denominations as to the need of cleansed denominational mission boards. *The Sunday School Times*, which is an interdenominational journal, cites the denominational meeting of last month as a profoundly significant event, and one that is likely to promote similar action in various denominations. An action of the same sort was taken in England some years ago when the evangelical or Bible-believing Christians in the Church of England parted company with the Church Missionary Society and formed the Bible Church Missionary Society.

The meeting of last month in Philadelphia was thrilling, and was, many felt, a historic occasion. It was led by Professor **Dr. J. Gresham Machen**, of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, who is President of the new Board.¹ He read 1 Corinthians 1:18-24, that wonderful passage beginning, "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God." **Dr. Machen** said that he was filled with a profound feeling of thanksgiving as he realized what this meeting might mean to the Church. The central sin of the Church, he said, had been that of unbelief and setting limits to the power of God. The Church must ask forgiveness for that sin. The Spirit of God is all powerful, and the working of the Spirit in

¹ **Dr. Machen** has written a notable book of 110 pages entitled "Modernism and the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A." which should have a wide reading by Christians of all denominations; it is packed with invaluable information on the issue that is not only a Presbyterian crisis, but that confronts every evangelical branch of the Christian Church. The book may be had, free of charge, by writing **Dr. J. Gresham Machen**, 206 South Thirteenth Street Philadelphia.

the Church can be felt today as it could not be even three or four months ago.

Dr. Machen called upon other members of the Independent Board for words of greeting. **Harold S. Laird**, pastor of the First and Central Presbyterian Church, Wilmington, Del., spoke of an Old Testament promise that had been a great blessing to him recently, and which he thought of in connection with the new movement: "When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him." **Charles F. Ball**, pastor of Bethany Church, Philadelphia, brought a word of encouragement from the history of the Reformation, and said that if a cleansing comes in the Church it may come as a result of this new Board. **Joseph A. Schofield, Jr.**, a pastor in Gouverneur, N. Y., spoke of the influence of Modernism in northern New York.

It was an impressive moment when **Dr. Machen** presented the first two missionaries of the Independent Board, **Mr. and Mrs. Henry W. Coray**. (At least twenty-two persons have expressed their desire to serve as missionaries under the Board.) . . .

There was a feeling of expectancy as **Dr. Machen** introduced the General Secretary of the Independent Board, the **Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge**. He is a graduate of Princeton University and Princeton Seminary, and obtained a fellowship enabling him to study in Germany for a year. For fifteen years of his early life he lived in China, where his father was a missionary for forty-four years, and at one time **Charles Woodbridge** taught in Nanking University. After finishing his studies he was pastor in Flushing, Long Island, during which time the membership of the church doubled. Then, under the (Northern) Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, he went to Africa as a missionary, where he spent nearly two years. He has just returned to become the Secretary of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions (Room 1531, 12 South Twelfth St., Philadelphia). **Dr. Machen** said that, in choosing the new secretary, the Board had looked for a man who would be at the same time a true missionary, a preacher of the Gospel in this country, and one who, as he did his work and went about speaking, would stir the fires of love for the Lord Jesus.

When **Mr. Woodbridge** rose to speak, his first words were to give glory to God for his Christian heritage, to which **Dr. Machen** had referred. His father was a minister, his grandfather was a minister, and so on back through fourteen generations, with only one exception, to 1493. All have known only one Gospel, the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ as set forth in the early verses of 1 Corinthians 15. **Mr. Woodbridge** declared he believed the meeting was a historic occasion, and that the parting of the ways had been reached in the Presbyterian Church. "I feel very humble, and yet proud to represent an organization that stands foursquare on the Word of God." . . .

Mr. Woodbridge said he knew some were asking, "Is the Independent Board legal?" "Yes," he said with conviction, "it is. This is a voluntary missionary organization, and is responsible to God and to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania." He believes it is the beginning of a reformation in the Presbyterian Church. Many are praying that there may be a true reformation, divinely planned and guided, in other branches of the Church of Christ at home and abroad.

Other periodicals also devoted space to an

approving discussion of the Independent Board, among them *The Restoration Herald* of the Disciples of Christ. This conservative periodical hailed the Independent Board as following in the footsteps of those who had already done the same thing, with great success, in their own Church.

Westminster Seminary Commencement

THE Fifth Annual Commencement Exercises of Westminster Theological Seminary were held on Tuesday, May 8th, at eight o'clock, in Witherspoon Hall, Philadelphia. The **Rev. Clarence E. Macartney, D.D.**, minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., presided. The processional hymn "O Worship the King All Glorious Above" was sung as Faculty and students slowly entered the hall in a column of twos. Following the Long Metre Doxology, the invocation was offered by the **Rev. J. C. McConnell**, of the J. R. Miller Memorial Presbyterian Church, Upper Darby, Pa. Then followed that most moving of all hymns:

When I survey the wondrous cross
On which the Prince of Glory died.

The Scripture lesson was read by the **Rev. T. Stacy Capers**, of Hollidaysburg, Pa., and prayer was offered by the **Rev. John H. McComb**, of the Forest Park Church, Baltimore, Md.

The address of the evening was delivered by the **Rev. Samuel G. Craig, D.D.**, Editor of *CHRISTIANITY TODAY*. His subject was "Westminster Seminary and the Reformed Faith." It will probably appear in an early issue of *CHRISTIANITY TODAY*.

The certificates of graduation were then awarded as follows: the regular certificate for the three years' course, to: **Henry A. Atkinson**, **Donald K. Blackie**, **James H. Blackstone, Jr.**, **W. Hobart Childs**, **Glenn R. Coie**, **Percy R. Comer, Jr.**, **Calvin K. Cummings**, **E. Harlan Frischer**, **Wm. P. Green**, **Lewis J. Grotenhuis**, **John A. Kauffroth**, **Irvin M. Morris**, **John F. Nute**, **Russell R. Paton**, **Leonard S. Pitcher**, **James W. Price**, **H. Wilson Sieber**, **Clifford S. Smith**, **Robert Strong**, **Wm. T. Strong**, **Theodore S. Wray**, **Jack Zandstra**.

The graduate certificate was awarded to **Henry S. Atkinson**, **Chi Syun Kim**, **Chas. S. McKenzie**.

The **Wm. Brenton Greene, Jr.** Prize in Apologetics was awarded to **Robert B. Cunningham**, of Langhorne, Pa.

The **Robert Dick Wilson** prize in New Testament was awarded to **Donald K. Blackie**, of Inglewood, Calif.

The **Richard H. Wallace** prize in Homiletics to **James H. Blackstone, Jr.**, of South Pasadena, Calif.

The address to the graduating class was delivered, as usual, by the **Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.** It will be found in full in another page of this paper.

Dr. Machen was given a great ovation by the largest audience ever to attend a West-

minster Commencement, which rose as he came forward to speak and greeted him with prolonged applause. His solemn appeal for freedom in the Church and the Lordship of God alone over conscience, brought frequent bursts of handclapping.

Then followed the hymn

"The Son of God goes forth to war
A Kingly crown to gain."

And the benediction.

World's Fundamentalist Convention Held in Washington

THE World's Christian Fundamentals Association met in annual convention at Washington, D. C., May 6th to 13th in the Fourth Presbyterian Church.

The Convention theme was, "*Modern Problems in the Light of Infallible Revelation.*"

Under the general theme the following subjects were discussed:

Russia in the Light of Prophecy.

Is America Doomed, or, What is God's Message to the Nation?

Is Evolution a False Philosophy?

Technocracy and the Lord's Return.

What is Fundamentalism?

What is the Gospel?

The Signs of the Times.

The Infallible Bible.

The Duty of Christ.

The Challenge of the Depression.

The Cause of the World's Unrest, or, Who Rules the World?

The speakers included the following: **Dr. W. B. Riley**, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Minneapolis, and President of Northwestern Bible and Missionary Training School; **Dr. Paul W. Rood**, Chicago, President of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association; **Dr. Charles G. Trumbull**, Editor of *The Sunday School Times*; **Dr. W. H. Rogers**, **Dr. Haldeman's** successor as pastor of the First Baptist Church, New York; **Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr.**, President of Wheaton College; **Dr. B. H. Shadduck**, Methodist Episcopal pastor and lecturer. Many other speakers appeared on the program.

Mecklenburg Presbytery Asks H. W. Smith Inquiry

THE Presbytery of Mecklenburg, Presbyterian Church in the U. S., at its meeting on April 25th adopted an overture to the General Assembly which meets in Montreat, N. C., on May 25th, to appoint an "ad interim" committee to investigate the alleged heretical views of **Dr. Hay Watson Smith** of Little Rock, Ark.

The decision was the result of a pamphlet submitted to presbytery and written by the **Rev. W. M. McPheeters**, professor

emeritus of Columbus Seminary, Decatur, Ga., who charges that Dr. Smith is out of harmony with the standards of the church.

The resolution adopted was as follows:

"Resolved that inasmuch as there seems to be good reason to believe that the presbytery of Arkansas did not investigate thoroughly the rumors concerning the soundness of the faith of Dr. Smith, therefore that the presbytery overture the assembly to appoint an ad interim committee to investigate the whole matter in the pamphlet of Dr. McPheeters and to report its investigations to that body."

There was a minority report which wished to accept the pamphlet as information and that since the whole matter was adjudicated in the last assembly it was deemed unwise to reopen the case. The majority report adopted was signed by W. H. Frazer, E. A. Dillard, Q. N. Huneycutt, J. S. Sibley and J. D. Woodside, while the minority report was signed by J. M. Walker, W. M. Ross and C. S. Massie.

The movement to investigate Dr. Smith's views was started by a paper from Caldwell Memorial Presbyterian Church which was represented at presbytery by Dr. S. B. McPheeters, a son of the Rev. W. M. McPheeters, D.D. Dr. McPheeters, the minister who wrote the pamphlet, was present at the presbytery, although he did not take part in the discussion.

American Tract Society 109 Years Old

THE 109th Annual Meeting of the American Tract Society and of its Board of Managers was held at the Chapel of the Collegiate Church of St. Nicholas, Fifth Avenue and 48th Street, New York, N. Y., on Wednesday, May 2, 1934.

The following officers were re-elected: President, Mr. William Phillips Hall, elected for the 29th time; First Vice-President, Mr. Hugh R. Munro; Second Vice-President, Mrs. Finley J. Shepard. New Honorary Vice-Presidents elected: Mrs. Samuel G. McRoberts, Mrs. Don O. Shelton, Mrs. J. E. L. Davis. New members of the Board of Managers: the Rev. W. H. Greever, D.D., Mr. Philip A. Benson, the Rev. Wm. H. Rogers, D.D., the Rev. Stewart M. Robinson, D.D. Members of the Executive Committee re-elected: Mr. Robert M. Kurtz, the Rev. Walter McCarroll, D.D., Mr. Paul H. Graef, Mr. Hugh R. Munro, Mr. Simeon B. Chapin and Mr. J. Frederick Talcott.

A report of the work of the past year was given by the General Secretary, the Rev. William H. Matthews, D.D. The Society has, since its organization in 1825, published and distributed Christian literature in 181 languages. Its missionaries have visited two and a half million homes and 650,000 religious meetings have been conducted by its colporteurs. Up to the present time 855,000,000 pieces of Christian literature have been circulated by the Society, a large

Champions Reformed Faith



The Rev. Samuel G. Craig, D.D.

"Simply . . . Biblical Christianity."

percentage of which has been given away gratuitously.

During the past year 5,899,103 pieces of Christian literature were printed by the Society in twenty-five languages, and in the month of March of this year it printed a larger number of pieces of Christian literature than it has printed in any one month in the past fifty years. At the present time the Society has nineteen missionaries who are laboring among many nationalities in the City of New York and vicinity. Other colporteurs are working in various parts of the United States among neglected and unchurched people.

Special Summer School at Moody Institute

AN opportunity for summer study has been made available at the Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, through the launching of a six weeks' special summer school, from June 18th to July 27th, during A Century of Progress Exposition. It is intended for college and seminary students, graduates and seniors of high schools, Sunday School teachers and other Christian workers, with elective courses for pastors and missionaries. The subjects will include besides the Bible and Christian Doctrine, Christian Education, Modern Apologetics, Expository Preaching, New Testament Greek, Home and Foreign Missions and other subjects; and in Music, Notation, Conducting, and Harmony. Tuition will be free, credit will be given for work completed, and all applicants will be granted the usual student rate for board and room, \$6.45 to \$8.70 a week. Particulars may be secured by addressing the Institute, 153 Institute Place, Chicago, Ill.

Montrose Bible Conference

VARIOUS conferences, general and special, will be held as usual at Montrose, Pa., in 1934.

The General Conference from July 25th to August 5th, will have as speakers H. A. Ironside, A. Z. Conrad, Will H. Houghton, Lewis Sperry Chafer, Robert F. Fritsch, Reginald Wallis, Charles J. Woodbridge, Mrs. Grace Livingston Hill, and others.

The Young People's Bible Conference will be held from July 2nd to 8th. Among the speakers will be Roy Talmage Brumbaugh, Harold S. Laird, and Harold T. Commons.

A Christian Education Institute will be held from July 9th to 15th, a Ministerial Institute from July 16th to 26th, and a Prophetic Bible Conference from August 6th to 12th, under the direction of Arno C. Gaebelein.

Information may be secured from R. M. Honeyman, Executive Secretary, Montrose, Pa.

New York Summer School Plans Third Season

THE New York Summer School of Theology, conducted by Dr. Will H. Houghton of the Calvary Baptist Church of New York, will conduct its third season from June 18 to 30, 1934. The Faculty and subjects are as follows: Dr. A. T. Robertson of Louisville, Ky., "The Epistle of James" and "The Epistle to the Philippians"; President J. Oliver Buswell of Wheaton College, "Theism"; Dr. Cornelius Van Til of Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia, "The Theology of Crisis"; President Nathan R. Wood, of Gordon College, Boston, "The Secret of the Universe"; Dr. Max I. Reich, Chicago Hebrew-Christian scholar, "The Gospel of John," and Dr. Harris H. Gregg, New York, "The Lord Jesus and His Bible."

The school is for ministers and ministerial students only. Other than the above, there are no entrance requirements, and there are no examinations. Rooms may be secured at six dollars per week in the nearby National Bible Institute building. Registration is one dollar for one week, two dollars for two weeks. Information may be secured by addressing Dr. W. H. Houghton, Calvary Baptist Church, New York, N. Y.

Second Annual Wildwood Bible Conference

THE second annual Wildwood, N. J., Bible Conference, under the direction of the Rev. Henry Shepard Atkinson, was held from May 10 to 13, 1934. Mr. Atkinson is the vigorous pastor of the First Presbyterian Church. The Conference was divided into three parts: a "Summer Bible School Conference," a "Young People's Conference," and a "General Bible Conference." Speakers were: Dr. A. L. Lathem of Chester, Pa., founder of the Summer Bible School movement, whose all-Bible courses are studied

by 170,000 to 200,000 children each summer; **Dr. Harold S. Laird**, minister of the First and Central Church, Wilmington, Del.; **Prof. R. B. Kuiper** of Westminster Seminary; the **Rev. Chas. J. Woodbridge**, General Secretary of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions; the **Rev. James Blackstone**, the **Rev. Otis D. Fuller** and Messrs. **Robert and William Strong**.

Dr. H. McA. Robinson Elected By Board of Christian Education

IN its annual session, closing April 18th, in Philadelphia, the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., elected the **The Rev. Harold McA. Robinson, D.D.**, general secretary to succeed **Dr. William Chalmers Covert**, who retires because of age in October of this year. **Dr. Robinson** is at present the administrative secretary of the Board.

The new secretary of this Board, which deals with the whole educational work of the Church, including 53 colleges and work at 47 university centers, has held the office of administrative secretary since 1927. In that office he has been responsible for executing all plans for the presentation of the work of the Board to the church, for the preparation and administration of the Board's budget, and for the administration of the educational policy and program of the Board in all its departments.

Dr. Robinson was born in Shelbyville, Mo. He was graduated from Park College, in his home state, in 1901, and received his Bachelor of Divinity degree from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1904. He did graduate work at the seminary from 1909 to 1911, on his return from studying at the University of Leipzig, Germany. In 1919 he received his Doctor's degree from Lafayette. Before becoming connected with the organization in 1919, when he took the position of secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sunday School Work, **Dr. Robinson** held pastorates in Milroy and Germantown, Pa., and was professor of Bible and college pastor at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. He has written much religious education material and is author of a book entitled "How to Conduct Family Worship."

The financial situation of the Board is reported to be considerably improved. While contributions from the churches were still below those of the preceding year, the percentage of decrease for the latter part of the year closed March 31st was much less than in the earlier months. The Board closed the year without adding to the deficit occurring in the two years preceding and which made necessary heavy retrenchments in personnel and expenditure.

Rev. William Lindsay Young, LL.D., has been elected director of the Department of Colleges, Theological Seminaries and Training Schools to replace **Dr. Frederick E. Stockwell**, who died last year. **Dr. Young**

Heads Education Board



The Rev. Harold McAfee Robinson, D.D.
Braintrustee of the Board.

has been connected with the Board of Christian Education as director of the Department of University Work since 1929.

The Southern Presbyterian Church

By the Rev. Prof. Wm. Childs Robinson, Th.D., Columbia Theological Seminary

Shall We Keep the Faith?

ACCORDING to news items appearing in the religious press the **Rev. Donald H. Stewart** who was twice refused admission to West Hanover Presbytery on account of his modernism is undertaking the pastorate of the University Church at Chapel Hill, North Carolina. This item raises several questions. Has **Mr. Stewart** changed the views he so emphatically re-affirmed before West Hanover Presbytery? Did the Presbytery which dismissed him satisfy itself as to his doctrinal soundness; that is, did it observe the requirement of the Constitution of the Church and examine into his reported unsoundness as required in paragraph 183 of the Book of Church Order? Did the Presbytery which received him for the North Carolina work satisfy itself as to his doctrinal fitness to renew the ordination and installation vows? The reports of the former examination indicated that **Mr. Stewart** accepted religious experience as his rule of faith rather than the Scriptures as set forth in the first ordination vow.

While the pamphlet issued and now being circulated by **Dr. Wm. M. McPheeters** was called forth by the actions of Arkansas Presbytery, it is a message which other presbyteries need to hear and heed. It is not too

much to say that every presbytery and every presbyter ought to reconsider the solemn truth of the ordination vows before men and especially before the God of truth. Now as ever an honest man is the noblest work of God. The Book still pronounces its blessing upon the man that sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not; and still excludes those who make and love the contrary. Rev. 22:15.

Standing in the shadow of eternity the eighty-year-old Southern Prophet, **Dr. Wm. M. McPheeters**, has issued a clarion call for a more faithful observance of the third and the ninth commandments—for truth and the keeping of vows made to the Holy God. Will the Church of today hear this word and gird herself to keep the faith before man and before God; or will she stone another prophet and leave it to the generations to come to build him a monument?

DECATUR, GA.

Denver and Vicinity

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

DENVER Presbytery met in the Central Presbyterian Church, Denver, the **Rev. Martin E. Anderson, D.D.**, pastor, on April 17th. The Women's Presbyterial met in the same church on the same day. The two bodies assembled at 9:30 for an opening devotional service at which the sermon was preached by the retiring moderator, the **Rev. Benj. F. Judd**, pastor of the North Church, Denver. The **Rev. A. W. Liggett**, pastor of our churches at Idaho Springs and Georgetown was elected moderator for the new year. A crowded docket of business occupied the attention of the presbytery. The following were elected commissioners to the General Assembly: ministers, **Martin E. Anderson** (Central Church, Denver), **G. Henry Green** (South Broadway Church, Denver), **Garrett S. Tamminga** (First Church, Golden). Elders, **H. A. Davis** (Central Church, Denver), **Dr. A. J. Murray** (First Avenue Church, Denver), **Harry Bashford** (First Church, Wray).

An abortive attempt was made to vote blanket approval of the Boards of National Missions, Foreign Missions and Christian Education, and to discourage the diversion of benevolent funds to other agencies. Lack of time at the moment the matter was first presented prevented its immediate discussion and it was not brought up later. The naivete of those who advocate such actions is apparent when one stops to consider that in spite of the fact the report of the Appraisal Commission of the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry has been repudiated both by the General Council and the Board of Foreign Missions, four members of the three boards mentioned above are voluntarily serving as members of the National Committee for the Presentation of the Foreign Missions Inquiry. Those members are the following: Foreign Missions, **Elder Alfred E.**

Marling; National Missions, the Rev. Wm. H. Boddy, D.D.; Christian Education, the Rev. James E. Clarke, D.D., and the Rev. M. Willard Lampe, Ph.D. Seemingly, loyalty to the boards is a matter solely for the common or garden variety of ministers, elders and communicants. Board members themselves reserve the right to be or not to be loyal as suits their own fancy.

In a somewhat similar connection it is interesting to note that the only Presbyterian minister who was a member of the Appraisal Commission of the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, namely, Dr. William Pierson Merrill, pastor of the Brick Church, New York City, is one of the seven ministerial members of the "Advisory Committee" on the *new hymnal*, one of the seven ministerial members of the "Content Committee" of the same and that the organist of the church of which Dr. Merrill is pastor, served as "editor-in-chief" of this work.

Dr. Wm. L. Barrett of the Montview Church, Denver, welcomed a class of approximately one hundred new members on Easter Sunday. Other churches also received large classes but the writer does not have the figures at hand.

Through the courtesy of the Rev. Wm. G. Kiery of Penrose, Colorado, stated clerk of Pueblo Presbytery, the writer is able to report the following items of business transacted by that presbytery at its spring meeting. The Rev. Wallace H. Carver, D.D., pastor of the First Church of Colorado Springs, was elected moderator. The presbytery unanimously endorsed the Board of Foreign Missions and commended the Senior Secretary, Dr. Robert E. Speer.

Through the courtesy of the Rev. Harry Heinecke of Greeley, Sunday school missionary and stated clerk of Boulder Presbytery, come the following items of news from that presbytery: Presbytery met in the First Church of Sterling, the Rev. E. R. Cameron pastor. The meeting of presbytery was preceded by an elder's conference, presided over by Elder F. S. Leuthi of Boulder. Elder Milt Warner was elected president for the new year. The Rev. Leon Stewart, pastor of the First Church of Ft. Collins, was elected moderator. Commissioners to the General Assembly are: ministers, Wm. Floyd Kuykendall, Estes Park; Frank L. Greenway, student pastor at Boulder; elders, Hugh Scilley of Loveland, and Charles S. Scott of Longmont. A memorial to the General Council calling for the reviving of the Presbyterian Magazine was introduced by the Rev. Norman E. Nygaard, pastor of the church at Boulder, and adopted by presbytery. The writer of these notes was interested to note that the Rev. Mr. Nygaard is a signer of the Auburn Affirmation as was the editor of the former Presbyterian Magazine.

BRIGHTON, COLO.

"The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions is not an organization in the Presbytery of Philadelphia, or in the Synod of Pennsylvania, or in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

"The term 'Presbyterian' refers to church polity and, by extension, to doctrine. Its use is not confined to any one church or to any one part of the world. There are a large number of churches in our own country using the term, as, for example, the Presbyterian Church in the U.S., the United Presbyterian Church, the Cumberland Presbyterian Church (Colored), the Reformed Presbyterian Church, the Reformed Presbyterian Church, General Synod, and the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Synod. Further, the name 'Presbyterian' is widely used by independent institutions organized for charitable and other purposes throughout the world.

"The Independent Board was formed for the purpose of sending out missionaries who would propagate Presbyterian doctrine and organize, as opportunity might be afforded, churches along the lines of Presbyterian polity.

"It is not of importance to the Independent Board whether its missionaries or its members are members of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. or not. What does matter, and matter tremendously, is that its missionaries and its members should be wholeheartedly in accord with Presbyterian doctrine, and believers in a Presbyterian system of church polity.

"The Independent Board neither has, nor desires to have, any official relationship to the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A."—(Statement adopted by the Executive Committee of the Independent Board on May 10, 1934, in view of certain misconceptions as to the ecclesiastical status of the Board.)

The Reformed Church in America

By the Rev. G. M. Van Pernis

By Way of Introduction

MOST gladly do we comply with the request of the editors of CHRISTIANITY TODAY to send a monthly contribution to the pages of this splendid magazine.

The firm stand taken by these men and their colleagues, respecting faithfulness to the Word of God, witness the establishment of Westminster Theological Seminary, the publication of this very monthly, their reaction towards "Rethinking Missions" and the consequent organization of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, is a challenge to all that which is called Reformed.

We therefore are very happy indeed to cast our lot with these "watchmen on Zion's walls," to defend the "Faith once delivered unto the saints."

In these days of tolerance—with a resultant "milk and water religion"—with our readiness to fetch within our gates any Trojan Horse, without figuring up the consequent cost, we, who still believe in the authority of the Scriptures, need to stand shoulder to shoulder.

The day has come for all the Reformed churches (this includes the Presbyterian Church) to unfurl the Banner of Truth.

Ours is no policy of fault-finding and of hair-splitting, but a defending of the truth. This necessitates an exposure and opposing of all the subtle means put forth by the forces of evil, to undermine the foundations of our Reformed Faith. For, "if the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"

This being the first monthly letter coming from the Reformed Church in America, we must needs introduce ourselves. This we do by means of the following:

"1834-1934"

Although only for a part of the ecclesiastical world, 1934 is a centenary year, we may readily say that all christendom has been affected by two events which took place 100 years ago.

The first of these events which we have in mind, and with which no doubt the larger part of the church is acquainted, is the birth of Charles Haddon Spurgeon, the great English Baptist preacher. He was born in the year 1834 at Kelvedon, Essex. His followers built for him the well known Metropolitan Tabernacle in London, which was opened in 1861. Besides this immense tabernacle, we think of Stockwell Orphanage, the Golden Lane Mission, of his sermons, but especially of his Treasury of David.

Surely Spurgeon's life has blessed the British Isles, the Continent, and even America.

The other event, possibly not so well known, but to which we refer especially, is in connection with a man whose name is not so familiar. He lived across the English

Channel in the land of dikes and mills. In the very year which gave birth to **Spurgeon**, this man was in the thickest of his battles, actively engaged for the purification of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands. This man has done as much for the Reformation of the deformed church, as **Charles H. Spurgeon** ever did for the deepening of the devotional life of the Church. That man was the **Rev. Hendrik de Cock** of Warfum in the province of Groningen, Holland.

Now Holland has played a very important role in the life of the nations. Our national system of education—a free public school—as also our form of government, was copied after that of the Dutch Republic. Above all, our religious liberty we owe in a large measure to the Netherlands.

America can never forget Holland. Think of a **Henry Hudson**, the Half Moon and its cargo of Dutch settlers. Of New Amsterdam, a **Stuivesant**, and a **Rev. Jonas Michaelius**. Think of the oldest Protestant church in these United States, the one-time Dutch Reformed Church, now known as the Reformed Church in America. Some six years ago, in 1928, she was privileged to celebrate her tercentenary.

But to return to Holland for just a moment, what a debt of endless gratitude does the Reformed world owe her, as we think of the eighty-year war with Spain (1568-1648) for religious liberty. The great Synod of Dort (1618-1619) and the work it accomplished. So also, in line with these great and telling events, is the movement of 1834 under **de Cock**, known as the Secession.

One hundred years, approximately, after the great Reformation under Luther, Zwingli and Calvin, the Church again needed a Reformation from the Arminian errors. The Synod of Dort in re-establishing the "five points" of a formerly "one-pointed Calvinism" brought about such a Reformation.

And when after the Napoleonic days of the early 19th century Holland's king reorganized the Reformed Church by superimposing a General Synod which was not a Synod according to our Presbyterian form of Church Government, and then attacked the Reformed doctrine, it was a **de Cock** who opposed that Synod and who insisted on the faithful preaching of the Word of God in all its purity. That was the beginning of the fight against "modernism."

The emigration to the United States of 1847, under the leadership of **Dr. C. Van Raalte**, was a direct result of the secession of 1834. The coming of that contingent of Holland colonists to the virgin woods surrounding Black Lake in Western Michigan, meant the strengthening of the Dutch Reformed Church in America. It also meant an extension of its missionary endeavor, both at home and abroad.

There in the heart of that Holland Colony arose Hope College, graduates of which have gone forth to all parts of the world, and are active in all fields of science. The Western Theological Seminary also has sent

forth her graduates by the score into the Gospel Ministry at home and upon the Foreign Field.

Pella, Iowa, and its settlement under a Scholten, where today Central College has become another fountain to bless the Church, holding forth the Reformed teachings as purified by the movement of 1834.

While in 1857 a large section seceded from the United Reformed Church (1628-1847), giving rise to a new Reformed denomination, the Christian Reformed Church, we gladly extend to them the right hand of fellowship. Calvin College and Theological Seminary; the two Church organs, "The Banner" and "De Wachter," have stood for decades for the purity of the Reformed Faith.

Thus we see how 1934 is indeed a centenary year for the Reformed churches. We rejoice to celebrate that event this year and thank God for raising up men like **de Cock** and his associates, men who have hazarded their lives for the Word of God and for the honor of our Triune God.

In that movement of 1834 was struck a note which of late has found an echo, if not a consonant, in **CHRISTIANITY TODAY**.

That note is the desire to be Reformed and to continue the process of Reformation by a constant return to the Word of God.

While the days are evil, let all Reformed forces—Presbyterian, Reformed, and Christian Reformed—rally, that the Church may be manifested and God's honor triumph.

FULTON, ILL.

News from Detroit and Vicinity

By the Rev. Roy L. Aldrich

REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D., minister of the First Presbyterian Church, was elected moderator of the Detroit Presbytery at the spring meeting. The **Rev. E. P. Clark**, who has served 24 years as stated clerk of Presbytery, was re-elected for a term of five years. The commissioners to the General Assembly elected are the **Rev. A. M. Boyd** of Milford, the **Rev. Homer Noble** of Howell, the **Rev. Ralph Cummins**, director of the Dodge Community House, Detroit, and the **Rev. David Porter** of Ypsilanti. The elders elected are **William Craig Keith**, **John Farmer**, **Irvin Newcomer** and **St. Clair Sterns**.

Dr. Charles G. Sterling was installed pastor of the Bethel Presbyterian Church, Tuesday evening, May 1st. The sermon was preached by **Dr. F. Paul McConkey**, pastor of Immanuel Church; the questions were asked by **Dr. Morton C. Pearson**, Secretary of the Board of Church Extension; the charge to the pastor was given by the **Rev. Norman H. Camp** of Chicago; the charge to the congregation was given by the **Rev. Roy L. Aldrich** of Central Church, and the installation prayer offered by the **Rev. George Muran** of Knox Church.

The Detroit Bible Institute held its clos-

ing service for the year in the Central Presbyterian Church, Friday evening, May 4th. Seventeen students completed the four-year courses and were awarded diplomas. **Dr. Herbert Mackenzie** of Cleveland preached the sermon. The Detroit Bible Institute is interdenominational. The **Rev. Roy L. Aldrich**, pastor of Central Church, is the principal.

The **Rev. Ralph C. Crissman** has resigned from the pastorate of the Highland Park Presbyterian Church due to ill health.

DETROIT, MICH.

New Letter from Western Pennsylvania

By the Rev. H. J. Ockenga

UNION sentiment seems to be running high in Pittsburgh area. With few dissenting votes the Presbytery voted to hold a large Fellowship Meeting of the two local denominations. This will take place May 8th in the Third Presbyterian Church of which **Dr. Louis H. Evans** is pastor. The moderators of both assemblies, **Dr. W. B. Anderson** and **Dr. John McDowell**, will speak. With few dissenting votes the Presbytery also adopted a report favoring the plan of union between the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., and the United Presbyterian Church of North America.

Dr. C. E. Macartney's "Thou Shalt Say No!" raised a considerable protest from the United Presbyterians who groundlessly charged him with a breach of ministerial courtesy. They said: "In the judgment of your brother ministers of the United Presbyterian Church, this encroachment upon the evening service was a breach of ministerial courtesy, and under the circumstances was calculated to have a disturbing effect on their work." The resolution was not unanimous. It was correctly ignored.

April 30th, the Pittsburgh Ministerial Union met at the Smithfield Methodist Church to discuss the Kirby Page Questionnaire on war. The **Rev. Herbert B. Hudnut** of Bellevue Presbyterian Church and the **Rev. W. K. Anderson** of Johnstown spoke. The pacifist sentiment is growing. All of us are pacifists of some stripe and should pray and labor to prevent war, but I can find no prophecy or promise in the Bible that this age will be warless or converted. Adequate national defense is necessary. Much energy is wasted in pacifist meetings. **Harvey O'Connor**, the author of "Mellon's Millions," was in Pittsburgh at the invitation of the League for Social Justice. He spoke on "Surveying the Washington Scene."

Two Y. M. C. A. secretaries who have grown famous visited Pittsburgh recently. **Max Yergan** of South Africa, who has done a daring piece of work in race relations spoke on "Pioneering Good Will in Africa." Without a doubt South Africa is one of the hot spots of race prejudice and class exploi-

tation. Mr. Yergan's message is entirely practical and embraces brotherhood of man with the principles of Christ in operation. His statements about a spiritual experience and faith are so hazy that there was nothing to commend or criticize. His idealism is practical. His faith a nebulous nothing when expressed, although it may mean much to him. **Waldo H. Heinrichs**, the present Y. M. C. A. secretary of Jerusalem and famous war ace, spoke of the "Y" work during the Arab riots in Palestine. A magnificent new building is the property of the Y. M. C. A. in Jerusalem. The present writer saw it in 1932. There Arabs, Christians and Jews meet on common ground, and while the feeling ran highest during the riots the "Y" remained open and carried on its usual work. Bible classes are held only for Christians, and men of all three races are on the staff. It is interesting to note that of the twelve Y. M. C. A. centers in India only three are now operating due to curtailed income. No doubt, this accounts for the presence of these two "Y" leaders in America just now.

The writer while lecturing at Taylor University was impressed with the splendid body of devoted Christian students. Many are expecting to enter the ministry. The pressing question they all asked was, "What seminary shall I attend in order to be thoroughly trained in the faith?" Not a few are looking toward Westminster. Some were fitting themselves as medical men to enable them to be self-supporting missionaries. The flame of the gospel still brightly burns.

A group of seven candidates were licensed by Pittsburgh Presbytery on April 30th. Four were sons of ministers, six were graduates of Western. Many questions on theology were asked. The students for the most part revealed a sound faith and they preached ably. Two will study abroad.

PITTSBURGH

Eastern Pennsylvania Letter

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

DR. HAROLD McAFEE ROBINSON, of Philadelphia North Presbytery, was recently elected General Secretary of the Board of Christian Education, succeeding **Dr. W. C. Covert**. The Summer Evangelistic Committee of Philadelphia Presbytery has opened an office at 419 Witherspoon Building in connection with its Daily Vacation Bible School program, said by the committee's chairman, **Dr. Warren R. Ward**, to be the most complete and practical program yet put forward.

Delegates to Synod from Philadelphia Presbytery are: the Revs. **O. T. Allis**, **John B. Thwing**, **Ralph E. Wallis**, **George F. Ellison**, **George H. Bucher**, **Vincent Steffan** and **H. M. Morgan**; and Elders **George C.**

Patton, of Calvin Church; **George G. McEwing**, of Arch St. Church; **Harry Rickards**, of Westminster Church; **James H. Irvin**, of Reeve Memorial Church; **J. Wilber Yeats**, of Central-North Broad St. Church; **Matthew Neilly**, of Scots Church; and **James C. Leeper**, of Evangel Church.

Synods, councils and columnists do sometimes err, and this column tenders its apology to **Dr. Jesse M. Corum** for the statement in the last issue that his church no longer supported the official Board of Foreign Missions. Obtained from an official source, the information was nevertheless erroneous, and we are glad to make the correction.

Two opposite petitions to Presbytery emanating from the Holland Church resulted in the appointment of a committee of Presbytery to investigate the status of this vacant church.

An overture from Lehigh Presbytery regarding the changing of the terms of a pastoral call, and requiring action by Presbytery even in cases of mutual consent, was not concurred in by Philadelphia Presbytery.

Statistical reports showed that Westminster Church, **Dr. Warren R. Ward**, pastor, leads the presbytery in accessions on confession, as well as in total accessions during the year, 139; while Tenth Church leads in its gifts to benevolent causes, \$34,115.

Four students from Westminster Seminary were licensed and dismissed: **Donald K. Blackie**, to West Jersey Presbytery; **Clifford Blakey**, to West Jersey Presbytery; **Clifford S. Smith**, to Connecticut Valley; **Robert Strong**, to Philadelphia North, and his brother, **William T. Strong**, to West Jersey. Older members of the presbytery arose to commend the examinations and sermons of these four young men, **Dr. William P. Fulton** remarking that never in his life had he seen four such examinations as they sustained. This feeling was evidently universal among the presbyters, and reflects, as another said, great credit upon their teachers. It was a real occasion, though we must regret that the presbytery immediately lost them as they accepted charges elsewhere.

An impressive memorial service was held for the 22 elders lost by death during the year. The Rev. **H. McAllister Griffiths** and **Elder D. T. Richman** were appointed a committee to defend the presbytery in the complaint, now regularly filed with Synod, against the reception of **Dr. J. Gresham Machen** from New Brunswick Presbytery. Other appointments and elections included **Dr. William P. Fulton** to the National Missions Committee, and the Rev. **I. Sturger Shultz** to the General Council of Synod for a term of three years.

PHILADELPHIA

Delaware-Maryland Letter

By the Rev. Henry G. Welbon

THE Presbytery of New Castle met on April 16th and 17th at White Clay Creek Church, near Newark, Delaware, the Rev. **Clyde E. Richabaugh**, pastor. The Rev. **Thomas A. Williams** of Salisbury, Maryland, was elected moderator. The Rev. **John P. Clelland**, pastor of the Eastlake Church, Wilmington, was the other nominee. The following commissioners to General Assembly were elected, the Rev. **Hermann Bischof**, the Rev. **John D. Blake**; elders, **William B. Steel** and **F. Leonard Wailes**. Mr. Steel has been an elder in the Port Deposit Church for 53 years without having gone to General Assembly. The Rev. **Franklin W. Stevens** of Delaware City made the nominating speech for the Rev. **Harold S. Laird** who had been suggested by the Presbyterian League of Faith as the conservative candidate for moderator of General Assembly. The coalition of the modernistic group with those who consider themselves conservatives but vote otherwise, succeeded in preventing Mr. Laird's election, and thereby showed great discourtesy to him and to a large group of the Presbyterian ministry. It has been stated in one of the other Church papers that "New Castle Presbytery declined to allow an outside group to name in advance their commissioner to General Assembly." It has not been so long, however, when an outside group put forth their candidate for moderator and asked that his presbytery, although conservative, elect him a commissioner out of courtesy. This it did unanimously. It is apparent that generosity is to be expected from the conservatives, but that the liberals have no liberality to spare.

An overture asking that General Assembly sever its connections with the Federal Council of Churches was presented by the Rev. **Robert Graham**. The committee on bills and overtures was divided on the matter but debate was prevented by a motion made by the Rev. **Albert H. Kleffman, Ph.D.** to lay it on the table. The Rev. **John P. Clelland** presented an overture asking that we oppose the proposed union with the United Presbyterian Church. Mr. Clelland very ably presented the dangerous features of the proposed union. This matter was also tabled.

On account of the ill health of the Rev. **Charles H. Bohner** who is chairman of the Home Missions Committee, the Rev. **Colin C. Weir** gave the report of that committee. He pointed out that approximately \$500,000 of Home Missions money goes to support individual churches, while two millions of dollars is used for other causes. Members of Presbytery were advised to find out where this sum is spent. One of the matters presented by the Council of Presbytery for approval was that the Rev. **William P. Shriver** of the Board of Home Missions be invited to make a survey of the home mis-

sions work here. In spite of his ill health, the Rev. Charles H. Bohner vigorously opposed the measure on the grounds that it was unnecessary and a waste of money, inasmuch as some years ago a survey was made by Mr. Shriver which resulted in the formation of Italian, Polish, and Negro missions in Wilmington and cost the Presbytery thousands of dollars. He said these missions had all been closed and that the weak churches in Makemie land had received no help from these outside experts. This measure failed to pass. The Foreign Missions committee presented its more or less usual report, with nothing said in opposition to the support of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

NEWARK, DEL.

Parade

DR. F. W. LEWIS, Vice-President of the Biblical Seminary in New York, has been chosen as minister of the influential Throop Ave. Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn, succeeding the long-time pastor, Dr. William Carter. Dr. Lewis is, however, not severing his connection with the Biblical Seminary of which Dr. W. W. White is President, but will still serve it in a limited and honorary capacity. . . . The Moody Bible Institute in Chicago has revived the practice of putting out student gospel teams, and during the spring recess five or six such teams were in operation in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Missouri. This activity was in addition to the regular church, mission, and visitation work done by students in and around Chicago. Each group consisted of a speaker, a vocalist, an instrumentalist, and in some cases vocalists. . . . Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn., held a Spiritual Emphasis Week for Youth, February 26th-March 4th. The services were conducted by the Rev. Herman L. Turner, pastor of the Covenant Presbyterian Church of Atlanta, Georgia. Although attendance was not compulsory, the services were well attended. Many fraternities and other groups on the campus invited Mr. Turner as special guest to dinners and meetings where he made informal and inspirational talks. At the last meeting in the First Presbyterian Church the students rededicated themselves to more faithful and effective spiritual service. Cumberland has a large Law School, the only professional school connected with a Presbyterian institution. It is said that practically every student in the University, including the students in the professional school are not only Christians but interested in Christian activities.

The annual meeting of the Olivet Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., the Rev. Jos. G. Snyder, minister, was a great success. "The spirit of prayer was upon Olivet's birthday, and the annual meeting was rich with a sense of God's presence and blessing. The report called forth repeated thanks-

giving to God, and the election result was evidently of Him. Elders Jeanson and Oliver and Deacon Hagen were re-elected by large majorities. A hearty vote of thanks was given our faithful and efficient musicians and other volunteer workers." . . . At the South Presbyterian Church, Syracuse, N. Y., the Rev. John T. Reeve, D.D., Minister, large congregations were present at all the services in connection with the Easter season. At the Good Friday evening Communion Service and on Easter Sunday there were the largest congregations in many years. The offerings were larger than last year. Twenty new members united with the Church on Good Friday evening. Cottage prayer meetings which have been held all winter, bringing a great blessing, will be continued. . . . The 7-year-old son of the Rev. Ralph B. Colton of Fort Branch, Ind., died of scarlet fever recently. Mr. Colton, his wife, and three other sons have all been sick, but are expected to recover. The Rev. Jack Masters, Sullivan, Ind., has been given a leave of absence by the Presbytery of Vincennes for 90 days, owing to illness. . . . The Rev. Milton Bennett Lambdin of Washington, D. C., has recently come into possession of a huge brick, in perfect condition, from the ruined walls of ancient Babylon. Recently Dr. Lambdin was elected to the American Academy of Political and Social Science, and to the Victoria Institute, of Great Britain. . . . The Forks of Brandywine Church, the Rev. H. H. Kurtz, minister, in the Presbytery of Chester, has been bereaved of one of its most faithful elders, Samuel D. Curry, who after a lingering illness entered into the presence of the Lord on Saturday, April 14th. Although he had been kept from the services of the Sabbath for more than two years, and had been living within the bounds of another parish, so large was his place in the affections of the people, that loving inquiries as to his condition characterized every gathering. Not only the congregation, but the entire community, feels a sense of great and intimate loss. Mr. Curry was a commissioner to the Assembly of 1929, and labored earnestly in prayer for the security of Princeton Seminary. The organization of Westminster interested him intensely. He was present at the meeting in Philadelphia at which the founding of the Seminary was decided upon, and at every commencement and opening exercise, until increasing weakness prevented. "He held fast the truth of Christ as the ground of his personal hope, and quietly but unflinchingly maintained the doctrines upon which the Presbyterian Church stands. His monument is the reverence and love of a sorrowing people." . . . The past year was one of the best in the history of the First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood, Calif. Four hundred and eighty-two new members were received into the church, of whom two hundred and eighty-seven were on confession of faith. The active membership now numbers two thou-

sand seven hundred. The pastor, Dr. Stewart P. MacLennan, recently conducted two weeks of special services to deepen the spiritual life of the church. The attendance was most gratifying and increased steadily. Every department of the church was deeply stirred. The spiritual life of the church increased most significantly. The Bible School has an enrollment of nearly 3000, with 800 more enrolled in week-day Bible study classes and in the Cradle Roll. . . . Dr. Francis Shunk Downs, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Berkeley, California, has accepted the invitation of the Chosen Mission to participate in the Golden Jubilee of the beginning of Presbyterian Missionary work in Korea, to be held in Seoul, the first week of July. First Presbyterian Church has given him a leave of absence that will enable him to see some of the Mission work in Japan and China as well as Korea. He will visit various mission stations and will fill different preaching and conference appointments, meeting with groups of missionaries and national church leaders in each one of the three countries. He will have nearly three weeks in Japan before giving a series of addresses at the Annual Mission Meeting in Korea the last eight days of June. He will visit other stations in Korea the last eight days of June. He in Korea and from there go to Manchuria and to various mission centers in China, sailing from Shanghai to be home early in August. . . . The Presbytery of El Paso convened at Fort Davis, Texas, on Tuesday evening, April 10, 1934. The Rev. Wistor R. Smith, Moderator, preached the opening sermon. The Presbyterial Society met at the same time and place. . . . The regular Spring meeting of Willamette Presbytery convened at Corvallis, April 2nd and 3rd. The Rev. John S. Burns, pastor of the federated churches of Corvallis, was elected moderator of the Presbytery. The Rev. E. W. Warrington, Professor of Religion in Oregon State College, led a forum discussion on "What Is Spiritual," and Dr. Henry B. Master, secretary of the National Board of Pensions, preached the evening sermon on the topic, "What Think Ye of Christ?" The election of the Corvallis pastor as moderator fills the position held during the past year by Dr. G. C. Birchett, Salem. Other officers elected at the opening session were Dr. W. H. Lee, Albany, stated clerk; the Rev. J. Y. Stewart, Albany, permanent clerk; the Rev. G. H. Wilbur, Salem, recording clerk; F. E. Graham, Cove Orchard, temporary clerk. All the churches of the Willamette Valley were represented at the meeting. A call from the McMinnville Church to the Rev. Harry G. Kenney was accepted and the Presbytery was given authorization to arrange for installation in the near future. The Presbytery also accepted a call from Mill City Church of the Rev. James McAuley with installation set for April 12th. Presbytery elected four commissioners to

the General Assembly at Cleveland, Ohio, May 24th-29th. These were the Rev. James A. Smith, Cottage Grove; the Rev. Louis M. Anderson, Newport; Mr. F. C. Graham, Cove Orchard; Ralph S. Harper, Gervais. In the report of trustees, the Rev. G. H. Wilbur reported the sale of the old defunct church at Whiteson for \$50.00 and the money sent to the Board of Election, and the bell given to the new edifice being constructed at Cannon Beach. Presbytery voted an adjourned meeting for May 28th at Eugene to ordain Mr. Glen Coie, a graduate of Albany College and soon to graduate from Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia, who is to assume the pastorate of the North Bend Church.

Irish Letter

By S. W. Murray

(Corrections—In the "Irish Letter" on page 20 of CHRISTIANITY TODAY for March, for "Rev. James McCameron, M.A." please read "Rev. James McCammon, M.A.," and for "Rev. James Hutton, M.A.," please read "Rev. James Hunter, M.A.")

TWO eminent ministers of the Irish Presbyterian Church recently passed away—the Rev. Wm. Colquhoun, B.A., Minister-Emeritus of Fitzroy Church, Belfast, and the Rev. E. J. McKee, B.A., LL.D., of St. Andrew's Church, Bray. News has come to hand of the death of Mrs. Miskelly of Manchuria who has been a missionary for many years.

A recent letter received from the Rev. Morris Sigel of Damascus tells of encouragement in his work among Jews. Owing to the closing of the Zionist Workmen's Club by Government action, many of the club members are now attending the meetings addressed by Mr. Sigel. He asks prayer that the message of the Gospel may be brought home to many hearts during this time of opportunity.

Mr. Robert E. C. Calhoun, B.A., has been ordained to the ministry and appointed to the pastoral oversight of the congregation of Boyle and Ballymote (Connaught Presbytery). Mr. Calhoun is a graduate of Magee College; Derry and Trinity College, Dublin, and studied theology at Princeton Seminary, and Assembly's College, Belfast. Mr. A. W. E. Forbes, B.A., a licentiate of Derry Presbytery, has received a call from Roseyards Presbyterian Church (Route Presbytery).

On April 12th the closing public meeting of the Assembly's College 1933-34 Session was held. The Rev. Principal F. J. Paul delivered the closing lecture, his subject being "Discipline in the Christian Church." At this meeting the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred on the Rev. Wm. Elliott, M.A., of Ballinasloe and the Rev. T. M. Johnstone, Belfast (Moderator Designate).

The speakers at the 1934 Portstewart Convention are announced as follows: the

Rev. Alex. Frazer (Aberdeen), the Rev. John Macbeath, M.A. (Glasgow), the Rev. J. Stuart Halden, D.D. (London), Mr. A. Lindsay Glegg (London) and Mr. G. F. Whitehead. The convention is to be held the last week in June.

At the annual meeting of the local auxiliary of the China Inland Mission held in Belfast on April 10th, Mr. J. B. Martin (Secretary of the Mission) said that 1933 was a year of advance. Baptisms numbered almost 7000, this being the largest in the history of the Mission. The membership of the C. I. M. was now 1313 and 19 new stations were opened during the year. The income from all sources in 1933 amounted to £138,000.

Towards the end of April a two days' Conference of Presbyterian, Church of Ireland, and Methodist ministers was held at Howth (near Dublin). This was arranged jointly by the Irish Christian Fellowship and the Friends of Reunion. Among those taking part were the Dean of Belfast, Dr. J. J. Macaulay (Presbyterian) and the Rev. J. E. Neill, B.A. (Methodist). One of the speakers said, "If the problem of uniting the Churches were settled we should gain a valuable equipment with which to tackle the immense difficulty of reconciling the religion of the man who wanted to be free to think with that of the man who accepted his faith on authority. The reconciliation of faith and unbelief is surely an 'immense difficulty.'"

BELFAST

Netherlands Letter

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

ON the 20th March died our very beloved Queen-Mother Emma of Waldich-Pyrmont, and the royal family, which consists of only four members, was reduced to three.

There is great reason to remember in this ecclesiastical journal the death of Queen Emma. As a girl of twenty-two she married our last king William III, who was at that moment a man of twenty-two. Three princes born out of his first marriage died the one after the other. And it is the daughter of Queen Emma, who is our reigning Queen Wilhelmina. King William III died in 1890, when his only remaining child Wilhelmina was a girl of ten. So Queen Emma took up the regency. She governed our people in difficult years excellently. She cemented the ties between the people and the dynasty and she acquired the love of all. Above all, she was a very religious woman and she educated her royal child according to the Word of God. That our present Queen fears the Lord and is not ashamed to confess her faith at all opportunities, she owes, in God's providence, to her mother.

After her retirement Queen Emma devoted herself to various social and religious work and in this manner she retained the

love of the people. A great estate, the legacy of her royal husband, she devoted to the nursing of consumptives, and she did not cease to visit and to show her interest in all institutions of social work.

And now, when after more than forty years the royal crypt of the famous church at Delft, the last resting place of the Orange Nassaus was opened again, a whole people mourned its queen. Even the socialists testified: she was a good woman and loved our people as a mother.

The weeks after Easter are the weeks of the meetings of the ministers of the different churches. It is a remarkable fact that not only in the conference of the ministers of the Reformed churches, was the great secession of 1834 commemorated, but that other conferences took notice of it. However, the last published number of the quarterly, "Onder Eigen Vaandel," the paper of the confessional party in the Dutch Reformed Church (singular) is completely devoted to remembrance of the secession. Although all members of the Reformed Churches cannot be content with many explanations in this number, I regard it as a happy token, that in the Reformed Church the secession is mentioned with considerate esteem.

AMSTERDAM

Korea Letter

By the Rev. Bruce F. Hunt

THE retreat has been sounded! A cable from the Board, requesting the first official withdrawals from the mission, has been received.

Dr. S. A. Moffett, pioneer missionary, whose retirement was announced in the February letter has been presented with a gold medal from the Japan Imperial Association for "distinguished service in the cause of education in Chosen." He was twenty-five years president of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, and ten years president of Union Christian College, and it was largely due to his stand that the Presbyterian academies, while recognized by the Government as standard, are allowed to teach Bible as a regular part of the curriculum (these schools being known as "designated" schools, as opposed to "recognized" schools, which may not teach the Bible in school hours).

The question of closing some of the mission stations, due to the reduction in Board receipts, has been raised, and the Executive Committee of the mission has taken action that, due to the fact that we have accepted responsibility for the fields worked by comity agreements with other missions, we cannot close any of our Stations "unless its territory can be turned over to the Presbytery concerned, to the Boards of the General Assembly of the Korean Church, or to some other Foreign Mission Board." A committee was also appointed to ascertain what savings could result from the closing of any

Station, institution, or form of work, and to study practical plans to turn over the work to the Korean Church.

Korea lost one of her prominent men on February 27th, in the death of Elder Yoo (Sung Jun), who has served many government positions in his lifetime, including the Governorship of two of Korea's provinces and the Vice-Governorship of two others. He was a proud witness to the Gospel during all of these years and at one time served on the board of editors which put out the mixed-script version of the Korean Bible.

March is graduation month in Korea and the following institutions graduated workers who will take up positions in the church:

Presbyterian Theological Seminary (Pyengyang), 33 men.

Women's Higher Bible School (Presbyterian, Pyengyang), 21 women.

Methodist Theological Seminary (Seoul), 7 men, 7 women.

Martha Wilson Women's Seminary (Presbyterian, Wonsan), 10 women.

There was a debate at the last General Assembly whether the name "Seminary" applied to the Martha Wilson School in Wonsan did not indicate that a group in the Presbyterian Church had committed themselves to the ordination of women as ministers, following the example of the Methodist Church in Korea.

CHUNGJU, KOREA

China Letter

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

A GREAT revival was experienced among the students of the Lutheran Theological Seminary near Hankow under the leadership of the Rev. Chia Yu Ming, D.D., Chairman of the League of Christian Churches.

Never have the faculty and students of the North China Theological Seminary and the Mateer Memorial Institute entered more heartily into nor been more signally blessed in their spring holiday evangelistic campaign throughout the TENGHSIEN field than they have this spring. Their reports have been most thrilling and show a real soul-hunger on the part of multitudes all over this great county.

The Rev. Chang Feng Ming, a graduate of the North China Theological Seminary, whose work among the Chinese in Korea has been richly blessed, reports a recent preaching tour along the Manchurian-Korean border in which the Holy Spirit's presence was powerfully manifested and 232 Chinese and 36 Koreans professed conversion. At the urgent call of the Presbyterian Station at Tengchowfu, Mr. Chang now returns to Shantung to become superintendent of evangelistic work in that station field.

The unevangelical and inclusive elements in church and mission circles, especially in such centers as Shanghai and Peiping, gave

Almost everyone

who subscribes to Christianity Today, renews. We are proud of the faithfulness of our growing "family." We will appreciate your sending your renewal without waiting for a notice, if it is due. Your address-label will inform you. A blank is enclosed for your convenience and for any who wish to join our world-wide circle of readers. Christianity Today is still the same old price—one dollar a year, EVERYWHERE.

a most enthusiastic reception and hearing to Dr. Norwood, the noted "modernistic" pastor of the City Temple Church, London, upon his recent visit to China, and they feel that he has done much to strengthen their cause. Those who would take the Bible rather than the Laymen's Appraisal as guide in Mission work cannot but deplore his influence, especially in the community churches and mission universities.

The live group of evangelical students at the Shantung Christian University were fortunate this year in securing the services

of one of China's very strongest young evangelists, Mr. Wang Ming Tau, at their special Spring holiday meetings. A time of deep spiritual refreshment and victory is reported.

The League of Evangelical Students in China asks the earnest prayers of God's people that the way may very soon be open financially for it to hold its first national conference. They regard the early holding of this conference as vital and are praying for one next summer.

TENGHSIEN, SHANTUNG PROVINCE, CHINA

Letter from Melbourne, Australia

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

IT is reported that a very great number of persons witnessed the enthronement of Archbishop Mowl recently as Metropolitan of New South Wales and Archbishop of Sydney. St. Andrew's Cathedral could not accommodate the people, and more than a thousand are said to have been refused admittance.

Very much appreciation may be expressed of the article in January number of CHRISTIANITY TODAY entitled "The Great Delusion," by E. Van Deusen. It is a valuable summary of the position in regard to the popular doctrine. Evolution has broken down on all lines of proof.

In Australia, though in some quarters we do not hear quite so much about evolution, and this may perhaps be true of the pulpit, yet the popular magazine for the most part and the newspaper still give it a great vogue. The university and the college still seem infatuated with it. Many of those who claim to speak with authority apparently ignore the fact that it is destitute of real proof, brush aside all suggestions of doubt, and with amazing assumption and assurance, treat it not only as a faith (more properly termed credulity or superstition) but as science. Probably on that ground a speaker not long since referred to the early chapters of Genesis as poetry.

Much the same is true in regard to those Modernistic and Higher critical interpretations of the Bible which are founded on evolution. Here again we are told that we must study the Bible in the light of modern knowledge, presumably evolution assumed to be science. Lord Kelvin said—"I marvel at the undue haste with which teachers in our universities and preachers in our pulpits are re-stating truth in terms of evolution, while evolution itself remains an unproved hypothesis in the laboratories of science." Perhaps more amazing still is it that so-called modern views of the Bible should have such persistence in face of the true science of archæology. Can this fact be adequately explained apart from the revelation in Scripture of the subtlety and power of the great spirit of evil and of error?

MELBOURNE

IN THIS ISSUE:

Name Calling in the Presbyterian Church	4
FRANK H. STEVENSON	
A Missionary's Statement to the Home Constituency	7
ALBERT B. DODD	
Servants of God or Servants of Men	9
J. GRESHAM MACHEN	
The Christian Assembly	10
Impressions of Philadelphia Presbytery	12
AN OBSERVER	
Is This Hellphobia?	12
THOMAS M. SLATER	
MacKenzie v. Van Til	13
He Was a Good Man: A Sermon	15
ALEXANDER MARLOWE	
This Changing World	17
"CALVINIST"	
Sunday School Lessons for June	18
N. B. STONEHOUSE	
The Comfort of the Scriptures	19
DAVID FREEMAN	
News of the Church	20