

F. S. DYRNES
MAY 1935-R
R 2
QUARRYVILLE PA
14950

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.

AUGUST, 1934

Vol. 5

No. 3

\$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

UNITED PRESBYTERIANS REJECT MERGER

IT SHOULD be a source of satisfaction to all intelligent and informed Presbyterians that the Plan of Union proposed by the Joint Committee on Organic Union has failed. The consummation of this union, as we have consistently maintained, would not have been for the best interest of either of these churches. It would not have been for the best interest of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. because it would have been obtained at the cost of a serious lowering of its doctrinal standards and under conditions that would have made further revision in the direction of Modernism relatively easy. It would not have been for the best interest of the United Presbyterian Church because it would have resulted in a church which on the whole is seemingly soundly evangelical in a Reformed sense—despite the reduced and in some respects erroneous creed which—we are at a loss to know why—it adopted a few years ago, being swallowed up by a church which, whatever may be true of many of the rank and file of its ministers and members, is dominated and controlled by a modernist-indifferentist group that is not only hostile to or indifferent to the system of doctrine taught in the Bible and in the Westminster Standards, but which is seeking to wrest from its members as a whole their constitutional and Christian liberties. CHRISTIANITY TODAY is the only paper in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. that has opposed the plan of union proposed by the Joint Committee. While it seemed a foregone conclusion that it would receive the endorsement of our General Assembly, we have all along thought it likely that the United Presbyterian Assembly would reject it. Our already high opinion of the United Presbyterians has thereby been increased.

The vote in the United Presbyterian Assembly was 113 for and 123 against with a two-thirds vote required for approval. It has been repeatedly alleged in the press that the vote against the merger in our Assembly was only twenty. That is unquestionably a misrepresentation. It is more accurate to say that approximately one hundred voted against it with a considerable number not voting because it was obvious that the opposition was hopelessly outvoted. But even if the vote against it had been less than twenty, it would still be true that this was one of the many cases in which the minority has been right and the majority wrong.

The United Presbyterians dismissed their Committee on Organic Union. It would seem to be high time for the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. to do likewise. The department on Church Cooperation and Union should be abolished or at least have its personnel changed and its functions modified. It certainly has proved itself an expensive as well as an inefficient department. The abolishment of this department would not mean

that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is averse to union with other churches. It would be much better, it seems to us, to appoint special committees to consider particular proposals of union rather than have a standing department. Such a department feels that it must do something to justify its existence and so is under constant pressure to promote mergers even where there is no real demand for them on the part of the rank and file of the churches concerned.

"GOD GETS SECOND PLACE"

UNDER the above title *Church Management* for July contains the following editorial comment on the last General Assembly:

"If you like family fights you should have been at the meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. which recently met in Cleveland. A fundamentalist group headed by PROF. J. GRESHAM MACHEN, believing that the foreign board has grown modernist, has organized its own board of foreign missions. This the church fathers agreed is all wrong. So they served notice, in no indifferent way, that every minister and officer in affiliation with the new board must withdraw. If they failed to do so in ninety days they must stand trial before their respective presbyteries.

"The little group fought back, appealing that it had an obligation to God and conscience which must come ahead of the ruling of the Assembly. But it was overruled. The Presbyterian Church is a constitutional body. The right of conscience can be granted only so far as it does not interfere with the law of the church.

"Several days later the same assembly debated war. But what a difference? Now it held that 'Christians owe an allegiance to the Kingdom of God superior to loyalty to their own country.'

"So as far as this assembly is concerned it appears that the Presbyterian Church comes first, God and conscience next, while the nation must take third place."

The editorial we have just cited contains about the most illuminating press comment on the last General Assembly that we have noted. Most of these comments are suggestive of many if not most present-day sermons. Just as one might listen indefinitely to these sermons without obtaining any real understanding of what Christianity is or the purpose for which it was established—even those that do not give a positively false conception of the nature and purpose of the Christian religion—so these comments even when not positively misleading (as many of them are) are strangely blind to the significance of what took place at Cleveland. Here, however, is an editorial that has been written with insight and understanding. We are glad to be able to pass it on to our readers.

The Reformed or Calvinistic faith which is taught in our standards stresses the sovereignty of God. The God-concept occupies a place in the Reformed or Calvinistic faith that it does not occupy in any other. "The Calvinist in a word," to cite the late DR. WARFIELD, "is the man who sees God; he has caught sight of the ineffable Vision, and he will not let it fade from his eyes. God in nature, God in history, God in grace; everywhere he sees God in his mighty stepping, everywhere he feels the working of his mighty arm, the throbbing of his mighty heart." And yet the last General Assembly assigned God to second place, ascribed to His sovereign Word a place secondary to its own deliverances!

The General Assembly was, of course, right when it declared that "Christians owe an allegiance to the Kingdom of God superior to loyalty to their own country." It was, however, dead wrong when it affirmed or implied that Presbyterians owe an allegiance to the General Assembly superior to that which they owe to God. The General Assembly to the contrary notwithstanding, "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."

THE AUTHORITY OF THE STATED CLERK

AN AMAZING development within the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is the assumption of authority by the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly as indicated, for instance, by the letters he has recently written to presbyteries and at least one synod (see report of Synod of Pennsylvania in this issue) instructing the former as to what action they should take in the licensing of students and the latter as to what action it should take relative to the complaint against the action of the Presbytery of Philadelphia in admitting DR. MACHEN to its membership. And this notwithstanding the fact that his status, according to the Constitution of the Church, is merely that of a clerk with no more authority to interpret either the Constitution of the Church or Assembly deliverances—still less to tell presbyteries and synods their duties—than any other minister or elder in the Church. The words of Shakespeare seem applicable: "Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed, that he has grown so great?"

What is even more amazing, perhaps, is the complacency with which this assumption of authority (or at least of superior wisdom) is accepted by many. *The Presbyterian* (June 28th) in referring to the question whether the action of the last Assembly relative to the Independent Board denied the right of the individual Presbyterian to exercise liberty in the matter of gifts thinks it sufficient to say: "We heard the stated clerk of the General Assembly state very positively (if memory serves us aright) that nothing in the action of the Assembly at Cleveland had anything whatever to do with the right of every individual to do what he or she liked with benevolent gifts."—as if the *ipse dixit* of the stated clerk settled the matter.

The editor of *The Presbyterian* does not state positively that the stated clerk made this assertion; but whether he did or not it must be obvious to every person who takes the trouble to read the resolutions adopted by the Assembly at Cleveland, relative to the Independent Board for Foreign Missions, that, according to these resolutions, the only liberty the individual Presbyterian has is to give through the official Boards and agencies of the Church. The resolutions recognize that the Presbyterian Church is a voluntary organization and that no one is bound to remain in its fellowship, and so to that extent admits the right of the individual to do as he or she likes in the matter of gifts. But it is perfectly clear, whatever the stated clerk or any one else may say about the matter, that, according to the action of the last Assembly, the individual is denied the right to give save through the official Boards and agencies as long as he or she continues a member of the Presbyterian Church.

Not only are we told that "it is the definite obligation and the sacred duty of each individual who is affiliated with any of its churches or judicatories to support these Boards and agencies *to the utmost of his ability*," but we are told that "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." We submit that the words italicized leave no room for the individual Presbyterian to make benevolent gifts to boards or agencies not approved by the General Assembly. If the action of the last Assembly is binding (we do not think it is), it is the *sacred* duty of every individual to contribute to the official Boards and agencies of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. *to the utmost of his ability*—or withdraw.

A BLEND OF MODERNISM AND FUNDAMENTALISM

UNDER the title of "Beyond Fundamentalism and Modernism," DR. GEORGE W. RICHARDS, president of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church at Lancaster, Pa., has written and CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS has printed a book that seeks to indicate "the catholic and constant gospel in the Bible that we may have an evangel for the world of today." In harmony with this aim and purpose, it has as its sub-title, "The Gospel of God" and is submitted "to the reader in the hope that it may help him to turn for life and light from the darkness, despair, and disillusion which beset him on every side to the word of the living God spoken and written in the language of mortal men, which is God's way of entering into human hearts, transforming lives, and making a new world."

We wish we could say that the contents of this book are such that, in our judgment, DR. RICHARDS' version of the gospel of God is the version that the world of today needs. We are glad to be able to say that it is not as bad as some modern versions. It is not consistently modernistic and so is not anti-Christian throughout. It recognizes that salvation is from God. "The benefits of the gospel are *freely given* to men; for they could not of their own efforts attain them, or by their merits deserve them, or in any way remunerate God for them." (p. 19). But while it stresses some of the characteristics of the gospel as it is set forth in the Bible and as it has been proclaimed throughout the ages yet it either denies or ignores so many other characteristics of this gospel that at the best it is a reduced gospel and at the worst "another gospel which is not another." We fear it is fitted to deepen the "darkness, despair and disillusion" which beset men on every side today rather than lead them into the "light and life" that is the portion of those who embrace the full-orbed gospel of the grace of God.

It would take an extended review to deal at all adequately with this book. All we are seeking to do is to indicate the impression it has made upon us. That it is fitted to grieve the hearts of those whom the Lord hath not made sad is indicated among other things by its attitude toward the Bible. DR. RICHARDS is far from recognizing the Bible as the infallible Word of God. "There is much in the Bible," he writes, "that is neither 'good news,' nor reliable science, history, ethics, or theology" (p. 165). What is even worse, if anything, is his attitude toward the historical element in the Bible. "The gospel," he writes, "is revelation *in* history, but the gospel cannot be discovered in the processes of history. There is historical data in the Bible, but, strictly speaking, as ministers of Christ and messengers of glad tidings we have no more interest in the history of the Israelites and of the Jews than in the history of the Greeks and Romans" (p. 135). It is true, as DR. RICHARDS maintains, that the gospel is an act of God in behalf of man that includes the declaration of a purpose, a promise and an imperative, each

addressed by God to man (p. 3) but it also includes acts of God that are historical in the strictest sense of the word. There is a pseudo-disjunctive in his statement: "This is not history; this is gospel" (p. 145). Apart from history there is no gospel for the gospel is dependent on events that happened in space and time. A minister who has no more interest in what happened in Palestine some 1900 years ago than he has in what happened in Greece and Rome of the same period is hardly a preacher of the Christian gospel.

This book contains an essentially Barthian version of the gospel. But while Barthianism is much to be preferred to Modernism, it is a far from adequate version of Christianity. We think the book would have been more accurately named if it had been called "A Blend of Modernism and Fundamentalism"—a blend, however, in which Modernism rather than Fundamentalism is the predominant element.

FAITH AND SALVATION

IT IS the constant teaching of Scripture that faith and salvation are inseparably connected. Paul speaks not only for himself but for all the Biblical writers when he says: "By grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works that no man should glory." It is of first importance, therefore, that the church be clear in its teaching as to the nature and function of faith. There is no point at which error is more dangerous to the soul's welfare for time and eternity and so no point at which obscurity and ambiguity are more deplorable. Hence it should be a matter of deep concern that much of the teaching in our churches leaves its hearers in ignorance or uncertainty as to the faith that saves. It is to be feared that some of these teachers are themselves strangers to this faith, but even those who have experienced its power frequently refer to it in ways that are more obscuring than illuminating.

Much of this obscurity and ambiguity is due to a failure to distinguish sharply between "saving faith" and "faith in general." There can be no clear understanding as to how or why faith saves where this distinction is ignored. The Scriptures never tell us that "faith in general" saves. What they tell us is that faith in Jesus saves. We may believe a thousand and one things, but unless faith in Jesus is included we lack the faith that saves. This means that faith as a state of mind or as an attitude of soul has saving significance only as its object is Jesus—not, of course, any object that men may designate by the name of Jesus but the object that is so designated in Scripture. That such is the case is due to the fact that this Jesus and this Jesus alone is the one object that is possessed of the ability to save from the guilt and power of sin. As DR. WARFIELD put it: "It is not faith that saves, but faith in Jesus Christ; faith in any other saviour, or in this or that philosophy or human conceit (Col. 2:16,18; I Tim. 4:1), or in any other gospel than Jesus Christ and him as crucified (Gal. 1:8,9) brings not salvation but a curse. It is not, strictly speaking, even faith in Christ that saves but Christ that saves through faith. The saving power resides exclusively not in the act of faith or the attitude of faith or the nature of faith, but in the object of faith" (Biblical Doctrines, p. 504).

If "faith in general" saved, all men would be saved. And that because all men exercise "faith in general." The difference between the Christian and the non-Christian is not that one believes while the other does not. All men are believers—the atheist as truly as the Christian. Faith, in fact, underlies all our mental processes to such an extent that it is literally true that "he who believes nothing knows nothing." This means that it is only when we concern ourselves with *what* men believe that we deal with that which distinguishes the Christian from the non-Christian. More particularly it is only when we direct attention to the fact that the Christian has faith in Jesus Christ

while the non-Christian does not that we direct attention to that which distinguishes the one from the other.

The Scriptures give one answer and one answer only to the question, What must I do to be saved? That answer is: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." This answer is rooted in the conviction that the Lord Jesus Christ is a living reality who, by virtue of what He did and suffered on earth, is able to save and does save all those who believe *on* Him—not believe *like* Him as the Modernists teach but believe *on* Him. If to exercise "saving faith" meant to have faith *like* Jesus, it would have to be confessed that Jesus himself exercised "saving faith." This in turn would involve the thought that Jesus himself was a sinner. The line of distinction between the Saviour and the saved must not be erased. If Jesus himself had needed to be saved, He would not be qualified to save others.

Faith saves when, and only when, it has Jesus as its object. The saving power of faith is not in itself but in the almighty Saviour on whom it rests. The matter is so important that an illustration may not be out of place. Suppose yourself in a burning building from which there is no way of escape save across a ladder that has been extended from an adjoining building. In order that you might escape, two things would be absolutely essential: (1) the ladder would have to be strong enough to sustain your weight; and (2) you would have to have sufficient confidence in its strength to lead you to attempt to cross over it. The strength of the ladder would be the thing of primary importance. No matter how strong it looked, no matter how firm your faith in its strength, if, as a matter of fact, it was not strong enough to sustain your weight it would not enable you to reach a place of safety. But assuming that the ladder is sufficiently strong, that fact would profit you nothing unless you have sufficient confidence in its strength to lead you to cross over it. It would not be necessary for you to be fully persuaded that it was strong enough to support your weight; you would only need to be sufficiently persuaded to lead you to cross it. You might have many misgivings, you might be filled with fear, but that would not prevent your getting to a place of safety. So in the matter of salvation. The thing of primary importance is Christ's ability to save. Faith in Christ is the only faith that saves because He alone is able to save those who put their faith in Him, even though their faith be weak and wavering. Because the effects of "saving faith" are wrought by Christ, it is the presence of such faith rather than its strength that is the essential thing. He is able to save and does save all those who put their faith in Him even though their faith be weak and wavering. A weak and wavering faith argues an inadequate knowledge of the character and power of Him in whom we have put our faith—a defect that should be remedied.

RELATIVE TO THE INDEPENDENT BOARD

THE Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions while established to promote Presbyterianism in foreign fields is, as its name implies (or rather asserts), free of ecclesiastical affiliations. As such it is no more subject to control by the courts of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. than by the courts of the United Presbyterian or the Southern Presbyterian Church. The fact that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is the largest Presbyterian Church does not give it a proprietary right over the word "Presbyterian." Hence the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. has no more right to take action against the Independent Board for Foreign Missions than has any other General Assembly. It ought to be clear to all that no law of the Church was violated when this Independent Board was established and hence that the action of the Cleveland Assembly in regard to it was as unconstitutional as it was unjust and un-Christian.

CHRISTIANITY TODAY sustains no official relation to the Independent Board. It is true that its managing editor is one of its members but he holds this position as an individual, not as a

representative of this paper. Moreover while its managing editor is a very important factor in the production and publication of this paper, the responsibility for its contents rests wholly upon its editor.

Westminster Seminary also sustains no official relation to the Independent Board. It is true that two members of its Faculty and five members of its Board of Trustees are members of the Independent Board, but six members of its Faculty and twenty-six members of its Board of Trustees are *not* members of the new Board. What is more, the Independent Board has not sought or obtained any sort of approval or indorsement on the part of Westminster Seminary. Some of the representatives of Westminster Seminary approve and some disapprove the Independent Board but how many approve and how many disapprove no one, as far as we know, has attempted to discover. "The two institutions," to cite the President of Westminster's Board of Trustees, "are as distinct and separate as they can be." Approval of Westminster Seminary does not necessarily involve approval of the Independent Board or *vice versa*. To speak as though the interests of these organizations are identical is sheer misrepresentation.

The question whether the organization of the Independent Board was wise or unwise is relatively unimportant compared with the questions which have been raised by the action of the last Assembly together with the actions of certain presbyteries in refusing to license or ordain men, otherwise admittedly well qualified, because of their refusal to pledge themselves to support whatever agencies may be sanctioned by the General Assembly whether or no they believe those agencies to be loyal to the Constitution of the Church and the Word of God.

Is the General Assembly the final seat of authority in the Presbyterian Church so that its deliverances are superior to the

Constitution and even to the Word of God? Must Presbyterian ministers pledge themselves to a blind obedience to whatever the shifting majorities of General Assemblies may determine? Must Presbyterians support the official Boards of the Church "to the utmost of their ability" even though they are convinced that these Boards are engaged in Modernistic, *i. e.*, anti-Christian propaganda? Are men to be received into the ministry of the Presbyterian Church who deny and even flout such basic doctrines as the full trustworthiness of the Bible and the deity, atoning death and glorious resurrection of Jesus Christ while men whose only offense is that they refuse to support the official agencies of the Church, save in as far as these agencies are loyal to its Constitution and the Word of God, are excluded? Are men conspicuous for their loyalty to the Bible as the Word of God and for their fidelity to the gospel to be excluded from the Church while Auburn Affirmationists and worse are exalted to positions of honor and influence? Is the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. no longer a Church in which it is acknowledged that God alone is Lord of the conscience and that He 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?

It is the questions just put, and questions such as these, that have been raised by the action of the last Assembly (and of certain presbyteries). We submit that in comparison the question whether the Independent Board is wise or unwise, desirable or undesirable, is relatively unimportant. In opposition to this action all true and loyal Presbyterians, whether they judge the Independent Board wise or unwise, desirable or undesirable, should present a united front for the maintenance of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. as a truly Christian, a truly Protestant and a truly Presbyterian and Reformed Church.

The Synod of Pennsylvania in 1934

A Study in Present Day Presbyterianism

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



ATTENDANCE at the sessions of one of the higher judicatories of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is calculated to raise in the mind the insistent question, What is the primary purpose of these annual gatherings? Is it inspirational and educative? Or are they intended to be deliberative, administrative and judicial in character? For an answer to this question, let us look at the Synod of Pennsylvania recently in session at Washington, Pa.

On Tuesday evening, June 19th, after a brief Devotional Service and the Address of the retiring Moderator, Dr. W. M. Lewis, president of Lafayette College, Synod was "constituted" by prayer. Then came the Roll Call. Answering the Roll Call is the first official act of a commissioner. Only commissioners are *members* of Synod. They are elected for one year; and apparently only the retiring Moderator is ordinarily regarded as eligible for re-election. Hence the Synod of 1934 differed in its personnel almost totally from that of a year ago. What proportion of its commissioners had ever attended Synod before, it would be difficult to say. Synod is in session less than three days, having only five business sessions. If the purpose of Synod is simply to educate its members, this practically complete change in its membership is almost ideal. If it is to secure their mature judgment on the matters pending before Synod, it leaves much to be desired.

As if to offset the defect just alluded to, a very definite element of permanence and continuity is added to this ephemeral body called the Synod by its General Council, Permanent Committee on National Missions, and Trustees. The General Council is made up of twenty-four men: the Moderator, his two nearest predeces-

sors in office, the chairmen of National Missions and Promotion, and one representative from each of the nineteen presbyteries, nominated by their respective presbyteries. The Executive Committee of the Council consists of the three moderators and two other members of the Council, the Stated Clerk serving in an advisory capacity. The Permanent Committee on National Missions consists of 20 men: an executive president and 19 ministers representing the presbyteries of Synod. All the presbyterial representatives serve for three years and are eligible for re-election. But since the Presbyteries elect ministers and elders in alternate years to the General Council, immediate re-election is possible only for members of the Committee on National Missions, all of whom are ministers. This year the Synod re-elected for at least a third term the members of the Committee on National Missions whose term had expired, which means that all six will have served at least nine years on this Committee when their new term is at an end. The Trustees, seven in number, also serve for three years and are eligible for re-election.

The Council is required to meet shortly before Synod and to continue in session during at least part of it. The Committee on National Missions meets "immediately preceding the meeting of Synod." The Trustees must meet at least once annually, prior to the meeting of Synod. Thus it appears that Synod practically consists of two almost distinct bodies. The one body comprises the members or commissioners—they number about 120; they are elected for one year; they are usually new men; *they have the vote*; they are the Synod. The other consists in the main of the Council and the National Missions Committee—they number about 40; they serve for *three* years (sometimes for many

more than that); they meet at practically the same time as Synod; they prepare its docket and reports; they guide and advise and all but direct; but *they have no vote*. A remarkable situation!

The first important act of Synod after Roll Call is to elect a moderator. To many of the commissioners the rival candidates, if there be such, are unknown or little known. Consequently, they have to trust to what they are told by others and much canvassing is often done and many assurances are given by proponents of the rival aspirants. In the Synod the Moderator occupies a more dominating position than in the General Assembly. He appoints all the members of the seven standing committees (a total of 40 men, which is about one-third of Synod!). By serving for three years as one of the five members of the Executive Committee of the General Council he is in a position to influence the policies and acts of the Synod for three years after he has with a stroke of his gavel dissolved the Synod which elected him and over which he has presided for two days and a half. If he is a forceful man or the representative of an influential group, his position is formidable. The successful candidate this year was Dr. B. B. Royer of Franklin, Pa.

The next act of Synod is to approve the "docket." This, as we have seen, is prepared for it by the Executive Committee of the General Council. Several things attract attention. The first is the relatively large amount of time which is given to what is not in the strict sense the "business" of Synod. Synod was in session at Washington only from Tuesday evening to Friday noon. There were consequently three evening, three morning, and two afternoon sessions, a total of not much over 24 working hours. The three evening sessions, except for the time on Tuesday evening devoted to the constituting of Synod and the election of the Moderator, were devotional sessions at which no business was transacted. Besides this the first *hour* of each of the three morning sessions was given to a devotional service and address. The standing rules of Synod provide for a "Devotional Service" and set the time as a "half hour." But for some years, apparently, this has been extended to an hour, the greater part of the time being given to the address. This year the speaker was Dr. Buttrick, the successor of Dr. Henry Sloan Coffin as pastor of the Madison Avenue Church of New York City. One of the evening preachers was Dr. Hindman, pastor of the First Church of Buffalo of which Dr. Buttrick was formerly pastor. The other was Dr. J. Harry Cotton of the Broad Street Church of Columbus, Ohio. How thoroughly the docket of Synod was in the hands of the Modernists is shown by this list of speakers. For certainly the least that could be said of these gentlemen is that not one of them would wish to be classed as conservative. We believe with the Preacher that "there is a time to every purpose under the heavens" and we raise the question whether the primary purpose of Synod is to listen to inspirational addresses, be they liberal or conservative, or to transact the business that has called it together.

In addition to these devotional addresses, with which that of the retiring Moderator properly belongs, there were a number of others of a promotional character. Most of Wednesday and Thursday mornings was given up to such addresses: Dr. Randolph of the Farm School, Asheville, N. C.; Dr. Reid S. Dickson of the Board of Pensions; Dr. W. P. Shell of the Foreign Board and the Rev. A. C. Salley of Brazil; Mrs. Beitler, president of the Woman's Synodical; the Rev. H. C. Weber of the Every Member Canvass; three students and Dr. Covert for the Board of Christian Education; and on Friday morning Dr. Covert again in his capacity as Moderator of the General Assembly. All of these addresses except the last came under the head of "Program." Wednesday and Thursday afternoons there were "Reports." These Reports were already in print in a 39-page pamphlet, which was given to the commissioners when they reached Washington. Yet in the face of protest considerable time was devoted to reading more or less fully from them. It would seem a simple matter to have mailed them to the commissioners a week or two earlier. Had this been done much valu-

able time might have been saved. Especially noteworthy is it that not only were these Reports prepared for Synod by committees of or under the direction of the General Council; they were actually presented to Synod by the chairmen of these committees who themselves presided at the sessions at which their causes were presented, despite the fact that none of them had to be—in fact only two out of seven actually were—commissioners to and so members of the Synod.

Turning again to the docket we notice further that not a word is said anywhere about new business. The only intimation that Synod might want to "start something" is found, if indeed it is intended to appear even there, under the item "Miscellaneous Business." This item appears as one of ten which are to occupy Synod during the last hour of its final session. The docket suggests that anything in the nature of new business is an intrusion which will not be welcomed by the chair unless absolutely necessary.

The question of the docket has an important bearing upon what will probably prove to have been the most important business of the Synod of 1934. This Synod had a judicial function to perform: "complaints" from several presbyteries were to come before it. The Synod has a Standing Committee on Judicial Business with seven members, *all* of whom are appointed by the Moderator. These appointments are announced at the beginning of the first morning session and papers of a judicial nature in the hands of the Stated Clerk are on motion referred to it. But no place on the docket is assigned this committee. This makes it look as if the reports of this important committee were an intrusion on the regular business of Synod.

The Committee on Judicial Business made its first report early in the afternoon session of Wednesday. It recommended the setting up of a Judicial Commission and the transmitting to said Commission of the complaint against the licensure of W. T. Jackson by Chester Presbytery, the reason for the complaint being the inadequate academic preparation of Mr. Jackson. The motion was then made that "the Moderator nominate and the Synod elect" such a commission. Objection was made to the motion that the Moderator nominate the Commission on the ground that this would not constitute an "election" in the meaning of Chap. XIII, Sec. 1, of the *Book of Discipline*, since any nominations from the floor would be at a hopeless disadvantage as over against the Moderator's slate. But the motion to amend by striking out the words "the Moderator nominate" was voted down. The Moderator read the list of his nominees and put the vote without asking if there were any further nominations. The election, consequently, amounted merely to the *approval* of the Moderator's choice. Consequently the Committee on Judicial Business was actually appointed, the Judicial Commission was practically appointed by the Moderator.

The result of this method of constituting these important bodies is interesting. Membership on the Committee and Commission was distributed among the presbyteries as follows:

Presbytery	Committee on Judicial Business	Judicial Commission
Pittsburgh	2	2
Carlisle	1	2
Kitanning	2	1
Erie	0	2
Clarion	1	1
Donegal	1	1
Huntingdon	0	1
Lehigh	0	1

There are 19 presbyteries in the Synod. Pittsburgh, the presbytery of the Permanent Clerk, had four representatives; Carlisle, the presbytery of the Stated Clerk, had three; Erie, the presbytery of the Moderator, had two. In other words, the three presbyteries of which the chief officers of Synod were members had a majority on the Commission and three out of seven on the Committee. Eleven presbyteries were not represented at all. Of these eleven, four (Chester, Lackawanna, Northumberland, and Philadelphia) had judicial business to be adjudicated by Synod and were properly not represented on the Committee or

Commission. But why were Beaver, Blairsville, Butler, Philadelphia North, Redstone, Shenango, and Washington thus completely ignored?

About two hours later the Committee on Judicial Business made a further report. It recommended that action upon the complaint against the reception of Dr. Machen into Philadelphia Presbytery be "held by the Synod of Pennsylvania until the next regular meeting of Synod." In connection with the offering of this recommendation a letter from the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly to the Stated Clerk of Synod was read by the latter who explained that he had thought it wise to secure the advice of the former in view of the "difficult situation" now confronting Synod. Since when, we may well ask, has the great Synod of Pennsylvania ceased to be competent to conduct its own business on its own initiative and responsibility? The full text of the letter is as follows:

June 11, 1934.

Rev. Glenn M. Shafer, D.D.,
243 S. Hanover St.,
Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

Dear Dr. Shafer:

There does not seem to be any "difficult situation facing the Synod of Pennsylvania in its consideration of the complaint against the action of the Presbytery of Philadelphia in admitting Dr. Machen to membership." On the contrary the answers to the three questions which you present in your letter of June 8th indicate clearly what the action of the Synod of Pennsylvania should be.

1. Dr. Machen now belongs to the Presbytery of New Brunswick and will be so reported in the forthcoming Minutes of the General Assembly. Chapter II, Section 3, of the new Book of Discipline, states that "a minister dismissed from a Presbytery shall be subject to its jurisdiction until he actually becomes a member of another Presbytery." Since the complaint against the action of the Presbytery of Philadelphia was signed by more than one-third of the members of the body present when the action was taken the reception of Dr. Machen into the Presbytery was automatically held up and he has not as yet, in the language of the above quotation of the Book of Discipline actually become a member of the Presbytery of Philadelphia.

2. As Dr. Machen's membership is still in the Presbytery of New Brunswick it is necessary for me, in accordance with the instructions of the last General Assembly, to send a communication to that body instructing it to take up the matter of Dr. Machen's relationship to the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. This communication will be sent within the next few days and will, therefore, be in the hands of the Presbytery of New Brunswick before the convening of the Synod of Pennsylvania at Washington, Penna. As this communication is authorized by the supreme judicatory of the Church, namely, the General Assembly, it must take precedence over all other matters in the Church which may affect Dr. Machen's ecclesiastical status.

3. Since Dr. Machen is now under the jurisdiction of New Brunswick Presbytery and that body has been directed by the General Assembly to take up certain matters with reference to his relationship to the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, any attempt on the part of the Synod of Pennsylvania to adjudicate at its meeting in Washington, Penna., the complaint already before it would affect Dr. Machen's relationship and thereby interfere with an action already begun between the General Assembly and the Presbytery of New Brunswick. Under such circumstances it would seem to me that the logical thing for the Synod to do would be to hold the complaint pending the action of New Brunswick Presbytery. This could be done very easily on the recommendation of the Committee on Judicial Business without having the complaint placed in the hands of a Judicial Commission.

If there is any further information you desire upon this matter do not hesitate to write me immediately. With warm personal regards and the earnest hope that you may have a very fine meeting of the Synod, believe me

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) Lewis S. Mudge,
Stated Clerk.

It is not necessary to discuss this letter in detail. The most significant thing about it is the phrase "it seems to me" which occurs toward the end of the fourth paragraph. Dr. Mudge had no authority from the Assembly to instruct Synod. He wrote purely on his own authority at the invitation of Dr. Shafer. Furthermore Dr. Mudge's presentation of the facts is not convincing.

The direction of the Assembly to which he refers reads as follows:

"That all 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."

The direction, it will be observed, is intentionally indefinite. No individual is named: no Presbytery is designated. If it be granted that owing to the complaint Dr. Machen is still in New Brunswick Presbytery, the dismissal of the complaint would make him a member of Philadelphia Presbytery. The result would then be simply this: New Brunswick Presbytery would report to Dr. Mudge that Dr. Machen was no longer subject to its jurisdiction, and Philadelphia Presbytery would have one more member (eight instead of seven) of the Independent Board to whom the Assembly's mandate would be applicable. What is there difficult about that? A letter from the Stated Clerk of New Brunswick Presbytery stating the facts would be all that would be needed. Why should New Brunswick Presbytery be obliged to go to all the trouble to make a special case of Dr. Machen when Philadelphia Presbytery could simply add him to its already sizable group of offenders?

The object of the reading of this letter was clearly to give the impression that the recommendation of the Committee on Judicial Business was in accord with the recent action of the General Assembly, as interpreted by its Stated Clerk, and that any other action on the part of Synod than acquiescence would be discourteous to or defiant of the highest judicatory of the Church. In short, it constituted the introduction of *ex parte* testimony for the purpose of influencing the decision of Synod. Nevertheless the recommendation was vigorously debated. It was pointed out that it was unjust to deprive Dr. Machen of his rights as a Presbyterian minister for a year. (Until this case is decided Dr. Machen can vote and deliberate neither in New Brunswick nor in Philadelphia Presbytery.) It was further pointed out that, if any question of courtesy is involved, it should be remembered that New Brunswick Presbytery dismissed Dr. Machen to the Presbytery of Philadelphia with a letter stating that he was "in good and regular standing" and that the majority of Philadelphia Presbytery voted to receive him on the basis of that certificate. It was discourteous of the minority in Philadelphia Presbytery to contest its action in receiving Dr. Machen. It would be discourteous of Synod to refuse the majority of that Presbytery an opportunity to secure vindication through a hearing and decision by the Judicial Commission. It was pointed out that the deciding of the case by Synod would in no wise interfere with the mandate of the Assembly regarding the members on the Independent Board. If the complaint were dismissed Dr. Machen could be reached with several of his colleagues in Philadelphia Presbytery. If the complaint were sustained, he could be tried by himself in New Brunswick. In either event, if appeal were made, the matter would go to the General Assembly; but, at least, Synod would have done its duty. It was even pointed out by more than one plain spoken commissioner that the reason for the great desire of some to keep Dr. Machen in New Brunswick Presbytery was that it would be easier to convict him there than in Philadelphia. One youthful commissioner even ventured the remark that Dr. Machen ought to be glad to stand trial in New Brunswick Presbytery, because were he cleared there, it would be all the greater vindication. We commend this new principle of justice to our civil courts; the place to try a man is where his chances for a favorable verdict are of the slightest. Finally it was voted to refer the case back to the Committee on Judicial Business to be reconsidered.

Thursday morning a further report of the Committee on Judicial Business was made the "order of the day" for 2 o'clock. Probably the expectation of many was that the debate on the

Machen case would be resumed. If so, they were doomed to disappointment. The Committee repeated its recommendation that action be delayed for a year. The Moderator took it upon himself to inform the Synod that, in his opinion, it had debated the question long enough the previous afternoon (an hour, at most!), which, of course, was equivalent to saying that they should accept the recommendation of *his* Committee. A commissioner from Philadelphia, one of its two commissioners who were among the complainants against its action in receiving Dr. Machen (twelve were in favor of that action), moved the "previous question" which is undebatable and so discussion of the recommendation was shut off. The motion was put and carried by a vote of somewhat more than two to one. After this wise the Synod of 1934 washed its hands of one of the most important matters that came before it, and was ready to listen to more reports and addresses.

Later that afternoon an overture was introduced dealing with the Board of Foreign Missions. It was referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, considered by them, modified slightly with consent of the mover and reported to Synod in the following form:

Recognizing that there is a widespread conviction that the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is tolerating and even fostering activities not in harmony with the doctrinal standards of our beloved Church, the Synod of Pennsylvania in session at Washington, Pa., respectfully overtures the 147th General Assembly to take such steps as are necessary to remedy the situation in order that the Assembly's Board of Foreign Missions may ask and receive the united, loyal and enthusiastic support of all who believe in the great cause of truly Biblical and Presbyterian Foreign Missions."

The unanimous recommendation of the Committee was "no action." And this recommendation was approved by a large vote.

The treatment of this overture is significant. There are many who, in private, are willing to admit that all is not well with the Board of Foreign Missions, there are even those who hold that a house-cleaning is needed; but when it comes to doing anything they prefer to keep silence or denounce the Independent Board. Yet it is as plain as day that the most effectual way to put the new Board out of commission would be to remedy the situation that brought it into being, Modernism in the Assembly's Board.

On Friday morning the Judicial Commission announced its judgments upon four cases that had been referred to it. The most important of them had to do with the complaint against the licensing of two Westminster Seminary students by Chester Presbytery. The complaint was based solely on their unwillingness to give unqualified support to the Board of Foreign Missions.

The decision of the Commission was not unanimous, the complaint being sustained by a vote of 6-4. The Commission also dismissed the complaint against the action of Lackawanna Presbytery in outlawing the Independent Board. In both of these cases the Board of Foreign Missions had a direct interest and only in these. It is, therefore, noteworthy that one of the members of this Commission was a foreign missionary serving under the Board of Foreign Missions. The fact that he served on the Commission and voted on these cases was in direct violation of the provision of the *Book of Discipline* (Chap. V, Sec. 2) which expressly declares that no member of a judicial commission shall sit in judgment upon a judicial case "who is personally interested in the issue thereof." If four presbyteries were denied representation on either the Committee or Commission because they were interested in one or more of the cases to be heard, what excuse can be found for the placing of a foreign missionary on the Judicial Commission? He should at least have refrained from sitting and voting on the cases in which the Foreign Board was directly interested. Instead, these were the only ones at which he was reported as present and voting. The especial heinousness of this violation of the law of the Church is shown by the fact that it may have been the decisive factor in the verdict in the Chester Case. For the shift of one vote from the majority to the minority would have resulted in a tie and the complaint, instead of being sustained, would have been dismissed. All of this is stated without intent to question the integrity or impugn the motives of this gentleman for whom the writer personally has a high regard.

The announcing of the judgments of the Judicial Commission, all of which were without debate declared to be the judgments of the judicatory, marked the conclusion of the Synod. Only a little routine business remained and the Synod was adjourned.


Notices of complaint were subsequently filed with the Stated Clerk of Synod against the action of Synod regarding Dr. Machen, against the way in which the Judicial Commission was "elected," and against the judgment of the Commission in sustaining the second of the Chester complaints. These will all come before the Judicial Commission of the General Assembly in 1935.

We have endeavored in the above to show how curiously the Synod is constituted, how thoroughly it is dominated by a non-voting machine, how much time it gives to matters of secondary moment, how little to matters of great importance. The Pennsylvania Synod of 1934 will be longest remembered not for its obedient adoption of the Reports and Recommendations which were submitted for its "O.K.," but for the way in which it dealt or failed to deal with the vital issues which came before it.

The Church Militant, the Church Expectant, and the Church Triumphant

By Lawrence B. Gilmore, Th.D.

Text: "... I will build my church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it" (Matt. 16:18).

EW YORK papers of October 26, 1933, reported an auction of books and manuscripts of Eugene Field's writings. The sale attracted wide interest. Its items included a manuscript copy of Field's famous column "Sharps and Flats" in *The Denver Tribune*, love letters to his wife, and handwritten pages of his much-loved poems, such as "Little Boy Blue" and "A Dutch Lullaby."

One extraordinary item in this auction was a sermon composed by Field at the age of nine. In his childhood years his grandmother, a pious Vermont woman, was in the habit of paying him ten cents a sermon. This sermon, written in a wavering, childish script, begins with the sage remark:

"The life of a Christian is often compared to a race that is hard and to a battle in which a man must fight hard to win. These comparisons have prevented many from becoming Christians."

Our Saviour and His Apostles certainly do teach us that Christians as individuals and as a Church must expect hardship and conflict. Our Lord's words in our text, stating that the gates of Hades should not prevail against His Church, indicate that He expected His Church to be bitterly and perilously opposed. But He confidently predicts that neither the forces of dissolution and death, nor the machinations of Satan and his allies, will be able to conquer the Church.

Our Lord here appears to be thinking of the Church as a building His enemies cannot wreck, or a fortress they can-

not destroy. The Apostles, therefore, in using military language to describe the Church's conflict with evil, only carry on and further elaborate the Saviour's teaching.

St. Paul especially draws from military life figures of speech illustrating the Christian's attitudes and activities. He urges the Thessalonians to put on the breastplate of faith and love, and to take the hope of salvation as a helmet (I Thessalonians 5:8). He supports his right to subsist at the expense of the Church by asking if men would engage in military service at their own expense (I Corinthians 9:7). He refers to his spiritual and disciplinary powers in the Church in terms of one holding a military command and putting down a mutiny (II Corinthians 10:3-6). He mentions his weapons of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, that is, the sword for attack and the shield for defence (II Corinthians 6:7). Epaphroditus and Archippus he terms his fellow-soldiers (Philippians 2:25; Philemon 2). In Ephesians 6:12-18 he gives a detailed description of the offensive and defensive armor of a soldier, and elaborates the parallel between military battles and the Christian's struggles against evil angelic powers. In the Pastoral Epistles we find St. Paul urging Timothy to war a good warfare (I Timothy 1:18), and to bear hardship as a good soldier of Jesus Christ, remembering that no one going on military service gets entangled in the affairs of civil life, for his aim is to please the commander who enrolled him (II Timothy 2:3, 4). We must notice that St. Paul, as if aware that his words might be misunderstood, twice reminds his readers that he refers not to earthly but to heavenly warfare (II Corinthians 10:3-6; Ephesians 6:12).

In Hebrews 2:10, where Christ is called the captain of our salvation, the term means leader or pioneer, but in the Apocalypse He is clearly represented as a warrior overcoming all His enemies (6:2, 19:11). In a tremendous conflict He will conquer the Beast and the kings of the earth (16:13-16; 19:11-21).

It is natural that St. Paul's descriptions of Christian soldiers and St. John's picture of the Conquering Christ should become fused in the minds of believers into a conception of the Church Militant led by her Victorious Redeemer.

Accordingly Clement of Rome writes to the Corinthians about 96 A. D.: "Let us render service, then, brothers, as strenuously as we can under His faultless orders. Let us consider those who serve our governors, in what an orderly, obedient, and submissive way they carry out their instructions. For all are not prefects or tribunes or centurions or captains of fifty and so on; but each in his own rank performs what is ordered by the Emperor and the governors. The great cannot exist without the lower, nor the lower without the great." In the same strain, Ignatius of Antioch, writing about 110-115 A. D., says: "Please Him whom ye serve, and from whom ye receive wages. Let no one of you be found to be a deserter" (*Epistle to Polycarp*).

As time goes on Christian writers frequently employ this imagery, especially in the third century, when the Church suffered widespread and intense persecution. Christians are spoken of as Christ's soldiers. He is their general. The Church is His camp. Baptism is the *sacramentum*, or sol-

dier's oath. Heretics and schismatics are rebels and deserters. The true Christian will fight to the end, even to martyrdom. As the tide of battle goes this way and that, the Christian writers speak of frightening and conquering the persecuting powers.

The Church did conquer. The persecutions failed. But victory brought dangers more perilous than persecution. Through the centuries the Church continued her warfare with only partial success. But her warfare continued, and so on earth she is called the Church Militant.

Of this term H. B. Swete says in his book *The Holy Catholic Church*, 1915, p. 138: "The visible Church is 'militant here on earth.' This phrase, which was added in 1552 to the bidding of prayer 'for the whole state of Christ's Church,' is not peculiar to the second Book of Common Prayer. It occurs in pre-Reformation documents from the fourteenth century onwards (Sendamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 406 f.), and it is used in the Roman Catechism [1566], which says: 'The Church militant is the society of the faithful still living on earth, and is called "militant" because she wages perpetual warfare with those implacable enemies, the world, the flesh, and the devil' (*Catechismus Romanus*, I. x. 5. Cf. Ambrose, *de mysteriis*, 2)."

Following Dr. Swete, we may distinguish the Church Militant believers here on earth; the Church Expectant, the blessed dead; and the Church Triumphant, the Church in the eternal state.

Medieval theologians confused the doctrine of the Church Expectant with the idea of purgatory. This confusion continues even in Wyclif (1320-1384), who defines the Church thus: "The congregation of all the predestined, which contains the three in itself: part triumphant in heaven; part sleeping in purgatory; and part warring on earth" (*De ecclesia*, I. p. 8, 4 ff). John Huss (d. 1415) in his treatise on the Church has a similar definition.

The Romish theologians restrict the true Church Militant to the Roman Catholic Church, but Huss has the courage to say that the Pope is not even the head of the Church Militant, nor is it necessary to have one head in order to preserve the Church Militant. Huss also distinguishes: 1) the community of the elect; 2) the nominal Church; 3) pagans; and 4) elect Christians outside the visible Church. The true Church Militant, therefore, is composed of the elect still on earth.

Let us now go on to view more closely the Church Militant, not only as a society, but as individual Christians in warfare against the world, the flesh, and the devil.

The individual believer wars against the world, conceived of as a hostile power dominated by Satan. "We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in the evil one" (I John 5:19). The world at once lures and oppresses the Christian. Witness how Christian and Faithful in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* are first invited to indulge in the pleasures of Vanity Fair, and then on refusal are persecuted and imprisoned, with Faithful finally burned at the stake. But the believer triumphs. "For whatsoever is begotten of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that hath overcome the world, even our faith. And who is he that over-

cometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God" (I John 5:4, 5).

The Christian soldier wars also against the flesh. St. Paul describes this great inward conflict in Romans the seventh chapter, and states it concisely in Galatians 5:17, where he says: "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; for these are contrary the one to the other; that ye may not do the things that ye would." This is the battle of the remnant of the unregenerate nature, the Old Adam, the selfish and sensual natural self, against the Godward leadings in the Christian soul. Here the battle waxes fierce, and the believer needs God's grace as he seeks to obey the rebuking and heartening word in Hebrews 12:4, "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin."

The believer wars not only against the world with its lure and oppression, and the flesh with its evil tendencies, but also against the devil. "Put on the whole armor of God," St. Paul exhorts, "that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil" (Ephesians 6:11). "Your adversary the devil," St. Peter warns us, "as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour: whom withstand steadfast in your faith" (I Peter 5:8, 9). The terrific onslaught of Apollyon on Christian in *Pilgrim's Progress* is true to Scripture and to Christian experience. Similarly true is Bunyan's other famous allegory, *The Holy War*, in which Mansoul is a town with Ear-gate and Eye-gate, where Diabolus and his army make their attacks, and Mouth-gate, from which the defenders with the help of Immanuel make brave sorties. Here we see how the believer through Christ's all-powerful grace overcomes the devil.

Turning now to view the Church as a society, we see her as ever militant, for in the purpose of God she embodies the conflict of light against darkness, truth against falsehood, righteousness against sin, faith against unbelief. But particularly in our time is the Church at war. Powerful intellectual, social, and political forces attack her from without. Perilous heresies also form a desperate mutiny within. Unbelief in the visible Church, whether called Liberalism, Modernism, or Humanism, imperils the very existence of historic Christianity. Were it not for the sure promise of the Church's Founder, we might well be in doubt as to the outcome of this mutiny.

Concerning the Church's relation to the world, the world in general is a hostile power. "The world hates Christians, because they set themselves against it," says the anonymous Epistle to Diognetus, written in the latter half of the second century. This hostility against the Church was expressed in the persecutions of the first three centuries. The Church conquered the world as embodied in the Roman Empire, but the world retaliated by partly secularizing the Church.

Augustine (354-430 A. D.) in his celebrated work *The City of God* saw in the Church and the world two cities or states, the former of God and heavenly, the latter of the earth, and secular, even devilish. Yet the State needs the moral influence of the Church, and the Church, on the other hand, can hold her property and position only by the consent of the secular power. But the State owes far more to the Church than the Church to the State, and the Christian

State recognises this, and willingly yields to the City of God. Augustine imagined a condition in which the State should ultimately be identified with the Church, fulfilling the vision of St. John, "The Kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ" (Revelation 11:15). The Papacy failed to realize this splendid conception and became secularised by the world.

The passing centuries have shown that the Church opposes the vain pomp and power of the world best by earnestly endeavoring to build the higher order of faith and hope formed of believers united to Christ by faith. When the Church used the arm of flesh, as in the Crusades, failure ensued. Likewise when monks, withdrawn from normal life, called themselves soldiers of Christ, the New Testament idea of Christian warfare was not realized. Not in secular conflict, nor in interfering with the business of life, but in opposing the lure and oppression of the outward order insofar as controlled by Satan, does the Church Militant war effectively against the world.

The opposition of the flesh to the Church is found in selfish and sinful motives lingering in the members of the Church visible. Thus arise compromises with unbelief and worldliness, bringing materialism, humanism, and communism, with a neo-pagan ethic into the organized Church. Humanistic teaching exalts man and neglects God. It over-emphasizes the importance of this world. Intellectually this leads to materialistic natural science and philosophy. Practically it results in brutal self-seeking, money-getting, and pagan sensuality, all in sad contrast to the pure Bible standards. Worldly wisdom and pagan standards welcomed into the organized Church force Bible Christians to fight with all their power to stem this tide of evil, and to restore the Church to real Christian faith and life.

The Church wars also against the devil. He is a deceiver, a liar from the beginning (John 8:44). Dominating the world, he employs its lure and power against the Church. Tempting the flesh, he tries to mislead Christ's followers. Thus he seeks not only to crush the Lord's army from without but also to throw it into mutiny within. The man of the world cares naught for this, but God cares, and watches over the Church.

This brings us now to view the people in the great and ever-increasing society known as the Church Expectant. We see them in two splendid passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Therefore let us also, seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and perfecter of our faith" (12:1, 2). "But ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable hosts of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of a new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel" (12:22-24). These multitudes of believers, like the Penitent Thief, have gone to be immediately with Christ after death

(Concluded on page 70)

Mountains and Why We Love Them

By J. Gresham Machen

[The following paper was read before a group of ministers in Philadelphia, November 27, 1933. It is printed here almost as it was read.]

WHAT right have I to speak about mountain-climbing? The answer is very simple. I have none whatever. I have, indeed, been in the Alps four times. The first time I got up Monte Rosa, the second highest of the Alps, and one or two others of the easier Zermatt peaks. On my second visit I had some glorious days in the Grossglockner group and on a few summits in the Zillerthal Alps and also made my first visit to that beautiful liberty-loving land of South Tirol, where, as a result of a war fought to "make the world safe for democracy," Mussolini is now engaged in the systematic destruction of a language and civilization that has set its mark upon the very face of the landscape for many centuries. On my third visit, in 1913, I did my most ambitious climbing, all in the Eastern Alps, getting up the Kleine Zinne by the north face, certain of the sporty Cortina courses, and even the Campanile di Val Montanaia, which is not considered altogether easy. In 1932 I was on three of the first-class Zermatt peaks.

Why, then, have I no right to talk about mountain-climbing? For the simple reason that I did all of these climbs with good guides, safeguarded by perfectly good Alpine ropes. An Alpine guide is said to be able to get a sack of meal up the Matterhorn about as well as he can get some tourists up, and then those tourists go home and boast what great mountaineers they are. Well, I differed from the proverbial sack of meal in two particulars: (1) I am a little superior to the sack of meal in climbing ability; (2) the sack of meal is unaware of the fact that it is not a mountaineer, and I am fully aware of the fact that I am not. The man who leads on the rope is the man who has to be a real mountaineer, and I never did that. I am less than the least of the thousands of real climbers who go to the Alps every summer and climb without guides.

But although I am not a mountaineer, I do love the mountains and I have loved them ever since I can remember anything at all. It is about the love of the mountains, rather than about the mountains, that I am venturing to read this little paper today.

Can the love of the mountains be conveyed to those who have it not? I am not sure. Perhaps if a man is not born with that love it is almost as hopeless to try to bring it to him as it would be to explain what color is to a blind man or to try to make President Roosevelt understand the Constitution of the United States. But on the whole I do believe that the love of the mountains can at least be cultivated, and if I can do anything whatever toward getting you to cultivate it, the purpose of this little paper will be amply attained.

One thing is clear—if you are to learn to love the mountains you must go up them by your own power. There is more thrill in the smallest hill in Fairmount Park if you walk up it than there is in the grandest mountain on earth if you go up it in an automobile. There is one curious thing

about means of locomotion—the slower and simpler and the closer to nature they are, the more real thrill they give. I have got far more enjoyment out of my two feet than I did out of my bicycle; and I got more enjoyment out of my bicycle than I ever have got out of my motor car; and as for airplanes—well, all I can say is that I wouldn't lower myself by going up in one of the stupid, noisy things! The only way to have the slightest inkling of what a mountain is is to walk or climb up it.

Now I want you to feel something of what I feel when I am with the mountains that I love. To that end I am not going to ask you to go with me to any out-of-the-way place, but I am just going to take you to one of the most familiar tourist objectives, one of the places to which one goes on every ordinary European tour—namely, to Zermatt—and in Zermatt I am not going to take you on any really difficult climbs but merely up one or two of the peaks by the ordinary routes which modern mountaineers despise. I want you to look at Zermatt for a few minutes not with the eyes of a tourist, and not with the eyes of a devotee of mountaineering in its ultra-modern aspects, but with the eyes of a man who, whatever his limitations, does truly love the mountains.

In Zermatt, after I arrived on July 15, 1932, I secured Alois Graven as my guide; and on a number of the more ambitious expeditions I had also Gottfried Perren, who also is a guide of the first class. What Ty Cobb was on a baseball diamond and Bill Tilden is on the courts, that such men are on a steep snow or ice slope, or negotiating a difficult rock *Ueberhang*. It is a joy, as I have done in Switzerland and in the Eastern Alps, to see really good climbers at work.

At this point I just want to say a word for Swiss and Austrian guides. Justice is not done to them, in my judgment, in many of the books on climbing. You see, it is not they who write the books. They rank as professionals, and the tourists who hire them as "gentlemen"; but in many cases I am inclined to think that the truer gentleman is the guide. I am quite sure that that was the case when I went with Alois Graven.

In addition to climbing practice on the wrong side of the cocky little Riffelhorn and on the ridge of the Untergabelhorn—which climbing practice prevented me from buttoning my back collar button without agony for a week—and in addition to an interesting glacier expedition around the back side of the Breithorn and up Pollux (13,430 feet) and Castor (13,850) and down by the Fellikjoeh through the ice fall of the Zwillingsgletscher, on which expedition I made my first acquaintance with really bad weather in the high Alps and the curious optical illusions which it causes—it was perfectly amazing to see the way in which near the summit of Castor the leading guide would feel with his ice-axe for the edge of the ridge in what I could have sworn to be a perfectly innocent expanse of easy snow-field right there in plain view before our feet, and it was

also perfectly amazing to see the way in which little pieces of ice on the glacier were rolled by way of experimentation down what looked like perfectly innocent slopes, to see whether they would simply disappear in crevasses which I could have sworn not to be there (if they disappeared we didn't, because we took the hint and chose some other way through the labyrinth)—after these various preliminary expeditions and despite the agony of a deep sore on my right foot in view of which the Swiss doctor whom I consulted told me that as a physician he would tell me to quit but that as a man he knew I would not do so and that therefore he would patch me up as well as possible, and despite the even greater agony of a strained stomach muscle which I got when I extricated myself and was extricated one day from a miniature crevasse and which made me, the following night in the Theodul hut, feel as helpless as a turtle laid on its back, so that getting out of my bunk became a difficult mountaineering feat—after these preliminary expeditions and despite these and other agonies due to a man's giving a fifty-year-old body twenty-year-old treatment, I got up three first-class Zermatt peaks; the Zinalrothorn, the Matterhorn and the Dent Blanche. Of these three, I have not time—or rather you have not time (for I for my part should just love to go on talking about the mountains for hours and Niagara would have nothing on me for running on)—I say, of these *you* have not time for me to tell about more than one. It is very hard for me to choose among the three. The Zinalrothorn, I think, is the most varied and interesting as a climb; the Dent Blanche has always had the reputation of being the most difficult of all the Zermatt peaks, and it is a glorious mountain indeed, a mountain that does not intrude its splendors upon the mob but keeps them for those who will penetrate into the fastnesses or will mount to the heights whence true nobility appears in its real proportions. I should love to tell you of that crowning day of my month at Zermatt, when after leaving the Schönbühl Hut at about 2.30 A. M. (after a disappointment the previous night when my guides had assisted in a rescue expedition that took one injured climber and the body of one who was killed in an accident on the Zmutt Ridge of the Matterhorn, opposite the hut where we were staying, down to Zermatt so that we all arrived there about 2 A. M., about the time when it had been planned that we should leave the hut for our climb) we made our way by lantern light up into the strange upper recesses of the Schönbühl Glacier, then by the dawning light of day across the glacier, across the bottom of a couloir safe in the morning but not a place where one lingers when the warmth of afternoon has affected the hanging glacier two thousand feet above, then to the top of the Wandfluh, the great south ridge, at first broad and easy but contracting above to its serrated knife-edge form, then around the "great gendarme" and around or over the others of the rock towers on the ridge, until at last that glorious and unbelievable moment came when the last few feet of the sharp snow ridge could be seen with nothing above but a vacancy of blue, and when I became conscious of the fact that I was actually standing on the summit of the Dent Blanche.

But the Matterhorn is a symbol as well as a mountain, and so I am going to spend the few minutes that remain in telling you about that.

There is a curious thing when you first see the Matterhorn on a fresh arrival at Zermatt. You think your memory has preserved for you an adequate picture of what it is like. But you see that you were wrong. The reality is far more unbelievable than any memory of it can be. A man who sees the Matterhorn standing at that amazing angle above the Zermatt street can believe that such a thing exists only when he keeps his eyes actually fastened upon it.

When I arrived on July 15, 1932, the great mountain had not yet been ascended that summer. The masses of fresh snow were too great; the weather had not been right. That is one way in which this mountain retains its dignity even in the evil days upon which it has fallen when duffers such as I can stand upon its summit. In storm, it can be almost as perilous as ever even to those who follow the despised easiest route.

It was that despised easiest route, of course, which I followed—though my guide led me to have hopes of doing the Zmutt ridge before I got through. On Monday, August 1st, we went up to the "Belvedere," the tiny little hotel (if you can call it such) that stands right next to the old Matterhorn Hut at 10,700 feet. We went up there intending to ascend the Matterhorn the next day. But alas for human hopes. Nobody ascended the Matterhorn the next day, nor the day after that, nor that whole week. On Wednesday we with several other parties went a little way, but high wind and cold and snow soon drove us back. The Matterhorn may be sadly tamed, but you cannot play with it when the weather is not right. That applies to experts as well as to novices like me. I waited at the Belvedere all that week until Friday. It is not the most comfortable of summer resorts, and I really think that the stay that I made in it was one of the longest that any guest had ever made. Its little cubby-holes of rooms are admirable as Frigidaires, but as living quarters they are "not so hot." People came and people went; very polyglot was the conversation: but I remained. I told them that I was the hermit or the *Einsiedler* of the Belvedere. At last, however, even I gave it up. On Friday I returned to Zermatt, in plenty of time for the Saturday night bath!

The next Monday we toiled again up that five thousand feet to the Belvedere, and this time all went well. On Tuesday, August 9th, I stood on what I suppose is, next to Mt. Everest, the most famous mountain in the world.

From the Belvedere to the summit is about four thousand feet. The Matterhorn differs from every other great Alpine peak that I know anything about in that when you ascend it by the usual route you do not once set foot on a glacier. You climb near the northeast ridge—for the most part not on the actual ridge itself but on the east face near the ridge. In some places in the lower part there is some danger from falling stones, especially if other parties are climbing above. There is scarcely anything that the blasé modern mountaineer calls rock climbing of even respectable difficulty; but it is practically all rock climbing or clambering of a

sort, and it seems quite interesting enough to the novice. The most precipitous part is above what is called "the shoulder," and it was from near this part that the four members of Whymper's party fell 4000 feet to their death when they were descending after the first ascent in 1865. There are now fixed ropes at places in this part. You grasp the hanging rope with one hand and find the holds in the rock with the other. It took me five hours and forty minutes to make the ascent from the Belvedere. It would certainly have been no great achievement for an athlete; but I am not an athlete and never was one, and I was then fifty-one years of age and have an elevator in the building where I live. The rarefied air affected me more than it used to do in my earlier years, and the mountain is about 14,700 feet high. I shall never forget those last few breathless steps when I realized that only a few feet of easy snow separated me from the summit of the Matterhorn. When I stood there at last—the place where more than any other place on the earth I had hoped all my life that I might stand—I was afraid I was going to break down and weep for joy.

The summit looks the part. It is not indeed a peak, as you would think it was from looking at the pictures which are taken from Zermatt, but a ridge—a ridge with the so-called Italian summit at one end and the so-called Swiss summit three feet higher at the other. Yes, it is a ridge. But what a ridge! On the south you look directly over the stupendous precipice of the south face to the green fields of Valtournanche. On the north you look down an immensely steep snow slope—with a vacancy beyond that is even more impressive than an actual view over the great north precipice would be. As for the distant prospect, I shall not try to describe it, for the simple reason that it is indescribable. Southward you look out over the mysterious infinity of the Italian plain with the snows of Monte Viso one hundred miles away. To the west, the great snow dome of Mont Blanc stands over a jumble of snow peaks; and it looks the monarch that it is. To the north the near peaks of the Weisshorn and the Dent Blanche, and on the horizon beyond the Rhone Valley a marvelous glittering galaxy of the Jungfrau and the Finsteraarhorn and the other mountains of the Bernese Oberland. To the east, between the Strahlhorn and Monte Rosa, the snows of the Weissthor are like a great sheet let down from heaven, exceeding white and glistening, so as no fuller on earth can white them; and beyond, fold on fold, soft in the dim distance, the ranges of the Eastern Alps.

Then there is something else about that view from the Matterhorn. I felt it partly at least as I stood there, and I wonder whether you can feel it with me. It is this. You are standing there not in any ordinary country, but in the very midst of Europe, looking out from its very centre. Germany just beyond where you can see to the northeast, Italy to the south, France beyond those snows of Mont Blanc. There, in that glorious round spread out before you, that land of Europe, humanity has put forth its best. There it has struggled; there it has fallen; there it has looked upward to God. The history of the race seems to pass before you in an instant of time, concentrated in that fairest of all the lands of earth. You think of the great men whose memories

you love, the men who have struggled there in those countries below you, who have struggled for light and freedom, struggled for beauty, struggled above all for God's Word. And then you think of the present and its decadence and its slavery, and you desire to weep. It is a pathetic thing to contemplate the history of mankind.

I know that there are people who tell us contemptuously that always there are croakers who look always to the past, croakers who think that the good old times are the best. But I for my part refuse to acquiesce in this relativism which refuses to take stock of the times in which we are living. It does seem to me that there can never be any true advance, and above all there can never be any true prayer, unless a man does pause occasionally, as on some mountain vantage ground, to *try*, at least, to evaluate the age in which he is living. And when I do that, I cannot for the life of me see how any man with even the slightest knowledge of history can help recognizing the fact that we are living in a time of sad decadence—a decadence only thinly disguised by the material achievements of our age, which already are beginning to pall on us like a new toy. When Mussolini makes war deliberately and openly upon democracy and freedom, and is much admired for doing so even in countries like ours; when an ignorant ruffian is dictator of Germany, until recently the most highly educated country in the world—when we contemplate these things I do not see how we can possibly help seeing that something is radically wrong. Just read the latest utterances of our own General Johnson, his cheap and vulgar abuse of a recent appointee of our President, the cheap tirades in which he develops his view that economics are bunk—and then compare that kind of thing with the state papers of a Jefferson or a Washington—and you will inevitably come to the conclusion that we are living in a time when decadence has set in on a gigantic scale.

What will be the end of that European civilization, of which I had a survey from my mountain vantage ground—of that European civilization and its daughter in America? What does the future hold in store? Will Luther prove to have lived in vain? Will all the dreams of liberty issue into some vast industrial machine? Will even nature be reduced to standard, as in our country the sweetness of the woods and hills is being destroyed, as I have seen them destroyed in Maine, by the uniformities and artificialities and officialdom of our national parks? Will the so-called "Child Labor Amendment" and other similar measures be adopted, to the destruction of all the decencies and privacies of the home? Will some dreadful second law of thermodynamics apply in the spiritual as in the material realm? Will all things in church and state be reduced to one dead level, coming at last to an equilibrium in which all liberty and all high aspirations will be gone? Will that be the end of all humanity's hopes? I can see no escape from that conclusion in the signs of the times; too inexorable seems to me to be the march of events. No, I can see only one alternative. The alternative is that there is a God—a God who in His own good time will bring forward great men again to do His will, great men to resist the tyranny of experts and lead humanity out again into the realms of light and freedom,

great men, above all, who will be the messengers of His grace. There is, far above any earthly mountain peak of vision, a God high and lifted up who, though He is infinitely exalted, yet cares for His children among men.

What have I from my visits to the mountains, not only from those in the Alps, but also, for example, from that delightful twenty-four-mile walk which I took one day last summer in the White Mountains over the whole Twin Mountain range? The answer is that I have memories. Memory, in some respects, is a very terrible thing. Who has not experienced how, after we have forgotten some recent hurt

in the hours of sleep, the memory of it comes back to us on our awaking as though it were some dreadful physical blow. Happy is the man who can in such moments repeat the words of the Psalmist and who in doing so regards them not merely as the words of the Psalmist but as the Word of God. But memory is also given us for our comfort; and so in hours of darkness and discouragement I love to think of that sharp summit ridge of the Matterhorn piercing the blue or the majesty and the beauty of that world spread out at my feet when I stood on the summit of the Dent Blanche.

Starting an Every-Day Bible School on Faith—Another Testimony

By A. Peters

[Mr. Peters, an elder in the Christian Reformed Church, is associated with the System of Local Christian Schools in Holland, Michigan.]

WITH appreciation I read in the March issue of *CHRISTIANITY TODAY* the address of the Rev. Henry Shepard Atkinson, delivered before a Summer Bible School Conference at Chester, Pa. Its title, "Starting a Summer Bible School on Faith," immediately drew my attention and its contents did not disappoint me. The address manifested the consciousness that the youth of our day and specifically the children of confessing Christians, *i. e.*, the children of God's covenant, the lambs of the flock of the Great Shepherd should be made acquainted with the will of God as He has revealed it to us in His Word.

However, the address also moved me to reflection on the condition of education of the youth in the Christian churches of our present time. To the testimony of the Reverend Atkinson I should like to add a testimony concerning the starting of an *Every Day* Bible School on Faith.

With all due respect for the Christian education given to the children of the church in Sunday schools, Catechism classes, Summer Bible Schools, etc., it appears to me that these labors are largely nullified by the education given in the schools which these same children attend during five days of the week throughout the nine school months.

Even were these day schools able and willing to give neutral education, education with no definite character, such would fall woefully short of that to which these children as belonging to the covenant of God are entitled.

But our day schools cannot and do not give neutral education; it would be an absurdity to demand it. And yet it is generally claimed that our day schools are neutral, and millions of Christians foolishly accept this statement.

Truth of the matter is that what is generally called neutral in education today is nothing but the standpoint of unbelieving science which is taught from the university down through the kindergarten. It either ignores or denies the truth and authority of the infallible Word of God. At the same time, in order to appease the demands of many Christian folk, singing of some Christian songs, reading of a few Bible selections, reciting of the Lord's Prayer, etc., are in many schools added to the daily curriculum and, presto! we have

a day school where Christian parents can safely send their children, or rather, where they can safely send God's children (for that is the primary truth), to receive education.

Poor children who at home and in church learn that God, the God of the Scriptures, created the universe and who learn at school that something, some power, some influence (we do not know what), made all. Poor children who at home and in church learn that God, and He alone, directs all events and that individuals as well as nations are subject to His will, and who in the every-day school are taught that history is simply a systematic record of past events of human beings without recognition of the all-controlling hand of Him in whose sight the nations are as a drop in the bucket!

Thus we could continue and could point out how in all branches of study pertaining to secular life and taught in the every-day school there is no possibility of neutrality for the teacher. He either denies (or ignores) God, or acknowledges Him.

Another reason why millions of Christians are lulled into the belief that their children are educated in the God-willed way is, that a considerable number of teachers in the every-day school belong to some church. Naturally, but at the same time very superficially, these parents think that because teachers are members of a Christian church, they must be true Christians in their instruction in the every-day school. However, this is very far from being the case; not because these teachers deliberately aim to be anti-Biblical in their instruction, but simply because in their misconception of life they think they are at liberty to manifest a dualism which is appalling. They regard Christian truth as one thing and so-called scientific truth as an entirely different thing and both as having their appointed places in life. Sad to say, many of the parents whose children they teach have exactly the same destructive view of life, not only in regard to education but also in regard to all other spheres of life, as for instance, politics, economics, recreation, etc.

When will the Christians of our land awake to the terrible conditions existing in regard to the education of the youth? What sinful incongruity, on the one hand to educate our

children at home, in Sunday schools, Catechism classes, summer schools, etc., in accordance with the will of God regarding them, and on the other hand to entrust them to an education which, generally speaking, in all its branches of instruction ignores or denies the God of the Scriptures!

Thus the covenant child, the child of the church, is taught, from school age on, opposing ideas and conceptions concerning life. He is educated partly according to the will of God and partly, if not largely, contrary to His holy revelation. Is it any wonder that Christianity reveals, or rather, that Christian men and women increasingly reveal a dualism in their life which would be almost unbelievable if the overwhelming facts did not force us to accept this disheartening situation as a "fait accompli"?

In view of this appalling situation in the education of the youth, many Christians have made and are making efforts to introduce principles of positive Christian education in the daily instruction of the every-day schools, or in other cases to add an hour per week of Bible instruction for the pupils whose parents desire it; such instruction to be given by ministers or other qualified persons.

However laudable these efforts may be, they must necessarily fall entirely short of the mark of God's demand.

In the first place the every-day school controlled by citizens of all manner of belief and without belief, and founded upon school laws which absolutely forbid "sectarian instruction" which in our day is interpreted to include positive Christian education, according to the truth of God, can never be made into an every-day Bible school where God and His Word is the highest authority and where in every branch of study He is fully acknowledged.

In the second place, the home, the Sunday school, the Catechism class, the Summer Bible School and any other agency which we care to mention can never undo and counteract the anti-Biblical and God-ignoring instruction which a pupil receives five hours a day, nine months a year in the every-day school.

Besides, there is the all-comprehensive statement of God Himself who calls the children of His people, "My children," from which naturally follows that those children may never be taught contrary to His will, whether by the parents themselves or by others to whom they are entrusted to receive instruction.

If the foregoing is according to the demand of God to His people, which we do not doubt in the least, then we are confronted with a very grave situation which must be met with Christian faith and courage. What is the remedy and solution? None other than every-day Bible schools to which all Christian parents can safely entrust the covenant-youth, the children whom God calls "My children." Such schools are the outstanding need of our age for the true welfare of the home, the church and the state. How to obtain them, how to finance them, how to supervise them, and many other questions of like nature do not strictly come under the scope of this article, and even if they did, they would require too much space to answer in one issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY. But for such schools I plead with my whole soul. On this account, "Another Testimony."

The Church Militant

(Concluded from page 65)

(Luke 23:43). Like St. Paul, for them to depart and be with Christ was very far better (Philippians 1:23).

The final state of the Church is that of complete triumph, following the Second Advent of Christ, the Judgment, and the ushering in of the eternal state, when all the redeemed are gathered body, soul, and spirit, into their final condition of worship and service. "At the resurrection, believers, being raised up in glory, shall be openly acknowledged and acquitted in the day of judgment, and made perfectly blessed in the full enjoying of God to all eternity" (Westminster Shorter Catechism, Q. 38). The Church Militant and the Church Expectant become the Church Triumphant. The Church Expectant must wait for all the members of the Church Militant before being made perfect (Hebrews 11:40). Then the Church victorious becomes the Church at rest.

It remains for us to ask ourselves, are we really soldiers in the Church Militant? That means, as believers in Christ, as those who have been redeemed by His precious blood, and sworn into His army, are we fighting for Him the good fight of faith? Are we contending earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints (Jude 3), or are we found in sleep, or sloth, or, worst of all, in the mutiny of heresy and unbelief?

Christ calls us in these critical times to wake up and fight for Him. Our weapons are not carnal, but spiritual. Our sword is the Sword of the Spirit, that is, the Infallible Word of God. Our attitude is to be that of watchfulness and prayer, our deeds those of love and truth. We are to defend the citadel of faith, and also to sally forth into the enemy's territory and convert his soldiers into warriors of the Heavenly King. Our battle line extends from our own imperfect, but Christian, hearts, to the farthest outposts of heathendom. Our efforts count for eternity.

If we claim to be Christ's soldiers we should attend drill. That means going to church. We should become familiar with the weapons of our warfare. That means to read the Bible and pray. We should be alert to carry the Gospel banner forward everywhere by word and deed. This is warfare in the field.

God grant that we may truly be reckoned not in the Church Dormant, or the Church Quiescent, or in the Church Recumbent, but in the Church Militant, so that some day through Christ's redeeming grace we may stand in the ranks of the Church Triumphant, and hear Him, our Glorious Captain, say to us, "Well done. Thou hast been faithful unto death. Behold, I give thee the crown of life."

[Editor's Note: The author of the above article is the pastor of Emmanuel Church, Independent Presbyterian, which was incorporated in 1928 with a membership drawn from the continuing minorities who came out from the merger of the Park Presbyterian Church and the South Street Church of Morristown in 1925. The minorities refused to go into the merged church, now called the Presbyterian Church in Morristown, because of the hasty consummation of the merger, and because the pastor of the merged church is an Auburn Affirmationist. The minorities had to organize an independent Presbyterian Church because Morris and Orange Presbytery, in which Morristown, N. J., is located, refused to allow them to form a new church within the presbytery. Emmanuel Church now has 122 members, and is located at 33 Maple Avenue, Morristown, N. J.]

Sunday School Lessons for August

(International Uniform Series)

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

Lesson for August 5, 1934

ELISHA HELPS THE NEEDY

(Lesson Text—II Kings 4:1-7, 42-44. For entire lesson, see II Kings, ch. 4. Golden Text—Matt. 25:40. Catechism—Q. 32.)

THE days of Elijah and Elisha like those of the Exodus are signalized by many miracles. In these times of extreme peril, the God of Israel manifested His presence and power in conspicuous ways for the saving and comforting of His people. It is interesting and instructive to compare these wonders. Of the two in our lesson, the first is of a private and personal character—the miraculous oil to pay the debt of the widow. Note the words, "shut the door upon thee and upon thy sons." The other is in a sense public and more or less spectacular, though it concerns directly only the prophetic community—the feeding of the hundred men. At Carmel, on the other hand, Elijah staged a great trial of strength between his God and the prophets of Baal and the miracle was of national significance.

Some of these miracles stand entirely unrelated to the resources of those for whom they were wrought. At Carmel Elijah poured water on the sacrifice to prove that he had not and could not set it on fire; and the divine answer to his prayer was so overwhelming that it could not be gainsaid. In other instances, and to these belong the ones in our lesson, the manifestation of divine power is directly related to the resources of the one for whom they are performed. The oil is multiplied; the twenty loaves and fresh ears are made sufficient for a hundred men. The human supply is patently insufficient: it is made sufficient by God. The very inadequacy of the available supply is both a challenge to faith (vs. 3) and a stumbling block to unbelief (vs. 43). The obvious lesson is that where human, God-given resources are available they should be used to the full, in reliance upon Him who values the widow's mite more than the wealth of the miser. Where man can do absolutely nothing, faith is the only recourse. Otherwise faith and works—the faithful use of means—must go together.

The miracle of the oil also teaches that there is or may be a proportion between man's faith and God's response. The widow is told to borrow vessels "not a few" (vs. 3). How many she borrowed is not stated. Apparently, it was enough to contain oil somewhat in excess of her debt (vs. 7). Her faith sufficed for the pressing need: she may have deemed it presumption to expect more. Yet vs. 6 seems to indicate that she might have had more, perhaps much more, for the asking. Sometimes God gives us only as

much as we ask or hope for (cf. II Kgs. 13: 14-19), when He would gladly give abundantly (Ps. 81: 10, Jn. 10: 10, 15: 7). On the other hand God's answer may be out of all proportion to our faith or expectations. Often the Christian is reminded of the words of Jacob: "I had not thought to see thy face: and lo, God hath shewed me also thy seed" (Gen. 48: 11, cf. 37: 35).

There is in some cases an interesting parallel between Elisha's miracles and those performed by Elijah and by our Lord. The resemblance is due at least in part to the fact that the basic needs of man in every age and under every condition are essentially the same. The son of the widow of Zarephath, the child of the wealthy woman of Shunem, the daughter of Jairus—death is no respecter of persons! The multiplying of the meal and oil to feed Elijah and the widow, the increase of the oil to pay the widow's debt; the increase of the loaves by Elisha to feed the hundred, our Lord's feeding of the five thousand and the four thousand—the resemblance is striking, but only superficial. The higher critics make much of so-called "doublets" (e.g., Gen. 12: 13f, 20: 2, 26: 7) as a proof of the unhistorical character of the Pentateuch. Were they to apply this canon of criticism rigorously they could cast suspicion upon many of the best accredited facts of history, both sacred and profane. That history repeats itself is an axiom familiar to all.

Lesson for August 12, 1934

AMOS PLEADS FOR JUSTICE

(Lesson Text—Amos 5:1, 10-15, 21-24. For entire lesson, see Amos, chs. 5, 7. Golden Text—Rom. 13: 10. Catechism—Q. 33.)

Amos, the herdsman of Tekoa, is one of the earliest of the writing prophets. Between him and Elisha there is an interval of some three-quarters of a century.

It is of prime importance for the correct study of the Old Testament prophets to remember that they occupied a position subsequent and subordinate to the Mosaic Law (Dt. 13: 1f). It was their great duty to enforce that law (Amos 2: 4, cf. Mal. 4: 4) and to draw out its teachings. The correct order is: "the law and the prophets" (Mt. 7: 12). The higher critics have tried to reverse this order by treating the Pentateuch as late and non-Mosaic. Such statements as this, "Amos sounded a new note in prophecy, the note of social justice," are based upon this fundamental error. The crowning sin of Ahab was his acquiescence in the judicial murder of Naboth, by means of which he took from him the "inheritance" of his fathers (I Kgs. 21: 3). The word "inheri-

tance" reminds us that in Israel the land was apportioned by lot and possession was by inheritance. The law of Moses aimed to safeguard the heritage of the Israelite. The year of release (Dt. 15) and the jubilee (Lev. 25) had this directly in view. The second table of the Decalogue (Ex. 20: 12-17) and most of the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 21-23) deal with social relations. It was to be the duty of the ideal, the Messianic king to enforce social justice (Ps. 72).

The failure of the people and especially of their rulers to keep the law is responsible for the strong emphasis on social justice in the messages of the prophets. They were the spokesmen of the God of Israel, who is holy and just and good. The widow and orphan, as helpless and unprotected, were His especial care (Dt. 10: 18). A curse was pronounced upon their oppressors (Dt. 27: 19). Consequently Amos, Isaiah and the prophets as a class denounce injustice and pronounce the vengeance of God upon those who oppress the poor and needy.

It is especially important to remember that it was in the name and as the representatives of the God of Israel that the prophets delivered their social message. Justice to our fellowman is not primarily a duty which we owe him because of his inherent dignity and rights. It is ultimately a duty which we owe to God, which He requires of us and for which He will hold us accountable.

In the Decalogue we have first man's duty to God set forth, then as secondary to and consequent upon it man's duty to his fellowman. The great defect in many of the social programs of today is that they ignore this great basic principle: God first, man second. The order of the tables of the Decalogue is often reversed by our social reformers, or the first table is ignored entirely and humanitarianism, the cult of humanity, is substituted for true religion, the worship and service of God, which is and must be the source and inspiration of all true and adequate service of man (Jas. 1: 27). Socialism and Communism with all their grandiose schemes for the amelioration of human relations are doomed to failure and constitute a terrible menace, because they ignore or deny that fact which is writ so large on the pages of Holy Writ that he who exalts man destroys him, while he who magnifies God is the only true helper of his fellowman. It is only as we realize that man is made in the image of God that we can truly appreciate his rights or adequately perform our duties toward him.

Lesson for August 19, 1934

AMOS DENOUNCES SELF-INDULGENCE (Temperance Lesson)

(Lesson Text—Amos 6: 1-7, 11-14. Golden Text—Amos 5: 14. Catechism—Q. 34.)

Liberty, freedom, democracy, self-expression, are words to conjure with. They are

great words: they represent ideals for which men have suffered and died. But they may easily deteriorate into the one word *selfishness*. The right to "develop one's personality" may be simply a grandiloquent way of saying, "to do as I please."

The Bible speaks in terms not of self-expression but of service. Man is either a servant of God or a servant of sin. To be the one is freedom: to be the other is bondage (Rom. 6: 12f, 8: 2, Gal. 5: 1). To serve self is to be under bondage to sin (Rom. 7: 20f).

Men think they are free when they are in bondage (John 8: 33). The drunken sensualists of Samaria thought themselves free when they were the slaves of carnal appetite. The best way to determine whether we are free is to try to discontinue some habit-forming practice. The result may surprise us.

The sensualist tries to keep the thought of a day of reckoning beneath the horizon (vs. 3), to forget God (Ps. 10: 4). He thinks God is like himself (Ps. 50: 21), that He is indifferent or impotent (Zeph. 1: 12). The sensualist does not resist sin: he seeks it (vs. 3), draws it to him (Isa. 5: 18), enthrones it in his life (Ps. 94: 20). His attitude is the exact opposite (Mic. 3: 2, Jer. 4: 22) of what it should be (Ps. 97: 10). He has no thought of higher things: his own high calling, the glorious destiny of his people, mean nothing to him (vs. 6). He uses David's harp, but not for the singing of psalms.

This Old Testament picture of self-indulgence has its New Testament parallel in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk. 17). In the latter the most solemn word is, "Son, remember." In Deuteronomy, we meet repeatedly the words, "Remember," "Forget not." Israel's tragic history is the record of her failure to heed this warning. Again and again the prophets warned her: punishment after punishment was visited upon her, because she failed to remember the will of God to keep it.

"Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth" (Eccl. 12: 1). How many would have escaped shipwreck had they done this! "This do in remembrance of me" (Lk. 22: 19). To keep ever before us the dying of the Lord Jesus upon the cross for our salvation should be the strongest deterrent from a life of self-indulgence, the greatest incentive to a life of Christian service.

Lesson for August 26, 1934

HOSEA PREACHES GOD'S LOVE

(Lesson Text—Hos. 11: 1-4, 8, 9; 14: 4-9. For entire lesson, see Hos., chs. 6: 11; 14. Golden Text—John 3: 16. Catechism—Q. 35.)

The temptation is epitomize, to reduce a man to an aphorism, to summarize a movement in history in a single paragraph is

sometimes very great. It is a great help to the memory: it seemingly reduces the complex to simplicity. Hence the fondness of the Bible student for "key words": the effort to condense a book into a word or sentence. Amos and Hosea illustrate this tendency: Amos is called the prophet of the justice of God, Hosea of the love of God. We might think to read some extreme statements that Amos is all or merely justice (and vengeance) and Hosea all and only love. Those who take this unitary view look askance at the closing verses of Amos (9: 11-15) because, forsooth, mercy and hope are, or should be, foreign to Amos' message (but cf. also 5: 15, 7: 3, 6).

It is true that Hosea gives us a wonderful picture of the forgiving, yearning, saving, love of God (e.g., 1: 10, 2: 19f, 11: 8f, 13: 9f, 14: 4f). But it is to be remembered that this love constantly appears in a setting of judgment: the two are set over against one another in the sharpest contrast. Chapter 13 illustrates this particularly clearly. The figure of the lion, leopard and bear (vss. 7f) reminds us of Amos's terrible figure (3: 11); the familiar words of Rev. 6: 16 are a quotation from Hos. 10: 8; and the closing words of the book, "for the ways of the Lord are right, and the just shall walk in them; but the transgressors shall fall therein," show that this loving God is a God of righteousness and justice.

Regarding Hosea's doctrine of the love of God, we will do well to remind ourselves that it is not original with him, but has its roots deep down in the soil of the Old Testament. The idea of which we hear so much today, that the God of the Old Testament, especially the early part, is an "angry god," as distinguished from the God of love, who was "discovered" by the Prophets and "perfected" by Jesus, is unjust to both alike. Hebrews (12: 29), in describing the severity of God, quotes the words of Deut. 4: 24, "Our God is a consuming fire." Our Lord in summing up the Decalogue in terms of love quotes from Deuteronomy (6: 5) and Leviticus (19: 18). The text of Hosea's prophecies might be found in Ex. 34: 6f.

It is important that while doing full justice to the beautiful and stimulating variety of Scripture, we should ever keep in mind its fundamental unity and harmony. Destructive criticism tends to magnify superficial differences and to pit Scripture against Scripture finding contradictions where none exist. Hosea and Amos are servants and ambassadors of the same God and their message is essentially the same. They do not contradict, they supplement each the other.

The book of Hosea may be regarded as a beautiful Old Testament commentary on John 3: 16. The person of the Redeemer is not set forth as by Isaiah in the suffering Servant. But Hosea gives us a wonderfully revealing picture of the Love that gave its best for the salvation of sinful man.

The Comfort of the Scriptures

A DEVOTIONAL MEDITATION

By the Rev. David Freeman, Th.M.

"I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day."—II Timothy 1: 12.

THE Apostle Paul rises to the great height of the assurance of salvation. Who would not like to be able to say that salvation is certain and secure for time and eternity!

The place of assurance is reached by committing everything to Christ. This can only be done by renouncing every human merit.

Who could boast of more in the flesh than Paul? He was a Hebrew of the Hebrews and in regard to the righteousness which is in the law, he was blameless. But all this could not bring him into the favor of Christ. For the excellency of the knowledge of Christ he renounced all of human worth.

It is impossible to be the Lord's and still cleave to sin. It would cling to the Apostle as long as he was in the body but he renounced it with all his soul. The chief of sinners he, but Christ died for his sins. He was therefore dead to sin. He tasted of Christ's dying love for his soul.

To commit all to Christ is not to misplace trust. To trust without knowledge is folly. Paul had the understanding of Christ that comes when one accepts Him as He is freely offered in the gospel. There is not to be found the impotent Christ of the modernist but One who has all power in heaven and earth, very God of very God.

Not only was Christ able to save him but He was willing. Such a Saviour has God given to us. He will not turn the repentant and believing one away. If men only knew Him as He is in truth. No wonder Paul's heart burned to make Him known to sinners. The grace that is in Christ Jesus surpasses man's highest hopes.

But we might say to Paul, "Perhaps you are being carried away in your enthusiasm when you so confidently express your assurance of eternal life. You are not making allowances for the feebleness of the flesh. Who knows what you might do under the stress of temptation? You may even deny your Lord." To this he would reply, "O wretched man that I am!" "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing." No one knew his weaknesses better than the Apostle. "But," he would add, "have I not committed everything to Him? Is He not able to keep what I have committed to Him?" "Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us."

Christ has sealed our redemption with His own blood. It is unthinkable that He should desert one for whom He died.

The soul that trusts in Christ can sing the song of the redeemed.

Book Reviews

English Deism: Its Roots and Its Fruits

by
JOHN ORR, A.B., A.M., B.D., Ph.D.
Professor of Bible, Westminster College
New Wilmington, Pa., U. S. A.
Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company
Grand Rapids, Michigan
1934

DR. ORR has given us a useful book. From the story of English Deism as he has told it in this book we can learn how easy it is for men to find objections to Christianity, but how difficult it is to put something better in its place! The Deists of the seventeenth and eighteenth century made much the same objections against Christianity that Celsus and other critics of the early church made. The critics of Christianity at the present time are making much the same objections that the Deists made.

The Deists had very little that they could offer as a substitute for Christianity. They spoke vaguely of some principles in nature and in man, though they dignified these principles with the name of God. So, many philosophers and scientists today speak of various sorts of principles and call them God. The Deists had no solution for the problem of sin and evil, though they ridiculed the Christian doctrine of the atonement through the blood of the cross. Philosophers today have no solution for sin and evil, though many of them, too, ridicule the cross of Christ. It is becoming clearer that the only alternative to Christianity is hopeless despair.

Dr. Orr has not put the matter in just this way. His primary desire was to give a careful study of the writings of the Deists. In this he has, so far as we can judge, succeeded admirably. Studies such as these, though not undertaken with an immediate apologetic objective in mind, are very useful for the Christian apologist. As Benjamin Franklin said that he was to a great extent convinced of the truth of Deism when he read the writings of its opponents so many who read this story of the attack of Deism on Christianity may well become convinced of the truth of Christianity.

C. VAN TIL.

And the Life Everlasting

by
JOHN BAILLIE, D.Litt. (Edin.),
D.D. (Edin.), D.D. (Toronto)
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933
\$2.50
(The Ayer Lectures of the Colgate-Rochester
Divinity School for 1931-32)

THIS is a book on immortality and the resurrection. The writer, who is the Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York,

has had sufficient training in theology and philosophy to enable him to deal comprehensively with these subjects. One would expect to find erudition and breadth of scholarship in such a book by such a writer even though one might disagree with the point of view and the conclusions, and as a matter of fact we find both in this book.

The point of view of the Writer seems to be that of modern religious liberalism as one would expect from one who is a professor in Union Seminary. He seems to accept the documentary and development hypotheses of the Old Testament, and the evolutionary view of the development of religion (cf. pp. 74, 81, 90, 91, 103, 119, 120, 149, 155, 161). His idea of the resurrection of Christ is that the question of the empty tomb is really immaterial (p. 178), and quotes with approval a statement from Dr. Coffin's book, *The Meaning of the Cross*, to the effect that the resurrection was not an event in the physical world as ordinarily understood (p. 175). In fact, he seems to accept a modified form of the vision theory of the resurrection of Christ, and classes the resurrection appearances with the many other visions and revelations of the Bible. These visions, however, give revelations of really genuine reality back of them (p. 182, 183). We are told, moreover, that while these visions were indeed not properly speaking objectives, they nevertheless were probably not illusory (185). In regard to the New Testament, parts at least are not inspired and a book like *The Revelation* is based on Jewish apocalyptic literature (p. 238). We would hardly expect our author to believe in a literal Hell, but we are rather surprised to find that he seems to reject the idea of eternal punishment and accept some form of universalism which he is not quite sure has yet been discovered (p. 294). Somewhat after the Barthian system, the Last Day, instead of being a definite Judgment Day in the future, is thought of as really immanent over the believer all the time (p. 299). On this same page the author seems to hold that our bodies will not really be raised in any real resurrection corporeal form (p. 299 ff.).

We would not give the impression that the book as a whole is bad apart from these above mentioned parts to which we take exception. Naturally we cannot accept this Liberal point of view, but on the subject of immortality there is much that is true and admirably said. The argument against the radical psychological theory which would deny any persisting personality to individuals is excellent in the main (p. 104 ff.). In fact, the argument for the immortality of the souls of Christians consisting in communion with God and the redeemed is mostly satisfying and beautifully set forth (p.

112 ff., Chap. VI, particularly p. 227 ff.). His insistence on the *quality* rather than the *quantity* of eternal life is very cogently expressed (p. 244 ff.).

The really disappointing thing about such a book as this is that although much that is true and fine is said, one is left with the uncomfortable feeling that all his arguments are at best only capable of giving us probability because they are not solidly grounded on a Christ who actually *broke* the bonds of death and by a historical act which left the tomb actually empty, proved once for all that He was the victor over death and therefore could be trusted when he gave us the precious words in the fourteenth chapter of John, for example. A mere vision of a living Christ, if His body was really in the tomb, could never convince the world that the recipients of the vision were not the victims of mere illusion or hallucination. If that is all we have on which to base our hope of immortality, then that hope is still only a hope. Moreover if the Bible is not completely trustworthy and inspired by God, then doubt is cast on all statements about the future life and we can be sure of nothing beyond what our reason can tell us, at the best only a probable persistence which we *hope* will be with God. The Christian who believes in his Bible as God's Word, *knows* that his Saviour is indeed the Captain of his salvation because He has once for all conquered death, and can be trusted in His statements as to what will happen to the believer in the future.

FLOYD E. HAMILTON.

Letters to the Editor

Editors of CHRISTIANITY TODAY:

I HOPE that a few words from me, a member of another denomination (Lutheran), on the present situation in the Presbyterian Church will not be looked upon as meddling. Let me say frankly and kindly just how the situation in your church impresses me.

Some time ago a large number of Presbyterian ministers signed what is known as the Auburn Affirmation, which is so obviously out of harmony with the Presbyterian confessional system that no argument is needed to prove it so. But not one of those signers has ever been censured by the General Assembly, nor has there been the least sign of a movement to discipline any of them.

Again, it has been clearly proven that there is Modernism connected with the personnel of the official Board of Foreign Missions. Yet no effort has been made by the General Assembly to call the Modernists to account, or to discipline them, or even to investigate the charges made against

them. On the other hand, the Assembly has expressed confidence in the said Board. No movement has been made in the Assembly to cleanse the Board of its Modernism and un-Presbyterian doctrine.

But note: when a number of Presbyterian ministers and laymen, who stand loyally for the evangelical and Presbyterian doctrines, try to establish an Independent Board for Foreign Missions that will uphold and promote the evangelical faith, immediately the General Assembly pounces upon them, condemns them outright, and threatens to discipline them if they do not obey its mandate.

Now how does an outsider who holds the evangelical doctrinal system see the situation in the Presbyterian household? He is bound to say that the General Assembly in its official capacity *sits loose* on matters of doctrine divinely revealed, and therefore fundamental; but *sits very tight* on its *humanly devised machinery*. Here surely is a clear case: if the official Board of Foreign Missions had remained loyal to "the faith once for all delivered," there never would have been any thought of forming an Independent Board. Would it not have been more consistent to begin disciplinary measures with the Modernists in the Presbyterian fold?

Sincerely yours,

Springfield, O. LEANDER S. KEYSER,
*Professor Emeritus in Hamma Divinity,
Wittenberg College.*

Editor CHRISTIANITY TODAY,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Sir: Some of your readers, in fact all of them, may be interested in the action of Hudson Presbytery at its meeting in Middletown, N. Y., on June 26th.

A candidate from Auburn Seminary came up for Licensure. In his examination in theology on the floor of Presbytery the following facts were brought to light: Concerning the doctrine of the Trinity he said he had always thought of God as a Person who manifested Himself in different ways. Concerning the Resurrection of Christ he was unable to affirm its bodily character, or to attempt an explanation of the empty tomb. He was unable to say that he believed the historical statements of the Bible to be historically true. Finally in answer to the question, "Do you believe in the Virgin Birth of Christ?" he replied that he did not.

In spite of this, the Presbytery voted by 26-18, with some not voting, to sustain the examination, and licensed the candidate who readily answered in the affirmative the constitutional questions as required.

Yours truly,

(REV.) LESLIE W. SLOAT.
Ridgebury, N. Y.

News of the Church

The Presbyterian Church in Canada Sixtieth General Assembly

By T. G. M. B.

ONCE again Knox Church, Toronto, was the meeting place, and the opening evening was that of Wednesday, June 6th. In the absence of Dr. Hugh R. Grant of Fort William, on account of illness, Dr. Robert Johnston of Ottawa read Dr. Grant's sermon. The nominee of the Rev. Alexander C. Stewart of Toronto, Dr. James S. Shortt of Barrie, was then elected Moderator. Dr. Norman A. MacLeod of Brockville, nominated by Principal F. Scott MacKenzie, D.D., of Montreal, moved that the vote for Dr. Shortt be made unanimous. The new Moderator appealed for the cultivation of the qualities of friendship, good-will and brotherly love.

The Thursday morning session began with a Communion Service at which Dr. Alexander Esler assisted the Moderator. It was fitting that the preacher chosen for that solemn occasion should be a minister who, in the thirty-eight years since he left Princeton, has served as faithfully as an Evangelist as Dr. Esler has. He has ministered in West Chester, Pa., in Cooke's Church, Toronto, in Philadelphia, in Grace Church, Calgary, and since 1919 in Robertson Church, Vancouver. The reports of the Board and Senate of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, were presented by Principal MacKenzie. He pointed out that last year's deficit was \$2673 on account of their allocation having been cut to \$11,000. He pleaded for \$4000 more this year, because the building, an old one, constantly needed renovation. The decision as to this was delayed. No permanent appointment to the chair of Church History and Homiletics was asked for by the Board and the Assembly authorized the Board to appoint the lecturers necessary. Nine graduated in theology at Montreal this spring, the largest class since 1916, and the academic standing of the students has never been higher; two of the second year students, Canadians, have Ph.D. degrees from Scottish universities.

Dr. Andrew S. Grant, secretary of the General Board of Missions, declared that "We are on the edge of a precipice, but I don't want to give the impression that the Presbyterian Church in Canada is going bankrupt. Nothing of the kind! We will continue with the work." He stated that provision had been made for preventing an increase in the deficit this year. Though frail after his illness of last winter, Dr. Grant is still carrying on undaunted. Ordained forty-five years ago, he is still sole secretary of a Board that carries on Home Mission work from Newfoundland to the Pacific and Overseas Missions in Manchuria,

Japan, Formosa, Central India, and Jhansi, India, and British Guiana. He was medical missionary to the miners in the Yukon back in 1898 and some years later left Dawson to become superintendent of missions in Western Canada. In 1925 he was appointed to his present position. Three recommendations of the Mission Board's report were held over to be discussed later—the one regarding the cut in students' salaries for this year from fifteen to thirteen dollars a week; the one asking for no further reductions in the budget estimates for 1935-1936; and the one suggesting that no children's allowances be paid to missionaries on furlough when salaries are paid in full and house rent is provided. Dr. S. Banks Nelson of Hamilton protested against students' stipends being reduced over thirteen per cent, when some city ministers with large salaries had not yet taken any reduction.

On Thursday afternoon splendid reports were received from the Women's Missionary Society, Eastern and Western Divisions. Miss Bessie MacMurchy, president of the latter, said that they had not only balanced their budget by economizing in certain places, but that they also would have the \$25,000 on hand at the appointed time which they had promised towards the Church's budget deficit. Later the Clerk of Assembly, Dr. J. W. MacNamara, presented the statistical and financial report for the year ending December 31, 1933, as follows:

	1933	1932	Incr.	Decr.
Communicant Membership	180,072	180,174		102
Ministers	735	725	10	
Preaching stations	1,305	1,320		15
Self-sustaining congregations	616	626		10
Augmented congregations	304	320		16
Mission congregations	385	374	11	
Elders	6,198	6,144	54	
Families	89,278	90,537		1,259
S. S. Teachers and Officers	11,400	11,609		209
S. S. Scholars	96,473	100,296		3,823
Communicants received	10,560	12,284		1,724
On Profession of Faith	6,332	7,243		911
Communicants removed	9,558	11,417		1,859
Manses or Rented Houses	566	555	11	
Stipend paid by congregations	\$1,127,588	\$1,210,278	\$82,690	
Mortgage indebtedness	2,926,156	3,007,916	81,760	
Raised by W. M. S.	166,847	175,969	9,122	
Raised for all purposes	3,084,748	3,421,465	336,715	
Budget—Rec'd by Treasurer	321,408	366,582	45,175	

A reduction of \$81,760 in the mortgage indebtedness of congregations is certainly a very remarkable showing for the year 1933. Since last Assembly eleven ministers have been called away by death.

Dr. Allan S. Reid, secretary of the Budget Committee, gave notice of some very interesting changes he proposed to have discussed by Assembly; these would enlarge the powers of the synods, and would, it is very likely, make the raising of the budget easier. We understand that Dr. Reid in his travels across Canada has found con-

siderable dissatisfaction with the present method of having the Board of Missions which meets in Toronto annually, or its executive resident in Ontario, decide how and where the Home Mission funds shall be spent. The synods should know local conditions better and could use their allocation of the funds where most needed. For example, a part of what is raised in the Maritime Provinces could be retained in that Synod as was the custom before the budget scheme was adopted and the remainder sent to the head offices. Dr. Reid's plan was, when it came before Assembly, sent down to Presbyteries to report back next year.

Thursday night was Home Mission night. The speakers were the Rev. C. Ritchie Bell of Truro, N. S., the Rev. James Wilson of Smeaton, Sask., the Rev. Michael Fesenko, missionary to 14,000 Ukrainians in Toronto, Miss P. B. Lamont, field secretary of the W. M. S., Western Division, the Rev. J. Alan Munro of Rosetown, Sask., and the Rev. E. Arthur Wright of Grande Prairie, Alta., from the newly-formed Presbytery of Peace River. Then on Friday evening, Foreign Mission Night, the following were heard from: the Rev. L. L. Young of Kobe, Japan, missionary to the Koreans; Miss Margaret O'Hara, M.D., formerly of Dhar, Central India; Miss Jean C. McLean of Kobe, Japan; Miss Alma M. Burdick of Tamsui, Formosa; Mrs. A. R. McMurrich of the W. M. S. Executive Committee; Mr. Angus Mackay of Jhansi, India, and the Rev. Chas. P. Young of the Bhil Mission, India, in which, by the way, the baptized Christian community increased from 874 to 1298 during the past year. "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few." Who will take the places of Dr. and Mrs. John Buchanan when they retire in a year or so? Who is to fill in the gap made by the passing of the late Rev. R. Gibson Fisher in British Guiana? Last January the Rev. Malcolm R. Mackay of Grand Falls, Newfoundland, graduate of Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia, and Dalhousie University, Halifax, arrived in Kobe, Japan, a most welcome addition to the staff of the Mission to Koreans in that country. But no graduate of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, has been appointed to the Foreign Field since 1925, and only three have gone forth from Knox College in that period—the Rev. Allan Reoch to Manchuria, the Rev. A. A. Lowther to Jhansi, India, and the Rev. J. Douglas Wilkie to Formosa. We must give the Women's Missionary Society credit for not forgetting this side of our Church's work.

On Friday the report of the committee appointed by last Assembly to investigate the "intolerable situation" in Knox College was presented by the Vice-Convener, Dr. Norman A. MacLeod of Brockville. The remaining members of the committee were: Hon. W. F. Nickle, K.C., Kingston, who on account of illness could not act; Dr. W. H. Leathem of Ottawa; Dr. H. H. Turner of Ingersoll; Dr. A. G. Cameron of Dese-

ronto; the Rev. A. H. Wilson of Paisley, and the Rev. J. M. Laird of St. Thomas, ministers; Mr. H. J. McL. Fiske of Ottawa; Mr. Richard Lees, M.A., of Peterborough; Mr. E. J. Anderson, M.P.P., of Welland, and Mr. A. E. Gibson of Oakville, elders. The report read, in part: "The committee set out to seek, under the guidance of God, a solution to best promote the cause of justice and righteousness and tend to heal this wound in the Body of Christ." The solution to which they came was that the former principal of Knox College, Professor Thomas Eakin, D.D., should be reinstated at Knox College and then immediately transferred to the Presbyterian College, Montreal, as principal there. Principal F. Scott MacKenzie, D.D., of Montreal, would in that event become principal of Knox College. Dr. Hugh Munroe moved that the report be discussed at a later date, and a petition from Dr. E. Lloyd Morrow, asking for a re-opening of his case, was ordered to be considered in connection with this report.

"That was well worth waiting for." So said an Elder Commissioner at the end of the address of Professor Loetscher of Princeton Theological Seminary on "Our Heritage as Presbyterians." The thousands of Toronto Presbyterians who attended the service at Massey Hall on Sunday afternoon, held in connection with the celebration of Toronto's one hundredth anniversary as a city, are not likely to forget that address. Dr. James Wilson also spoke, paying more particular attention to Presbyterianism in the history of Toronto. The Assembly preachers at Knox Church were, in the morning, the Rev. W. Gordon MacLean, B.D., of First Church, Winnipeg, Man., and late of Old Parish Church, Alexandria, Scotland, and in the evening, the Rev. W. H. Leathem, D.D., of St. Andrew's, Ottawa, and prior to 1925 minister in Helensburgh, Scotland, though born in the North of Ireland. A feature of the report of the Committee on Correspondence, presented on Monday, was: "That in view of the proposal in connection with the contemplated union in the United States between the United Presbyterian Church and the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., that the name of the new body should be The Presbyterian Church of North America, the General Assembly should communicate with both bodies inviting attention to the possibility of misunderstanding from the adoption of this name." The Rev. S. J. Macarthur, B.D., of Moncton, was named missionary-at-large in New Brunswick, his salary to be provided by a bequest from a lady who lived in that province. Another matter dealt with by General Assembly was to return to the minimum stipend of eighteen hundred dollars after one year's experience with a minimum of sixteen hundred, and the difficulty of calling and inducting ministers at that amount, when it might be raised at any Assembly.

When the report of the Committee on

Knox College was brought up for discussion it was supported by the following: Judge J. B. Moon of Parry Sound; Dr. W. H. Leathem of Ottawa; Professor T. Eakin, Mr. Richard Lees of Peterborough, and Dr. Robert Johnston of Ottawa. Those speaking against the proposal included Dr. John McNair of London, and the Rev. J. Alan Munro of Rosetown, Sask., Knox graduate of 1931 and convener of the Knox College house committee, 1930-31. Mr. Munro opposed Professor Eakin's reinstatement not because of any fault with his teaching but because of his personality being unsuited for the principalship, either in Knox or Montreal. If conditions are so satisfactory in the Presbyterian College, Montreal, as we have been told they are, then why disturb them? Mr. Munro asked. And apparently the Elder Commissioners especially agreed with the young graduate of Knox, for the report was defeated. Principal MacKenzie had not committed himself to the acceptance of the principalship of Knox College, though he stated that in the interests of the Church he was willing to assist the committee. It was not his own or his family's wish to leave Montreal.

Perhaps many who voted against the exchange thought that Dr. Eakin would continue as Professor of Old Testament and Lecturer in Homiletics and Pastoral Theology at Knox College, and that Dr. Morrow would be exonerated and left free to accept a call, notwithstanding the pleas of Dr. S. Banks Nelson that Dr. Morrow be restored to his professorship. If so, they were mistaken. On Wednesday morning the Rev. W. A. J. Graham of Thorold, Ont., moved that the report on Knox College be reopened, and the motion carried. On Tuesday afternoon Dr. E. Lloyd Morrow had spoken in support of his petition for an hour and a half, after a committee appointed to meet with him reported that they could reach no decision in so short a time. The deposed professor made charges against Dr. Eakin, saying that the latter had sought his downfall. Dr. Eakin refused to answer these charges, and when the Assembly late Tuesday night refused to transfer him to the Montreal College principalship, he asked that his dissent be recorded. When the case was reconsidered Wednesday, this motion was finally passed: "That Dr. Thomas Eakin be confirmed in his position as principal of Knox College; that Dr. E. Lloyd Morrow be confirmed in his position as Professor of Systematic Theology for one year, and that a Judicial Committee be appointed to investigate Dr. Morrow's complaint, and report to the next General Assembly, . . . that a commission of five men with full Assembly powers in all matters relating to Knox College be appointed with further authority to effect if it deems desirable, an exchange of principals." Mr. J. F. Irwin of Neepawa, Man., wanted to see the two men shake hands. Dr. Morrow was the first to reach the platform, and the hand-

shaking took place. Dr. Esler of Vancouver prayed for the success of the administration of Knox and for the work of the college in the future.

The Committee to investigate Dr. Morrow's complaint is as follows: Mr. J. G. Pelton, Convener, Montreal; the Rev. Wm. MacMillan, Collingwood; Mr. J. P. Thompson, Owen Sound; the Rev. M. B. Davidson, D.D., Galt; the Rev. C. S. Oke, Stratford, and Mr. D. H. McNab, Orillia. The Supervising Commission of five for Knox College includes: The Rev. H. E. Abraham, D.D., chairman, Toronto; the Rev. E. C. McCullagh, Brantford; the Rev. Wm. Barclay, Hamilton; Judge J. B. Moon, Parry Sound; and Mr. G. L. Sutherland, Toronto. We had hoped that no more commissions would be necessary, that the matter would be settled this year. And now the staff of Knox College is the same as prior to the Assembly of 1932: Principal Eakin, Professor Cunningham, Professor Bryden and Professor Morrow, with Dr. Stuart Parker no longer lecturing in Systematic Theology. Next June the Diamond Jubilee General Assembly is to meet in First Church, Montreal, where the first General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada met in 1875.

(All Canadian church news to be sent to T. G. M. B., Box 65, Dinsmore, Sask.)
DINSMORE, SASK.

The Reformed Church in America

By the Rev. W. G. Van Pernis

"Uncertain Sounds"

THE broadest gatherings of the various Reformed bodies convened this year at the appointed time and prearranged place. Whether these gatherings are called General Synod or General Assembly, they belong to history. And what history these gatherings have made!

As a delegate (commissioner) to the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, we have again had the opportunity to obtain a cross-sectional view of the church.

We have listened with bated breath to animated debates and the sweeping statements, often brushing away with a smile and as with one stroke, that which is most dear to the heart of the true children of the Reformation.

Names, terms and definitions which formerly held altogether different meanings and have now been revised or remodeled, were used to wage the oral battles.

Decisions have been made with regard to weighty matters which must have a much farther reaching result than any one is able to foretell just now.

Things of first importance were disposed of with apparent ease and things secondary viewed as being of paramount importance. At least by the majority.

I would like to write this time very briefly on "Echoes of Our General Synod."

Before so doing I am constrained to deviate—at least seemingly so—for a while.

It will be only a seeming deviation, for in reality—though not all who have read may realize this—that to which I shall refer has a most direct bearing upon these echoes of our General Synod. More than this: the decision of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., and the activities of the General Synod R. C. A. plus the article to which I shall refer immediately, form a triangle (an isosceles triangle) which shall prove to be the wedge which ultimately shall divide Modernism and Calvinism far apart.

And even now we ask: Is God leading the church in that direction where instead of amalgamation with the world as today, we shall indeed be a separate people? Should this be so, then we are on the eve of a New Reformation. God hasten the day!

The article referred to, in my opinion forms although the very narrow—yet nevertheless—the base of our triangle.

This article appears in our unofficial church paper (we have no official church paper), *The Leader*, and is from the hand of the youngest professor at our Western Theological Seminary, Dr. J. Mulder.

Under the heading of "Developments in the Presbyterian Church," see *The Leader* for June 13, 1934, he writes:

"As we indicated some weeks ago, the issue is that of Presbyterianism versus Congregationalism. In a loose federation such as Congregationalism represents, methods such as these used by the protesting Presbyterians during recent years would be perfectly in place; in Presbyterianism, as a form of church government, however, such procedure is quite anomalous."

And further, after he has stated that the General Assembly was, under the leadership of a mild liberal (boldface type ours V. P.) and having noted the resolution passed by the Assembly, to the effect "that the new Independent Board of Foreign Missions must be dissolved" the young doctor continues:

"Refusal to comply with the decision of the Assembly would naturally lead to ecclesiastical procedure against the unwilling parties who are fostering the Independent Board; compliance with this decision will mean a personal recognition of the authority of an ecclesiastical body. Action in either direction will catch the leaders of this Independent Board upon a horn of a dilemma."

Having made a personal reference to Dr. Machen, and involving Westminster Seminary, Dr. Mulder goes on to say: "But this time it is polity and not doctrine which is involved." Again: "The issue is clearly that of church government, doctrine being held altogether in abeyance at this point."

If we understand Presbyterianism at all, then Dr. Mulder argues from the Congregational rather than from the Presbyterian standpoint. Congregationalism speaks of ecclesiastical authority, though applied but locally. Our broader gatherings do not have

any authority above the session or consistory. And further, since when do Calvinists separate church government and church polity from doctrine?

Is our friend not aware of the very close relation existing between the two? The doctrine we hold shapes the church government to which we adhere. Change to any other form of Church government and the doctrine is changed accordingly. Church history proves this. We ask Dr. Mulder to compare Dr. Abraham Kuyper's *E Voto* on the 19th Lord's Day of our Heidelberg Catechism on the Kingship of Christ.

As a Presbyterian within the Reformed Church in America we maintain that the war fought at Cleveland, Ohio, during these last weeks concerns this very Kingship of Christ. And the battles fought at our General Synod in Grand Rapids, Mich., also concern the Kingship of Christ.

It is the fight between Modernism and Calvinism. It is the question of obeying God or Man.

There is a parallel between what took place at Cleveland and some of the decisions reached by a majority at Grand Rapids.

And now in all honesty we wonder whether the article referred to and of which we have quoted is to serve as a sort of warning to the minority which so valiantly opposed the majority at Grand Rapids.

There were references made to "East and West" (see our article in *CHRISTIANITY TODAY* for Mid-May showing the two sections of the Reformed Church R. C. A.); mention was made at times of the "Dutch" and the "American" elements. The writer is of the opinion that neither East nor West, Dutch nor American, have any bearing upon the principal questions. *It is Modernism versus Calvinism.*

We do not expect to see the minority in the Presbyterian Church bow before the liberal majority.

In all earnestness, we the minority in the Reformed Church mean to continue our opposition against all influences which tend towards Modernism.

The writer has conferred with the leaders of the minority and all of them mean to contend for the faith once delivered unto the Saints.

We shall not be confused by terms of church government in differentiation from doctrine; we hold to the Calvinistic life and world view. By way of reminder, that view places God first and, above all, knows of no compromise.

And neither shall we be frightened by any sword of Damocles of "Ecclesiastical procedure" hung over our heads.

We give warning that we shall continue our protest against membership in the Federal Council because there is no room for our Reformed Principles. We shall continue to contend for the basic principles underlying Christian Education, despite the taunts slung at the men of the West in this connection.

God helping us, we shall continue to stand firmly for all that which is truly Reformed.

No social questions of child-labor or world peace, of youth movements, shall ever take the place of, or receive the pre-eminence over the fundamental things, which make us to be distinctly Reformed.

We believe most assuredly in One Holy Catholic Church and we shall do all within our God-given power to promote such union as belief in that church implies. But we shall oppose all manner of dilution and watering down and amalgamation, no matter in what lovely language the proposals may be couched or by what prominent and popular men such a cause may be espoused.

We have heard at the Synod as at the Assembly "Uncertain Sounds."

But thanks be to God, we know the blessedness of that people who know the joyful sound and with them we hope to walk in the light of His Countenance.

FULTON, ILLINOIS

Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Irish Presbyterian Church

By S. W. Murray

THE General Assembly of the Irish Presbyterian Church was constituted on Monday, June 4th, at the Assembly Hall, Belfast.

The newly elected Moderator, the Rev. T. M. Johnstone, B.A., D.D., in a timely and eloquent address said *inter alia*: "It was all important that they should approach the people with the right message and with the right appeal. We need not be unduly concerned about the modern mind and what it was willing to accept. Far more important was the necessity for getting down to the needs of modern men's souls. The modern mind of each succeeding age had a reluctance to spiritual truth. Its whole tendency was to make light of sin, to call it by mild names, to extenuate or ignore its guilt. The Gospel of Christ must, therefore, of a necessity be an offence to it, and were it not an offence it would cease to be the Gospel. . . . Higher criticism had pulled down the Church's theological structure and left it scattered in ruins. But if they must visit with their strictures and condemnation those who by their destructive criticism and soulless scholarship left the temple of their faith in ruins, let them not now, in the days of better things, withhold their admiration and their gratitude from the scholars and saints who were once more setting up the sacred edifice, lest they be found, by a confusion of words or of signals, to have run down, as the Olympic the Nantucket lightship, the men who lived lonely and apart for the mental and spiritual illumination of their voyage. . . ."

"The stone which the theological builders of an earlier day as well as the building inspectors of modern times rejected was

back again at the head of the corner. It was not a fragment they had got for the foundation, as at one time seemed likely—not the historical Jesus only, for such a lop-sided personality never existed, but the historical Jesus plus the Petrine Apocalyptic Christ as well as the Logos found in the fourth Gospel and in the Pauline Epistles. A constructive scholarship had now put back the nature of God and of His Son Jesus Christ into their place in the scheme of things from which the destructive scholarship of an earlier date had removed it. . . ."

"You cannot with perfumed philosophies reclaim the harlot or win to virtue the degraded. Neither can you expect the boys and girls of this generation to evolve or grow naturally into sons and daughters of the King. By cultural methods we have tried to bring about that moral evolution, that spiritual awakening, but our plans have failed; such plans are ever doomed to failure.

"There is a difference between religious instruction and Christian teaching. . . . What is needed is Christian instruction, and that only comes to those who sit at the feet of teachers who know Christ first-hand as their own personal Saviour. Our Church has been greatly served by teachers of this description."

Church Union

Discussion on Church Union between the Church of Ireland and the Presbyterian Church was initiated by the General Synod of the former body in 1931. A Joint Committee representing both Churches has been considering ways and means to "prevent the wasteful overlapping of effort in many towns and districts in the South and West, and ultimately lead . . . to organic union."

The Assembly passed three resolutions, of which one may be cited—"That the Assembly hereby declare that without prejudice to the convictions held by either Church as to the preferable forms and methods of administering the rite of ordination and the Sacraments of the Church, and without prejudice to any future arrangements that may be mutually agreed upon; the Presbyterian Church in Ireland fully and freely recognizes as a basis for further progress toward union, the validity, efficacy and spiritual reality of both ordinations and sacraments as administered in the Church of Ireland."

A similar resolution was to have been submitted to the General Synod of the Church of Ireland which met in May, but instead the following proposal was submitted by the Primate (Dr. D'Arcy) and passed—"That the report of the Joint Committee be received and that the Presbyterian Church be respectfully requested to agree to the suspension of the discussions with that Committee until the report of the conversations of the Church of England with the Church of Scotland be made public and opportunity be given to their Synod for their consideration; and that the Committee be re-appointed."

In view of this, the Assembly decided to re-appoint the Committee to continue the discussions "when the General Synod shall have passed a resolution in identical terms regarding the validity, efficacy and spiritual reality of Presbyterian orders and sacraments as already recommended by their own committee to the 1934 General Synod."

In the meantime, this represents a "go slow" in Union negotiation. When the Joint Committee comes—if it ever does—to the Doctrinal Basis of Union, its task will be an unenviable one. The question is one that (to use legal phraseology) "is liable to lead to a breach of the peace."

Roman Catholic Missions

In the Report of the Irish Mission it is stated that sales of Scriptures to Roman Catholics were as follows: 1930, 9,300 copies; 1931, 10,800 copies; 1932, 16,500 copies; 1933, 27,717 copies. In the past year 65,562 visits were paid to Roman Catholic families.

Election of Professor

Following this was the election of a Professor of Old Testament Language, Literature and Theology for the Assembly's College. Three candidates were nominated: The Rev. H. A. Irvine, M.A., B.D. (Clogher), the Rev. R. J. Wilson, M.A., B.D. (Carrickfergus), and the Rev. S. J. Park, M.A. (Letterkenny). Mr. Irvine was elected on the second ballot.

Moderatorial Nomination

The Report on the Method of Moderatorial Nomination was then discussed. This Report proposes that the Moderator be nominated by a Committee consisting of the Moderator for the time being, Clerk of Assembly, ex-Moderators of the General Assembly, and one minister and one elder from each presbytery. The Rev. John Waddell, M.A. (Fisherwick), urged that this method would do away with canvassing and unofficial nomination committees. But many members of the Assembly have their doubts about this. On a division the report was received and will be submitted to the Presbyteries in the form of an overture for consideration. "Overturitis" is almost as common a malady in Ireland as it is in America!

Foreign and Jewish Mission

On Foreign Mission night it was stated that the past year had been one of the most memorable in the history of the work in Manchuria. The Report on the Jewish Mission revealed the fact that owing to the Anti-Semitic persecution in Germany, the Hamburg Hospital would have to be transferred to a continental society. The Bernese Deaconess Society was willing to take over the hospital with 60 nurses and all responsibilities. The Church and Mission House still remain to carry on Jewish work as far as political conditions will permit. This work at Hamburg has largely grown up around the veteran Dr. Arnold Frank.

The next Assembly was convened to meet in Belfast June 3, 1935.

BELFAST, IRELAND

Independent Board Meets; Stands Fast

Elects Member, Appoints Missionary

THE Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, meeting in the Drake Hotel, Philadelphia, on June 15th, clearly indicated that it did not intend to dissolve, announced (1) that no members had resigned as a result of the illegal deliverance of the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., (2) the election of Mr. F. M. Paist, prominent Philadelphia manufacturer, to the Board; (3) the appointment of another missionary, the Rev. R. H. MacIlwaine, now assistant in the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa. A picture of Mr. MacIlwaine will appear in the September issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

Resignations of three members of the Board, offered prior to the Assembly, for various reasons, were accepted. They are: Dr. F. R. Elder of Cincinnati, Dr. W. Edmonds of Glendale, Calif., and the Rev. C. F. Ball of Philadelphia. No resignations, however, had been forthcoming after the Assembly action. The temper of the Board clearly was that, not being ecclesiastically connected, it should simply proceed as before on its appointed task of furthering biblical missions.

The following statement was issued by the Board:

"In view of current misunderstandings of its position, The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions desires to re-emphasize the fact that it is not connected, and does not seek to be connected, either with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. or with any other of the numerous Presbyterian churches. Its charter does not require any particular ecclesiastical connections on the part of its members or on the part of the missionaries whom it will send out; but what it does require of them is that whatever be their ecclesiastical connections they shall be whole-heartedly devoted to Presbyterian doctrine and to the fundamental principles of Presbyterian church government, in order that they may be instruments to lead men and women in mission lands to embrace not some partial or inconsistent doctrine but the great system of revealed truth which is contained in the Word of God.

"We deny any expressed or implied claim of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or of any group of ecclesiastical organizations, to have an exclusive right to the name 'Presbyterian' and thus an exclusive right to profess in clear and generally understood language adherence to that system of revealed truth which, to distinguish it from inconsistent and incorrect views of what the Bible teaches, is commonly called 'Presbyterian.'

"We regard as being opposed to the most fundamental principles of Presbyterian

church government the notion that a man should pledge himself, as a condition of licensure or ordination, that during his service as a minister in any church he will support whatever agencies may be appointed by shifting majorities in the General Assemblies or other councils of that church. A man who subscribes to such a pledge becomes a servant of men and ceases to be, in the high Biblical sense, a servant of God. Ecclesiastical privilege obtained by such subserviency to men is a mere travesty upon what the Bible presents ordination as being. A real minister of Jesus Christ obtains his message not from the minutes of General Assemblies or other human councils but from the Word of God.

"We are utterly unable to subscribe to the Modernist propaganda now being carried on and fostered by the Board of Foreign Missions of the largest of the Presbyterian churches in this country, the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. We rejoice in the knowledge that that propaganda is contrary to the dearest convictions of hosts of earnest Christian people in that church as well as in other churches. Such Modernist teaching, by whatever agencies it may be carried on, is leading precious souls to eternal destruction. We do not see how it can be supported by Christian men and women. Nor do we see how Christian men and women can refrain from all missionary endeavor or can limit themselves to missionary endeavor that is not committed altogether to a proclamation of the full system of revealed truth which the Bible teaches. Hence the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions has been formed to carry on truly Biblical and truly Presbyterian foreign missions.

"In the prosecution of our task we ask for the prayers of Christian people everywhere. Multitudes of men and women throughout the world are lost in sin, without God and without hope. There is one gospel and one only through which they may be saved. It is not the vague message of Modernism, but it is the gospel which tells us how the Lord Jesus died on the cross as a substitute for sinners. We humbly ask those who have themselves received that gospel, who have been bought with that precious blood, to help us, while yet there is time, to carry the good news to those who without that good news are lost."

News from Detroit and Vicinity

By the Rev. Roy L. Aldrich

THE Covenant Church has called the Rev. Walter E. McClure, D.D., of New Castle, Pa., to the pastorate. The Highland Park

Church is still without a pastor. This church recently celebrated its thirtieth anniversary.

The Martha Holmes and Wesley Methodist Churches are cooperating with the Central Presbyterian Church in an evangelistic campaign to last during the summer. The meetings are held in a large tent in the downtown section.

The Hebrew Christian Mission of Detroit, in which a number of Presbyterian churches are interested, has invited the Rev. Fred Kendal of Toronto to become associated with the work here. A splendid work is being done by this mission among the many Jewish people of Detroit.

DETROIT

Abyssinia

By the Rev. James L. Rohrbaugh

IT is the witness of Church History that a Church once dead never comes to life again. The Armenian, Greek, Russian, Coptic and Roman Churches are good examples. Nevertheless, there does seem to be a possibility of new life in the Coptic Church of Ethiopia. The Coptic Church here has a membership of over three million, all of whom take great pride in the fact that while nations all around it were succumbing to Mohammedanism, Abyssinia alone remained true to the Christian Faith and stands today an island in a sea of Moslems. The average Copt knows his Bible fairly well and has a general idea of the history of his Church. He almost worships its founder, Athanasius, that doughty old warrior who spent most of his life fighting for the doctrine of the eternal Sonship of our Lord. The Copts know that the Portuguese tried to convert their country to Roman Catholicism in the fifteenth and sixteenth century, but they do not realize that though driven from the country these same Portuguese gave to them Mariolatry and Saint worship. The Copts can tell you *how* Jesus died on the Cross, but they haven't the faintest idea *why*. They have an elaborate system of feasting and fasting which, if rigorously followed, will guarantee Paradise for them. The Church is completely dead, there is no doubt about that. Nevertheless, there are some hopeful signs.

One of the Princes of the land, himself a priest, has declared that the Coptic Church needs a Spiritual revival. He hasn't come to the place where he will do much about it but he is opening the provinces he rules to Christian missionary work and has offered to build a mission station. Several missions are preparing to enter his territory in northern Abyssinia and within a very few months work will have been begun there, God willing.

The Secretary to the Archbishop of Ethiopia is a splendid young Egyptian who knows his Bible, Theology and Church History well. He studies English commentaries and seems to have been guided to an understanding of the Scripture, very close to the

Reformed Faith. He sees and deplores the legalism of the Coptic Church and doubts if the average priest really knows the way of salvation. He is working quietly preaching the Word and trying to stir up the priests to a new interest in it. He is but twenty-three years of age, already a brilliant scholar and seems predestined of God to do a great work in his Church. If only he could spend a year at Westminster Seminary! He is now assiduously studying the Greek New Testament with the aid of my Machen's grammar and Thayer's Lexicon.

The great encouraging fact is this. All through the Coptic territory government schools and priests' schools are springing up. People are learning to read by the thousands, but when they can read they find that there is no literature for them to read, and if there was they couldn't afford to buy it. The great need is Scriptural expositions, simply written and distributed in tract form. The people are eager for something to read and each tract would be certain to be read many times. The schools in this country may mean for it what the invention of printing and subsequent primary schools meant for Europe. This land might well be on the verge of a great awakening.

ADDIS ABABA, ABYSSINIA

Washington, Oregon, Idaho

Notes

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

THE Pacific Northwest is some distance from the center of denominational activities, but no member is too far away from the body to be unaffected by the general conditions in the denomination. There are outstanding groups of loyal Bible-believers in the Northwest.

There was organized recently in Seattle a Christian Fellowship "for continuing and contending Christianity." This Fellowship is made up of Presbyterians in Seattle who are Bible-believers and who have the courage of their convictions. They protest against the policy of the ecclesiastical leaders in general, and of the Board of Foreign Missions in particular.

The Whitman Memorial Federated Church of Seattle seems to have aroused the opposition of the machine. As a result, it is reported that the union will be dissolved and the building taken from the congregation. The pastor and people are not inclined to support boards and agencies which are un-Scriptural and un-Presbyterian. Perhaps there is a connection between the stand of the church and its dissolution by Presbytery. But the faithful group will carry on somehow.

At the annual meeting of the congregation and corporation the First Church of Tacoma unanimously adopted a Declaration of Trust, somewhat similar to that adopted by the Tioga Church of Philadelphia.

TACOMA, WASHINGTON

"I have kept the Faith"



Henry Shepard Atkinson

The first alumnus of Westminster Seminary to enter into the joy of the Lord in the heavenly city has begun his days of communion which shall never end.

The Rev. Henry Shepard Atkinson was born in Harpoot, Turkey, of missionary parents, on November 4, 1904. His father's life was taken as a result of the Armenian massacres. Receiving his preparatory education at the Mount Hermon School, Mr. Atkinson graduated from Princeton University with the Bachelor of Arts degree in 1927. He entered upon a course of studies in Princeton Theological Seminary. On November 27, 1928, he was married to Miss Lillian Hoagland of Princeton, and the following summer commenced a fruitful ministry in Montana. After ordination by the Presbytery of Yellowstone on June 29, 1929, he entered upon a blessed work in the Treasure County Presbyterian Church of Hysham.

In 1931 Atkinson returned to the East to pursue further his theological studies, now in Westminster Seminary. He continued these studies until May, 1934, at which time he received both the certificate and graduate certificate of Westminster Seminary.

From 1932 on he performed a signally successful work as regular pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Wildwood, New Jersey. His evangelistic zeal in preaching to great throngs of summer visitors on the Boardwalk at Wildwood brought the news of the gospel to thousands. His ministry in the church was one of comfort to the discouraged and of evangelistic preaching of the Word of God to all. He built up a large and successful vacation Bible School in Wildwood in co-operation with other churches in the city. The many branches of his activity are almost too numerous to mention. His zeal for foreign missions re-

sulted in the generous contributions of his church to the support of the Rev. James L. Rohrbaugh, a young missionary in Ethiopia.

Mr. Atkinson's last sermon was the baccalaureate for this year's graduates from the Wildwood High School. Although he had been in suffering for some time, it was his earnest desire to carry out his promise to preach this sermon and he rose from a bed of pain to do so and to proclaim once more the unsearchable riches of Christ.

On June 21st the Lord took him home from the Presbyterian Hospital in Philadelphia. Of him it may be said that by the grace of God he had already accomplished more than it is granted to many to do in a lifetime full of years.

Indiana News

By the Rev. Geo. C. Hitchcock

HANOVER COLLEGE was host to Synod and Women's Synodical Society June 11th-14th, at Hanover. Honor guests were the Moderator of the General Assembly, Dr. Covert; Dr. George A. Buttrick, pastor of Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City; Dr. Cleland B. McAfee, secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions; Miss Anne Elizabeth Taylor, secretary of the Board of National Missions; Dr. William Ralph Hall, director of the Department of Home and Church, Board of Christian Education; Dr. Henry B. Master, secretary of the Board of Pensions. The Rev. John L. Prentice, pastor of First Church, Bedford, was elected Moderator. Mrs. F. W. Backemeyer, wife of the pastor of First Church, Gary, was elected president of the Synodical. Synod changed its Standing Rules so that chairmen of permanent committees are to serve only six years, and recommended to Presbyteries that they follow this plan in the election of chairmen of committees represented in the Synod. The next meeting of Synod will be in June, 1935, at Winona Lake.

The Presbytery of Vincennes took action similar to the above-mentioned relative to chairmanships, at its spring meeting in April. The call of the Rev. Louis O. Richmond, D.D., was found in order and he will be installed over Central Church, Terre Haute, at the fall meeting in that church.

A United States Dollar

will still bring Christianity Today to any address on earth for a year. An increasing number of people think it a good investment. They say so with letters and dollars from all parts of the globe. If you really want to keep intelligently informed concerning Christianity the world over, we will expect your subscription, or renewal!

If you could use a little extra money, we have an attractive offer for agents. Address the Circulation Department, 501 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

Korea Jubilee

The Korea Mission of the Presbyterian Church will celebrate the Fiftieth Anniversary of the beginning of its work in Korea, following the annual meeting of the Mission. Date, June 30th-July 3rd. Place, Seoul, Chosen.

1. Papers will be read on the following subjects:

"Fifty Years of Promotion by the Home Board and Home Church." The Rev. G. S. McCune, D.D., LL.D.

"Fifty Years of Missionary Life and Service." The Rev. S. A. Moffett, D.D.

"Fifty Years of Mission Principles, Practice and Organization." Dr. C. A. Clark, Ph.D., D.D.

"Fifty Years of Christian Literature." The Rev. H. A. Rhodes, D.D.

"Fifty Years of Women's Work." Miss Margaret Best.

"Fifty Years of Comity and Cooperation." The Rev. N. C. Whittemore.

"Fifty Years of Christian Training." The Rev. S. L. Roberts, D.D.

"Fifty Years of Development of the Korean Church." The Rev. H. E. Blair.

"The Contribution of Educational Work for Young Women to the Christian Movement." Miss B. I. Stevens.

"The Contribution of Educational Work for Young Men to the Christian Movement." The Rev. E. M. Mowry.

"The Contribution of Medical Work to the Christian Movement." O. R. Avison, M.D., LL.D.

"Present Day Economic Problems." The Rev. Edward Adams.

"Present Day Social Problems." The Rev. E. W. Koons, D.D.

"Present Day Religious Problems." The Rev. R. H. Baird.

"The Forward Look." The Rev. J. G. Holdcroft, D.D.

Each paper is to be discussed and a Committee on Findings is to report at the end of the Conference.

2. The Purpose of the Celebration: "Historical events will be recounted, but the motive determining the jubilee program is to review the principles and policies which the Mission believes that God has so signally honored in the establishment of the Korean Presbyterian Church."

3. Printed material to be available:

(1) The Mission's official pamphlet containing in compact form history, statistics, principles, and problems.

(2) 600-page "History of the Korea Mission," with history, charts and tables and 50 pages of pictures.

(3) August number of the "Korea Mission Field," will contain short account of the Jubilee, extracts from papers, and a summary of findings.

(4) 150-page book with the papers in full, the complete findings and as much of the discussion as possible.



The Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths
Managing Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY

In Mr. Griffiths' absence on vacation, we are taking this opportunity of having his picture in the paper.

Plan of Union Defeated

The Plan of Union between the United Presbyterian Church of North America and the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. has been defeated. By a vote of 123 against submission to the Presbyteries and 113 for, the United Presbyterian Assembly on June 22 decisively defeated the plan. Later it discharged its committee on union. Well-informed observers are practically unanimous in declaring the plan of union to be dead. A more complete account of the action will be carried in the next issue of "Christianity Today."

IN THIS ISSUE:

Editorials

United Presbyterians Reject Merger	57
"God Gets Second Place".....	57
The Independent Board.....	59
The Synod of Pennsylvania in 1934	60
OSWALD T. ALLIS	
The Church Militant, the Church Expectant and the Church Triumphant	63
LAWRENCE B. GILMORE	
Mountains and Why We Love Them	66
J. GRESHAM MACHEN	
Starting An Every-Day Bible School on Faith	69
A. PETERS	

Netherlands Letter

By the Rev. F. W. Grosheide, Th.D.,
Professor in the Free University,
Amsterdam

IN my former letters I related more than once the two overtures on the reorganization of the Dutch Reformed Church. The first, the more orthodox of the two, was already rejected by the Synod. This year the Synod has to judge the second, that of the middle party, which we call the *ethical*. This project has a somewhat double-faced character. Without doubt it founds the church on Jesus Christ. But it spares the liberals, because it creates the possibility of having what it calls "house-churches," that is to say, that groups who are not content with the leading of the local congregations receive an allowance to make a little congregation of themselves, having an independent existence. It is a matter of fact that the house-church is a form to allow the liberals to remain in a church which has an orthodox basis, for in all the greater congregations the liberals are a minority and they have no influence in the leading of the Church. It is true that this is the consequence of another fact, viz., that the greater part of the liberals have no interest in the matters of the Church. They do not vote or resign the membership, but nevertheless the influence of the liberals in the congregations of the main city is of no importance.

And now there is a great struggle about this "ethical" overture. The orthodox have great objection because they, and not without ground, see in it official acknowledgment of the liberals. The liberals are not content, because they do not acknowledge that the standards of the Church have vigour for its members and further because the new overture will found the Church on Jesus Christ.

The Synod of this year, in which the middle party has the majority, has to vote for the first time (for such proposals are treated at least twice) over the overture and we all are anxious to know the result.

Prof. Dr. H. H. Kuyper of the Free University, Amsterdam, reached this year the age of seventy, the normal age at which our professors resign. The board of the University, however, invited Prof. Kuyper, who is in full strength again after his serious illness, to continue his lessons for a year.

Finally a remarkable fact. Since the times of the Reformation there were in Holland many French congregations, which received a great increase of members by the recall of the edict of Nantes. In our times, however, the greater part of these French communities became "liberal." But now there is in Haarlem a young French minister, Swiss in origin, who is enterprising but also an orthodox man, a friend and congenial spirit of Professor Lecerf. Now the Rev. Mr. Krafft, as is his name, gives us a new edition of the Catechism of Calvin!
AMSTERDAM