

# General Assembly Report, Page 37

# 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.

JULY, 1934  
(MID-JUNE)  
Vol. 5 No. 2

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

## Editorial Notes and Comments


### THE ASSEMBLY AND ITS ACTIONS

 COMPREHENSIVE report of the proceedings of the Cleveland Assembly is the leading feature of this issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. That it is interpretative as well as descriptive does not detract from the accuracy of its factual statements. Rather facts are blind and meaningless save as they are interpreted. Just as it takes both the facts recorded in the Bible and the interpretations of those facts afforded us by the Biblical writers (*i. e.*, its doctrines) to yield us Christianity, so it takes a knowledge of the actions of the General Assembly plus an interpretation of those actions to give us anything like an adequate understanding of what happened at the 146th General Assembly. There is no such known thing as a bare fact, *i. e.*, a fact of which we have no interpretation. As DR. JAMES DENNEY once said: "A fact of which there is absolutely no theory . . . is a blank unintelligibility, a rock in the sky, a mere irrelevance in the mind of man." There may be a difference of opinion as to the right interpretation but some interpretation there must be if the fact is to have any meaning for us whatever. A history worthy of the name is much more than a chronology.

The Bible gives us not only the facts that lie at the basis of Christianity but an *authoritative* interpretation of those facts. The Bible speaks with authority. Is that also true of the General Assembly? It is to be admitted that it does in a judicial case, so far as the final disposition of the case in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is concerned. There are those who seem to think that it also speaks with like authority when as a non-judicial body it issues deliverances similar to that issued by the last Assembly relative to the Independent Board for Foreign Missions. Such, however, is not the case. The most that can be said is that such deliverance are "entitled to great respect and deference" (Report of Commission of Fifteen, Minutes of 1926, p. 83). We say advisedly that this is "the most that can be said" as not infrequently they are entitled only to such respect and deference as is due to a few self-chosen leaders. We do not subscribe to the view that the General Assembly "has all the power the Church would have if it were possible to convene the Church together in one place," but we do hold that the actions of a General Assembly are entitled to great respect and deference in as far as they express anything like the combined wisdom of the Church-at-large. As matters now stand, however, the actions of the Assembly can hardly be said to be expressive of the wisdom of the Church as a whole. A commissioner who goes to the Assembly merely because it is his turn to go is hardly a representative commissioner. Many of them look upon attendance at the Assembly as a junket trip. What is perhaps even worse, this


method of electing commissioners brings it about that the great majority of them, being without previous experience, are subject to easy manipulation by the "platform." As a result the commissioners often do little more than "rubber stamp" what the "Hierarchy" proposes. That this is what happened in the case of the action relative to the Independent Board is obvious from the fact that it was adopted without study. This means that it is entitled only to such respect and reverence as is due the recommendations of the General Council. In our judgment the adjective "great" is out of place in this connection.

### THE RIGHT TO PROTEST

 S long ago as 1758 the General Assembly recognized the right of any of its members "to protest against any act or procedure of our highest judicature . . . and to require that such protestation be recorded in their Minutes." This immemorial right finds expression in Section 106 of our Book of Discipline: "If a dissent or protest be couched in decorous and respectful language, and be without offensive reflections or insinuations against the majority, it shall be entered on the records."

This right to protest, while not denied, was unwarrantably curtailed by the last Assembly. Section 9 of the protest of the minority (see later pages for details) was deleted by vote of the Assembly on the ground that to declare what the minority considered an unconstitutional act of the Assembly to be a "nullity" is an insinuation against the majority. But unless we are prepared to say that an act of the Assembly is binding even if unconstitutional—we are not sure but that many, including the General Council, are prepared to say that—it is perfectly proper to say that such an act is plainly a nullity. Surely it is an unwarranted curtailment of the right of a minority to protest to require that they put nothing in their protest that does not meet with the approval of the majority. The next thing we know the Assembly will be appointing committees to write or at least edit protests before they are allowed to be submitted to the Assembly for record on its minutes.

### A NEW PRESBYTERIAN PAPER

 T was announced at the last Assembly that it is expected that the *Presbyterian Advance* will cease publication and that its place will be taken by a new paper to be published in New York and edited by DR. EDMUND B. CHAFFEE, Director of the Labor Temple in that city. The *Presbyterian Advance* which has been forced to discontinue for financial reasons has agreed to present its list of subscribers and good will to the new paper. It is intimated that the new enterprise has sufficient financial backing to carry it through its opening years.



The indications are that the new paper will be no less liberal, probably more liberal at least along social lines than the *Presbyterian Advance* has been. DR. CHAFFEE is a signer of the Auburn Affirmation. We are informed that he is an avowed Pacifist, that he is closely identified with the Sacco-Vanzetti and the War Resistance Leagues, and that he sustains sympathetic relations with the Communists. While the Presbyterian Church is not committed to any specific social system, it is committed to the Bible as God's infallible Word and to the Westminster Standards as setting forth the system of doctrine taught in that ever trustworthy book. It seems clear that this new paper will not reflect the historic doctrinal position of the Presbyterian Church. Whether the testimony of CHRISTIANITY TODAY is wanted by the majority of Presbyterians, so-called at least, there was never a time, we believe, when it was more needed.

### THE INDEPENDENT FOREIGN MISSION BOARD

**T**HE editor of this paper does not sustain any official relations to the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. It does not seem, therefore, that he is in any immediate danger of being ejected from the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. because of his lack of sympathy with the Modernist-Indifferentist party that now dominates the policies of said Church. Be that as it may, his sympathies are with the members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions as over against what he regards as the unjust, unconstitutional and un-Christian action of the General Assembly in regard to them.

Shortly after the resolution, offered by the General Council, relative to the Independent Board, had been adopted by the General Assembly a statement by the editor of this paper was given to the press and printed in whole or in part in a number of newspapers, including the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* and the *New York Times*. That statement follows in unabridged form:

"There is room for difference of opinion among real Presbyterians as to whether an organization of the type of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions should have been established until further efforts had been made to so reorganize the official Board that it would deserve the confidence and support of those who in all heartiness and sincerity accept the Bible as the Word of God and who believe that the Gospel it proclaims is the one hope for mankind—whether for this life or the life to come. There is no room for difference of opinion among such, however, as to the right of the organizers of the new Board to do what they have done.

"The Independent Board is not an organization within the

Presbyterian Church as the General Council alleges. It has and claims no ecclesiastical affiliations. If it involves disloyalty and disobedience to constituted authority for a Presbyterian to contribute to this organization, it is equally true that no Presbyterian can maintain his good standing and contribute to the China Inland Mission or any other missionary or even philanthropic organization, not under the control of the General Assembly.

"Whether we approve or disapprove of the new Board we can assent to the General Council's notion of the authority of the General Assembly only at the cost of surrendering those liberties for which our Presbyterian forebears fought and even died."

In view of the above statement it will be seen, not to mention other matters, that the editor of this paper holds: (1) that the official Board of Foreign Missions, as at present constituted, deserves neither the confidence nor the support of those who are intelligently interested in extending the Kingdom of Christ—and hence that such should either designate such gifts as they make to missions through the official Board in such a way that they can be used only for the support of sound missionaries or make their gifts through other channels; (2) that while there may be room for difference of opinion among those interested in promoting truly Biblical and truly Presbyterian missions as to whether the organizers of the new Board acted prematurely there is no room for difference of opinion as to their right, under the constitution of the Presbyterian Church, to do what they have done—and hence that the action taken by the General Assembly was *ultra vires*; and (3) that to assent to the conception of the authority of the General Assembly that underlies the action taken by the last Assembly relative to the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions is to admit that Presbyterians are the slaves of men rather than the Lord's freemen.

### "STUDIES OF THE CONSTITUTION"

**T**HE forty-four page document, entitled "Studies of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.," which the General Council sent to all the Commissioners to the

146th General Assembly for their "guidance" in dealing with the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions is certain to be much discussed for some time to come. In this connection we content ourselves with certain preliminary comments that will at least serve to indicate our valuation of it.

1. We are by no means sure that Section II of Chapter XXVI of the Form of Government obligated (or even justified) the General Council to take official notice of the Independent Board.

## The Hierarchy of the Presbyterian Church

By the Rev. Dr. Maitland Alexander  
A Former Moderator of the General Assembly

One of the attractive things about the Presbyterian Church to an American is its representative form of government. High and low, rich and poor, all its Presbyters, clergymen and lay officers alike, stand on a parity to vote as they please and to do as they please under the authority of the Presbytery to which they belong. If they do wrong it is the Presbytery's business to correct and discipline them. Any self-constituted authority attempting to interfere outside the bounds of their Presbyteries should be disregarded and condemned. I heard (only heard) the other day that the Moderator of the Assembly and the Stated Clerk had called certain Presbyters before them and had threatened them with an Assembly action on the course they were pursuing. Whether that course was wise or unwise, legal or illegal, how can these self-appointed Presbyterian Mussolinis justify such an action?

For some years the Church has felt the hand of what has been called "The Hierarchy." The Boards of the Church, its General Council, the officers of the Assembly, some professors in our Theological Seminaries, have been assuming to exercise powers which they do not possess. Influence they undoubtedly have and they can and do use it. No one will gainsay them the right. But it seems a pity that the rank and file of Presbyters have nothing to do but to go along at their dictation and that the only protests should be votes in obscure Presbyteries. If we are to have a Presbyterian Mussolini, give us one with Mussolini's brains. If we are to have a Pope, give us one with the wisdom and conservatism of the Vatican. I have not seen any material who could qualify or take the place of our Form of Government.

We have reached, or soon will reach, the time for a final showdown as far as the self-constituted dictators in the Presbyterian Church are concerned. Let us clearly limit the power of the Moderator and the Stated Clerk. They will have enough to do if the one returns to his regular job after the Assembly and the other to his clerical work which ought to occupy all of a man's time. It is wonderful how "power" goes to the heads of men even of mediocre ability who are given by the Church positions of preferment. Humility is a good virtue but hard to practice when in office.



It is true that said section assigns to the General Council the duty of considering "between annual meetings of the General Assembly cases of serious embarrassment or emergency concerning the benevolent and missionary work of the Church, and to provide direct methods of relief." It does not appear, however, that the organization of the new Board was itself the occasion of any "serious embarrassment or emergency" in the missionary work of the Church—nor does the General Council make any attempt to show that it was. It is no doubt true that the official Board of Foreign Missions has been seriously embarrassed in its work by reason of reduced income, but to assert that this has been due mainly or even largely to the organization of the new Board is merely to throw dust in the air, as it were, in order to conceal from view the real cause of this diminished income. If the General Council had felt itself obligated to consider the injury done to the cause of Foreign Missions by the failure of the Board of Foreign Missions to take a Christian attitude toward the Laymen's Report, toward Mrs. Buck, towards Modernism at home and abroad, it would have not only called attention to the main cause of the "serious embarrassment" in the missionary work of the Church but might have rendered a real service to the missionary enterprise. The new Board is a symptom not the cause of the disease that afflicts the missionary enterprise, and until that cause is dealt with in an effective manner it is vain and futile to expect an increased interest in the missionary work conducted under the auspices of the official Board. It is a thousand pities that the General Council is blind to the real cause of the falling off in missionary offerings. Even if the incredible thing should happen, namely, that the members of the new Board in obedience to the mandate of the Assembly should forthwith resign, it is safe to say that there will be no increase of missionary offerings to the official Board by evangelical Presbyterians as long as its present policies are continued.

2. If it is "contrary to fact," as the General Council alleges (p. 3), to state that the charges against the official Board of Foreign Missions, made by DR. MACHEN in his pamphlet, have never been answered, it is passing strange that the representatives of the Board who, according to the General Council, in the presence of the Standing Committee on Foreign Missions, "answered every point he (DR. MACHEN) had made one by one" have not seen fit to make their reply available to Presbyterians in general. We are sure that we speak not only for ourselves but for a multitude of Presbyterians when we say that our attitude toward the official Board of Foreign Missions would be quite different than it is if it was made clear to us that DR. MACHEN'S allegations are unfounded. There may be those whose confidence in the General Council is such that they are willing to take their word for it. We, however, are not among that number.

3. It is "contrary to fact," we believe, to state that the Independent Board is an organization "within the Church" in the sense alleged by the General Council. If so, it would seem that The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, under whose auspices CHRISTIANITY TODAY is published, is also an organization "within the Church" and subject to General Assembly control. It, too, is incorporated under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with a Constitution and By-Laws. All its officers and members are either ministers or elders of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Moreover, inasmuch as its editors are subject to its Board of Directors, it "assumes the direction of persons who are subject to the authority of church judicatories" and to that extent exercises what the General Council calls "ecclesiastical functions." It would seem also that without authority of the General Assembly it exercises what the General Council calls "administrative functions" as it appeals to Presbyterians to "provide the ways and means"—to make financial contributions in other words—by which the paper may continue to be published. What is true of the Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company is also true in all essential respects of the companies that publish the *Presbyterian*, the

*Presbyterian Advance* and the *Presbyterian Banner*, not to mention a host of other educational and benevolent corporations. We submit that the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions is no more an organization "within the Church" than are our religious newspapers or any educational or benevolent organization that employs Presbyterian ministers or that appeals to Presbyterians for financial support.

4. We believe that the General Council has a radically mistaken conception of the power of the General Assembly. The General Assembly, it affirms, "has all the power the Church would have if it were possible to convene the Church in one place." It would seem as though the General Council is under the impression that the General Assembly has all the powers of the Synod of 1788. It is true that the General Assembly is the successor of the Synod but it is not true that the Synod transmitted all its powers to the General Assembly. DR. MARK MATTHEWS at least should know better. At any rate he apparently knew better in 1926, when he signed the Report of the Special Commission of Fifteen in which it is stated that "the General Assembly is not heir to all the powers of The (General) Synod. This is a distinction often ignored by those who quote the actions of The (General) Synod, as though its authority passed over unchanged to the General Assembly. The (General) Synod was composed of all the ministers of the denomination and of a representative from the session of every particular church. The (General) Synod was the whole Church. Supreme authority inhered in it. The (General) Synod had no constitution except that which belonged to its own nature and to the nature of the Presbyterian system, besides such statements and decisions as, in the exercise of its supreme power, it choose to make. By the same power, it could rescind or alter these actions without reference to any superior authority" (Assembly Minutes of 1926, p. 81). This means that the Synod of 1788 transmitted not all but only a part of its power to its successor, the General Assembly. This appears from the fact that it imposed a Constitution on the Church—a Constitution to which the General Assembly itself is subject. There is room for difference of opinion as to whether the Commission of Fifteen was right in affirming that the powers of the General Assembly are "delegated" but certainly it was right in saying that they are "limited and defined." We do not pretend to have a very high opinion of the Report of the Commission of Fifteen but it did not speak without warrant when it said: "Behind the General Assembly is the Constitution itself, the great charter of a regulated liberty within the confines of unifying law. And above the Constitution is the Word of God, the supreme Standard of our faith" (Assembly Minutes of 1927, p. 82).

5. That the General Council has an exaggerated conception of the powers of the General Assembly appears with special clearness in what it says about its authority over church offerings. The General Council to the contrary notwithstanding, it is a flat misinterpretation of the Constitution to assert that church organizations in designating their gifts must confine themselves to agencies approved by the General Assembly. That interpretation is contradicted by the fact that Section IV of Chapter VI of the Directory of Worship merely states that offerings "for objects other than those connected with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A." may not be made "without the approval of the session." Presbyterian churches are under obligation to give their members an opportunity to contribute to the Boards and Agencies of the Church but the General Assembly has no power to compel any particular Church to give to those causes. Here the saying applies: "You can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink." The most amazing thing in this connection, however, is the General Council's allegation that individual Presbyterians must support the Boards and Agencies of the Church to maintain their good standing. "A church member or an individual church that will not give to promote the officially authorized missionary program of the Presbyterian Church is in exactly the same

(Concluded on Page 49)



# On Dealing with Dissenting Minorities

An Echo of the Cleveland Assembly

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

**T**HE question of the adoption or rejection of the "Plan of Union providing for the Organic Union of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and the United Presbyterian Church of N. A." was one of the major issues which came before the Cleveland Assembly. In opposing its adoption the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths pointed out that the opponents of the proposed union were not averse to the union as such, but only to the basis upon which it was proposed to unite. With a view to making this basis satisfactory by eliminating serious defects, both doctrinal and ecclesiastical, Mr. Griffiths proposed a number of amendments, all of which were promptly rejected. One of these amendments was particularly significant because it showed so clearly the attitude of leading proponents of the union.

The amendment referred to merely stipulated that dissenting minorities—congregations the majority of whose members were unwilling to enter the union—be permitted to retain their church property. The offering of this amendment called forth two very noteworthy statements from leading advocates of the Plan of Union, from Dr. Mudge, stated clerk of the Assembly, and Dr. J. Ross Stevenson, chairman of the Assembly's Department of Church Cooperation and Union. Dr. Mudge declared the amendment to be unconstitutional on the ground that church property does not belong to the individual congregation but to the Church as a whole. In saying that Dr. Mudge overlooked the obvious fact that were the amendment embodied in the Plan of Union the adoption of the Plan by the necessary two-thirds of the presbyteries would make the amendment *ipso facto* constitutional. The Plan contains a number of features that are at present unconstitutional. The reason for sending it down to the presbyteries is to make it constitutional. Furthermore, Dr. Mudge's statement ran directly counter to an action of the Assembly taken a few hours previously in dismissing two entire Presbyteries (North and South Siam) to unite with the Presbyterian Church of Siam, a native church independent of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Consequently, Dr. Mudge's objection to the proposed amendment was without warrant in fact, but is significant as showing the strong desire of those in authority to force every congregation to enter the Union.

The statement of Dr. Stevenson was even more significant. In introducing his amendment Mr. Griffiths pointed out that it was in line with the action of the last Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church, which had instructed its representatives on the Joint Committee to see that such a provision was included in the Plan of Union. Mr. Griffiths appealed to Dr. Stevenson to confirm this statement. But Dr. Stevenson confined himself to the rejoinder that no such proposal had been brought to the attention of the Joint Committee. This placed Mr. Griffiths at a disadvantage, since he had not gone to the platform armed with a copy of the last

Minutes of the United Presbyterian Church. But on page 331 of those Minutes the following action is recorded:

The following resolution of recommendation and instruction to the Committee on Presbyterian Unity was presented and adopted:

## RESOLUTION

Whereas, Memorials from seven Presbyteries were presented to the last Assembly desiring for one reason or another that all further efforts at Union with the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., and other denominations of the Presbyterian family be, for one reason or another, discontinued; also, eleven Sessions and Congregations petitioned said Assembly in opposition to the proposed Union with the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.; and,

Whereas, said Assembly nonetheless granted the prayers of our Union Committee that it be permitted to continue its efforts at Union for another year, but with the following recommendation: "that any basis of Union with any denomination shall make provision for the protection of congregations, in the matter of Church property rights, which vote not to go into a Union, and that said provision shall be a part of the basis for any Union." See Minutes of General Assembly, page 52. . . .

Now, therefore, be it resolved that this Assembly calls the attention of the Committee on Presbyterian Unity to the above recommendation and instruction of the 1932 General Assembly with the assurance that this Assembly heartily approves of the same.

We are not primarily concerned to determine the exact method by which the expressed will of the United Presbyterian Assembly was "smothered in committee." What we are concerned to point out is that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., insofar as the Cleveland Assembly represents it, has clearly no intention of granting any rights to dissenting minorities. The majority is to rule; the minority is to submit or get out, leaving everything except its conscience behind it.

This little episode at the Cleveland Assembly probably passed almost unnoticed by the majority of the commissioners who were apparently more concerned to vote down Mr. Griffiths' amendments than to find out what he was really aiming to secure by means of them. But it may have and we believe will have far-reaching consequences. The words spoken recently at Cleveland will be heard at Oxford, 200 miles away when the United Presbyterian Assembly meets there a month later. They will not be unheeded by the United Presbyterians who are outnumbered by the Presbyterians nearly ten to one. Now they are quite free and independent. If the union goes through, they will be a minority, and the Cleveland Assembly has given an illustration of its regard for minorities which furnishes much food for thought.

The action of the Cleveland Assembly was to say the least ungenerous and tyrannical. Such actions do not promote peace—they foster strife. The tragic results of a coerced union are writ large upon the pages of recent Canadian

(Concluded on Page 49)



## Man Versus Machine: The 146th General Assembly

**I**N recent years it has been the fashion for historians and students of human institutions to conduct long debates concerning the effect of the machine upon civilized life. Will the machine emerge as the servant of man, or as his master? If some of those learned gentlemen could have been present in the great auditorium of the Euclid Avenue Baptist Church in Cleveland, Ohio, from May 24th to 30th, they would have seen a well nigh perfectly staged laboratory exhibition of a clash between human and machine values. And they would have noted, perhaps with some surprise, that a machine which ruthlessly crushed out human values (while ostensibly entirely occupied in doing other things), was composed of human parts.

In attempting to describe, in a comparatively brief manner, the deliberations of a body which sat for a week, much that is of interest and even significance, must be omitted. One person can hardly see all, or even be able to tell all he saw. The final impression is bound to be made up from the totality of what one witnessed and felt, and not alone from that part of it set down in a report. And that impression the writer will try to set down clearly and truthfully. For his opinions he alone is responsible. The facts he quotes will be those about which no question of truth can possibly be raised.

The author of this report was a commissioner to the Assembly. Not because of any particular desire to do so, but because of the relentless logic of circumstances, he found it necessary to take a considerable part in its deliberations (if such they may be called). Whether the effect of his participation was commendable or not, is hardly for him to say. When he comes to the parts recounting his own actions and remarks, he will try to record them impartially and objectively. Yet he is bound to say that, if the same circumstances were duplicated again, he would act on the same principles, and to the same effect.

Before the Assembly actually began, one of the veteran newspaper men said to the writer, "I have never seen such a perfect and smooth-working machine in my life as the one they are getting ready for you fundamentalists." This impartial but observing gentleman was quite right. It might be of interest to probe just a little into the technique of this church machine, to see the source of its steady power.

It is a mere truism of politics that the ones who rule are those who control the jobs. The reference is, of course, to paid jobs. Now those familiar with the Presbyterian Church know that it supports a considerable number of paid officials, together with their staffs. Main offices are in New York and Philadelphia, but there are sub-offices in various other sections. It might surprise those not entirely familiar with the machinery of the Church to know that under the items of "promotion," "administration," and "general expense" the four boards spent for the last fiscal year a grand total of \$1,184,453.49! And this figure does not include either \$22,554.24 spent for "cooperating agencies" by the boards, or the sum of \$624,152.53 spent by the Board of Christian Education under the heading of "service and field activities." The item *does* include, however, the sum of \$93,903.52 given out of the undesignated funds of the four boards to the support of the General Council. To get a complete picture one should add also at least the expense of the office of the General Assembly. Figures of the last fiscal year are not before the writer at this moment, but for the year ending March 31, 1933, the office of the General Assembly cost \$63,758.14. This is, of course, the expense merely of keeping up the routine work. It does not include the expense of holding the yearly session of the Assembly.

Naturally these boards and agencies employ a good many

persons. Not all the moneys mentioned above are spent in salaries and travel expense, but a large proportion is so spent. Even in an item not included in the total above, namely, the figure for "service and field activities" of the Board of Christian Education, thirty-five persons are listed as being paid salaries. These people are the executive type, stenographers and clerks not being included. The Board of Christian Education has five executives plus fifty-one persons employed in a clerical capacity, exclusive of the publication department. The latter department employs thirteen executives and an undisclosed number of others whose salaries as "managers, bookkeepers, salesmen, clerks, etc.," are listed as a total of \$225,591. The other three boards employ a total of seventy-four executives and an unnamed number of persons in clerical capacities.

But the inwardness of the situation has only begun to appear. The official family of the great bureaucracy is not composed merely of "jobholders." It is also composed of Board Members and of what we might coin a word to describe as "jobhoppers." The members of the Boards are, in some respects, the very core of the controlling clique in the Church. Of these there are approximately one hundred and forty. Some are far more active politically in the Church than others.

The "jobhoppers" are the most numerous class of all. They represent the gentlemen who are outside the gate of paid office looking in, but who are in hopes of getting in. Getting in, they know, depends upon their willingness to "vote right" and "talk right," according to the wishes of those in power. Without doubt most of these expectant ones believe that they are seeking the glory of God. But he would be a person of only slight intelligence who could not perceive that in the Presbyterian Church, ambition for place and power, ambition to retain power once it is acquired, are great and powerful motives in shaping the actions of men. It is a sad thing that this should be in a Christian Church. The present writer confesses to a belief that this fact is very largely responsible for the unwillingness of many men to stand up for their faith. Tangible rewards bulk large and risk of losing one's livelihood is a powerful argument for keeping silence. But do not blame the writer for speaking of this. He did not create or even discover the situation. He merely notes it in passing. Nor does he mean to infer that men always consciously betray their convictions to secure official favor. Rather they are far more likely to find those convictions being shaped and molded by their official associations and ambitions.

The natural attitude of any dominant political group is a desire to retain power. When criticisms come, wise political leadership makes apparent concessions, while keeping the sources of power and revenue intact. Unwise political leadership concedes nothing, pours scorn and abuse upon the opposition, usually descends to personalities, trusting to the natural inactivity of men for exemption from exposure and overturn. But unless it rules over a body of people who are either ignorant or extremely apathetic, this kind of political machine eventually wrecks itself by its own tactics.

Now consider the bearing of all this upon the atmosphere in which a General Assembly meets. Upon the city where the Assembly is to convene, descends an array of officialdom of one kind or another. They contact the press, the local churches. Preaching appointments for Sunday in Assembly week are arranged for the faithful. The Pre-Assembly conferences are arranged, and when the advance guard of commissioners begins to straggle in, officialdom is ready for it. The Pre-Assembly conferences are addressed by the "big men" of the Church. The



so-called "popular meetings" held each evening the Assembly is sitting are presented in the interests of the boards and agencies. Upon the platform roams a horde of secretaries and officials. They address the Assembly constantly—perhaps as much or more as the Assembly is addressed by its own members. They are called upon at frequent intervals to give the Assembly the benefit of their weighty counsel. Almost every bit of the commissioner's crowded time is taken up with hearing somebody speak, from the moment he arrives until the time he leaves. The general impact of these conferences, speeches and popular meetings is very simple: "the work of the Church" is identified with the machinery of the Church as organized and administered by those in power. Only the strongest-minded and forewarned of commissioners could possibly escape the rhythmic effect of this mental goose-step. The commissioners are unconsciously won over by being allowed to march in the parade.

Nor is this any reflection upon the commissioners. Most of them have never before attended an Assembly, will probably never attend another in the next decade and a half. Those who are perennial commissioners, like Dr. Mark A. Matthews of Seattle, and others, are either cogs in the machine, or do not wish to antagonize it. When the moderator of the Cleveland Assembly asked all new commissioners to raise their hands, the great forest suddenly appearing seemed almost like a unanimous vote. Nor is it unfair to say that most of the new commissioners have very little idea either of the law of the Church, under which the Assembly is supposed to work, or of the inwardness of the great mass of business that is presented to the Assembly, hour after hour, day after day, demanding a vote one way or the other. Most of these commissioners admit these things freely. They have to rely upon somebody's judgment. If a conflict comes between people of whom they know little, and the group of officials whom they see every day running the Assembly on its clocklike way, what is more natural than that they should vote for what the platform recommends? It is doubtful whether, under present conditions, speeches of debaters make much impression on the Assembly as a whole. To the average commissioner, officialdom incarnates the Church. He votes for what officialdom wants, not because he always understands it, but because he trusts its leadership.

One last word, before plunging into an account of the specific acts of the 146th Assembly. Charlie Chan, that delightful detective of fiction, once declared that "He who stands on pinnacle has no place to step but off." The leaders of the dominant party in the Church know this. For their purposes, the Church must be "at peace," that is, without outward conflict. Controversy imperils the *status quo*. That is why the machine frowns upon doctrinal controversy, if started by the opposition. It is not averse to conflict, however, if it sees an opportunity to destroy the power of the opposition, or if it must fight in its own defense. Witness the siege and capture of Princeton Seminary (*Obit 1929*) and the offensive launched against the Independent Board this year. To the organization, controversy is a deadly sin—if it is started by anybody else.

A Church political organization has one advantage that is not shared by secular cliques. It can defend itself behind a breastwork of halos. Attack its policies because they are wrong, and somebody will arise in tears to defend the Christian character of some "dear beloved brother who has been the victim of a bitter attack." And they get away with it! O Tammany, what a weapon you lack!

### Opening Service

On Thursday morning the Assembly opened in the usual manner, with public worship and sermon, followed by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The Rev. John McDowell, D.D., Moderator of the 145th Assembly, presided as is customary. His sermon subject was "The Opportunity and Responsibility of the Christian Church." His text was John 8:12. He said that Christ was the Christian message, that Christ was the solution of all human

problems, that the supreme task of the Christian Church was the interpretation and application of the Christian message to all life. The supreme need of the hour was for the Christian churches to make a thorough application of the principles of Jesus Christ to the individual, the social, the economic, the national and international life of our day. This form of service was demanded to make Christianity widely effective among all classes of men, thus promoting a genuine revival of interest and power throughout the land to open the pathway to spiritual life for great masses of people to whom the spiritual life is blocked because of the lack of this service on the part of the Church. It would satisfy that deeper spiritual life which the Church craves for itself and without which the Church could not fulfill its mission to the individual or to the community, would answer the challenge of present conditions and demonstrate the adequacy of Christ for all the fears and needs of this hour. The Spirit of God was seeking today for men and women in whom Christianity is a way of life, of discipline, of utter self-committal to a career of unceasing service and unlimited sacrifice. The new man, the new nation and the new world, he said, are to be bought with the price of consecrated personality. This was the call of the Cross and a call of victory.

### Election of Moderator

On Thursday afternoon the Assembly opened with the singing of "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name" and "My Country, 'Tis of Thee, Sweet Land of Liberty." After various time-honored preliminaries had been accomplished, the main business, election of a Moderator was begun.

First to gain the floor was the Rev. Henry Seymour Brown, D.D., of the Presbytery of Chicago, who nominated Dr. William Chalmers Covert in a polished and careful speech. He mentioned Dr. Covert's birth on a farm, his dedication to the ministry by his patriarchal grandfather, his early education, his pastorates, his secretaryship of the Board of Christian Education.

The Rev. G. A. Briegleb, of Los Angeles, then arose to nominate the Rev. Herbert Booth Smith, D.D., of Immanuel Church, Los Angeles. He lauded him for his great and fruitful pastorate in the second largest Church in the denomination. He told of how he had led his people through the depression in such wise that they had maintained their benevolences at an extremely high level. It was indicated that as Moderator, Dr. Smith could pull the Church out of its financial troubles by his genius in that direction. He was lauded as a pastor and as a man.

The third nomination was that of the Rev. J. C. McConnell, of the J. R. Miller Memorial Church, Upper Darby, Pa. (A suburb of Philadelphia). Mr. McConnell was put in nomination, at the instance of a strong group of Eastern conservatives, by the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths of Philadelphia, managing editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. He said that if he were merely to nominate a candidate because of personal qualifications, then the Rev. J. C. McConnell could rank unashamed with the other candidates mentioned. He was a successful evangelistic pastor, ministered to a rapidly growing Church, and had been this year elected as Moderator of his own Presbytery of Chester. He also had that greatest asset of any candidate for public office in America: he had been born on a farm! (Laughter) But Mr. McConnell was not being nominated on a personal basis, worthy as he was to be so recognized. He had conducted no campaign. He had, however, consented to be named as the standard bearer of a testimony. The Church was in a great crisis. In this crisis, Mr. McConnell stands for the Everlasting Gospel. Something had been said in the last nominating speech about financial skill being needed to pull the Church out of its slump. The problems of the Church were far too serious to be settled in any such superficial way. The trouble in the Church today was sin. The Church could never regain her lost power unless she were willing to come to the place of repentance: repentance for her unbelief, for her false toleration of misleading and soul-destroying teaching, repentance for her lack of love to the Lord Jesus Christ



and those out in the world for whom He died. Mr. McConnell stood as the standard bearer not only of those who were for the Gospel, but who were also against anything that sought to destroy the Gospel. He stood therefore, without shame, against Modernism, and for the Gospel of Salvation through the precious blood of Christ.

Further, because Mr. McConnell believed in the Gospel he also believed in Gospel liberty, the freedom of the Christian man. He did not believe that in entering the Presbyterian Church a man checks his Christian liberty at the door! No! he brings it in with him! This liberty is, of course, under law. No man is free unless he is the bondsman of Christ. We love the law and polity of the Presbyterian Church. We would be willing to die for it if need be. The Constitution of the Church is over you, over me, but it should not be forgotten that it is also over the General Assembly! There are things this or any Assembly cannot do. The very purpose of a constitution is to restrain the impulsiveness of temporary majorities.

A great attack on liberty was in prospect in the Church. The speaker was not judging the motives of those who were making it. They might be as sincere as the day is long, but yet making an attack on liberty just the same. Some men seem to have forgotten that we are a Protestant Church. It is of the essence of Protestantism that the voice of man has no power to bind the Christian conscience, that the only authority in which man may rest is the voice of the Holy Spirit of God speaking in the Scriptures. This was the law of the Church, her doctrine from the beginning. "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." (Confession of Faith, Chapter XX, Sec. II.) This Assembly cannot bind the conscience. In denying it this power we are not opposing the constitution, but defending it. The Word of God is above the word of man. If thus to say that we refuse to allow this or any other Assembly to bind our consciences, thus setting its authority up as equal to the authority of the Word of God—if this be treason, then we are guilty of treason, and make the most of it, whoever will! If the Church consents to be bound by the word of man, then it will cease to be an abode of free men, and will consist only of servile slaves who labor at the taskmaster's whip! If you desire Christian liberty to be maintained, if you stand with Mr. McConnell for the eternal truth of the Gospel, then vote for him, and let the whole world know where you stand.

The Rev. Albert H. Gammons, of Orange Cove, California, then arose to nominate one who, he said, did not even know his name was to be offered. He trusted someone would second the nomination. The name he offered was that of the Rev. Ralph Marshall Davis, D.D., of Erie, Pa. (a signer of the Auburn Affirmation). Dr. Davis promptly withdrew his name from consideration. Nominations were then closed, and seconding speeches ordered in the inverse order of the nominations.

Ruling Elder Edwin T. Ross of the Presbytery of Brooklyn-Nassau, seconded the nomination of Mr. McConnell. He declared that he had found Christ in Scotland forty years ago, and that his Saviour was more precious today than then. He was glad to second the nomination of a man who stood four-square for that Gospel, and who was out and out for the liberties of Christian men—liberties for which some of the speaker's own ancestors had bled and died in covenanting times. The issues for which they contended were the same as those before us now. Is Christ to be the sole head of His Church? He quoted a portion taken from the "Studies in the Constitution" sent out by the General Council: "A church member or an individual church that will not give to promote the officially authorized missionary program of the Presbyterian Church is in exactly the same position with

reference to the constitution of the Church as a church member or an individual church that would refuse to take part in the Lord's Supper. . . ." Mr. Ross said that, to him, such a statement was little short of blasphemy.

The nomination of Dr. Smith was seconded by Auburn Affirmationist William T. Hanzsche, of Trenton, N. J. The Rev. Walter L. Whallon of Newark, N. J., a member of the Official Board of Foreign Missions, seconded the nomination of Dr. Covert.

No one, of course, expected that Mr. McConnell would have any show of being elected. Many who expressed themselves privately as being well-wishers of the cause he represented, informed the writer that they had already been pledged, some of them long before, for either one of the other candidates. In fact, few members of the Assembly had not been worked upon strenuously either by the friends of Dr. Covert or Dr. Smith. Relatively few votes were unpledged by election day, which makes the showing of Mr. McConnell remarkable to the present writer. This is all the more so in view of the fact that his candidacy appealed to unattached conservatives only.

Results of the first ballot were as follows:

| Voting Section | Covert | Smith | McConnell |
|----------------|--------|-------|-----------|
| 1              | 22     | 14    | 1         |
| 2              | 23     | 9     | 5         |
| 3              | 20     | 18    | 1         |
| 4              | 17     | 26    | 8         |
| 5              | 25     | 14    | 3         |
| 6              | 13     | 16    | 14        |
| 7              | 16     | 27    | 6         |
| 8              | 14     | 25    | 3         |
| 9              | 25     | 15    | 6         |
| 10             | 37     | 4     | 0         |
| 11             | 33     | 6     | 2         |
| 12             | 21     | 17    | 6         |
| 13             | 17     | 17    | 6         |
| 14             | 23     | 12    | 3         |
| 15             | 12     | 17    | 10        |
| 16             | 18     | 14    | 1         |
| 17             | 21     | 17    | 4         |
| 18             | 26     | 12    | 2         |
| 19             | 22     | 16    | 3         |
| 20             | 11     | 27    | 0         |
| 21             | 20     | 19    | 1         |
| 22             | 5      | 35    | 2         |
| Total          | 441    | 377   | 87        |

On the second ballot, 908 votes were cast. Dr. Covert received 485, Dr. Smith 391, Mr. McConnell 31. Most of Mr. McConnell's strength thus having gone to Dr. Covert, that gentleman was elected. The two electing sections in which the conservative candidate did best were numbers six and fifteen. Section six comprised commissioners from the presbyteries of Chester, Lackawanna, Lehigh, Philadelphia, and Philadelphia North. Section fifteen comprised the Synods of Iowa and West, German.

In transferring the gavel and the Manual of the Assembly to Dr. Covert, Dr. McDowell said that as Moderator Dr. Covert would preside over a united, Bible-believing, constitutional, liberty-loving Assembly. (Applause) Dr. McDowell added that the Church was safe in the spiritual leadership which was sure to be given by Dr. Covert and reiterated that the gavel and Manual represented the constitutional liberty of the Presbyterian Church. Jocular reference was made to the final authority of the Stated Clerk.

Moderator Covert in responding emphasized constitutional authority. He humorously compared the beginnings of Dr. McDowell in the Pennsylvania coal fields to his own beginnings between two corn rows in Indiana.

"I do not believe, if history could tell the story of the way from John Knox to John McDowell, that you would ever learn of a General Assembly that had been gaveled into any kind of



order or action," said the new Moderator. "The Manual roots back into authority that we all love and reverence. Back of the precepts of this simple book lie the great deposits of authority from which it is drawn—the Word of God—the Westminster Confession—the Catechisms—our Form of Government—our Book of Discipline—our Directory for Worship.

"There must be achieved what my old teacher in parliamentary procedure said must be achieved by a gavel and a book of order; justice for everybody: courtesy from everyone to everyone: one thing at a time: the rights of the majority: the rights of the minority."

How consistently these fine phrases of the two moderators were made effective in practice is now written indelibly into the record of the Assembly. Protestations of high regard for certain principles of action are tested in all spheres of life, not by words merely, but by the works that follow them.

After a few more routine matters, the Assembly adjourned until Friday morning.

### Spiritual Fellowship

At this point the writer cannot avoid mention of what was to him as well as to some others a veritable stream in the desert. Each night, almost, during the Assembly, beginning late, a number of friends, evangelicals all, on whom the state of the Church and the various acts of the Assembly weighed heavily, met for prayer and consultation. These little gatherings, held in the quiet of a hotel room secured for the purpose, will always remain a blessed memory. On days when the Assembly, doing the bidding of the platform, had trampled underfoot the Constitution and even the solemn teaching of the Word of God, some of us were sore and heavy of heart. How refreshing it was to us, to come together, to hear the eternal Word, to voice our common faith in the Sovereign power and purpose of God, and to make use of that perfect access to the Mercy Seat provided through the blood of the Redeemer! It made us feel anew how small we were, and how great God is. Yet it also was a time of reminder to us that God uses men, weak and powerless though they be in themselves, to carry out His eternal decrees. As to the men of the Reformation, whose belief in the eternal purpose rather strengthened than weakened their arm, so came to us the echo of Martin Luther's great hymn:

What though this world with devils filled,  
Should threaten to undo us?  
We will not fear, for God hath willed  
His truth to triumph through us. . . .

And in that upper room we realized, perhaps as never before, what a slight thing is the boasted power of man as compared with the slightest motion of the majestic power of the Sovereign God.

### Friday

Friday morning was occupied with taking care of a host of small matters that hardly need to be included in detail here. Yet as a whole they symbolize the complex sum of matters with which the commissioners had to deal. Some of them were: presentation of gavels, adoption of preliminary reports of the Department of Church Cooperation and Union, report of the office of the General Assembly, arrangements for printing of the minutes, report of the department of publicity (under the able direction of Walter Irving Clarke, doyen of Church publicity men), report of the office of Vacancy and Supply, report of the Department of History, decision on the weighty matter of whether to restore the practice of printing honorary degrees in the minutes, a memorial service for ministers deceased during the year, report of the national capital commission, consideration of the "Spiritual emphasis" campaign, youth budget plan, every-member canvass, and the resignation of Dr. C. Franklin Ward as Promotional Secretary of the General Council. The Assembly went through the solemn nonsense of rising during the arrival of the Permanent Judicial Commission (called nonsense because in doing this the

higher court stands up when its *legal servants* enter—servants over whose judgments the Assembly has final rights), and listened to one of its preliminary judgments, which was promptly adopted.

### Resolution on German Liberty

Perhaps the most interesting feature of Friday morning, however, was the adoption by the Assembly of a resolution concerning Protestant liberty in Germany. It was doubly interesting to the writer, in view of the fact that at its afternoon session the same day, the same Assembly took action against some of those within its own fold that was of exactly the same nature as the action condemned in Germany! Apparently it is a terrible thing if a man in Germany is deprived of his Christian liberty by a tyrannical Church organization, but the same thing in the United States, done by a General Assembly, is quite all right! It would be only just if the German Reichsbishop Müller were to send the resolution back with his compliments, requesting the General Assembly first to clean up the mess in its own front yard. When one contrasts the words of the Assembly in wanting "the government of the Christian Church by reasonableness and persuasion rather than by force," with their invocation of force a few hours later, one has thoughts. The resolution follows (boldface portions being those of unique interest):

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. expresses grave concern over the conditions confronting Protestantism in Germany. We are most deeply disturbed by tendencies which might destroy the freedom of the Church through measures to set up a racial qualification for membership in the Church.

**We acclaim the courageous stand of those German pastors who are struggling to maintain the liberty of Christian conscience, the universality of Christian fellowship and the government of the Christian Church by reasonableness and persuasion rather than by force.**

Rejoicing in the heritage which has come to us in the past from the homeland of the Reformation, we acknowledge our present debt to those in Germany who, in the face of great confusion and difficulties, **hold their loyalty to Christ above every other loyalty** and refuse to admit racial distinctions in the Church.

We find ourselves in hearty agreement with those protesting German pastors who insist that **the Church of Christ must be spiritually free and maintain its life in accordance with the Biblical teaching and historic usage.**

Chairmen of Standing Committees were also announced as follows:

Bills and Overtures—The Rev. Henry Seymour Brown, Chicago, Ill.

National Missions—The Rev. Herbert Booth Smith, Los Angeles, Calif.

Foreign Missions—The Rev. William L. McCormick, Phila., Pa.  
Christian Education—The Rev. Raymond C. Walker, Harrisburg, Pa.

Pensions—The Rev. Rasmus Thomsen, Amarillo, Tex.

Polity—The Rev. Jesse Herrmann, Lexington, Ky.

Theological Seminaries—The Rev. Adelbert P. Higley, Cleveland, Ohio.

Finance—Elder F. Leonard Wailes, Salisbury, Md.

Mileage—Elder Geo. L. Eastman, Hollywood, Calif.

Leave of Absence—The Rev. J. Servis LaRue, Hudson Falls, New York.

Synodical Records—The Rev. Peter Snyder, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Nomination of Members of Permanent Judicial Commission—Rev. S. Willis McKelvey, Kansas City, Mo.

Resolutions of Thanks—The Rev. Karl P. Miller, Seattle, Wash.

Social Welfare—The Rev. Walter L. Whallon, Newark, N. J.

### Dr. McNaugher

Friday afternoon almost the first item of business was the presentation of Dr. John McNaugher, of the Pittsburgh-Xenia



Seminary in the United Presbyterian Church, as a "fraternal delegate." With a full realization of what he is about to say, this observer cannot refrain from setting down as his considered and matured judgment that Dr. McNaugher was guilty of an unfortunate type of behaviour which cannot be condoned by those who understand and value the courtesies of social life. Consider the situation: Dr. McNaugher was a guest of the Assembly. He occupied, as guest, a peculiarly privileged position. Whatever he was to say could not be made the subject of a reply without seeming to brand an opponent as himself discourteous. In such a position a guest, by all the canons of civilized life, refrains from engaging in whatever may be offensive to any one of his hosts. Dr. McNaugher, however, used his peculiar position to make an argument in favor of organic union—in the course of which he went out of his way to pour scorn upon those who have in good faith and earnestness criticized portions of the United Presbyterian "Confessional Statement." What he said, whether all the commissioners realized it or not, amounted to an outrageous personal attack upon men who in the nature of the case could not possibly reply. Further, he joked in a light way concerning doctrines precious to the hearts of many who had to listen in silence, and even in what impressed the present writer as a patronizing and sneering manner, judged the hearts and motives of those who differed from him. Whether the commissioners would have been so impressed with his extravagant defense and praise of the "Confessional Statement" if they had known that he is commonly credited with being its chief author, is doubtful!

Dr. McNaugher defended Article II of the Confessional Statement which had been criticized on the ground that it obscured the difference between natural and supernatural revelation, by quoting Dr. B. B. Warfield to the effect that natural and special revelation were "a unitary whole." This was quite far from the point, however, as Warfield was referring to the *source* of revelation and not to the manner—a subject very different. No one in his right mind would deny the truth of Warfield's statement—but it had nothing to do with the case.

Concerning Article II, the speaker said that that objection to the phrase "in spiritual truth" warped it out of its context, "and in hermeneutics that's a damnable sin!" (Laughter) Concerning Article V, he defended the semi-pelagianism there by the not too convincing assertion that "That charge is just a piece of twisted thinking." Of Article XIV, which had been charged as teaching unlimited atonement, a clear departure from the Calvinistic system, the speaker declared that "It does, in consonance with universalistic passages of Scripture." Then, in a sarcastic vein he remarked that this, of course, was true only "If you consider I Timothy and Hebrews as canonical." This, he asserted, was held in agreement with Scripture passages concerning election. This view (he claimed) had the support of the following theologians: Warfield (in "The Saviour of the World"), Kuyper, Shedd and Dabney.

He referred to the Confessional Statement as "this viciously maligned Confessional Statement," and remarked with biting sarcasm that "Our critics are afflicted with astigmatism or abysmus, and, in addition, they need a heavy injection of First Corinthians thirteen!" (Laughter and great applause.) To any impartial reader, this writer will leave the determination of where such an injection was needed.

Further, Dr. McNaugher said, "Read this through [The Confessional Statement] with an open and unbiased eye before you retire, and it will compose you into an orthodox sleep (laughter)—not that it is soporific, but it will make you happy, and when you roll over to sleep you will say 'Return unto thy rest, O my soul.' (More laughter.) Dare I say that the Westminster Standards are neither inspired nor inerrant? They are not a pure precipitate of Divine truth. . . . If you would read the minutes of the Westminster Assembly you would see how much was a matter of compromise. . . . You will be astounded at the paucity of references to the Holy Spirit in the Confession of Faith until

you remedied it. . . . We [The United Presbyterians] began tampering with our distinctives in 1868 at the Argyle Assembly, and have been slipping ever since—to our great satisfaction!" (Laughter and applause.) Then Dr. McNaugher made a plea for the adoption of Union by a great majority, lauded the recent union in Scotland ("of course there are a few fragments left out of the Union, Scotchmen are Scotchmen, you know"), eulogized the great New York Modernist Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, and in peroration cried "in essentials, unity, in non-essentials, liberty, in all things, charity." He made a great hit with the Assembly, especially by his very clever use of satire and invective. But that such a scene could take place, and such light and airy treatment of great points of redemptive doctrine be so enthusiastically received, seemed then and even more in retrospect to the present writer, as the symptom of a tragedy of the first order that has overtaken a large portion of the Protestant Church. May a Holy God have pity on us!

### The Independent Board

One can now imagine the psychological setting achieved on that afternoon for the consideration of the resolutions of the General Council concerning the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. What action the Council was to recommend was kept a dark secret from the commissioners and the representatives of the Independent Board until 1 o'clock of the afternoon on which the decision was to be taken! At that time, just before adjournment for luncheon, the printed recommendations were passed out. There was no opportunity for study. Many commissioners did not have an opportunity to read the proposed action until it was time for debate to begin. Certainly even the most elementary rights of justice were violated in that those attacked in this action had no time to prepare any kind of answer or defense to the action proposed.

First, the Stated Clerk, Dr. Mudge, read the Proposed Action to the Assembly. It is as follows:

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, in its solemn belief that, "there is no other way of salvation than that revealed in the Gospel," and, "that Christ hath commissioned His Church to go into all the world and make disciples of all nations," has consistently maintained throughout its entire history that as a Church, it is required and is admirably formed by its Constitution to become a great missionary society, and that specific provisions incorporated in said Constitution afford the best means for securing harmony of sentiment and unity of action on the part of its entire membership in the supreme task of extending the Kingdom of Christ throughout the whole earth.

In Chapter XXXV of the Confession of Faith, therefore, and in repeated deliverances of the General Assembly, the truth is clearly set forth that the Presbyterian Church in its nature and organization is a missionary society whose object is to aid in the conversion of the world to Christ, and that every member of the Presbyterian Church is a member of the said society, and obligated by virtue of his membership, to contribute by his prayers, gifts and personal efforts, toward the accomplishment of this object. Further, Chapters XII and XVIII of the Form of Government, commit the responsibility for the superintendence and direction of the Presbyterian Church as a missionary society solely to the General Assembly to discharge in any way it may deem proper and efficient.

In the assumption of this responsibility, the General Assembly in the first fifty years of its existence, designated certain interdenominational and independent or voluntary societies as accredited agencies through which the missionary work of the denomination was to be accomplished. Finally, almost one hundred years ago, when many years of actual experience had clearly demonstrated the inefficacy of such agencies under a Presbyterian form of government, the General Assembly reached the decision, the constitutionality of which has never been questioned, that all the missionary work of the Presbyterian Church should be conducted by Boards or Agencies of the General Assembly, except for certain interdenominational work which in its judgment the Presbyterian Church could not undertake alone, and which the General Assembly itself would, therefore, agree to approve in specific deliverances.

Upon reaching this decision, the General Assembly immediately declared that the Presbyterian Church could best contribute to the great task of evangelizing the world through Boards created by the General Assembly, which are responsible to it alone, which are under



its advice, review and absolute control, and which are required to exercise their sound discretion and judgment in deciding upon and in conducting the business entrusted to them.

From the day when that decision was made until the present hour, the General Assembly has endeavored scrupulously and faithfully to discharge the great responsibility thus laid upon it, in the unwavering and unvarying conviction that nothing further is needed to impart unity and vigor of effort to the missionary work of the whole Presbyterian Church, than the honest adherence to, and the loyal support of, those specific provisions governing that work which are set forth in the Constitution to which all persons consent when they become members of the Church, and which all church officers profess sincerely to receive, adopt and approve when they assume their office.

In emphasizing this responsibility of all church members and church officers under the Constitution, to engage actively in the spread of the Gospel through the officially designated Boards and agencies of the Church, the General Assembly would most emphatically state that there is no arbitrary abridgment of personal liberty in the requirement of this duty of all who have affiliated themselves with the Presbyterian Church. As the judicatory of jurisdiction in all matters relating to missionary operations, it has never presumed to interfere with the rights or preferences of individual members to give their money or efforts to such missionary objects as they may choose.

On the contrary, it has always maintained that the right to control the property of the members of the Church, to assess the amount of their contributions, or to prescribe how they shall dispose of their money, is utterly foreign to the spirit of Presbyterianism. Every contribution on the part of an individual member of the Church must be purely voluntary. In fact, the Presbyterian Church itself is a voluntary association. All of its members voluntarily associate themselves with the Church, and maintain their affiliation with it no longer than they voluntarily choose to do so. All that they do for its support, therefore, is a voluntary donation, and there is no power which can compel them to contribute to any ecclesiastical object to which they are not willing to give.

In maintaining, however, this personal freedom of individual members, in their contributions to the Church, the General Assembly has never recognized any inconsistency in asserting with equal force, that there is a definite and sacred obligation on the part of every member of the Presbyterian Church to contribute to those objects designated by the authorized judicatory of the denomination. When a church is organized under a written Constitution, which contains prescribed provisions as to giving for benevolent purposes, every member is in duty bound to observe those provisions with the same fidelity and care as he is bound to believe in Christ and to keep His commandments according to the doctrinal provisions set forth in that same Constitution.

Therefore, when the General Assembly, in accordance with specific provisions of the Constitution of the Church which empower it so to do, declares that it is the purpose of the Presbyterian Church to secure the proclamations of the Gospel in a prescribed way, by means of Boards and agencies, which are created, controlled and maintained by it, then it is the definite obligation and the sacred duty of each individual who is affiliated with any of its churches or judicatories to support those Boards and agencies to the utmost of his ability. Certainly, if the Constitution declares that it is the duty of the General Assembly, which represents in one body all the particular churches of the denomination, to act in such matters, it must naturally follow that it is the duty of all those who compose those churches to unite in the action. There is, therefore, no abridgment of personal liberty when the Presbyterian Church demands of its members who have voluntarily attached themselves to it, and are thereby under its Constitution, to honor, sustain and extend the Church of their choice in the manner the Constitution itself prescribes.

This General Assembly has carefully reviewed the foregoing principles, specifically set forth in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, for the purpose of explaining the only remedy which appears to be applicable to a certain distressing and deplorable situation which during the past year has arisen within its jurisdiction, and which is revealed in a certain pamphlet being circulated throughout the Church, entitled "The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions—A Statement as to its Organization and Program."

It is definitely stated in this pamphlet to which the names of certain ministers and laymen of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America are appended, that an Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, with officers, members, executive committee, general secretary, constitution and by-laws, and an established office in the city of Philadelphia, has been organized, and incorporated under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which is not responsible to the

General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, or to any other ecclesiastical body, and whose purpose among other things is to commission and send out missionaries, to establish mission stations, and to seek "to encourage Presbyterian churches and individuals to support this Board," (see charter) of "The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions," Article 3(d), which will thereby divert the missionary offerings of our churches from the channels which the Presbyterian Church has made for them.

Such an attempt on the part of Presbyterian ministers and laymen, to exercise ecclesiastical and administrative functions without the sanction of the General Assembly, and in the precise sphere of missionary operations officially assigned by that judicatory to its own Board of Foreign Missions, is not only an usurpation of authority, but also a repudiation of the jurisdiction of the General Assembly, and of those terms of fellowship and communion contained in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church which all solemnly and faithfully promised to observe when they assumed membership or office in the Church.

No organic body, whether it be a nation or a church, organized under a constitutional form of government, as is the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, can tolerate such a defiance of lawful authority on the part of any of its constituents. Therefore, the General Assembly, as the Supreme Judicatory of the Presbyterian Church, must insist that all those who have affiliated themselves with the Presbyterian Church and desire to remain in its fellowship, must be held strictly accountable to the agreements and the covenants which they have made with it and with each other. To admit of any other alternative would inevitably mean that similar independent movements prompted by the same disloyal and divisive spirit could be organized within individual churches, presbyteries and synods, throughout the entire denomination, creating eventually such anarchy and chaos as would be absolutely fatal to that law and order which have been the glory and strength of the Presbyterian Church from the very beginning of its existence.

In view of the principles herein set forth, the General Assembly would issue the following directions to its officers and judicatories:

1. That "The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions" be and is hereby directed to desist forthwith from exercising any ecclesiastical or administrative functions, including the soliciting of funds, within the Synods, the Presbyteries, the particular churches and the mission stations of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

2. That all ministers and laymen affiliated with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, who are officers, trustees or members of "The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions," be officially notified by this General Assembly through its Stated Clerk, that they must immediately upon the receipt of such notification sever their connection with this Board, and that refusal to do so and a continuance of their relationship to the said Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, exercising ecclesiastical and administrative functions in contravention of the authority of the General Assembly, will be considered a disorderly and disloyal act on their part and subject them to the discipline of the Church.

3. That Presbyteries having in their membership ministers or laymen who are officers, trustees or members of "The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions," be officially notified and directed by this General Assembly through its Stated Clerk to ascertain from said ministers and laymen within ninety days of the receipt of such notice as to whether they have complied with the above direction of the General Assembly, and in case of refusal, failure to respond or non-compliance on the part of these persons, to institute or cause to be instituted promptly such disciplinary action as is set forth in the Book of Discipline.

4. That each Presbytery be and hereby is instructed to inform the ministers and sessions of the particular churches under its jurisdiction that it is the primary responsibility and privilege of all those affiliated with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America to sustain to the full measure of their ability those Boards and Agencies which the General Assembly under its Constitutional authority has established and approved for the extension of the Kingdom of Christ at home and abroad.

The General Assembly profoundly deplores the existence of a situation within the Church which compels it to issue directions which may possibly result in the censure of certain persons affiliated with the Church. It firmly believes, however, that only by the issuance of such directions, can it be faithful to the solemn obligations committed to its sole jurisdiction by the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.



Following the reading of this document, the Moderator recognized the "Tall Pine of the Sierras," Dr. Mark A. Matthews, who had been charged by the General Council with the task of preparing the popular presentation of the case. Well prepared, and as usual in bearing and voice showing himself to be a keen master of the art of discourse, Dr. Matthews anesthetized the Assembly with a patient, long and fatherly dissertation upon the theory of government by representation, with particular reference to the division of executive, legislative and judicial power within the Presbyterian Church. The present reporter must honestly record the fact that to him it seemed at least 95% irrelevant. But most of the commissioners seemed to feel that everything he said proved the independent Board "illegal." Even granting that much of what Dr. Matthews said was elementary truth known to every student of Church law, yet it is sober fact that only at the close of his lengthy remarks did he get to the point at issue, and then only by indirection. The fact is, of course, that there is no provision in the law of the Church rendering the Independent Board illegal, but that, on the contrary, many portions of the law guarantee the freedom of the Christian man in relation to matters of faith and conduct not laid down in the Bible. But when men cannot find a *particular law* on their side, they are likely to expatiate at length upon "the law," in vague and general terms. This, frankly, was the course which Dr. Matthews had to pursue if he were to speak at all, by the inexorable necessity of the case. In passing, however, certain of his remarks are of intense interest to thinking people:

"If you give undesignated gifts, the General Assembly has prescribed how it is to be spent. You have no authority under the law of the Presbyterian Church to divide it any other way. You must divide it as you are directed. *This disposes of the question of conscience.*" [Students of the law know that the Assembly apportionments for benevolences are actually only suggestions, never mandatory. The Session is given by the Constitution the right to divide the benevolences. See the Directory For Worship, Chapter VI, Sections III and IV. But the question of conscience—is it disposed of so easily?]

"No man has a right to charge another with an offense without furnishing (1) a written notice, (2) a list of witnesses and (3) with a bill of particulars . . . the General Assembly cannot sit as a court unless it is constituted as such."

Concerning the Confession of Faith, Chapter XX, Section II, "God alone is the Lord of the conscience," etc., Dr. Matthews made the perfectly amazing statement that the words "in matters of faith or worship" referred to the Jewish law! "In other words, you couldn't force a Christian back under the law." This astounding and, of course, totally unhistorical interpretation of the passage caused many a gasp. Could it be that a noted "church lawyer" was in such abysmal ignorance of one of the great, pivotal doctrines of the Confession? It still seems almost incredible to the writer.

When Dr. Matthews had at last concluded with the hopeful but ambiguous declaration that "No, you never lose your rights in the Presbyterian Church," the debate was taken up for the opposition by the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths.

Mr. Griffiths spoke with a copy of the proposed action in his hands. He began by giving the Assembly the earnest assurance that he and those whom he represented would not yield to any other persons in their loyalty to the Constitution of the Church. The proposed action was a gross violation of many great constitutional principles. If it were adopted by the Assembly it would not change the constitution, but simply mean that the Assembly had attempted to set up its own authority to bind the consciences of men, which is in clear violation of the Constitution and the Word of God. He pointed out that those opposed to this action had had only a very few hours in which to study it and frame an answer to it. Turning to the paper in his hands, he remarked that while the paper in some parts professes to recognize the right of donors to give where they please, that yet the whole force of it is to deny to them that very thing. He said that time

would not permit him to point out all the inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the motion as presented. Only a few of the outstanding blunders in it could be mentioned.

The twelfth paragraph, beginning with the words "Such an attempt . . ." was severely questioned. It is not true, he said, that the Independent Board assumes ecclesiastical functions. As far as administrative functions were concerned, it only undertook to administer its own affairs, and since the board was *independent*, having nothing as a board to do with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. under what theory of jurisdiction did the Assembly think it could claim power? The Independent Board, he said emphatically, is *not in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.* If this one simple fact could be properly appreciated the commissioners would see how superfluous any action by the Assembly would be.

### The Ordination Compact

Further the speaker pointed out the statement in the same paragraph's last sentence, concerning the terms of fellowship and communion accepted by office-bearers and members. When he himself was received as a minister of the Church, he said, he had been asked to answer certain questions. The result of his answering the constitutional questions was in effect to make a compact between himself and the other components of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. To the obligations therein created both parties must be loyal. The minister must keep his obligations. But the Church must keep its obligations, too, and in binding him to the constitutional questions, the Church had by compact left him free of those considerations not covered by the questions. To deny this would be to make a farce of the constitution and of the terms of subscription. The time had now come, he said, when he must ask of the Church that it remember its part of the compact. In his reception he had never vowed submission to whatever any Assembly might decree. That would be contrary to the Constitution itself! For the constitution said clearly, in the Confession of Faith, Chapter XXI, Section II, that the decrees and determination of synods and councils are only to be received "if consonant to the Word of God." And if the synods and councils themselves were the parties to determine when their decrees were consonant to the Word, the whole point and force of the sentence would be lost! Further the very next section of the Confession stated the principle even more clearly: "All synods and councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both." Since, therefore, his obligations at reception clearly did not involve his submitting his conscience to the authority of men, he denied the right of the Assembly to demand of him an obedience not imposed by the constitution and the Word of God.

Continuing, the speaker referred to the statement by Dr. Mark Matthews that no one has a right to charge a person with an offense in the Church without written notice, a list of witnesses, and a bill of particulars. There is a constitutional manner of deciding in the Presbyterian Church whether a man is guilty of an offense. That constitutional manner this action makes no pretense of following. Instead of beginning with the court of original jurisdiction, the action here begins with the supreme court! The highest court of appeal initiates the case, calls upon the parties to cease what it declares to be an offense, and then if they do not obey, directs their presbyteries to try them. To try them for what? Have they not already been decreed to be offenders if this action prevails? Have they not already been found guilty—and that without an appearance before any court, without their day in court, without the presentation of any evidence, or the opportunity of presenting any defense? This proposed action is all back-end-to. As judged by the very words of its distinguished advocate Dr. Matthews, it lacks the very elements of a proper case. But suppose it should be denied that this action determined the guilt of anyone? That fact *could not be denied*, because it called upon them to stop. If their guilt and their right



to continue the Independent Board were still undetermined, how could they be commanded to desist? The very words of the second recommendation said that "a continuance of their relationship to the said Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, exercising ecclesiastical and administrative functions in contravention of the authority of the General Assembly, will be considered a disorderly and disloyal act . . ." You couldn't say that without having concluded that the persons involved are guilty of an offense. This action violates the Constitution and he would be less than frank if he did not respectfully but plainly inform the Assembly that he and others would refuse to obey such an obviously illegal order. Have we forgotten that we are a Protestant Church? Do we not remember the cost of blood and tears at which our forebears purchased their spiritual as well as political freedom? It is of the essence of the Protestant Reformation that no Church court can lawfully do things of the very sort now being proposed. Let the commissioners ponder well the incalculable and far-reaching consequences of their vote. Majorities were not always right, very often they were wrong. That was why the constitution limited the power of temporary majorities. Majorities cannot down truth. He would be the last person to assume for himself a personal importance, or to identify his own worth with that of the great heroes of faith of past ages. His sense of humor was too active for that. Yet at such a time as this he was inevitably reminded of other years and times when men have stood up against majorities even when it meant prison or death—majorities whose powers have now passed away like the snow of some forgotten winter. He could not help thinking of Luther, lonely, soul-shaken but unmoved of will, as he faced the brilliant assembly of power arrayed against him at Worms. And in all humility, yet with unalterable firmness, the speaker must now make the words of Luther his own word to this Assembly: "Here I stand. God help me. I can do no other."

Following the first speech for the opposition, the debate was taken up by the Rev. Gustav A. Briegleb, of Los Angeles, for the General Council's motion. Almost at the beginning a distressing incident occurred, when Dr. Briegleb said that Mr. Griffiths had said a good deal about the proposed action and the Constitution, but nothing about the pamphlet issued by the Independent Board concerning its own work. He read from the pamphlet the sentences: "Why was the Independent Board established? Because a great many loyal Presbyterians have lost faith in the official Board of one of the largest Presbyterian Churches, which is the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. They cannot in good conscience support an organization which they regard as disloyal to the Word of God. . . ." Dr. Briegleb said that from this it was quite evident that "there were some individuals who had taken their vows with fingers crossed." The fact that he had mentioned the name of the previous speaker in introducing his remark made it plain that it was intended to apply to him as well as to others. Therefore the writer felt it his duty immediately to gain the floor on a question of personal privilege, to demand a retraction from Dr. Briegleb. The Moderator assured Mr. Griffiths that Dr. Briegleb had not meant any personal reflection. Dr. Briegleb commenced to proceed. The writer again asked for an apology. Then Dr. Briegleb said in a rather irritated voice that "If it will soothe Mr. Griffiths' ruffled feelings I will apologize." It is hard on paper to indicate the tone of voice, but it was evident to the writer that Dr. Briegleb felt that he had no apology to offer but would go through the form of one in order to "soothe Mr. Griffiths' ruffled feelings." Such an answer would be no apology at all, therefore the writer simply remarked that he did not wish an apology unless it were offered sincerely, and resumed his seat. Dr. Briegleb went on talking about the vow to be subject to the brethren in the Lord, the last three words of the phrase being ignored in his exposition. He ended with the story of a Yale man in the varsity crew who jumped out of the boat and swam for shore after he had broken an oar. Presumably the idea was that those supporting the Independent Board should go and do likewise.

At this point the Rev. T. Roland Philips of Baltimore came forward to amend the motion. His amendment was to the effect that the ban of the Assembly be placed upon the signers of the Auburn Affirmation of 1923 as well as on the Independent Board. He spoke to his amendment to the effect that the action should be of equal force against the Affirmationists because they also had defied an Assembly deliverance.

The writer confesses that he regarded the Philips amendment with mixed feelings. He saw the point that was obviously large in the mind of the maker, that justice should be measured out equally to all, and that the powers that he had shown absolutely no disposition to discipline the signers of the modernist Affirmation. Mr. Philips felt that it was a miscarriage of justice to proceed against one party without also proceeding against the other. And there is a very great truth there. On the other hand, if the Assembly really did not possess the lawful power to take the action at all against the Independent Board, then, obviously, it did not have the right to proceed in the same way against the Affirmationists. One wrong does not justify another. The writer could not have voted for the amendment, much as he is averse to the Auburn Affirmation. But the choice was not given to the Assembly to vote. The Moderator ruled the motion out of order as having nothing to do with the main motion, and there was no appeal from his decision.

Others who took part in the debate in favor of the resolution were: the Rev. Elliot Field of Springfield Gardens, N. Y., the Rev. Jesse Herrman, Ph.D., of Lexington, Ky.; the Rev. Herbert B. Smith, D.D., of Los Angeles (who tried to make an analogy between the situation in the church at large and the situation in a Church whose session had prohibited certain organizations from functioning within the Church), and Dr. Samuel M. Zwemer of Princeton Seminary. The last named speaker said that he was not against the Independent Board because it was independent, but because it was divisive. The writer of this report is compelled to acknowledge that the speech of Dr. Zwemer was very offensive to him as a Christian man. For Dr. Zwemer did something that no man has really the right or ability to do: he tried to look into the hearts and motives of the organizers of the Independent Board, and judge them on the ground of what he thought he saw there. He said that the adherents of the Independent Board were preaching Christ of strife and envy, that their motives were mixed. He had been to China and there the effect of this new Board was no benediction but only a division. (He made no reference to the appalling advances of Modernism in China, where the effects of unbelief are as a great tidal wave compared to the little ripple caused there, as yet, by the Independent Board.) Of course, his quotation of the first Chapter of Philippians was really in favor of the Independent Board, for his conclusion ought to have been that, in spite of what he called bad motives, the Independent Board was preaching Christ, and he might have rejoiced in that, as Paul did.

Against the proposed action spoke the Rev. S. Leslie Reid, D.D., of Buffalo, N. Y., Ruling Elder Henry C. Albin of Philadelphia, and Ruling Elder E. A. Zeller of the Presbytery of Philadelphia North. The Rev. Garrett S. Tamminga moved to lay on the table until the next day at 10.30, on the ground that many commissioners had had no time to consider the matter. This motion was voted down.

The last two speeches were by Mr. Griffiths and Dr. Matthews. The former simply read in his allotted five minutes relevant extracts from the standards, notably Chapters XX and XXXI of the Confession of Faith, and from Chapter I of the Form of Government. He reasserted the alone right of Christ to lordship over the conscience of the Christian man. Dr. Matthews concluded the debate by reassuring the Assembly "that this is simply a constitutional issue"—as if a constitutional issue could not have involved in it moral and doctrinal issues of the most far reaching and important nature! Dr. Matthews, who ran long over his five minutes without action by the Moderator, said that if the Church or any of its boards needed cleansing "it should be done



in a constitutional way." He pledged himself to help in any such efforts. To the writer (whose judgments being those of an opponent may be discounted at the pleasure of the reader), Dr. Matthews' speeches fell into two categories: the parts of both in which he said a great deal that was true but that had nothing to do with the case, and the parts when he *did* come to the point at issue, when he uniformly begged the question by conceding to himself everything in dispute. His argument never actually met that of the opposition.

At five minutes after six the Moderator assured the Assembly that he had been fair, and the vote was taken. According to the impression gained by the writer, who was sitting at the press table facing the auditorium, and concurred in by at least a dozen observers on the floor and in the galleries, not more than about half the commissioners actually voted. That is very significant. The chorus of "Ayes" was nothing like as loud as usual, and for a moment a number of persons thought the motion was going down to defeat. The chorus of "Noes," however, was very much weaker than the chorus of "Ayes." Half, or almost half, of the commissioners sat silent. The vote would be estimated by the writer as about four hundred to one hundred, or perhaps fifty more, for the minority. This is, of course, only a personal estimate. After all, men who stand upon a principal of truth are not primarily concerned with how many people vote for it. They welcome support, but lack of it does not discourage their belief in its ultimate triumph. The Calvinist (who is simply the Biblical Christian) may be cast down, but he is never destroyed. To do that, you would have to destroy the Sovereign God in whom he trusts.

### Saturday

Saturday was quiet. The report of the Standing Committee on Pensions was received and adopted. The Assembly, having evidently been touched in a tender spot by a newspaper headline calling the vote on the Independent Board a Modernist victory (which it was), adopted a resolution at the instance of the Rev. J. M. Broady of Birmingham, Alabama, repudiating the idea that any doctrinal issue had been involved. (As though the seat of authority for the Christian were not a doctrinal issue, not to speak of anything else!)

Dr. John McDowell paid glowing tribute to the stated clerk, which was followed by applause. If all the complimenting of those on the platform by others on the platform, back and forth, had been eliminated the Assembly might have saved an extra day.

The American Bible Society and the American Tract Society were heard through their representatives.

Saturday afternoon was spent in sightseeing by many commissioners. That evening was held the "Men's fellowship dinner."

### Sunday

On Sunday the Moderator preached in the Old Stone Church on the Public Square. Others preached in city churches. Dr. Matthews preached in the Euclid Avenue Baptist Church. Dr. J. Gresham Machen preached in the morning at the West Side Christian Reformed Church, and in the evening at the East Side Christian Reformed Church. In both instances he addressed capacity congregations, and dealt with some of the doctrinal issues raised by Assembly actions and prospective actions.

Dr. Donald MacKenzie of Princeton gave a lecture on Calvin, on Sunday afternoon.

The writer appeared before the standing committee on Foreign Missions on Sunday evening. He did not choose the time of meeting, but since the chairman, Dr. W. L. McCormick, of Philadelphia, who has been an active opponent of the Independent Board, informed the writer that it would be his only opportunity, he thought it best to go. The chairman further told him he was to be limited to ten minutes. The writer protested rather vigorously, but to no effect. So, on Sunday evening he appeared. The story of that two hours is too long to tell here, and will have to be reserved for some other time. In view of certain newspaper

and magazine reports, however, it is only fair to say this: that while he was not allowed actually to speak uninterrupted for five consecutive minutes, the writer was quizzed for more than an hour on many subjects. He was asked "if he had anything more to present" and when he said that he had a great deal more to present, but that the documents had not been brought along since he had to select ten minutes' worth on the word of the chairman, then various members attempted to have him try to recite his main lines of additional evidence offhand. This he refused to do. He felt then, and feels yet, that it is not fair to limit a man to a mere ten minutes in a very positive way, and then, after he has made a selection of evidence, to try to quiz him on what he did not bring. The writer would have been very happy to have had a much longer time in which to present more evidence. He had plenty—and still has it. The so-called "answers" made by Dr. Speer before the Committee were not, in his sincere opinion, answers at all. Dr. Speer may have sincerely thought them to be answers—no doubt he did. But to the writer some of the defenses were more amazing than the accusations they failed to answer. It was made plain that objection was not to individuals as such, but to their policies. Yet since those policies were the policies the members of the Board thought good and best, it was plain that no adequate reform could take place without changing the personnel of the Board. When asked if he objected to the Secretaries of the official Board, and asked for their removal, the writer replied that he was not asking for anything just then, simply presenting evidence. The matter of secretaries, he thought, was something that was for the Board, not the standing committee, although the policy of the Board in selecting secretaries certainly should be considered by the standing committee in nominating members to the Board. When the appearance was over, your reporter departed with nothing but personally cordial feelings toward the committee, which were evidently reciprocated. At least there were no signs of bloodshed.

### Monday

Monday was comparatively quiet in the morning, but very lively in the afternoon, when the report of the newly elected Committee on Social Welfare came before the Assembly. The morning sederunt was devoted to the report of the Board of Christian Education, through the Standing Committee. Dr. Hugh T. Kerr made a eulogistic speech concerning the services of Dr. Covert, retiring General Secretary. Dr. Harold McAfee Robinson delivered an address which it was the misfortune of the present reporter to miss. It was described by many as being both able and eloquent.

The Committee on Social Welfare presented resolutions concerning the Lord's Day Alliance. General Secretary Harry L. Bowlby addressed the Assembly. The department of moral welfare presented resolutions on Temperance, Moving Pictures, and Peace. The Department of Social and Industrial Relations presented resolutions concerning economic life and the so-called "Child Labor Amendment." It was over the resolutions called "peace" that the most controversy developed, although there was a flurry over the resolutions on moving pictures. As finally adopted, the resolutions on Peace read as follows:

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, in General Assembly at Cleveland, Ohio, on May 28, 1934—

In view of the prevailing dangerous war psychology among the nations, their spirit of self-seeking nationalism and war-provoking programs of armament-expansion, in the name of Christ and of country declares anew its break with the entire war system. We proclaim our adherence to the following principles of faith and of policy, calling upon the churches to make unmistakably clear to their constituencies and to the world at large:

(1) That God in Christ has broken down "the middle wall of partition" that separated the races and nations, and that it is incumbent upon all who profess the name of Christ to frown upon and disavow all that is a barrier to free and friendly intercourse between the races and nations of mankind;

(2) That Christians owe an allegiance to the kingdom of God that is



superior to loyalty to their own country, and that in any matter in which the laws of their country conflict with the commands of God, they must assert their duty and right "to obey God rather than men";

(3) That Christians cannot give their support to war as a method of carrying on international conflict;

(4) That we are opposed to the increase of our naval and other war forces, as both provocative to other nations and tending to induce "armament races," as indeed the threat of it already has done, but also as an inexcusable waste of the people's money, and a burden they are not able to bear;

(5) That we are opposed to military training, especially in our secondary schools and colleges, as tending to cultivate the war spirit and as distinctly anti-Christian in character, and further as a waste of the people's money. We especially deplore the continued expenditure of vast sums of money to maintain military training units, including the Citizens' Military Training Camps and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and we call the attention of our people and of the public to the increased appropriations of the government for these purposes in days when the facilities for primary and secondary education have been lessened because our local units are, in many places, unable to maintain them. It amounts to a public scandal that a nation should increase its expenditure for military training while ordinary educational institutions cannot be maintained;

(6) We recognize that military policies have been the support of economic imperialism, and we condemn as godless any system of economics that requires war for its support and maintenance;

(7) We announce our support of all conscientious objectors to war, and we hereby demand in their behalf from all educational institutions requiring military training that such objectors be excused from classes in military instruction without loss in academic standing or official censure of any kind.

We direct the Board of Christian Education to record the signature of young people of our constituency who object to war on the grounds of their religion to a declaration to that effect, in order that their objection may be a matter of record and they may so receive the full support of the church;

(8) We urge upon the Congress and the President the necessity of making the requirements for citizenship compatible with the terms of the Pact of Paris, wherein the United States has contracted with other nations that it will not resort to war as a method of furthering its policies.

(9) In order to promote more friendly relations between our own and far eastern nations, we advocate the repeal of the exclusion act of 1924, and the admission of orientals on the quota basis now in effect with respect to other nations;

(10) As a practical means of preventing war, or, in the event of war breaking out between other nations, of preventing our own nation from becoming a combatant, the General Assembly directs its Board of Christian Education to make available to our pastors and other leaders blank pledges to the following declaration, a record of subscriptions to which shall be sent from time to time to the President and the Congress and a duplicate kept in the records of the Board:

"I will not cross the borders of any nation except in friendship, nor will I support my country in such action."

(11) We call the attention of the church to the sinister part played by the manufacturers and distributors of munitions of war, in arousing mutual fear and suspicion on the part of nations, and of overt acts promoting military rivalry. The munitions industry in general knows no patriotism, but promotes the sale of its wares to the citizens and governments of all nations, so that we continually hear of the slaughter of nationals by means of arms made in their own country, and by which their fellow-citizens have profited. We therefore urge our pastors and leaders to inform their people of these facts, and urge them to bring all lawful pressure to bear upon our government to place an embargo upon the sale of munitions of war.

We further advocate the abolition of the private manufacture and sale of munitions of war.

(12) We counsel the Boards to scrutinize their investments and consider the advisability of withdrawing their investments, if any, from such businesses as derive their profits from munitions industries.

(13) We further recommend that the Assembly approve the Peace Crusade now being promoted by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, embracing a national conference, the erection of three commissions to study various aspects of the peace promotion and the promotion of local peace conferences, and that the Board of Christian Education appoint one member to each of these three study commissions.

The main debate was over the elimination from section eight

of certain words which would have recognized that more should not be asked of an alien seeking citizenship than is asked of a citizen. The words, which were stricken out on motion of Dr. Matthews, were as follows: "It is inconsistent with this Pact, which is a part of the law of the land, to require those seeking citizenship to take up arms in defense of our national policies." Those speaking against the motion included Dr. E. B. Chaffee, of the Labor Temple, New York, and the present reporter. The latter was in some embarrassment owing to the fact that he was also *against* sections five, seven, and ten. Nevertheless, he was in favor of Section Two as an elementary Christian principle. The report as a whole, however, shows how and where the Presbyterian Church is drifting. Fortunately the Presbyterian Church as a whole is not bound by this mere deliverance, in spite of the grandiose claim of the first sentence.

### Westminster Seminary Dinner

On Monday evening was held the annual dinner in the interest of Westminster Seminary. An account will be found in the news pages. It was perhaps the largest Seminary dinner held during the Assembly.

### Tuesday

Tuesday will be long remembered by those who were present at the Assembly, for it was the day when the Assembly actually voted down its own constitution as a basis for Union with the United Presbyterian Church, and adopted the Plan of Union as offered by the joint committee.

The main business of the morning was the routine report of the Standing Committee on National Missions. The Permanent Judicial Commission also reported judgments in two cases.

### Church Union

After the report of the joint committee on Church Union had been read and moved, the debate for Church Union was opened by the Rev. J. Ross Stevenson, D.D., President of Princeton Theological Seminary and chairman of the Joint Committee. Dr. Stevenson made a long and exceedingly effective speech. Much as the writer profoundly disagrees with the courses in the Church advocated by Dr. Stevenson it is only fair to record that from his own point of view, Dr. Stevenson could hardly have done better. It is sometimes said that most people do not go to church to learn anything, but to be confirmed in their prejudices. Whether that is true or not, it is certain that the Assembly was already persuaded on the subject of union. This made Dr. Stevenson's task much easier. He did not have to convince, and he knew it. Rather he saw that his task was to work on the minds of those already convinced so that a great volume of mass sentiment would be aroused. Mass emotion is a powerful thing, and when aroused nothing can avail before it. The pity is, that there are often those who mistake mass emotion for "spiritual power." At any rate, Dr. Stevenson had the Assembly hanging breathless upon his every word. His "refutation" of the objections to the proposed basis of union was only effective on those who already agreed with him, for so far as logic is concerned it broke down at many points. He held up the fact of the retention of the "system of doctrine" phrase in the formula of subscription as being a great concession by the United Presbyterians, ignoring the basic objection that as used in the proposed formula *it does not imply that the system of the confession is the only system in the Bible*, but one that may be found there along with others. Of course, the seventeenth chapter of St. John's Gospel was quoted as usual concerning organic union. It has been said that Dr. Stevenson's logic was unconvincing. That is true. But more people are swayed by emotion than by reason. The almost hysterical atmosphere generated was more persuasive than any amount of unvarnished reasoning would have been. Near the end of his address Dr. Stevenson remarked that, after all, the two churches were not coming together so much on the basis of a platform as in the spirit. Inasmuch as the platforms he had been speaking about were the creeds of the Church, supposedly derived from



the Word of God, it seemed to the reporter that at this point, whether knowingly or ignorantly, Dr. Stevenson was giving expression to one of the central dogmas of modern unbelief. At the close of his speech he quoted from the first chapter of Ephesians. The gathering was deathly quiet. Then he ended with these words: "What is it we desire? A larger temple of God. A sacramental host of God's elect. A Presbyterian Church above which floats the old blue banner of the Covenant, on which is inscribed the blood-red Cross of Him who always leadeth us in triumph," and a Scripture ascription of glory.

Needless to say, when the spell was broken Dr. Stevenson received a great ovation. But there were many who could not join in it, who were not so much moved by his emotional appeal as appalled by the basis for which he was pleading.

At this point Dr. Mark Matthews arose to ask a few questions. He wished to know, first, Are we subscribing to a system of doctrine, or *the* system of doctrine? Dr. Stevenson's answer, of course, was that we are subscribing to *the* system of doctrine. (The question, of course, missed the whole point of the objection. It is not, Do we subscribe to a system or the system, but do we subscribe to the system as being the only one taught in Scripture? And the answer is, No.) Second, are we taking this union on the basis of *our* doctrinal standards? Answer: Yes (!). Third: Will our present Form of Government govern us in voting for the plan of union, that is, by presbyteries rather than presbyters? He was assured that it would. Fourth, he added rather than asked, that the decision of the U. S. Supreme Court in the Walnut Street Church case means that all property goes in automatically with the United Church. Only he seemed to think that the Walnut Street Church case grew out of the Cumberland Union, when as a matter of fact it grew out of the Civil War.

After these questions were asked and answered, Dr. Matthews bowed and took his seat, evidently satisfied that he had scored somehow. Just on which side the writer is at a loss to know, although there is no doubt that the effect of the interchange was to make people think that he had had some difficulties removed. Several others asked questions for information, and then the time was open for debate.

Using no names, the writer feels bound to divulge one fact that has a bearing upon the course of debate. The night before he had arranged with another commissioner that that other should open the debate against the plan of union, and that the amendments to be offered should not be proposed until further along in the discussion. However, something went wrong, and the plan agreed upon did not materialize. Your reporter had no desire to do all the speaking. He waited and waited until the last split second before the question would have been called for and put. Then he addressed the chair and was recognized.

The objections to the Plan of Union were presented under three general heads. But, in a preliminary way, the speaker told the Assembly frankly that he knew he was speaking for a minority. Yet it was an earnest minority that believed with all its heart that the adoption of the proposed plan of union would be a great and tragic mistake. He was not opposed to union as such—Dr. Stevenson had that much right about our position. It was not "for union" or "against union" at all. It was simply: "Is the proposed basis right?" If not, and if as Dr. Stevenson had intimated, there was no departure from our present standards, then why not unite on the basis of those standards? He was not, therefore, speaking against the union. He would welcome the fine body of United Presbyterians into the United Church—if only we could come together on the right basis!

Mr. Griffiths took up the "Confessional Statement," and sought to lay bare one or two of the great errors that lurk in it. He challenged the idea that as an "Historical Interpretative Statement" it would be a nonentity, since it would, he declared, have been adopted by a vote of the Presbyteries. How could it be claimed, then, later, that it was not a part of the constitution, and not of use in doctrinal disputes, no matter what else the plan of union may say?

The formula of subscription came in for analysis. The speaker showed just what the great difference was. There are three general forms of subscription: (1) The very strict, in which the minister subscribes to the whole teaching of the Confession. The United Presbyterian belongs in this category. (2) The slightly looser form, in which the person subscribing avows the system of doctrine of the Confession as being the system taught in the Bible. This is the present form of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. (3) The loose form in which the minister takes the creed only in a very general way—such as the form in use in the United Church of Canada. Now, said the speaker, in order to make a so-called "compromise" between our form and the United Presbyterian form, we are really going over to the third form, *which is unlike the one now possessed by either!* He quoted the Christian Century to show that even Modernists agree with conservatives that the change in the formula of creed subscription is really a step in the direction of Modernism—"a step so long that it may fairly be called a stride" (The Christian Century, March 14, 1934).

In the last place, he argued that it would blacken the union if no provision were made for the retention of property by dissenting congregations. Anyone who had seen, as he had, the tragic results of forced union in Canada, would pray God that the same should never happen here. The United Presbyterian Assembly had *instructed* its members on the joint committee to place such provision in the plan of union. Why had it not been done? An amendment would be offered shortly to provide for this lack. If we voted it down we would be voting down exactly the thing that the United Presbyterian Assembly had asked for!

After concluding his speech with a plea for a basis of union that would not disrupt the Church and lose more than we might gain in numbers by the United Presbyterian union, Mr. Griffiths presented eight amendments. The following protest, filed the next morning with the Assembly, recites the amendments one by one. They were voted down one by one, *viva voce*. Those opposing the basis of union did not make much of an attempt to shout, as it all seemed so cut and dried. One wonders what the United Presbyterians would think if they were to become a small minority in the united Church, as they would be, and were walked on with such monotonous regularity. The protest follows:

We, the undersigned commissioners to the 146th General Assembly in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., wish respectfully to record our dissent from and protest against the action of the General Assembly in approving the Plan of Union after rejecting the following amendments offered from the floor.

1. Changing paragraph (C) of the Categorical Question on the Plan of Union to read as follows: "On the basis of the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, and the Directory for Worship of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A."

2. Changing the Formula of Subscription to the form now in use in Chapter XV, Section XII, of the Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

3. To strike out from the concurrent declarations paragraph 1(c) the following words: "Except as to representation, the procedure of this first General Assembly shall be ordered according to the Provisional Form of Government and the Provisional Book of Discipline submitted with this Plan of Union, these to be in effect until the adoption of a permanent Form of Government and a permanent Book of Discipline by the united Church."

4. To add to the Concurrent Declarations, Section 9, a new paragraph to read as follows: "In consonance with the foregoing, it is agreed and declared that if any individual congregation or congregations desire not to enter the united Church, they shall be free to refuse to do so by a vote of the congregation, and in such event shall be entitled to retain their congregational property."

5. To strike out Section 7, "Historical Interpretative Statements" from the Plan of Union.

6. To substitute the Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. for the Provisional Form of Government as Section 8 of the Plan of Union.

7. To substitute the Directory for Worship of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. for the Provisional Directory for Worship as Section 10 of the Plan of Union.

We believe that adoption of these amendments would have secured



and guaranteed the historic doctrinal continuity of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. At two points at least the Plan of Union is, we believe, in opposition to the Word of God, and is a sharp break with the historic belief of the Church concerning the Bible. The Confessional Statement in Article III, in speaking of the Bible calls it "an infallible rule of faith and practice and the supreme source of authority in spiritual truth." This, we hold, gives comfort to the central error of the time in which we live in teaching that "spiritual truth" is something different from any other kind or kinds of truth. We also believe that the formula of subscription in Question number 2, allows of the interpretation that the Bible may contain more than one system of doctrine, a proposition subversive of the Christian Faith, and utterly repugnant to the historic and jealously guarded position of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Further, we believe that the refusal to grant to non-concurring congregations the right to retain their own property, is a great and tragic injustice, unworthy of a great Church.

For these and other reasons too numerous to state we protest against adoption of the Plan of Union, and pray God that He may overrule what we believe to be a great mistake, to His own glory.

In connection with the fourth amendment, relating to congregational property, one very significant fact emerged. When Drs. Mudge and Stevenson were telling the Assembly that it could not pass such an amendment, Dr. Stevenson was asked point blank by the writer if he did not know that the United Presbyterian Assembly had asked for it. He hesitated a moment for words, and then replied: "No such representation was ever made to the joint committee by any of the United Presbyterian members." We frankly wonder what our United Presbyterian friends will think of that? Someone will have to do a deal of explaining. (The resolution referred to was passed by the 1933 Assembly of the U. P. Church, *confirming* a similar resolution of the year before! It is found on page 331 of the United Presbyterian Minutes of Assembly, Vol. 18, No. 2. It is quoted in full in this issue in the article by Dr. Oswald T. Allis.)

Concerning congregational property there was considerable furore, many of the commissioners feeling strongly that the amendment should be carried, and more very bitterly opposed to it. But the most amusing feature of all, to the writer, was when Dr. Mudge tried to persuade the commissioners that such a provision would be illegal, since the Supreme Court of the United States had decided that all congregational property is held for the denomination! And yet the same people argue that the same Supreme Court will never, on the doctrine of *Watson v. Jones* go behind the decisions of the supreme ecclesiastical court! Further, your reporter pointed out, putting such a provision in the plan of union would make it constitutional even if it were not so now.

When the amendment relating to the formula of subscription was about to be voted upon, Dr. Stevenson made a plea for the form in the plan of union on the ground that it was what the United Presbyterians had. Then Mr. Griffiths turned to him on the platform and asked: "Do you mean us to understand that the United Presbyterians use the form proposed here?" Answer: "I mean that, in general, it is like theirs." Question: "Is question two of the formula of subscription in use in the United Presbyterian Church?" Answer (after hesitation, and in a lower voice): "I do not know."

Before the vote was taken, Dr. Zwemer arose and asked the Moderator if they could not have prayer giving thanks to God "for this wonderful unanimity," *before the vote was taken*. The Moderator assented, but when Dr. Zwemer was on his way to the platform ruled that the prayer should take place after the vote. Some confusion resulted, however. The Moderator decided to take the vote for union on the plan as proposed by standing vote. When those in favor stood, some at least thought they were standing for the suggested prayer, and voted unwittingly for the plan. The writer was told this by some to whom it happened. Of course the great majority were for the motion. When the "Noes" were called for, only about fifty stood, and some of them in the rear of the hall were actually up and then seated again before some of those in the front were up. The statement went out that the vote against union was only twenty.

That is quite in error, as a checkup by the writer showed. In addition others did not vote at all who were opposed to the union, but who actually for one reason or other disliked to stand at the end. Of these persons the writer estimated there were from seventy-five to a hundred. There were probably anywhere from one hundred and twenty-five to one hundred and fifty who did not vote for union. Taking the poll by standing was an exceedingly astute measure. After all the emotion that had been generated it was a wonder that anybody would stand up.

Dr. Zwemer led in prayer, a hymn was sung and the Long Metre Doxology. And then that part of the Assembly was over.

### Wednesday

Wednesday morning the Standing Committee on Foreign Missions made its report. It was a "whitewash" report, of course, yet somewhat guarded in its references to the Board. It went no further in repudiating the positive poison in "Re-thinking Missions" than did the last Assembly, merely disagreeing with whatever is wrong in the book.

Dr. John A. MacKay, a Secretary of the Board, gave an address concerning which the writer may have somewhat to say in a later issue.

There was not much debate on the report, conservatives having decided that it would serve no good purpose to prolong the discussion at that point. The following statement had been issued by the present correspondent the night before, and appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

"When the report of the standing committee on foreign missions comes up in the assembly tomorrow morning, I do not anticipate any extended debate by conservatives. Our position is perfectly well known. We believe that the official board of foreign missions has been unfaithful to its trust and disloyal to the Bible.

"It will be utterly impossible, however, to make a full and adequate presentation of the great mass of evidence against the policies of the foreign board.

"The fact that we will not engage in debate does not mean that we have ceased to contend for the truth or that we approve the board. We shall vote 'no' on any resolutions commending its fidelity."

This was the plan carried out.

### Edited Protests

Wednesday morning the writer offered two protests. The first one, concerning Church union, appears above. The other, concerning the action against the Independent Board, was offered and accepted for record by the Moderator as follows:

We, the undersigned, commissioners to the 146th General Assembly, desire respectfully to record our protest against and dissent from the action of this Assembly in the matter of "The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions," and for reasons we assign the following:

1. The action taken was in violation of the Constitution of the Church, particularly of the following provisions: Confession of Faith, Chapter XX, Section II, and Chapter XXXI, Sections II and III; The Form of Government, Chapter I and Chapter XXXII.

2. The resolution as a whole is in clear contradiction of other constitutional principles long cherished in the Presbyterian Church, and embodied in its law.

3. The action was taken without proper time for study by the Assembly, the text of the proposed resolution being submitted to the commissioners only after noon of the day on which the action was taken.

4. The action ignores the basic fact that dissatisfaction with the Board of Foreign Missions will not be allayed, but rather increased, by this attempt to penalize those who are conscientiously opposed to its policies.

5. The resolution is self-contradictory, appearing to grant liberty of choice to Presbyterian donors, while in fact denying such freedom to them.

6. The resolution is in error in stating that the Independent Board is *in* the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. or that it exercises ecclesiastical functions.

7. The resolution by attempting to make the orders of the General Assembly binding upon the consciences of men is in clear violation of



the Word of God and the Protestant character of the Presbyterian Church.

8. The resolution in effect declared certain ministers, elders and members of the church guilty of offenses without making even a pretense of observing the constitutional rules made and provided for the trial of causes.

9. The resolution, being, we believe, beyond the rightful power of the General Assembly to pass, is plainly a nullity.

About ten minutes before adjournment, and at a time when everything seemed over, the Moderator announced that because of further thought he had decided that he could not admit this protest with Section 9 in it. He said that Section 9 was a reflection against the majority! The writer hurried to the platform to defend his right to state the legal position of the minority. The amazing decision of the Moderator took everyone by surprise. It was so obviously unfair that a large proportion of the Assembly would not agree. Debate was sharp. "When we assume to try to edit the protest of the minority, it isn't their protest any more," cried a commissioner from the Synod of New York. "Certainly there is no reflection there!" Mr. Griffiths obtained the floor, and plead for the right of the minority to have the record clear as to its position. "What we say does not commit *you*," he said, "but it is the only place where *we* can get upon the record the fact that we believe the action to be illegal. Take away from a minority the right to express its protest in decent and respectful language, and what rights have the minority left?" The Moderator called for a vote, and *Section 9 of the protest of the minority was eliminated by a vote of the majority!* But about three hundred and fifty commissioners voted with the minority. Many observers feel that if the Assembly had lasted another week it might have been a different story. Many eyes were beginning to get accustomed to the inwardness of things.

Just before dissolution the protestant reporting here managed to get in a third protest in the following terms: "I wish respectfully to protest against the action of this Assembly in refusing to allow Section 9 of my protest against the action concerning the Independent Board to be entered upon the record." Subsequently, this protest was also signed by the Rev. Leo Alvin Gates, D.D., of Buffalo, N. Y.

Prior to the sudden and dramatic reconsideration of the protest after it had been accepted for record by the Moderator, an interesting incident occurred. It is thus recorded in the Assembly Daily News:

"The Rev. Walter Westerfield through the Moderator requested Mr. Griffiths to withdraw his protests. Mr. Griffiths responded that he realized that he represented a minority against a majority which was overwhelming in its opposition to his position. He said that he bore no ill will, but that his protests were based on convictions and he could not do out of courtesy what his conscience told him not to do. This statement was received by the Assembly with considerable applause. Mr. Westerfield and Mr. Griffiths shook hands."

And so the 146th General Assembly was dissolved. To the writer it was in many respects an Assembly of tragic decisions. No doubt it realized that it was a historic Assembly, but it is the conviction of your reporter that it will loom famous in historical perspective not for the reason that its decisions were wise, but that some of them were so extreme and partisan that they aroused a great reaction in the Church. For the wind is in the trees, and the Bible believing hosts in the Presbyterian Church are stirring to life as they have not stirred for ten years.

What will be next? We do not know. But this we *do* know, that whatever comes, His own are in the hand of God.

H. MCA. G.

### "Studies of the Constitution"

(Concluded from Page 35)

position with reference to the Constitution of the Church as a church member or an individual church that would refuse to take part in the celebration of the Lord's Supper or any other

of the prescribed ordinances of the denomination as set forth in Chapter VII of the Form of Government"—so we read on page 43 these "Studies of the Constitution." When it is remembered that the ordinances prescribed in Chapter VII of the Form of Government includes prayer, the expounding and preaching of the Word of God and Baptism as well as the Lord's Supper, such a statement is nothing short of sacrilegious.

6. It does not appear wherein the right of private judgment as held by the General Council differs from that of the Roman Catholics. It apparently holds that we should first have an *explicit* faith in the power of the General Assembly to decide all controversies respecting doctrine and discipline and then an *implicit* faith in its decisions. In this it forgets that the General Assembly itself is subject not only to the Constitution of the Church but to the Word of God. One wonders whether the General Council has ever read the thirty-first chapter of the Confession of Faith where it is not only stated that the "decrees and determinations" of synods and councils "are to be received with reverence and submission" "if consonant to the Word of God" but that "all synods or councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith and practice." Be that as it may, the General Council has such confidence in church judicatories that it holds that they can "decide cases of conscience" (p. 10). And that despite the fact that the Confession of Faith affirms that "God alone is lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in any way contrary to his Word, or beside it, in matters of faith and 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" (Chap. XX, Sec. II).

It was not in vain that the General Council prepared these "Studies of the Constitution" for the "guidance of the commissioners to the 146th General Assembly." Probably the General Council itself was surprised at the meekness and docility with which the great mass of the commissioners followed its leading. As a result the Cleveland Assembly not only virtually ordered the dissolution of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions but commanded all affiliated with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. to sustain its official boards and agencies "to the full measure of their ability." We hardly think, however, that either the members of the new Board or that Presbyterians in general will prove as tractable as did the mass of the commissioners to the last Assembly. There are some Presbyterians at least who still think for themselves and who, moreover, are aware that their primary responsibility is to the Lord who bought them. Such would much rather be accounted disloyal to the Presbyterian Church than disloyal to Jesus Christ. And disloyal to Jesus Christ we are if we use the funds He has entrusted to us for the propagation of modernistic missions—as the General Assembly has in effect ordered us to do. For nothing is more certain than that Modernism in all its consistent forms of expression is anti-Christian to the core.

### On Dealing with Dissenting Minorities

(Concluded from Page 36)

church history, so large that he who runs may read. If the Union proposed for American Presbyterians is so eminently desirable and so generally desired, it should not be necessary to coerce and penalize those who do not wish to enter it. To permit them to forego its benefits should be punishment enough. Here as in Canada the methods resorted to in the endeavor to bring about union are a serious indictment of the proposal itself, and a grievous hindrance to its realization.



# Sunday School Lessons for July

(International Uniform Series)

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

## Lesson for July 1, 1934

### AHIJAH AND THE DIVIDED KINGDOM

(Lesson Text—*I Kings 11:29-39. For entire lesson, see I Kings 11:26 to 14:31. Golden Text—Prov. 16:18. Catechism—Q. 27.*)

THE schism foretold in this lesson was one of the great tragedies which mark the history of the Chosen People. That there were Twelve Tribes, that they were all Abraham's seed and so heirs of the promises is frequently stated in Scripture. At Mt. Sinai these tribes became a nation, a theocracy, the people of God. But despite this unique solidarity, there were jealousies and animosities of long standing between the tribes. The sparing of the Gideonites and their allies (Josh. 9) raised a barrier between the North and the South, which tended to division (I Sam. 11:8). The establishment of the kingship was in one sense of God (Dt. 17:14f), but it was also an act of disobedience on the part of the people (I Sam. 8:7). It should have united all Israel. But the first three kings, not excepting the "man after God's own heart," were guilty of sins which kept the spirit of tribal jealousy alive and even fostered it. Saul, the Benjamite, was rejected. But he persecuted David of the tribe of Judah and David reigned seven years over Judah at Hebron before he finally became king over all Israel (II Sam. 3:1). The great promise of II Sam. 7 should have made his throne over all Israel secure. But Absalom's revolt, a punishment for David's sins (II Sam. 19:41-43), makes it clear that real solidarity was not achieved. Solomon built the temple. But his idolatries brought that temple into discredit, and paved the way for the golden calves of Dan and Bethel. He oppressed the people. Naturally the North was resentful. Everything was ready for revolt. Its spokesman was an Ephramite.

Like Saul, Jeroboam is represented as a goodly young man, who rose by sheer merit to a position of leadership. Like David (I Sam. 16:1f) he was marked out for the kingship secretly (I Kings 11:29). But in his case the warning was expressly given that the schism was to follow the death of the reigning monarch (vs. 34f). This was clearly meant to be a warning against impetuous acts on his part. But like Hazael (II Kings 8:7f) his ambition was aroused and "he lifted up his hand against the king" (vs. 26). This act of sedition or rebellion perhaps revealed him to Solomon as the unnamed "servant" referred to in vs. 11, and Jeroboam fled for his life. How widely Ahijah's prophecy became known we are not told, nor whether it was used by

Jeroboam's friends to smooth his way to the throne (12:2, 3, 20). The fact of its fulfillment is all that really concerns us.

Ahijah is known in sacred history only through this one incident and his later prophecy of the death of Jeroboam's son (14:1f). Probably it was through him that Solomon received the divine word foretelling the partition of his kingdom. But this is not certain. Ahijah's use of a symbolic action in his interview with Jeroboam has many parallels in Scripture (*e. g.*, Jer. 19; 25:15f; Ezek. 4). It may be noted that it was apparently his own mantle that Ahijah rent in pieces, not that of Jeroboam, as some suppose. Perhaps Ahijah had used it first as a disguise.

Jeroboam is remembered in sacred history as the man who "made Israel to sin" (I Kings 14:16). This he did by establishing the worship of the calves at Dan and Bethel. This action was prompted by fear (12:26f), which was the more inexcusable because the Lord had promised him a "sure house" (vs. 36) and also because it was the idolatry of Solomon to which he owed his throne. By following in the sins of Solomon he made the downfall of his own kingdom inevitable (16:7). Jeroboam and Jehu are tragically similar figures in Old Testament history. They followed the Lord in securing what their hearts desired. But by sinning against him, they forfeited their right to all that He had promised them, and proved that their obedience was prompted by self love, not by love of God.

## Lesson for July 8, 1934

### ASA RELIES ON GOD

(Lesson Text—*II Chr. 15:1-12. For entire lesson, see II Chr. chs. 14 to 16. Golden Text—Heb. 13:6. Catechism—Q. 28.*)

Asa was one of the good kings of Judah (16:2f). A grandson of Rehoboam, he came to the throne 20 years after the Division of the kingdom. He was probably young when he became king, but he may well have vividly recalled the invasion of Shishak which had occurred only 15 years earlier and marked so vividly the end of the golden age of Solomon (I Kgs. 14:26f). That humiliating event may have impressed on his mind the peril in which his kingdom stood from external foes. His long reign saw the downfall of the houses of Jeroboam and of Baasha and the establishment of Ahab, son of Omri, upon the throne of Israel. He followed the policy of his father and grandfather, of hostility toward the Northern Kingdom. He built fenced cities in Judah and maintained a powerful army (ch. 14:6-8).

Our lesson tells us of Asa's renewal of the Covenant (vs. 12). That the years since the schism and even before it had been marked by apostasy is clearly stated (vs. 3). Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah and Josiah were the great reforming kings. In their reforms the prophets played a prominent role.

As described in Chronicles, Asa's reform followed his great victory over the Ethiopians (14:4-15). This victory was the direct answer to Asa's prayer (vs. 11), one of the beautiful short prayers of the Bible. It is followed immediately by the words: "So the Lord smote the Ethiopians before Asa." This victory may have been the immediate cause of Asa's reforming activities.

Asa's reform was followed (on the dates in 15:19, 16:1, cf. Commentaries) by a testing of Asa's faith. Baasha of Israel built Ramah as a border fortress against Judah. Asa saw in this a menace to his safety and sought the help of Ben-hadad of Syria, who invaded Israel and forced Baasha to abandon Ramah which Asa then destroyed. This act of Asa was both shortsighted and sinful. It gave Judah relief for the moment from Israel; but it led inevitably to that period of alliance with Israel against Syria which almost brought about the extinction of the Davidic dynasty (II Kgs. 10 and 11).

The narrative in Chronicles is especially concerned with this sin of Asa in its personal aspect. In the case of Asa, it was a sin against a signal experience which had been granted him of the power of the God of Israel to overthrow all His foes. Asa had called on the Lord for help against the Ethiopians and He had wrought a mighty deliverance. Why turn to Syria for help against Israel? Asa had had faith before this great victory. He should have had more faith after it. Instead he had less. Why? Asa's inconsistency is not explained; but Hanani the seer points it out to him with the plainness of speech which we expect of a true prophet. Asa, instead of repenting as David did (II Sam. 12:13), acted like an Ahab or Joash, and made the seer suffer for his plain speaking (I Kgs. 22:27, cf. II Chr. 24:20-22). One further point is mentioned. In his final illness Asa "sought not to the Lord, but to the physicians" (16:12). Again he sinned against the great experience of his life.

The secret of Asa's inconsistencies is apparently given in the searching words of Azariah: "The Lord is with you while ye be with him: and if ye seek him, he will be found of you, but if ye forsake him, he will forsake you" (15:2). These words summarize in tragic fashion God's covenant dealings with Israel from the beginning. They are equally applicable to God's people in every age. One of the sins which the individual Christian should most lament and most carefully guard against is the sin against his own personal experience of the saving and sustaining power of God.



## Lesson for July 15, 1934

## GOD CARES FOR ELIJAH

(Lesson Text—I Kings 17:1-7; 19:1-8. For entire lesson, see I Kings, chs. 17; 19:1-8. Golden Text—Mt. 6:32. Catechism—Q. 29.)

Elijah is one of the grandest figures in the Bible. Of his antecedents we know nothing. It was not family, station, age, or education, but the call of God which made men prophets, "men of God," sent to speak the "word of God." His appearance on the scene is startlingly abrupt. "As the Lord God of Israel liveth before whom I stand"—like a voice from heaven he speaks to Ahab—"there shall not be dew nor rain these years, but according to my word." The last clause is especially significant, when we observe how Elijah's faith was tried and how he suffered as a result of the drought. Supernatural power was entrusted to him, but like his Lord (*e. g.*, Mt. 4:4) he made no effort to use this power for his own comfort or advantage. He saved the life of the widow's son; he won the victory of God over the prophets of Baal. But he was dependent upon the ravens, upon the failing waters of the brook, upon the widow's cruse, for the supplying of his own needs. "The brook dried up," probably not suddenly but gradually. To watch the slow approach of the seemingly inevitable is one of the severest tests of faith. Finally the crisis came: the brook was dry. Then and not till then did God speak to his servant. He sent him to a widow woman in a foreign land to share her handful of meal and the remnant of oil in her cruse. The command of God tested both his faith and hers: the meal and the oil, like the manna supplied the need of each day as it came. "Give us this day our daily bread" is a petition easier to make than to mean.

The opening verses of chap. 19 give us another impressive illustration of God's care of Elijah. It follows the mighty conflict on Mt. Carmel where Elijah proved so impressively that one with God is a majority. Single-handed he had overthrown the prophets of Baal, because the God of his fathers had answered the prayer of faith. Now, exhausted and seemingly panic-stricken at the threat of a vindictive woman, he flees for his life to Beersheba and beyond. Despair comes and he longs for death, an angel gives him food and drink; his strength is renewed and he journeys forty days and forty nights to Horeb, the Mount of God. Man's extremity is God's opportunity.

This lesson illustrates the advantage and disadvantage of the topical method of studying the Bible. The similarity between the opening verses of chaps. 17 and 19 is marked; and the words, "God cares for Elijah," brings this out well. But in between these passages is chap. 18 which records the most tremendous incident in Elijah's whole career, one of the most impressive chapters in Old Testament history.

Both chap. 17 and chap. 19 acquire added significance when viewed in the light of it, the one as preparation, the other as sequel. Yet our lesson omits it. Topical study is excellent, but it needs to be supplemented by expository study of complete and continuous passages. One reason many Bible teachers do not like the "uniform lessons," is that they are not connected and continuous. It is impossible to cover a period of four-score years in the five lessons for July without skipping much that is of prime importance.

It is often remarked that Old Testament names are—it would be more correct to say, may be—significant. The name Elijah (my God is Jehovah) is a striking instance of this. The name signifies or symbolizes the man. Elijah "stood before" (*i. e.*, was the servant of) the God of Israel, Jehovah. And when, after the fire descended at Carmel, the people cried, "Jehovah is God," their words were almost a paraphrase of the name of His heroic servant. We call ourselves Christians, we bear the name that is above every name. Do men take knowledge of us that we have been with Jesus and learned of Him?

## Lesson for July 22, 1934

## ELIJAH HEARS GOD'S VOICE

(Lesson Text—I Kings 19:9-18. For entire lesson, see I Kings 19:9-21. Golden Text—I Sam. 3:9. Catechism—Q. 30.)

Elijah at Horeb, by reminding us of a similar event in Moses' life (Ex. 33:17f), brings together those two great names which the New Testament couples together and suggests the scene on the Mt. of Transfiguration (Mt. 17:1f). There is more than mere coincidence. Elijah at Carmel had fought against Baal worship at Ahab's court as Moses at Mt. Sinai against the apostasy of the golden calf. What both needed was a new vision of the grace and power of God.

That Elijah was divinely led to Horeb seems clear. Yet the reiterated question, "What doest thou here, Elijah?" suggests at least that he must account for his flight from the scene of his recent triumph. Why flee from a woman, when he had mastered a host? Elijah's answer is practically the same in both cases—Israel's apostasy, his own peril. The Lord's replies are different. First, Elijah is commanded to go forth and stand upon the mount before the Lord. He does so and witnesses the forces of nature in terrifying display, only to be told that the Lord is not in them. Then there is a lull, "a sound of utter stillness," as it may perhaps best be rendered, followed by the repeating of the question, "What doest thou here, Elijah?" Elijah makes the same answer and then comes the call to service. He is to anoint Hazael king over Syria, Jehu king over Israel, and Elisha to succeed him in the prophetic office.

This command is of great interest. Some have inferred from the statement that the Lord was not in the wind, earthquake or fire, a rebuke of the violent methods used by Elijah to overthrow his enemies. Elisha is often contrasted with Elijah to the discredit of the former. There is no warrant for the charge, as this incident makes convincingly clear. For Elisha is represented as completing the work of destruction to be continued by Hazael and Jehu: "and him that escapeth of the sword of Jehu shall Elisha slay." Elisha, like Elijah, wielded the sword of the Lord. Modern attempts to impeach the fame of Elijah are not based upon Scripture; but represent that attempt which is so often made to exalt the love of God at the expense of His justice.

It is significant also that of the three things Elijah is commanded to do not one is carried out in the way we might naturally expect. Elijah is commanded to anoint Elisha to be prophet in his room. Instead he casts his mantle upon Elisha's shoulders. There is no record in Scripture of the anointing of a prophet. It seems natural to infer, therefore, that the word anoint is used figuratively in the sense of induct or designate. Elijah did not himself anoint Hazael. The command to do this was apparently carried out when Elisha told Hazael that he was to be king (II Kings 8:7-15). Elijah did not himself anoint Jehu. Elisha sent "one of the sons of the prophets" to Ramoth Gilead to anoint him (II Kings 9:1-10). This seems at first sight strange. Yet it is noteworthy that the narrative in Kings makes no comment upon Elijah's failure to carry out literally the commission given him at Horeb. It does not even suggest any failure or neglect on his part. The only hint which it gives us is afforded by the sequel to the murder of Naboth. After Elijah met Ahab in the garden of Naboth and pronounced that terrible curse on him we read that Ahab "went softly." Because of this the woe was delayed, but not recalled, "in his son's days will I bring the evil upon his house" (I Kings 21:29). This Old Testament example of the fulfillment of prophecy—God's command to Elijah at Horeb is essentially a prophecy, to be fulfilled apparently by Elijah himself—is a striking illustration of the fact abundantly supported elsewhere in Scripture that in the interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy great caution should be exercised. Prophecy is sometimes fulfilled literally, but this is not always the case as the incident we have been studying clearly indicates.

## Lesson for July 29, 1934

## MICAIAH SPEAKS THE TRUTH

(Lesson Text—I Kings 22:1-14. For entire lesson, see I Kings, ch. 22. Golden Text—I Kings 22:14. Catechism—Q. 31.)

Micaiah is an illustration of the proverb that men live by deeds, not years. One



vividly impressive chapter tells us all we know of the son of Imlah, but it suffices to show that he deserved to be called a "prophet of the Lord," to be numbered in that heroic company whose life motto and badge of office was: "As the Lord liveth, what the Lord saith unto me, that will I speak."

Ahab and Jehoshaphat are on friendly terms, allies against Syria. The sin of Asa in inciting Syria against Israel has born early fruit. But Jehoshaphat though in bad company has scruples: he wants divine approval. Ahab gathers 400 prophets, who are unanimous in their approval: "Go up: for the Lord will deliver it into the hand of the king." The unanimity was ominous. It aroused Jehoshaphat's suspicions: to Ahab it meant that Micaiah was absent. Perhaps Ahab had taken care that this should be so. At any rate, pressed by Jehoshaphat he calls Micaiah. Meanwhile the chorus of Ahab's prophets continues unabated: "Go up and prosper."

Micaiah, disregarding the suggestion that he join with those who "with one voice" prophesy good, declares that he will be simply the Lord's spokesman, the duty of a true prophet (vs. 14). First he repeats the chorus of the four hundred, but with such irony or contempt that Ahab chides him for his seeming levity. Then he describes briefly his vision of impending evil, Israel defeated and scattered (vs. 17); and he follows it up with "the word of the Lord" (vss. 19-22). Micaiah's vision of Deity enthroned is very impressive (cf. Isa. 6). It is noteworthy that Satan or another spirit of evil is represented here (cf. Job 1 and 2) as permitted to appear in the court of heaven in his role as accuser (Rev. 12:10). He offers to deceive Ahab by being a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets (cf. Deut. 13, Ezek. 14).

That God should "put a lying spirit" in the mouth of Ahab's prophets seemed at first sight hard to reconcile with the Scriptural teaching that God does not tempt man to do evil (Jas. 1:13f). It should be remembered, however, that the sending of the lying spirit (cf. Jg. 9:23, I Sam. 16:14, Isa. 19:14, Ezek. 14:9, II Thess. 2:11; also Ps. 18:26) is expressly represented as a punishment for Ahab's sinful perversity and thus a judgment of God upon one ripe for destruction. Patrick Fairbairn well states the matter in his Commentary on Ezekiel, in discussing, ch. 14:9:

"The point chiefly to be noticed in this deliverance of the mind of God is the connection between the self-deceived people and the deceiving prophet; regarding whom it is said, in peculiarly strong language, 'I the Lord have enticed (or deceived) that prophet.' It is an example in the highest sphere of the *lex talionis*. If the people were sincere in their desire to know the mind of God, for the purpose of obeying his will, the path was plain. They had but to forsake their idolatries, and the Lord was ready to meet them with direction and blessing. But if, on the other hand, they were bent on playing

the hypocrite, professing to inquire concerning him while their hearts in reality were cleaving to corruption, punishment was sure to overtake them, and that, too, in the first instance, after the form of their own iniquity. God would chastise their sin with a corresponding sin; and as they had rejected the safe direction of the true light, he would send the pernicious delusion of a false one. Prophets would be given them, who should re-echo the deceitfulness that already wrought in their own bosom, so that their iniquity should prove their ruin."

That Jehoshaphat despite his scruples failed to heed the words of Micaiah, shows how deeply he had been ensnared by the wiles of Ahab. That he was, nevertheless, spared the punishment visited on his companion in sin, is an illustration of the long-suffering grace of God.

## The Comfort of the Scriptures

### A DEVOTIONAL MEDITATION

By the Rev. David Freeman, Th.M.

"There are many adversaries" (I Cor. 16:9).

THE Holy Spirit came upon the disciples of the Lord Jesus on the day of Pentecost. They were endued with power.

But everything was against the disciples. Immediately they were beset by trials and persecutions of all sorts. The Christians were the objects of a determined effort of extermination by Jew and Gentile. Thus the words of Jesus, "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake," did not cease to be true after the crucifixion.

A true Christian will always arouse the enmity of the world. No true Christian has ever yet stood in well with the world. "If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." This state of affairs a Christian must be prepared to face.

If the world honors us and speaks well of us, then let us beware. A Christian will hate evil, will not consort with sinners and will not hold fellowship with the works of darkness. For these things he will be unpopular and even hated. We know this, that the world hated Him before it hated us.

Think of the Christians of past ages whom we honor now. Were they honored in their day? There is Peter and Paul of the early company, Luther and Calvin of a later day, and many, many others well known to us. What is true of them is true of the humblest Christian that ever lived. They all endured tribulation at the hands of ungodly men. Neither would they fare much better today.

We delight in the valiant stand of the saints of the past. But would we have counted it a joy to stand with them? Their witness meant persecution. Are we willing to bear it now for Christ?

If there is no enmity between the Christian and error and all unrighteousness of

men, then he is not a child of Him who endured the reproach of sinners.

There are no more peaceful and loving men than those who bear the gospel of salvation. Opposition to and hatred of them can only be accounted for because "men loved darkness rather than light" and because "every one that doeth evil hateth the light."

Oppression and affliction does a lot of harm to disciples. Those whose "minds (are) evil affected against the brethren" injure grievously God's elect. Shall the hinderer be guiltless? Woe unto him if he harm one of Christ's little ones!

Yet, unknowingly, the offender does much good. God uses the sore trial to remove the dross from his faith. God alone becomes the help and hope of the true servant. He flees unto God to hide him. God does hide him in "the secret of his tabernacle." He learns to sing "The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? the Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?" God becomes a strong habitation for him and he praises Him more and more. The hinderer little knows that he is helping the gospel to advance. How true it is that even the wrath of men shall praise God.

Let the children of God rejoice for their "reward is great in heaven."

## Western Pennsylvania Bible Conference

THE Western Pennsylvania Bible Conference will hold its sixth annual session in the First Presbyterian Church of Slippery Rock, Penna., June 24th to July 1st.

Sunday sessions will be at 2.30, 3.30 and 7.30 E. S. T., and week-day sessions at 10.00, 2.00, 3.00 and 7.30. The speakers will be the Rev. Harry McCormick Lintz of Chicago, a member of the Moody Bible Institute Extension staff, who will speak every night. Mr. Lintz is a powerful young preacher and was chosen last summer by the Christian business men of Chicago as one of their leading preachers during the World's Fair.

President J. O. Buswell of Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill., speaks the last Sunday afternoon.

The afternoon Bible teacher throughout the Conference, except the last Sunday, will be the Rev. Herbert Mackenzie, D.D., of Cleveland, Ohio, president of the Eriesside Bible Conference.

Other speakers are George M. Landis, secretary of the Greenwood Hills Bible Conference; the Rev. C. H. Heaton, pastor of the First Baptist Church of New Castle, Penna.; the Rev. Ivan O. Wilson, Presbyterian Missionary to Persia, and the Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D., noted pastor of the First Lutheran Church of Jamestown, N. Y. Programs may be secured and reservations made by writing to the Rev. H. H. VanCleve, secretary, Grove City, Pa.



## News of the Church

### Constitutionalists Win Victory in Presbytery of Chester

**B**Y a decisive majority on June 12th, Constitutionalists of Chester Presbytery rejected an attempt by a modernist-indifferentist coalition to refuse licensure to two graduates of Westminster Seminary who would not pledge future "loyalty" to the official Board of Foreign Missions of the Church. The candidates were **Mr. James Blackstone** and **Mr. John Kauffroth**.

In the morning sederunt, the Presbytery had questioned another applicant for reception, who seemed to know very little about the Independent Board. This was **Mr. W. C. Kann**, a recent graduate of the Evangelical Theological Seminary, Dallas, Texas. He was asked two questions by the **Rev. Frederick Schweitzer**: (1) As to his loyalty to the official Board of Foreign Missions, and (2) whether he intended to support the Independent Board.

Finally, after having asked for time to consider, **Mr. Kann** said that he was loyal to the Presbyterian Church, but must of necessity oppose anything in the Church that was contrary to the Word of God and the Standards. As to the Independent Board, he knew so little about it that he could hardly say. After this reply, he was received by a decisive vote.

When **Messrs. Blackstone** and **Kauffroth** appeared for licensure all went smoothly until **Mr. Schweitzer** again put the same questions as he had asked **Mr. Kann**. The two candidates replied, in general, that they were loyal to the Church, but that they would feel duty bound, as did **Mr. Kann**, to oppose anything in it that was contrary to the Word of God. They intended to support the Board of Foreign Missions insofar as it was true to the Word of God and the standards. Asked if they considered that the Board of Foreign Missions had so been true, they replied frankly that they did not. Thereupon they were ordered licensed by vote of the Presbytery. Since the vote against licensure was less than one-third of those present, which precluded the possibility of a stay by complaint, the licensure proceeded forthwith. It was intimated, however, that a complaint would be filed which, while it would not stay the action, might possibly result in its reversal by Synod.

### Not Licensed



**Calvin K. Cummings**

*"One only can be my Master."*

### Baltimore Presbytery Refuses Licensure to Calvin K. Cummings

**C**ALVIN CUMMINGS, a graduate of Westminster Seminary, witnessed a good confession at the June 12th meeting of the Presbytery of Baltimore by refusing to pledge allegiance to the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., even though his refusal cost him his licensure, by a vote of 33 to 23.

Every effort was made by the majority of the Presbytery to cause him to change his attitude toward the Board of Foreign Missions of the Church. He was cajoled, threatened, questioned and cross-questioned before the Presbytery but he stood firm, saying that he would not promise unqualified allegiance to any board or agency, and would only support those missionaries of the Church whom he considered true to the Bible, the Constitution of the Church and uninfluenced by modernistic policies of the present Board of Foreign Missions.

The matter of **Mr. Cummings'** licensure had come up two months ago at the April meeting of Presbytery but had been held over until the June meeting awaiting a pronouncement by the General Assembly on the legality of demanding unqualified support of the Boards of the Church as a condition for licensure or ordination. Though specific instructions from the General Assembly were lacking on this point, a letter from **Dr. Lewis S. Mudge**, Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, was presented which called attention to the deliverances of the

Assembly regarding the Independent Board of Foreign Missions as though these actions had settled the matter, and added to the Constitutional Questions, the demand for unqualified support of the Church Boards.

Failing in their attempt to shake **Mr. Cummings** in his determination not to pledge allegiance to the Board of Foreign Missions, those opposing **Mr. Cummings** voted that he retire from the room. Then all sorts of charges were brought against him by members of the Committee of Christian Education of the Presbytery which had examined him. It was charged he displayed an "un-Christian spirit" in standing so firmly on his convictions and that if he entered the Presbyterian Church he would in all probability disrupt the congregation to which he should be called, by his "contentious attitude."

Those who know **Mr. Cummings** refuted these charges, citing his gentle, Christ-like attitude before the Presbytery's Committee on Christian Education and in open Presbytery as clear evidence of their falsity.

Moreover those supporting **Mr. Cummings** cited Chapter 12, Section 6, of the Form of Government which distinctly states that before any overtures or enactments of the General Assembly shall be obligatory upon the Church, it shall be necessary to transmit them to all the Presbyteries, and to receive the returns of at least a majority of them, approving thereof. Friends of **Mr. Cummings** also cited Chapter XX, Section II, of the Confession of Faith which states that "God alone is lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to His Word, or beside it, in matters of faith and worship." But all these things were of no avail for it was manifest from the reopening of the question of **Mr. Cummings'** licensure that he was to be rejected unless he promised unqualified submission to the Board of Foreign Missions of the Church and repudiated the Independent Board.

In making his position clear, **Mr. Cummings** re-read his statements made to Presbytery at its last meeting, reaffirming them. (See **CHRISTIANITY TODAY**, May, 1934, page 20). He then made two other statements in answer to questions relative to support of evangelical missionaries under the Board of Foreign Missions and as to his attitude to the Independent Board. He said:

"1. The statements as of April 17, 1934, did not mean or imply that I will not support missionaries under the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church who are thoroughly loyal in their faith and conduct to the Word of God and to the subordinate standards of the church. I am sincerely thankful for such missionaries and for their preaching of the gospel. I am willing to support missionaries under the Board of Foreign Missions who are thoroughly loyal in faith and in conduct to the Word of God and the subordinate standards of the church."



"2. The statements as of April 17, 1934, do not mean or imply that I pledge loyalty to the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. I assure you, brethren, in honesty and sincerity, that I can pledge loyalty in advance to no human board or agency. This includes the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions as well as any other. My only pledge of loyalty is to the Word of God and to the constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., which is founded upon the Word of God. There can be no guarantee that the Independent Board for Presbyterian Missions, any more than any other human agency, will always remain loyal to the Word. One only can be my master, even Christ.

"Nor can I pledge disloyalty to any particular board or agency. The Independent Board is an agency with no official connection with the Presbyterian Church. I feel that there is no more reason to pledge disloyalty to it than to other independent agencies, such as the Y. M. C. A., the Anti-Saloon League, Presbyterian hospitals and orphanages, various faith missions, or charitable and welfare societies."

Afterward, Mr. Cummings said:

"I am not a bit down in the mouth about it all. We have much to be thankful for. The vote was good. A real fight was made. I feel that it has opened the eyes of many here in Baltimore. It is the clearest issue we have ever had—loyalty to modernistic boards and agencies, or get out. We have a Sovereign Father. Nothing is hard when we consider the eternity of our salvation through the blood of the everlasting covenant."

The fight for licensure of Mr. Cummings was led by the Rev. John H. McComb of the Forest Park Church, Baltimore. Active also on the conservative side was the Rev. T. Roland Philips of the Arlington Church of the same city.

### Presbyterian League of Faith Adopts Strong Resolutions

THE Presbyterian League of Faith, meeting in the Broadway Church, New York, on June 12th, adopted the following three resolutions concerning the state of the Church:

#### Church Union

"The Presbyterian League of Faith earnestly hopes that the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America will decline to send down to its presbyteries the proposed Plan of Organic Union between that church and ours, and it declares its intention of opposing the Plan in our presbyteries with might and main if the Plan is sent down.

"Our opposition is not to union with the United Presbyterian Church in itself, but to this particular Plan of Union. We are convinced that this particular Plan is derogatory to the authority of the Bible and sub-

versive of fundamental principles of Presbyterian church government. Among the objections may be mentioned the following:

(1) The Plan makes no provision for allowing retention of property by congregations that cannot conscientiously enter into the union, as was wisely recommended by the last General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church.

(2) The Plan elevates to a place in the Constitution of the Church (as "historical interpretative statements") the 1902 "Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith" (now merely a pronouncement of the General Assembly of our church) and the 1925 "Confessional Statement" of the United Presbyterian Church (*Plan of Union*, p. 25). Both these statements are quite unworthy of such a place in the Constitution. The 1925 Confessional Statement, in particular, undermines the authority of the Bible by a very erroneous statement regarding inspiration and by giving comfort to the central error of the day, which is that there is such a thing as "spiritual truth" distinguished from historical truth or scientific truth (*Plan of Union*, p. 28). In opposition to all such teaching, we hold that the Bible is a supernatural Book, the writers having been supernaturally preserved from error throughout.

(3) The proposed new formula of creed subscription (*Plan of Union*, p. 13), which is quite different both from the present formula of our church and from that of the United Presbyterian Church, permits the interpretation that the Bible contains various contradictory systems of doctrine and that the system contained in the Confession of Faith and Catechisms is only one among these contradictory systems. In support of this view of the formula, we can appeal to a leading Modernist journal, *The Christian Century*, which declares in its issue of May 14, 1934, that the adoption of this new formula of subscription would be "a step so long as that it may fairly be called a stride."

(4) The proposed form of government practically destroys all rights of the local church by permitting a presbytery, in the most unguarded way, to take over the affairs of the church through the appointment of a provisional session from the outside (*Plan of Union*, p. 66).

(5) The proposed Directory for Worship makes support of the church and of its agencies no longer a matter of free-will giving but a tax enforced by penalties, by declaring that "if any person of known pecuniary ability fails in giving of his substance" and does not voluntarily yield to exhortation, "the session may deal with him as an offender" (*Plan of Union*, p. 165).

(6) The proposed new method of amending the Constitution of the Church removes safeguards and makes it increasingly easy for the General Council or

other central agencies to rush amendments through without real scrutiny."

### The Action Against the Independent Board

"The Presbyterian League of Faith regards as contrary to the deepest principles of Christian liberty the action of the 1934 General Assembly ordering the presbyteries to take disciplinary action against those officers and members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions who are connected with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Support of the official boards and agencies of the Church ought, we are convinced, to be regarded as entirely voluntary, and not at all as excluding individual members of our Church from other forms of missionary endeavor. Moreover, we are utterly opposed to the policy advocated by a letter of the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly to the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Baltimore requiring of candidates for licensure or ordination a pledge to support the official boards of the Church. The requirement of such a pledge is quite contrary to the Constitution of our Church, which carefully limits the pledges to be required of candidates to what is set forth in the Constitutional Questions. If a candidate signs such an additional pledge as this new one advocated by the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, he promises to support whatever changing majorities in General Assemblies may advocate; and thus he places fallible men in place of authority that rightly belongs only to the Lord Jesus Christ."

### The Official Board of Foreign Missions

"The Presbyterian League of Faith regards the present policy of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. as being complacent toward Modernism and unfaithful to the Bible and the Constitution of the Church. We are convinced that this policy can be effectively changed only by a change in the membership of the Board, since no one of the members of the Board as hitherto constituted has made a minority report against the objectionable policy and since, therefore, all members have acquiesced in that policy."

The League, at the same meeting at which the above actions were taken, re-elected the following persons to serve as officers and as members of the Executive Committee: Dr. Oswald T. Allis, Professor of Old Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia; Dr. David DeForest Burrell, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Williamsport, Pa.; Dr. Samuel G. Craig, editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY; and the Rev. Albert Dale Gantz, pastor of the Williamsbridge Presbyterian Church, New York City. Of these persons the first three are to serve as Vice-Presidents, and the last-named as Secretary and Treasurer. The office of President, which was left vacant by the death



of Dr. Walter Duncan Buchanan, pastor of the Broadway Presbyterian Church of New York, is to be filled at the next meeting of the Presbyterian League of Faith.

### Westminster Seminary Dinner Well Attended at Assembly

IN connection with the recent General Assembly in Cleveland was held on Monday evening, May 28th, a dinner in the interests of Westminster Seminary. It was probably the largest of all the seminary dinners held. About one hundred and fifty persons sat down together in the Hotel Allerton. Presiding was the Rev. Clarence E. Macartney, D.D. Speakers were the Rev. E. H. Rian (to whom chief credit for the successful dinner should be ascribed), the Rev. H. McA. Griffiths, the Rev. C. J. Woodbridge, the Rev. J. C. McConnell, the Rev. A. Gordon MacLennan, D.D., and the Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D. Great enthusiasm was the keynote of the meeting, in spite of the anti-Protestant and repressive actions of the Assembly.

### Peter Stam, Jr., Appointed by Wheaton College

DR. J. OLIVER BUSWELL, JR., president of Wheaton College, has announced the appointment of Peter Stam, Jr., of Narberth, Pa., as chairman of the Music Department and Executive Director of the Conservatory of Music. Mr. Stam was chosen as manager of the Student Supply Store at Wheaton on January 1st of this year, and on September 1st will assume his new duties in addition to his present work.

Mr. Stam is a graduate of Columbia University (1914, Phi Beta Kappa) and has come to Wheaton after a publishing experience with the Sunday School Times and the Religious Press Association of Philadelphia. He has also been organist and choir director of churches in Narberth, Philadelphia, and Paterson, N. J. He is married and has four children. The family is still residing in Narberth but expect to join Mr. Stam in Wheaton in the fall. His father is superintendent of the Star of Hope Mission in Paterson.

Mr. Stam has been active in many Christian enterprises in Philadelphia. He is an elder in the Narberth Presbyterian Church, has been treasurer of the Million Testaments Campaign for Latin America and of the Philadelphia Fundamentalists, and is a member of the Executive Committee of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

### Eastern Pennsylvania Letter

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

PHILADELPHIANS were prominent in the affairs of the General Assembly this year. Dr. W. C. Covert, liberal member of Chicago Presbytery and the new Moderator

### This Issue Is Called

the "July" number in accordance with our new policy of dating the issue for the month immediately following, in line with almost universal custom. The volume number will remain the same and no subscription will be shortened by this change. Pages will be numbered, not by individual months, but for the whole year.

of the Assembly, is a Philadelphia resident. The evangelical candidate, Dr. James C. McConnell of Upper Darby, a suburb of Philadelphia, bravely bore the standard of the faith in the face of certain defeat. The Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths, however, was the most talked of figure on the floor of the Assembly, presenting in admirable fashion three protests against the unconstitutional acts of the Assembly, and receiving tumultuous applause when he courteously but firmly refused to accede to a request to withdraw his protests. Another Philadelphian, Dr. W. L. McCormick, was arraigned upon the opposite side, being chairman of the Foreign Missions Committee. Mr. S. Earle Hoover, vice-Moderator chosen by Dr. Covert, is also a suburban Philadelphian.

Dr. Richard Montgomery of Wyncote has been seriously ill. His work as Stated Clerk of Philadelphia North Presbytery is being assumed temporarily by the Permanent Clerk, Dr. Joseph Ewing of Ambler.

Your columnist, not to be affrighted by unconstitutional acts and threats, any more than his readers are, will continue to contribute to the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, at 1531 Philadelphia Saving Fund Society Building, Philadelphia, and hopes that the publicity given to these measures of attempted repression will but attract new sympathizers and givers, as they are already doing.

Philadelphia North Presbytery at its May meeting received the Rev. Walter H. Eastwood, from Elizabeth Presbytery, to accept the position of Assistant Pastor of the First Church of Norristown. The Rev. H. H. Hunsberger of Philadelphia Presbytery was also received, and installed in the Cedar Park Church of Germantown. Howard B. Haines of the Carmel Church of Edge Hill was licensed by the Presbytery, as was also Ellsworth Jackson, whose brothers are the Rev. J. R. Jackson of Union Tabernacle Church, Philadelphia, and the Rev. Samuel A. Jackson of New Hope, Pa. Licentiate Robert Strong, received from Philadelphia Presbytery, was ordained June 1st by Philadelphia North Presbytery. Commissioners from the latter to Synod are: the Revs. John Harvey Lee, H. W. Hathaway, John Muyskens, Alfred L. Taxis and John Clark Finney, and Elders William H. Hensel of the Mt. Airy Church, Henry Lee Willetts of

the Springfield Church of Flourtown; Samuel D. Milner of the Frankford Church; George Reuschline of the Olivet Church of Elkins Park, and Robert W. Stobbs of the Hermon Church of Frankford.

A petition from the Oxford Circle Mission that it be incorporated into the Glading Memorial Church was favorably acted upon. This church recently received a gift of a \$100,000 building. Robert Henry of Holy Trinity Church was taken under the care of the presbytery.

Northumberland Presbytery on April 16th elected to Synod the Revs. George H. Hemmingway, David D. Burrell and Hugh G. Moody, and Elders John R. Steele, Shamokin; William A. Elliott, Osceola, and Paul B. Fisher, Montoursville. Meeting the same day, Lackawanna Presbytery elected the Revs. P. H. Austin, Plummer Harvey, G. G. Kebler, A. D. Behrends and James D. Bryden, and Elders L. P. Brerly, West Pittston; James Bone, Pittston; A. F. Fey, Carbondale; F. W. Card, Sylvania, and J. H. Reynolds, Kingston.

Chester Presbytery on April 10th chose as Commissioners the Revs. Charles V. Hassler, John L. Foreman, Charles E. Graf and A. B. Hallock, with Elders F. T. Hufnal, Malvern; J. T. Robertson, Paoli; J. K. Barrell, Media, and R. H. Worth, Elmhurst. Carlisle Presbytery sends to Synod the Revs. Harold McMillan, G. L. Forney and J. G. Kell, and Elders T. C. McDowell, Williamson; R. A. Taylor, Carlisle, and Karl E. Richards, Harrisburg.

The Honey Brook Church has called the Rev. W. C. Kann, a recent graduate of the Evangelical Theological Seminary, Dallas, Texas. He will arrive on the field July 1st, with his bride. A recent supply at the Appleby Manor Church of Ford City was the Rev. Theodore Wray, a promising young graduate of Westminster Seminary.

PHILADELPHIA

### The Southern Presbyterian Church

By the Rev. Prof. Wm. Childs Robinson

#### Columbia Commencement

FEATURES of the one hundred and fifth commencement of Columbia Theological Seminary included a ringing proclamation of the Gospel as the Power of God unto Salvation by President John McSween of Clinton, S. C., over WSB, the inauguration of Dr. J. McD. Richards as president of the Seminary, a stirring final message to the graduates by Dr. A. A. Little of Meridian, Miss. Dr. Little stressed the danger of a minister diffusing his interests and activities in the social, economic and political fields so as to forget his true function. Dr. J. B. Hutton of Jackson, Miss., vice-president of the Board, ably presided in lieu of the president, who was ill. The following students were graduated: E. L. Jackson, cum laude, G. A. Fleece, cum laude, W. N. Bashaw, J. B. Dickson, J. G. Hand,



C. L. Landrun, W. H. Pruitt, E. R. Rhodes, G. L. Riddle, C. W. Sessions, J. M. Simpson, Laurence Williams, Fred Piper, in absentia.

**Mr. Kirby Page's Questionnaire**

At the May meeting of the Atlanta Evangelical Ministers' Association and the Christian Council the Rev. D. P. McGeachey and the Rev. Ashby Jones led a discussion of Mr. Page's questionnaire on *War and Economic Injustice*. Drs. McGeachey and Jones were collaborators with Page in circulating the questionnaire. The resulting pamphlet lists several Southern Presbyterian ministers as favoring socialism. Your correspondent has two fundamental objections to the whole questionnaire. In the first place the questions asked concern Christians as citizens, not as officers of the Church. Therefore, the questionnaire ought not to have been directed to ministers. As a minister of the Church, one's whole duty is to share in the gathering and perfecting of the saints; that is, to proclaim, administer and enforce the law of Christ revealed in the Scriptures. The other objection concerns the author of the questionnaire. Dr. Kirby Page is the author of a book entitled *Jesus or Christianity*. The word "or" in this title is a disjunctive. The book endeavors to set up a false dilemma and to lead readers to reject Christianity. One does not see how Christian ministers can delight to honor a man who writes a book the very title and purpose of which is to discredit Christianity.

**The Valley of Decision**

From his hospital bed Dr. Wm. M. McPheeters gives this message to the Church:

"We have reached a point where before God and man we ought to decide whether or not we believe in the system of doctrine and form of government taught in the constitution of the Church; and if we do to take such disciplinary action as is necessary to sustain the same."

"I have done all I have done realizing that only the Good Spirit can accomplish what I have been trying to accomplish, namely, a revival of the preciousness and practical value of the truth and the solemnity of ordination vows—and, I may add, the unity of the Church."

**General Assembly**

The 1934 General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church met at Montreat, N. C. In spite of a sustained effort to take the Southern Church back into the Federal Council of Churches this move was defeated almost two to one. An able paper by Dr. Henry Woods was a strong factor in this action. The Assembly set up a Committee on Social Questions with Dr. S. R. Oglesby as chairman. The proposal to decrease the number of seminaries was defeated. Assembly declined to take action as requested by Dr. W. M. McPheeters and a number of presbyteries in the case of Arkansas Presbytery.

"I took no part in the organization of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, nor am I now in any way connected with that board. Nevertheless, I regard the action of the General Assembly concerning this board and its members as a sad and lamentable thing, and a very serious invasion of Presbyterian liberty. The attempt to outlaw consecrated and faithful ministers and laymen who have had a part in the establishment of the Independent Board will only hurt the cause of the General Assembly's board in our Church. It looks as if there were those in the Church who wanted the Gospel preached to the heathen, but only under the auspices of our General Assembly. In spite of the emphasis laid upon the technicalities of our Constitution, this is only another victory for Modernism. The first stage in Modernism is an attack upon doctrine. After that comes the attack upon those who uphold and defend the doctrine of the Church."—(Clarence Edward Macartney, D.D., LL.D., Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., Moderator of the 136th General Assembly.)

**Substantial Additions**

The Central Presbyterian Church of An-niston led North Alabama Presbytery in the number of additions received last year, reporting 77. In the first two months of the present year this number has been further increased so that the record for fourteen months is at least a hundred, about seventy per cent. of these are on profession of faith, most of them adults. The Rev. J. E. Stouffer is the busy and beloved pastor of this aggressive congregation. DECATUR, GA.

**Japan Letter**

*By the Rev. Lardner W. Moore*

THE Church of Christ in Japan suffered a great loss in the death, on April 3rd, of the Rev. Takataro Takakura, President

of the Seminary of Japan and pastor of the ShinanoCho Presbyterian Church. Though he had been in ill health for over a year, his death came as a surprise to all. Mr. Takakura was best known as an ardent student and the ranking Japanese scholar in the Reformed Theology. It was his ambition to raise the Japanese Church in faith, piety and scholarship to the level of the Church in Europe and America. Though a close student of the Crisis Theology, he still felt that it could not be applied as such to the Church in Japan. The impression left on his students was that as those who specialize in the sciences spend the nights as well as the days in study so those who would master Theology should not scorn sound scholarship, he himself setting the example. But with his study he carried the practical labors of pastor of the ShinanoCho Church which was organized around him and was to be a model church in the heart of the great metropolis of Tokyo.

The unrest existing in the Higashi Honganji sect of Buddhism was brought to a crisis recently when Mrs. Motoko Mori, daughter of a former chief abbot of the temple in Kyoto and wife of a member of the firm of Mitsui, announced that she had renounced the religion of her fathers and intended to seek peace in the Christian religion. Her statement to the press was to the effect that a religion which could not settle the differences between father and son could not be a source of inspiration to its 5 million adherents. The reference, of course, was to the violent attempt made by the abbot, her father, to break into the ceremony in which the son was being installed chief abbot. How far Mrs. Mori will go in seeking peace through Christianity remains to be seen, but certainly she has turned her back on the ancient religion, and that publicly.

Those who know the hold the Imperial family has on the minds of the Japanese people were interested in the following incident: A lady who had been invited to assist in the training of one of the Imperial princesses stated that she was a Christian and would that make any difference. Her Highness the Empress is reported to have answered that it was because she was a Christian that she had been chosen for that particular service.

When the whole world is ringing with the cries of Nationalism of all kinds it is a comfort to turn to a little paper, "The Cross," published by the Rev. Ryoum Kamegai, a former Buddhist priest, and his plea to his countrymen that they turn from Militarism and Nationalism and look to the true God, the Father of all, thus making all men brothers. Mr. Kamegai has gone back to his old home where his younger brother is the leading priest and is preaching the Gospel to his own people. TOYAHASHI, JAPAN

**IN THIS ISSUE:**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| On Dealing with Dissenting Minorities ..... | 36 |
| OSWALD T. ALLIS                             |    |
| The 146th General Assembly .....            | 37 |
| Sunday School Lessons .....                 | 50 |
| OSWALD T. ALLIS                             |    |
| The Comfort of the Scriptures .....         | 52 |
| DAVID FREEMAN                               |    |
| News of the Church .....                    | 53 |