

O F S DYRNSS
MAY 1935-R
R 2
QUARRYVILLE PA

CHRISTIANITY TODAY



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

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

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

DECEMBER, 1934
Vol. 5 No. 7

\$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

BISHOP MANNING'S PRONOUNCEMENT

THE sermon preached by BISHOP WILLIAM T. MANNING, of New York, on October 21st, at Atlantic City, in connection with the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, continues to attract attention and comment. On that occasion, it will be recalled, BISHOP MANNING affirmed with all possible clarity and emphasis that the Protestant Episcopal Church as regards both its faith and its doctrine of the ministry is "fundamentally and definitely Catholic." "Her distinctive beliefs," he said, "are those which have been held and taught by the Catholic Church throughout the world since the Apostles' days, and she cannot compromise this position without disloyalty to her principles and disloyalty to her past . . . she holds definitely to the doctrine of the priesthood and to the necessity of Episcopal ordination." Most of these comments have been unfavorable. Many Episcopalians do not share the High Church views of BISHOP MANNING and so sympathize with Protestantism rather than Greek and Roman Catholicism. In fact it is hardly too much to say that apart from the Anglo-Catholic section of the Episcopal Church these comments have been generally unfavorable. Protestants in general, whether liberals or conservatives, by reason of the fact that they are Protestants, while they may commend BISHOP MANNING's upright attitude, have small sympathy with his anti-Protestant views. Roman Catholics on the other hand look upon BISHOP MANNING's Catholicism as a pseudo-Catholicism and do not recognize the validity of Episcopal ordination any more than Presbyterian ordination. The Anglo-Catholics are in the rather unenviable position of affirming that their position is in harmony with that of most of Christendom but finding no one except themselves to admit their claim.

BISHOP MANNING's pronouncement has significance largely because of its bearing on Church union. It indicates an insuperable barrier in the way of union between the Episcopal and other Protestant churches. So far from regarding Episcopal ordination as essential to the being of the Christian Church, Protestants in general do not even regard it as essential to or even as promoting the well-being of the Christian Church. We are disposed to look upon Anglo-Catholicism as a half-way position between Protestantism and Catholicism that has the disadvantages of both and the advantages of neither. But serious as is the obstacle that different conceptions of the ministry places in the way of Church union, it is by no means as serious as are the different conceptions that exist as to the Gospel itself. The difference between the Modernists and the so-called Fundamentalists is far deeper and wider than the difference between the sacerdotal and the evangelical conceptions of the ministry. Insistence on Episcopal ordination is a more or less harmless delusion as compared with the conten-

tion that Modernism in any of its consistent forms is an expression of Christianity. And yet there are plenty of "Presbyterians" who think that the "Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy" is much ado about nothing!

"THAT NEW FOREIGN BOARD"

UNDER this heading DR. HENRY SLOANE COFFIN, President of Union Theological Seminary of New York, has written and the *Presbyterian Tribune* has printed (November 1) an article dealing with the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions with special reference to the character of its members and the action of the last Assembly instructing the presbyteries to discipline them for their "disorderly and disloyal" conduct. Inasmuch as Modernism in the Foreign Board was the occasion of the setting up of the Independent Board, it is illuminative as well as interesting to know what so outstanding a Modernist as DR. COFFIN thinks about the matter in question.

It may be noted, in the first place, that DR. COFFIN has no word of criticism for "our officially constituted Board." He has only praise for those connected with it. "The General Assembly," he writes, "has done well to state the truth concerning the fidelity of its tried and trusted servants, and to call on congregations to sustain them." It may be a source of satisfaction to those in control of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions to be assured that DR. COFFIN fully approves their conduct of the missionary enterprise. It can hardly be expected, however, that Bible-believing Christians have obtained any satisfaction from this assurance and that as a result they will be led to feel that they ought to do more in the way of supporting said Board. Rather it is safe to assume that DR. COFFIN's whole-hearted approval of the official Board will strengthen them in the conviction that the official Board, as at present constituted, is unworthy of their confidence and undeserving of their support. This is not to deny that there are many sound missionaries working under the auspices of the official Board. Neither is it necessary to imply that Bible-believing Christians may not safely contribute to foreign missions through the official Board—provided they designate their gifts in such a way that they can be used only for the support of sound missionaries. Those who give undesignated funds, however, can have no assurance that a part or even that the whole of it will not be used to further Modernism. If the policy of the Board was anti-modernistic we may be sure that it would not have DR. COFFIN's unstinted praise.

It may be noted, in the second place, that DR. COFFIN holds that the last Assembly "acted unwisely" when it directed the presbyteries to discipline any and all Presbyterians connected with the Independent Board. He seems to be sceptical as to the validity of the legal argument by which the General Council seeks to justify its action. At any rate he says that he read it "with mixed

feelings." Moreover he writes: "Despite the legal argument that the Assembly has control of the benevolences of its churches, we are well aware that many congregations take up collections for enterprises not under the Assembly's jurisdiction"—a statement that seems to indicate that he agrees that there is nothing in the Constitution and practice of the Presbyterian Church that makes it mandatory for its members to contribute to missions only through its official Boards. But whatever he thinks about the legal status of the Independent Board he does not think it probable that the "sentiment of the Church, nor of the outside public, would approve so extreme a course as the removal from office of a minister or an elder because he disagreed with the conduct of the Church's missionary undertaking and joined in a rival enterprise." Moreover he has wit enough to perceive that "offerings cannot be compelled" and that "there is one way, and one only, by which our Boards can gain the support of our churches—by winning and holding it through the character of the work done." He is also fearful lest discipline may arouse sympathy for the members of the new Board. He puts it thus: "If they are disciplined by legal process, sympathy which now rightly sets strongly toward the abused leaders of our Foreign Board is likely to turn toward the disciplined. Such a turn of public feeling may be unreasonable, but none the less it often happens, for men, even Christian men, are not altogether rational." In this connection it may be pointed out that DR. COFFIN apparently thinks that discipline will lead to secession and that the action of the Assembly does not adequately safeguard liberty of conscience. With a member of the new Board in mind he writes: "We may consider what he calls his 'conscience,' his prejudices or his crankiness or even his personal animosities; but 'conscience' is not easily defined and delimited, and it is all important that its liberty be safeguarded."

Approving as he does of the official Board, it was not to be expected that DR. COFFIN would think well of the new and more or less rival Board. But while we did not expect him to approve the establishment of the new Board we were not prepared for the violent abuse that he heaps upon its members. We do not recall having known DR. COFFIN to become as vituperative as he does in the article before us. It would seem that the very mention of the new Board causes him (along with others who need not be mentioned) to "see red" to such a degree that he cannot speak or write dispassionately. He denounces them as narrow, bigoted, intolerant, bitter, unfair, disloyal, rebellious, treacherous, mendacious, and as given to slander, misrepresentation and vilification. And then as a climax—or shall we say as an anti-climax—he affirms that they have atrocious manners and expresses the wish that they were gentlemen. When he says that the male members of the new Board are not gentlemen, DR. COFFIN obviously implies that its female members are not ladies. We submit that it is hardly an edifying spectacle to see the President of Union Theological Seminary telling consecrated Christian women that they are not ladies. Gentlemen, as a rule at least, do not speak after that manner. Perhaps a yet more amazing thing in this connection is that DR. COFFIN, after this public denunciation of the members of the new Board, goes on to say: "We must live in the 13th Chapter of First Corinthians. We have to learn to be tolerant of those who are not tolerant of us." Apparently DR. COFFIN does not attach any significance to the saying that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones. We would suggest that he make Robert Burns's prayer his own:

"Oh wad some power the giftie gee us
To see oursel's as others see us!
It wad frae monie a blunder free us,
And foolish notion."

The editor of this paper holds no brief for the new Board. He thinks it an open question whether the establishment of this particular Board provided the most effective method available for promoting truly Biblical and truly Presbyterian missions. But that its members are not ladies and gentlemen or that they possess

all, or even any, of the characteristics DR. COFFIN ascribes to them he does not for a moment believe. Whether one approves or disapproves of the organization they have established, there is no warrant for denying that they constitute a group of Christian men and women of an unusually high type who are animated by noble motives. But even if they were as bad as DR. COFFIN paints them, that would not mean that the official Board is worthy of the confidence and support of those who believe in truly Biblical and truly Presbyterian missions. To denounce the members of the new Board is not to answer the criticisms that have been made of the official Board. If the criticisms of the official Board made by DR. MACHEN and others were answerable, we are sure that its friends and supporters would do something more than denounce these critics. The fact that up to date they have done nothing more than denounce their critics would seem to indicate that they are aware that the criticisms themselves are unanswerable.

DR. COFFIN says that the last Assembly "acted unwisely" concerning the new Board. It is a pity that he does not have the insight—or shall we say the independence and courage?—to say that its action was unfair, unconstitutional and unchristian.

DR. MILLIKAN DENIES THE SUPERNATURAL

DR. ROBERT A. MILLIKAN, a noted physicist, on his return from London, where he presided at the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics, gave expression to his views concerning a number of things, including the supernatural, according to various newspapers issued under date of November 2nd. He is reported to have said, when questioned as to whether his view of things excluded the supernatural, that "there is no such thing as supernatural. We have been calling everything we did not understand 'the supernatural'." DR. MILLIKAN'S view is consistent with materialism or pantheism but not with theism; and that because no man is really a theist who does not believe in the supernatural fact we call God. The materialist who holds that everything is a manifestation of matter or the pantheist who holds that everything is a manifestation of God need not and does not make any distinction between what is called the natural and the supernatural. But such a distinction is inherent in every genuinely theistic view as such a view in the nature of the case conceives of God as transcending the universe (as well as imminent in it) and so as a supernatural fact. It is no doubt true that men have often called what they did not understand "the supernatural" but that does not alter the fact that if we were omniscient we would still have to make use of this distinction to describe reality. "The representation is wrong," HERMAN BAVINCK rightly says, "that faith in the existence and providence of God finds its home exclusively in the chasms of our knowledge, so that as our investigations proceed, we must be continually filled with anxiety, and steadily lose the territory of our faith in proportion as more and more problems are solved. For the world is itself grounded in God; witness its law and order. Faith . . . maintains its demand that natural science shall retain consciousness of its limitations and that it shall not form a conception, out of the narrow sphere in which it works, in which no room is left for the soul and immortality, for intelligence and design in the world, for the existence and providence of God, for religion and Christianity." It is hardly necessary for us to point out that DR. MILLIKAN'S view, if valid, means that Christianity can be believed only by the ignorant. The supernatural as we have frequently pointed out and as DR. TOPPING pointed out afresh in our October issue, is the very breath of the nostrils of Christianity. It enters into its warp and woof to such a degree that it is literally true that Christianity de-supernaturalized is Christianity extinct. It lies at the very heart of our Christian confession that a supernatural person became incarnate for us men and our salvation. The choice before us is not between a natural and a supernatural Christianity but between a supernatural Christianity and no Christianity at all.

THE REFORMATION FELLOWSHIP AND THE AUBURN AFFIRMATION

WIDESPREAD publicity has been given to the fact that an organization known as the Reformation Fellowship had endorsed the action of certain of its officers in initiating judicial proceedings in Philadelphia Presbytery against those of its members who are signers of the Auburn Affirmation. Whether they will succeed in getting the Presbytery to consider the charges they have filed against these Auburn Affirmationists remains to be seen. The editor of this paper is not a member of the Reformation Fellowship and so had nothing to do, directly or indirectly, with the filing of these charges. Had he been consulted in the matter he would probably have advised against the step, not on the ground that these charges were not well-grounded, but on the ground that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is dominated by the Modernist-Indifferentist party to such a degree that there did not exist reasonable grounds for supposing that such a case would be tried on its merits. That the Auburn Affirmationists are heretics—the Bible and the standards of the Presbyterian Church being judge—seems to him as clear as the distinction between sweet and bitter, between day and night. To cite PROFESSOR CASPAR WISTAR HODGE: "The plenary inspiration (and hence the inerrancy) of the Scriptures, the Virgin Birth and bodily Resurrection of Christ, His substitutionary Atonement by which He rendered a Satisfaction to Divine Justice, and His personal Return, are not only explicitly affirmed in the Westminster Confession, but are also essential to that common Christianity adhered to by the Romish, Greek, Lutheran and Reformed Churches, and essential to the Christianity of the New Testament." But to suppose that General Assemblies such as we have had in recent years and such as we are practically sure of having for some years to come would pronounce the Auburn Affirmationists to be heretics indicates a confidence in their intelligence and integrity that he does not have. In his opinion even if the Reformation Fellowship suc-

ceeds in its efforts to get the Presbytery of Philadelphia to consider these charges the case will ultimately be set aside on technical grounds—unless it be true that the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. has apostasized to such a degree that it is prepared formally to declare that the Auburn Affirmationists are perfectly sound and orthodox in their teachings. If the rank and file of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. really approve the views expressed in the Auburn Affirmation common honesty demands that said church revise its creeds so as to bring it in harmony with its real views. No church should sail under false colors. Should that be done those of us who in all heartiness and sincerity believe the Bible to be the Word of God and that the Westminster Confession of Faith contains the system of doctrine taught in the Bible will no longer be able to justify our continuance in the membership of this church. But as long as the official creed of the church remains as it is, we at least have the satisfaction of knowing that the creed we profess is in harmony with our actual views. Moreover, it seems to be our duty to remain in the Presbyterian Church and work for its reformation as long as the creed of the church remains substantially as it is or until it becomes clear that the rank and file of the church has apostasized to such a degree that it is hopeless to suppose that it will ever return to its first love.

The editor of this paper wishes the Reformation Fellowship success in its laudable attempt to reform the Church so that, to cite its Certificate of Incorporation, it "may be purified of unbelief and controlled only by those who recognize and believe the system of doctrine of the historic standards of the Reformed Faith." Moreover, while he thinks it more than doubtful whether it will succeed in its immediate objective he does not think that there is any statute of limitation that can fairly be pled as debarring it from prosecuting the signers of the Auburn Affirmation. Be that as it may the very fact that the Auburn Affirmationists are pleading the statute of limitations is in effect a confession that they are fearful of having this case tried on its merits.

The Independent Board and Its Critics

By the Rev. David S. Clark, D.D.

WHOM the gods would destroy they first make mad." And we fear that the officialdom of the Presbyterian Church is mad in both senses of the word. *The Presbyterian*, while fair enough to include articles on both sides, takes occasion to say of the Fundamentalists: "We are not able to accept their *ipse dixit* as complete proof nor their assertion as a formal proved condemnation of the Assembly's Board." Further: "It ought to be remembered that critics of the Board have as yet never brought into any Church court a definite process for judicial attention. They are the judges in their own case. On the other hand the Board . . . does not wish for safety and peace alone, but to prosecute the cause of preaching the shed blood of Christ all over the world, with the unswerving loyalty of all, and that, not because nothing has been proved against the Board, but because there is nothing that *can be proved* against the Board." (Italics ours.) Shades of Blackstone ! ! ! ! What constitutes proof?

1. Has it ever been denied that some of Dr. Fosdick's books were translated by an agency with which the official Board works closely and sent to the mission field? Did not a secretary of the Board boast of this as one of the out-

standing events of the year? Report has it that "The Modern Use of the Bible" by Dr. Fosdick is used as a textbook in Nanking University with which our official Board co-operates. Too much Fosdick influence in our official Board.

2. Pearl Buck. We hope that episode is over; but how did it happen that she could say: "It makes no difference if Jesus Christ never lived," and remain a missionary of the Board till she voluntarily resigned?

3. We hope the Hadley episode is over, but how did it ever happen that an Auburn Affirmationist was made candidate secretary, and that prospective missionaries were advised to read modernist literature, as a preparation for their work? And now it is said that his resignation has been accepted with regret. Why not with thanksgiving?

4. "Unthinking Missions." We never did like a diet of milk and water. The Board's reaction was too tame and complaisant. But since the pastor of a very rich church in New York City was a member of the Laymen's Commission, and also on nearly every important Committee of the General Assembly, even to making the new Hymnal, we

figure that it seemed quite expedient for a money-seeking organization to try to please all sides.

5. James Speers, vice-president of the Board, advocates the Laymen's Report, and says: "Our earnest hope is that the Report will become more and more effective, as the inevitability of its major recommendations is recognized by an enlightened Christian public. The Committee perceives clearly the rising tide of interest in the new viewpoint of missions, and is profoundly grateful for the part the Report has played in arousing such interest. . . . The Committee wishes to express its deep conviction that the truth in the Report will ultimately prevail." *That* from the vice-president of the official Board, wishing that the Unitarian onslaught on evangelical missions might sweep the church!

6. Study-books, prepared by joint committees of various denominations, have been rather unsatisfactory to conservative Presbyterians, even the teen-age bearing witness to the paucity of religious material.

7. "No judicial process ever brought into a Church court for judicial attention." At least the Philadelphia Presbytery sent an overture to the 1933 Assembly, couched in respectful language, with not one disrespectful word in it, praying the Assembly to elect to the Board of Foreign Missions only such men as are true to our standards and awake to the dangers that are imminent. Even a liberal said: "Any Christian ought to vote for that." How was that overture treated? Absolutely rejected, its proponents labeled as trouble-makers, and stigmatized as "Guerrillas."

It makes no difference that the overture was administrative rather than "judicial," the temper of the Assembly was clearly against any reformation, or redress of grievances. It was because of positive refusal to remedy existing evils that the Independent Board came into existence. Dr. Machen and his friends are not to be blamed for the outcome; but the Assembly itself, and the official Board. They have George Thirded it so long and so arbitrarily that they have compelled a Declaration of Independence.

Dr. Mark Matthews writes voluminously and thunders vociferously about proceeding by constitutional processes. It sounds big and means little. How can a Board be charged with heresy and brought to trial for deliberate and joint actions? And what would be the use if it could? The Assembly that whitewashes the Board would acquit it in a judicial process. The Conservatives might as well save their powder and shot. *The Presbyterian* says: "There is nothing that can be proved against the Board." Of course not—if no proof is admitted. But nonetheless that is a pretty sweeping statement.

In penalizing the independents the Assembly has acted *ultra vires*. After all the labor and bluster about a Constitutional Church, and Court of Highest Authority, and overwhelming majorities, the coercionists have not made out a case. A fraction of liberty still belongs to members of the Presbyterian Church.

The following has been cited so often that it is commonplace: *Directory*:—"The offerings may be apportioned among the Boards of the church, and among other benev-

olent and Christian objects, under the supervision of the Session." The church Session has some liberties which the General Assembly cannot deny. The Assembly itself is subject to the Constitution.

A better declaration is found in the concurrent declarations of 1869, the force of which no Assembly can repeal: "There should be one set of Committees or Boards for Home and Foreign Missions, and the other religious enterprises of the church, which the churches should be encouraged to sustain, though free to cast their contributions into other channels if they desire to do so." That certainly establishes the right of any man to give his contributions to any cause he pleases, and if he chooses to give them to the Independent Board, he cannot be called to account.

8. Cleland B. McAfee, in the August number of *Women and Missions*, says: "The issue at Cleveland was not one of soundness in the faith, had nothing to do with 'modernism' or 'liberalism,' both of which had been disavowed in definite terms by the Board and the General Assembly in all their declarations." On the contrary, every one knows that the whole affair has grown out of the modernism of the official Board. If there had been no modernism in the official Board there never would have been an Independent Board. The facts penetrate any smoke screen that Dr. McAfee can throw around the official Board.

9. Dr. Covert in his letter to the pastors August 1, 1934, says: "These charges the General Assembly of 1933 heard at great length through its duly elected Standing Committee on Foreign Missions, which Standing Committee by a vote of 43 to 2, and the General Assembly, by an equally overwhelming vote, declared unfounded." If the General Assembly voted these charges unfounded it voted an egregious untruth. Was Mr. Hadley never Candidate Secretary? Was he not a signer of the Auburn Affirmation? Did he never commend modernist books? Did James Speers never commend the Laymen's Report? Were the Fosdick books never translated and sent to the Mission field? Is it unfounded that the perfectly reasonable overture from the Philadelphia Presbytery received scant recognition in the Assembly? Is it unfounded that the Board has in its membership some very decided modernists? Dr. Covert further says: "The right to control the property of the members of the church or to prescribe how they shall dispose of their money is utterly foreign to the spirit of Presbyterianism." On reading this an acute Presbyterian asked the categorical question: "Then what is he kicking about?" He is "kicking" that there should be any organization to solicit and receive it and call itself Presbyterian. But the existence of the Independent Board enables the Presbyterians to support the kind of missions they prefer. Otherwise they could only support some unPresbyterian agency since they cannot support the official Board with its bias to modernism.

10. The official Board cannot deny nor escape the charges made against it. And it has manifested no change of heart nor mended its ways up to the present minute.

(Concluded on page 167)

Frank H. Stevenson

By the Rev. F. R. Elder, D.D.

[Dr. Elder, the author of this memoir of the late Dr. Frank Stevenson, is particularly fitted to write it. He was a long-time friend of Dr. Stevenson, having been his classmate at Princeton Seminary and his successor as Minister of the Church of the Covenant in Cincinnati.]

FA! IT is a right Jerusalem blade," said Great Heart to Mr. Valiant-for-truth as he scrutinized the latter's sword. The world can never have enough men who will fight to maintain the truth but theirs is a feeble struggle unless they have as their chief weapon a right Jerusalem blade, the sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God. In the passing of Dr. Frank Stevenson we have lost a Mr. Valiant-for-truth who was skilled in the use of that weapon. His love for the Scriptures and his devotion to the faith revealed in them were the determining factors of his character and career. Not long before his death he wrote, "Let us ministers have done with the idea that we must have a new thing to attract and hold people. Learn the Bible; proclaim it; let eternal truths ring out! Such preaching does not empty the pews of a Church but widens the Church's walls. Preaching the Word, the whole Word, and nothing but the Word, will demonstrate the power of God."

With our blunted vision we regard his half-century here on earth as all too short and his departure as premature. We can dimly apprehend that circumstances in the higher altitudes of the kingdom of God must have demanded his services with a claim which outranked the need of Westminster Seminary for him as President of its Board of Trustees, the need of his friends for his inspiring companionship and even the need of his family for a devoted husband and father.

He was reared in California. His family was of pioneer stock. He was brought up in a home that must have been unusual. A mother's influence is revealed in her children's walk and conversation and Frank Stevenson always displayed the breeding and tastes of a gentleman of the old school. His familiarity with the best in literature was a constant surprise to his friends in seminary days for it was not a knowledge which is acquired by midnight oil. Rather he gave constant evidence of being early immersed in an atmosphere of good books.

At Princeton Seminary which he entered in the fall of 1908, he found himself under a temporary handicap, because of his several years' vacation from academic pursuits. But the time he spent in successful endeavors in the

business world had developed in him good judgment, decision of character, and understanding of the human heart. These qualities coupled with his rich cultural background soon enabled him to arrive rapidly at a place of true leadership.

Princeton in those days was a delightful place in which to live. The fine old buildings grouped with dignity upon the pleasing campus exercised a potent charm. The fellowship of kindred minds was in itself a sufficient cause for

life's enjoyment. Not least in affecting our pleasure in those departed days was the fact that Princeton Seminary was the stronghold of the conservative cause in the Presbyterian Church, a citadel which had not yet surrendered to the onrushing forces of Liberalism or the sapping and mining of Indifferentism. To all this Frank Stevenson was most sensitive and he threw himself into every phase of seminary life with characteristic abandon. He never ceased to be proud and grateful for the imprint that Princeton placed upon his life.

After his seminary course he had the great privilege of four years in the bracing atmosphere of the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, where for one year he was assistant and later associate minister. The work was not easy but he thrived under it. The intensive training he received in Pitts-

burgh fitted him for his great work in Cincinnati, to which city he was called in 1915 as pastor of the Presbyterian Church of the Covenant. His ministry of thirteen years in this downtown church was brilliantly successful and abundantly fruitful. Those were crowded years. A Gothic chapel adjoining the church and conforming to its beautiful architecture came into being at his inspiration. He took the lead in a Billy Sunday Campaign. His church was a mighty spiritual power and an unfailing fountain of comfort during the dark days of the war. Doubtless his greatest achievement in Cincinnati was the development in the church of an institutional work which was frankly and thoroughly Christian in every department. His own explanation of the high achievements of the Church was expressed in these words: "We have been prosperous in a marked degree in growth, in financial strength,



DR. FRANK H. STEVENSON

in the harmony of the membership, in making plans and seeing them through. I think it is because we have put first things first. We have not tried to compromise. We have not bought peace with the world at terrible cost. We are simply an old-fashioned Presbyterian Church humbly trying to serve our blessed Saviour whom we love." To which should be added that the Church had a pastor of dynamic personality who was zealous for the Kingdom of God.

The pastoral instinct was strong in him and displayed itself early. As a seminary student he became a shepherd of souls. His friends at Princeton never knew when he would appear with some bedraggled specimen of humanity who needed kindness and encouragement but above all needed desperately the saving grace of Christ. He was at home among all classes and conditions of people but he was at his best with the highest and lowest strata of society. He was at ease with the socially elect, fearless with the rich and powerful, and unembarrassed in the presence of the great. In homes of squalor and degradation, among the ignorant, the poor and the outcast he moved with sympathy and understanding. There was no constraint, no condescension in his dealings with the unfortunate. There are many in the poorer homes of Cincinnati who rise up and call him blessed.

Dr. Stevenson loved to preach. Doubtless the greatest disappointment of his enforced retirement from the active pastorate was that he no longer had a pulpit from which to expound the everlasting Gospel. He bore the deprivation without repining as was his habit but it was none the less a great sorrow. A sermon for him was not a speech to be tossed off on the inspiration of the moment. It must be written out in full with the expenditure of much nervous energy and prayer. He was keenly aware of the power of the printed word, hence he occasionally had prepared attractive copies of sermons which had brought light and healing. These his people sent far and wide and they still are being used of God.

His first printed sermons came from the press when he was half way through his seminary course. Two sermons were included in a little booklet which he called, "The Believing Heart." They were the sermons of a young man but a young man of great promise. In them is more than a hint of the fire, the movement, the felicity of phrase, the close linking of doctrine and life and the appreciation of present day issues that were to distinguish his later utterances. But these sermonic efforts are mentioned here not because of their subject matter but because of the brief preface which introduced them. This paragraph shows the moral earnestness, the passion for souls of the young preacher. "One purpose has prompted me to print this little booklet. I want it to speak for me to old acquaintances and business associates, most of whom I shall probably never see again. I am confident that it will at least meet with a friendly reception and if, perhaps, it may help to establish Jesus Christ in the heart of one man, I shall be satisfied."

As a broadcasting preacher in Cincinnati his voice was

eagerly awaited over a wide area from week to week. When he began this form of ministry the radio was just coming into its own and had not yet been taken as a matter of course. He dedicated station WLW and was the first minister in Ohio to use the radio for broadcasting his preaching services. People met in clubs, fire houses, hospitals and other institutions to join in the service. They procured hymn books and participated in the songs and prayers. Each week letters from grateful hearers arrived in shoals. Bed-ridden folk forgotten and discouraged in remote hamlets thanked God for the privilege of sharing in the worship services of the Church of the Covenant. Echoes from Dr. Stevenson's ringing messages still come back to the church where they were spoken so long ago.

His retirement from the exhausting responsibilities of a downtown institutional church in 1928 gave him the opportunity to use his remaining energies in a cause which had already begun to absorb much of his attention and interest. That cause was none other than the defense of the Reformed Faith in the Presbyterian Church. It was nothing less than an anomaly that the necessity for such defense should exist but beyond question the theology of Calvin which gave the Presbyterian Church its being had been wounded in the house of its friends. Throughout his ministry Dr. Stevenson had always aligned himself with those who were friends of the doctrines of grace. No one who heard him preach could come away from the service without knowing where he stood on these great matters. As President of the Board of Lane Theological Seminary and as a member of the Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary he had made every effort to insure the conservative character of these institutions. He had been active in the struggles in several critical General Assemblies, notably the one in Atlantic City in 1916, when New York Presbytery was required to obey the law of the Church and the Indianapolis Assembly in 1923 which declared once more in unequivocal language the essential character of certain doctrines, such as the Virgin Birth.

Dr. Stevenson's conservatism in theology was not a mere inheritance or a line of least resistance. He arrived at this position after many a soul struggle but having once made his decision he devoted his life to preserving the Reformed Faith in its purity and his conviction of the truth of that theological position grew with the years. Evangelicalism has been defined as Calvinism on fire. If so, he was a true evangelical. And best of all his religion was an increasing joy to him.

In ecclesiastical affairs he was not a placid person. He wanted peace but it must come in the Biblical way, as the fruit of righteousness. Jeremiah could not have felt more strongly than he about those who cry, "Peace, peace," when there is no peace. He was faithful to his ordination vows and did not forget that he had promised "to be zealous and faithful in maintaining the truths of the gospel, and the purity and peace of the church." He put the purity of the church first, just as the Fathers had done when they formulated the terms of subscription. Therein he differed

from the modern churchmen who want peace at any price but exhibit a cavalier indifference to purity.

With the assembly of 1929 the Princeton Controversy came to a close. Superior political maneuvering combined with a childish and persistent emphasis on personalities obscured the real issues involved and those who had struggled to preserve the fidelity of the seminary to the standards of the church went down to defeat. The latitudinarians were in the saddle. The directors, professors and students of Princeton who had been consistently loyal to the Reformed Faith had no where to go but out, and out they went.

Within a very few weeks after the death knell for the old Princeton was sounded a movement was on foot to establish a new seminary which should be loyal beyond peradventure to the Westminster Confession of Faith. Four months later Westminster Theological Seminary was founded in Philadelphia. Twenty-five young men of stout heart and quick conscience shook the dust of Princeton off their feet, took their ecclesiastical futures in their hands and presented themselves at the humble door of the new institution. They forsook a seminary beautiful for situation and teeming with honorable traditions, for one that had no past, no endowment, no ivy-covered halls, nothing but a sublime faith in One who will not fail or be discouraged. They were greeted by four of their former teachers at Princeton who counted comfort and assurance well lost as they committed themselves with open eyes to the hazards of this untried venture.

No one had been more active nor more eager in the arduous labors which preceded the opening of the new seminary than Dr. Stevenson. He had been one of the first to see the necessity for it and had given himself to the enterprise without reserve. When the Board of Trustees came to organize he was unanimously chosen as president thereof and for five years his life belonged to Westminster Seminary. Not only did he give liberally of his means but all the charm of his personality, all the skill of his pen and all the zeal of his soul he laid on the altar of the seminary, in order that it might be the kind of institution God wants for the training of ministers of his everlasting Gospel. During the first years in addition to his executive responsi-

bilities he gave his services to the seminary as teacher of pastoral theology and homiletics. The young men were drawn to him as young men always were. His rich experience, his enthusiasm, his engaging manner, his deep interest in the students made them devoted to him. No phase of his life's work appealed to him more than the opportunities offered for influencing the lives of young men.

God gave his favor in abundant measure to the new institution. Dr. Stevenson saw the student body double in numbers. He saw the friends of the seminary increase from year to year. He saw the financial credit of the institution unimpaired as each year closed, despite the fact that those were five years of incomparable depression. He had been one of the Lord's chief instruments in making this record possible.

An earlier Stevenson who also knew what it meant to battle for years against weakness and suffering and who also died in what we think of as the prime of life wrote a passage which can be considered prophetic of his namesake. "In the hot-fit of life, a-tiptoe on the highest point of being, he passes at a bound on to the other side. The noise of the mallet and chisel is scarcely quenched, the trumpets are hardly done blowing, when, trailing with him clouds of glory, this happy-starred, full-blooded spirit shoots into the spiritual land."

Wordsworth was thinking of a man like him when he described one

"Who, whether praise of him must walk the earth
Forever, and to noble deeds give birth,
Or he must fall, to sleep without his fame,
And leave a dead unprofitable name—
Finds comfort in himself and in his cause;
And, while the mortal mist is gathering draws
His breath in confidence of Heaven's applause."

His life was talented, interesting, colorful, devoted. Men like him are rare. But he made a real contribution to his generation because he dedicated his whole life with all its abilities and influence to the purposes of God. His death is a summons to a like consecration by those who love the Word of the Lord.

"In the Lord"

By the Rev. William Parsons

GREAT stress is being laid upon these words today as they are found in Question 4 of the ordination vows of the Presbyterian church. It would seem, however, the part of wisdom for our ecclesiastical leaders to ask themselves the question, "just what do these words mean," before pressing prosecution of conscientious men because of the failure to make good on this item of the vows.

Of course, these words are derived from Col. 3:18-20, and Eph. 6:1. Neither of these passages refer to ecclesias-

tical authority, but to parental. In fact it is rather remarkable how few passages in the New Testament do teach ecclesiastical authority. Matt. 18:20, 1 Thes. 5:12-13, 1 Tim. 5:17 and Heb. 13:7, 17 are the principal ones. Perhaps 1 Pet. 5:5 might be added, but that seems to enjoin that natural deference of youth to age and the mutual consideration of one another. It may, however, carry also the idea of submission to church authority.

When they who fashioned our ordination vows took over this Pauline expression, it is safe to assume that they

took it in its evident and natural meaning. That meaning is "within the limits of the Lord's teachings." While recognizing the fact that there have been two interpretations of these words from Origen's time to the present, the preponderating authority has been thrown to this historic interpretation. "In the Lord" modifies "obedience" and not "parents." It sets forth the sphere of that obedience.

A moderate acquaintance with "Reformed" thinking will assure any one that this was the meaning intended by its insertion in Question 4. But the present leaders of our church seem to put into it a vagrant meaning and make it modify "brethren." And that interpretation makes a world of difference. Under that interpretation, evidently assumed, they are demanding that we submit to our "brethren" who are officers in the church, right or wrong, and they being the judges. And if our knowledge and intelligence inform us that the Board of Foreign Missions is following a wrong policy and that the General Assembly erred in judging the matter of an Independent Board *in thesi*, when it was destined to come before the Assembly sooner or later in a judicial form, and our conscience tells us that we ought not to submit to such acts of church government, they flaunt these words in our faces and say as Dr. Zenos did in his letter to Dr. Buswell, president of Wheaton College, "Get out if you cannot submit." "A trial for the violation of your ordination vows, which among other things include the promise 'to be in subjection to your brethren in the Lord,' permit me to remind you, would involve many tedious and useless formalities." Why useless? Has the case been prejudged?

When I as a minister took that vow I took it with the understanding that these words delimited the sphere and extent of that obedience. I have always given that sort of obedience and always shall. But the brethren must show the Lord back of their mandates else it becomes a degradation to submit.

This present demand for submission of the part of the Members of the Board of Directors, of the Independent Board, which the Presbytery of Lackawanna has extended to employees of the Board, has too much the appearance and sound of the Sanhedrin when they said to the Apostles, "speak no more at all nor teach in the name of Jesus." Yes, it sounds too much like the voice of Rome at Worms. Fortunately, we have the answer given on both these occasions. That of Peter and John was, "whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto God more than unto you, judge ye. We cannot but speak the things we have seen and heard." Luther's, in substance was, "Prove me wrong and yourself right from the Scriptures and I will obey you. Until then, here I stand. I can do no other and God help me."

The vital questions at issue are these:

1. Has the Board of Foreign Missions purged itself of all modernistic methods, literature, relations and personnel?
2. Did the last Assembly act within the Constitution and the spirit of the Scriptures, in setting up the claim on the part of the Board and the Assembly of exclusive right to conduct Foreign Missions for the Presbyterian Church?
3. Had the Assembly the right to set up the "trust fund claim" for all undesignated benevolent funds that may hereafter come into the hands of the various sessions?

There are many of us who sincerely and emphatically say *NO* to all of these questions. And we affirm that to demand that we knuckle down to such exercise of ecclesiastical authority is to pervert the Scriptures, distort the church, stultify Reformed church history and violate the individual conscience. The spiritual family of Peter is not yet extinct and there are still "Lutherans" in the Presbyterian Church.

Faulty Orthodoxy and False

By the Rev. Prof. R. B. Kuiper

EVERYBODY knows that American Protestantism is divided into two camps, the orthodox camp and the liberal. Perhaps it is not so generally understood that much which is called orthodox is undeserving of the name.

The patent fact that liberalism, which is nothing less than a reversion to paganism, controls several of our large denominations may well sadden the hearts of all lovers of the truth. But there is another fact, not altogether so obvious, which should greatly augment their grief. Much of the orthodoxy still found in our land is considerably diluted, more than a little of it is badly distorted, and a great deal of it is orthodoxy only in name, not at all in reality. That makes the plight of the Protestant churches of America inexpressibly sorry.

DILUTED ORTHODOXY

An excellent test of one's orthodoxy is one's doctrine of salvation. It may safely be asserted that there is no better.

Any number of American Christians today boast of their orthodoxy, vow that they believe the Bible to be from cover to cover the supernaturally inspired Word of God, express an enthusiastic willingness to suffer, if need be, for the maintenance of such supernatural events as the virgin birth of Jesus and his bodily resurrection, witness boldly and beautifully of salvation by the precious blood of the Lamb slain on Calvary—and yet, strange to say, fail to hold consistently to the glorious doctrine of salvation by grace, the acid test of orthodoxy.

They insist that they build their hope for eternity on nothing less than Jesus' blood and righteousness. They

denounce in no uncertain terms the pestilent heresy of salvation by works or character. But alas! hardly have they finished throwing the demon of naturalism headlong out of their front door, when they welcome him with open arms at the rear entrance.

For the emphatic teaching of Scripture that the ground of election to everlasting life lay in the sovereign God alone, they substitute the lie that it lay in man's foreseen faith or good works. They deny Ephesians 1:5—"Having foreordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will." They make faith the reason for election rather than its fruit, thus contradicting 2 Thessalonians 2:13—"God chose you from the beginning unto salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth."

The unambiguous teaching of Ephesians 2:1 that the natural man is "dead through trespasses and sins" they nullify by the invention that God gives to every human being at birth sufficient grace to accept Jesus Christ by faith. In consequence, many a well-meaning but ignorant evangelist proclaims the absurdity that the sinner can contribute toward his re-birth. Faith is said not to be the fruit of regeneration, but a condition which man must of his own unregenerate volition satisfy if he is to be born again. From the emphatic command of Scripture to believe it is erroneously inferred that the unregenerate can exercise saving faith, the most basic of Christian virtues. The ability of fallen man is illogically made co-extensive with his responsibility. He is told that faith is not a gift of God, but an act of which every man is capable. The blessed promise of John 6:37, "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out," is indeed given due emphasis, but the clear statement of John 6:44, "No man can come to me except the Father that sent me draw him," is ignored. And thus the preacher has returned to his own vomit, the heresy of salvation by works.

In a word, salvation is made to depend ultimately on the free will of man rather than the sovereign will of God. God is said not to save the sinner, but to give him a chance to be saved; it is up to the sinner of his own volition to grasp the opportunity. It follows that God merely makes salvation possible; man must make it actual. Not infrequently it is declared that God cannot save the sinner if the sinner will not let him. The truth is ignored that God's very first act in saving the sinner is to make him willing. The age-old problem of the relation of divine sovereignty and human responsibility is destroyed, not solved, by the denial of the former.

Surely, this is a most inconsistent kind of supernaturalism. Yet the minister who preaches it is often vociferous in his condemnation of modernism and is eager to be known as a thoroughgoing fundamentalist. He fails to see that he has compromised with modernism and, in so doing, has in principle capitulated to it.

DISTORTED ORTHODOXY

Hardly anything seems to be so difficult for a human being as to maintain his intellectual balance, to see various truths in their proper relation to one another, and to

give to each its just emphasis. Even orthodox Christians often fail on this score. In consequence there is much distorted orthodoxy.

In order to honor the Bible as the Word of God one must receive all its teachings, never permitting one truth to crowd out another. If some one had asked Jesus' disciples whether they accepted the Scriptures as the very Word of God, they undoubtedly would have replied with an emphatic affirmation. And yet the resurrected Jesus reproved two of them on the way to Emmaus for their slowness of heart to believe *all* that the prophets had spoken. (Luke 24:25.) They stared so intently upon the prophecies relating to the Messiah's royalty that they were practically blind to those which describe his humiliation. That was badly distorted orthodoxy. Essentially the same mistake is made both by him who stresses the freedom of human agency so as virtually to exclude divine sovereignty and by him who does the reverse.

Again, only he gives due honor to the Word of God who regards its various teachings not as so many isolated truths, but as together constituting a unified system. The great creeds of Christendom are attempts to give due expression to Scriptural truth as a whole. How sad that some who call themselves fundamentalists seem to see only a few trees and to be wholly unaware of the forest! These are they who would relegate the creeds to the scrap-heap, while sounding the misleading slogan, "No creed but Christ!" That, too, is distorted orthodoxy.

How extremely saddening that there are fundamentalists who make a hobby of this or that teaching of Scripture and ride it to death! They stress one teaching of Holy Writ out of all due proportion to others, thus distorting the truth as a whole, and end up by fanatically twisting that truth itself which was their starting-point. This is done, for instance, by the perfectionist, who insists that sanctification may well proceed to the point of sinlessness in this life; by the antinomian, who interprets Christian liberty to be an utter disregard of the ten commandments; by that dispensationalist whose conception of the Church and the Kingdom leads him to the conclusion that the Christian is under no obligation whatever to try to improve society; and by him who says in effect that there is no excuse for the Christian's being troubled by bodily illness, its persistence being due solely to a lack of faith on his part.

What makes the situation all the worse is the fact that almost anybody who will present his religious views, however absurd, with the zeal of a fanatic, all the while quoting Scripture glibly, no matter how irrelevantly, can easily secure a following among the woefully uninformed members of our Protestant churches.

It is no exaggeration to say that distorted orthodoxy is the bane of American fundamentalism.

PRETENDED ORTHODOXY

There is an even greater evil parading under the name of orthodoxy in the Protestant churches of our land. Perhaps pretended orthodoxy is as good a name for it as any. The trouble with diluted orthodoxy is its inconsistency;

with distorted orthodoxy, its perversion of truth. Both are very faulty. But they are orthodox to a certain extent, even to a large degree. Their emphasis on the supernatural inspiration of Scripture, on such supernatural events as the Saviour's virgin birth and his bodily resurrection, on the supernatural meriting of salvation by the Son of God, and on his supernatural return is, of course, highly commendable and deserving of the warmest kind of approbation. But of pretended orthodoxy nothing good can be said. It is purely nominal. It is a sham. It is not orthodoxy at all.

More than a few ministers of Protestant churches are saying in effect: "We deplore it that the Church of Jesus Christ is split into factions. How sad that the body of Christ resembles a house divided against itself! How heinous a sin that men are actually hindering the granting of the High Priest's intercessory prayer 'that they all may be one'! To be sure, if we had to take sides on the doctrinal issue, we should cast our lot with the fundamentalists. They hold to the historical teaching of the Church, and we see no good reason for departing from it. We believe all the great doctrines of the Church and, when occasion presents itself, preach them. But it may never be forgotten that the members of Christ's Church are called unto peace. Nor may we be oblivious of the apostolic admonition that each is to esteem others better than himself. Therefore we practice Christian tolerance toward the brethren with liberal leanings. We regret it that some of the fundamentalist brethren fail to do likewise. They seem to think it their sacred duty, not only to oppose in debate those who differ with them on certain points of doctrine, but even to deny them a place in the Church. Such intolerance we cannot countenance. Rather than join with the orthodox wing of the Church in its cantankerous heresy-hunting, we will co-operate with the liberals in ousting these disturbers of the peace."

That Christian ministers should indulge in this hypocritical line of talk is well-nigh unbelievable. But their actions show that many do. It is almost as difficult to understand how supposedly intelligent church-members can "fall for" such prattle. Yet, obviously a great many do.

Orthodoxy is not an indifferent sort of subscription to a creed. It is a warm love of the truth. And he who loves the truth cannot but hate error. The antithesis of truth to error is absolute and active. As light banishes darkness, so truth drives out falsehood. *It is of the very essence of orthodoxy to be intolerant of heresy.* For one to tolerate the denial of such unmistakable and supremely important teachings of Holy Writ as the virgin birth of Jesus and the substitutionary atonement and yet to lay claim to orthodoxy is simply preposterous. And for a minister of Jesus Christ to sit idly by while precious souls are being led to perdition by a false gospel is nothing less than criminal.

How long will false prophets keep crying "Peace! Peace!" when there is no peace? Must history ever repeat itself in the betrayal of a good cause by its avowed friends who are really its enemies? When will the Church see that

it must love truth and peace, (Zechariah 8:19) and that the former is prerequisite for the latter? Why does the Church not lend its ears to the faithful minister as he turns on the false teacher with Elijah's indictment of Ahab: "I have not troubled Israel, but thou"? (I Kings 18:18.) Oh for the day when the Church will rise up in holy indignation and with the apostle Paul call down the divine anathema on those who preach a different gospel! (Galatians 1:8.)

DEAD ORTHODOXISM

There is something else which goes under the name of orthodoxy, but is utterly unworthy of it.

It would seem to be possible for a man to adhere to sound doctrine and even to preach it, without being a Christian at heart and leading a Christian life. There is such a thing as merely intellectual assent to the truth and more or less spirited defense of it apart from genuine love of the truth. This is usually termed dead orthodoxy.

Dead *orthodoxy* is probably a better name for it. Quibbling about mere words is seldom profitable, but there is good reason for reserving the word orthodoxy for favorable usage. If orthodoxy is not just indifferent subscription to the truth but positive love of the truth, then it manifestly cannot be dead, and "dead orthodoxy" becomes a contradiction in terms. But the reality of dead *orthodoxy* can hardly be denied.

While the Pharisees of Jesus' day scarcely deserved to be called the orthodox party in the Jewish Church, they were considerably more sound in doctrine than the Sadducees. Yet Jesus styled them whited sepulchres. (Matthew 23:27.) On the day of judgment many will plead: "Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name?" but Christ will respond in the awful words: "I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity." (Matthew 7:23.) In his famous ode on love Paul declares: "If I have the gift of prophecy and know all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing." (I Corinthians 13:2.) James's epistle, the burden of which is that purely speculative faith, faith without works, is dead, informs us that even the demons believe that God is one. (James 2:19.)

The history of the Church shows that the peril of dead orthodoxy is greatest in times when it is fashionable to be orthodox. That is precisely what one might expect. It would seem to follow that in days like ours, when the adherents of the orthodox faith are ridiculed as ignoramuses, sneered at as obstructionists, and actually persecuted as disturbers of the peace of Zion, this danger must be negligible. However, as a matter of fact it is always with us. It behooves every contender for the faith to examine himself, whether he is motivated by pure love for the God of truth and the truth of God. The simplest and best test is the doing of the truth, the leading of a life of loving obedience to God's holy law. Even the chief of the apostles buffeted his body and brought it into bondage, lest, by any means, after he had preached to others, he himself might be a castaway. (I Corinthians 9:27.)

TRUE ORTHODOXY

By way of contrast with both faulty and false orthodoxy, it should now be possible to name a few characteristics of true orthodoxy.

True orthodoxy refuses to compromise with error. It insists on Christianity as the supernatural religion and opposes the onslaughts of naturalism all along the line. It firmly declines to add water to the pure wine of the Scriptural teaching of supernatural salvation.

True orthodoxy is well-balanced. It sees the truth as a unified system and diligently seeks to give to each constituent element the same relative emphasis which it receives in God's Word.

True orthodoxy is intolerant of error. Because it loves the truth passionately it cannot but hate falsehood. It is militant in its opposition to all and every denial of the truth.

True orthodoxy springs from the principle of spiritual life implanted in the heart by the Holy Spirit at the new birth, and it issues in the Christian life, a life of loving and grateful obedience to God's commandments.

True orthodoxy adheres to the historical Christian faith. It knows the truth well, loves the truth dearly, holds the truth sanely, defends the truth valiantly, proclaims the truth actively, obeys the truth gladly.

Such is genuine orthodoxy. American Protestantism is in peril of perishing for want of it. Without it a revival is unthinkable.

The Independent Board and Its Critics

(Concluded from page 160)

The Presbyterian is authority for saying that on July 5, 1934, Rev. Mr. and Mrs. Blank sailed under the auspices of the Board to spend two years teaching and preaching in our missionary stations. We are reliably informed that they are both modernists. How can the Church have confidence in a Board that promotes modernism so openly and flagrantly? Dr. McAfee's denial that modernism is the issue does not change the facts.

11. Nothing has brought more disrepute on the Assembly and the officialdom of the church than sundry attempts at coercion and persecution. The persistent attacks on Dr. Machen have become picayune, at once contemptible, and small business for grown-up men. The threats of the General Assembly have not increased respect for it. And certain letters sent by the Stated Clerk, and the actions of Baltimore Presbytery, and the Synod of Pennsylvania will go down into history as a disgrace to the Presbyterian Church. The young men who declined to say that they would support the Foreign Board were absolutely right in the stand they took. No Presbytery nor Synod has any right to make such a requirement a condition of ordination. It is clearly unconstitutional. And it is a sin to require a young man to forswear himself to any Board, when no one knows what that Board may do or become. Christ

says: "Thou shalt not forswear thyself." Again I say that these attempts at coercion constitute a moral offense.

Why are not letters sent to the New York Presbyteries about the graduates of Union and Auburn? Why are Westminster graduates singled out for threats and persecution? Why are those who are true to the Scriptures and the Constitution of the Church discriminated against while Auburn Affirmationists, who repudiated the essence of Christianity, were never touched? Such persecution of sound and worthy young men will take money from the official Board and turn it into the treasury of the Independent Board. The conservatives would be most happy to support the official Board if there were any certainty that their money would not be used to propagate modernism. It is a shame, *Shame*, SHAME that they are driven to separation against their wish by conditions in the official Board. The Board would have no more enthusiastic supporters than the Conservatives if the Board itself were free from blame. In separating from the official Board they are obeying New Testament requirements: "Come out from among them and be ye separate." Dr. Covert calls it a "divisive movement." Well such movements become a duty when the purity of the Church is threatened. Paul says: "Withdraw thyself from every brother that walketh disorderly." If the Independent Board is a rival to the official Board, as is stated, there are some who think it ought to be. Shall our money be used to translate and distribute Fosdick's books? There are some of us who will utter a decisive No; not one red copper. We dissent from any such use of our money. Let the official Board return from its modernistic meanderings, and the Independent Board will have no further reason to operate.

The charges against the official Board have been proved, in our estimation; and the pretended refutation has never come to notice. Where is the refutation of the things cited in this article? We would like to know.

A recent issue of the *Presbyterian* contains a "vicious attack" on Dr. Macartney from the pen of Dr. Wm. B. Pugh, in which Dr. Macartney is accused of using "incorrect statements," "unsupported assumptions," "unwarranted inferences," "serious discrepancies," and "false interpretations," and the accusations against the official Board from other sources are called "false charges."

Will Dr. Pugh kindly go over the charges one by one and vindicate the Board from all complicity in modernism? By so doing he will confer a great favor on the Board, and upon the Conservatives as well.

Briefly, it seems to us that Dr. Macartney stands for the authority of the Constitution, and Dr. Pugh assumes that unconstitutional deliverances of the General Assembly have the authority of the written Constitution;—the very thing that the liberals wrongly accused the Conservatives of doing in 1923. The deliverance of the General Assembly, though 1000 to 1 constitutes no constitutional law. Brethren, we live in free America not under Hitler nor the Bolsheviki.

This Changing World

By "Calvinist"

MANY people are genuinely worried and hurt over divisions and "splits" in the visible Church. Where such divisions are unnecessary, and caused either for trifling or selfish reasons, they are to be lamented. No one of intelligence delights in what may be a scandal in the eyes of the world. Yet it would be a great error for one to deplore divisions *as such*, for most of what we hold dear has come to us as a result of past struggle and heartache and separation. Anyone who lamenting "division," refuses to recognize this, is either ignorant or simply flabbily sentimental.

* * *

One inescapable accompaniment of divisions is, that they result in what are called "majorities" and "minorities." People seldom divide in equal numbers. One side is nearly always stronger than the other. One of the curious things about life is the desire of so many to be on the "winning side"—i.e., the majority side. The natural tendency is for majorities to grow larger and for minorities to become smaller. People like to be well thought of.

* * *

But sometimes minorities, despised at first, ridiculed perhaps, become majorities, while the majorities of the first phase melt away. It has happened before, it will happen again. Why? Because there is something that binds people together so tightly as to resist the natural pull of the majority. That thing is the conviction that the little minority is *right*, that great and momentous consequences depend upon its maintenance of truth. Behind this, in turn, is a very simple but basic conviction: the conviction that it is better to be *right* than to be outwardly at one with others; if to be at one with them you must sacrifice or soft-pedal the truth.

* * *

The Christian who has any clear idea of what it means to speak of God as a God of Truth, finds that he *must* take his stand with those who put that truth first, who prefer it to the applause of men. But to most people, truth is only a far-off, abstract principle that eludes the mind, while the applause of men is something tangible, real, very much to be desired. To be popular with one's fellow men is "practical," and most people think that to "be practical" is to arrive very near to perfection. Therefore they are more concerned with being members of a majority than with ferreting out the truth. It is so much easier to drift along with the crowd, anyway. But on the contrary, it is so much *better*, truly

better, to be right and alone than wrong with a million others!

* * *

The true son of the reformation, the real protestant, is not so greatly crushed because he belongs to a minority. He is, indeed, somewhat contemptuous of passing majorities, and opposes to their arrogance an arrogance of his own. For his appeal is to something greater than the verdict of contemporary numbers or factions. His appeal is not to time or anything time-born, but to the eternal sovereign God from whose fountain of Being issues everlasting truth. In His eternal purpose they rest themselves, and calmly believe that His truth unsoiled and pure will triumph over all the inventions of men. Having such a God to trust, what else could they believe? The serenity, then, with which the staunch adherent of the Reformed Faith can view the breaking, the wreckage, the splitting of churches into fragments of worldly unimportance, is thoroughly understandable. He grieves over the passing of many a tall mast, the crushing of many a once mighty hull. His sense of loneliness and loss may be exquisitely acute. Yet he does not despair. In all this he sees simply the method by which the eternal God has decreed to work out His perfect will. To human minds those methods are often cloaked in mystery as dark as the blackest midnight. But the man who has apprehended his God knows that in Him is light and no darkness at all. Therefore he simply trusts, bends his back to the work, and waits for the morning. What power have the dark uncertain shapes of human fearing over the man who believes, trusts, loves his God?

And though that world with devils filled
Should threaten to undo us
We will not fear, for God hath willed
His truth to triumph through us!
Let goods and kindred go,
This mortal life also
The body they may kill,
God's Word abideth still,
His kingdom is forever.

There speaks in the clearest manner the voice of the Reformation. Majorities are scarcely worth the caring. To be *right*, to be on the side of the righteous, eternal, sovereign God who in Christ has loved beyond man's power to fathom or to repay—that is everything. If majorities, if particular churches adhere to the mighty ecumenical truth of the Gospel, then well. But if majorities waver, desert, dominate an unbelieving century or two, pour scorn upon those who are faithful—also well. To the little group more than once has been given

the thankless task of conserving and cherishing the light of truth through blind, pathetically proud ages. So it may be again. The little group is a minority—now. But it is confident that in God's good time it will become a majority again. For it rests in Him.

* * *

The "flaw in Protestantism" to which Romanists and Protestant Church Union zealots love to point—divisions repeated and many—is to the true son of the Reformation no flaw at all, or mark of failure. He gave up the idea implicit in the criticism when the Reformation was born, when he had to choose between outward unity and truth. To him each repeated division means that somewhere, somehow, some group of people is more concerned with being right than being big. Controversy and division are to him a sign of intellectual and spiritual life. Of course there are sometimes controversies born of ambition or unregenerate self-will. Everyone knows that. But normally each controversy in the Church is the result of and results in earnest thought. And it is good to arouse the people to think.

* * *

Reformed Church polity is based upon the assumption that the Church will be composed of earnest, thinking people, zealous to maintain the truth. And it is a true sign of spiritual life, which only the frivolous or the ignorant will dare to gainsay, when any group, no matter how small, believing that it is better to obey God rather than men, puts the honor of the Gospel above the possession of property, dignities, friendships, or loyalty to any lesser thing if loyalties conflict. And any loyalty that conflicts with loyalty to God, is not of Him. Those who so elevate the voice of assemblies as to make them bind the consciences of men, make an idol of the visible church. This is a ghastly thing. Let them recall a greater Word, spoken from the thunder and flame of Sinai: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me."

The Comfort of the Scriptures

By the Rev. David Freeman, Th.M.

"O Lord, why hast thou made us to err from thy ways, and hardened our heart from thy fear?" (Isaiah 63:17.)

HE THAT does not have the capacity to cry unto God is far from Him. If we really knew our condition we would not be slow to call upon God for healing. Only the hypocrites "cry not when the Lord bindeth them."

It is a sad condition not to be aware of the sin-shackles that bind us hand and foot.

However, it is a hopeful sign when we are capable of seeing our hardness and pouring out our regrets before God. Surely it is a mark of God's graciousness to us when we are given to discern our lack of godly fear.

Let us not think that our sad condition

is brought on by God. "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil neither tempteth he any man." God has nothing to do with our sinfulness. God's sovereignty is not obligated to give us grace; neither is there merit in us to warrant God's favor.

It is natural for the sons of fallen Adam to be hard-hearted and to err from the ways of God. We even hear God's gracious words and pray and then remain hardened sinners still. We love to walk in our own counsels.

Those to whom grace is given do not blame God neither do they speak proudly but they condemn themselves. They desire to know with deep yearning what they have done that has caused God to hide His face. "What is the sin that makes us so cold, lifeless and fruitless?" cry God's people.

Why is it that sin in the heart and life no longer alarms us? We are not gripped when the evil of our way is declared to us. The tender heart is instantly moved.

Why is it that after acknowledging our sin the result is not a more godly life? We are not a bit better after all our confessions. We see our sin with the eye but not with the heart.

What indicates more the hardened condition of our heart than our knowledge that it is not well with our soul and then pass off the call to true repentance?

Why is it we cease to pray when trouble and adversity come upon us? Evil came upon us and "yet made we not our prayer before the Lord our God, that we might turn from our iniquities, and understand His truth." Is it not a sad day when trouble stifles the Godward cry of the redeemed?

What think we, is there a worse state than this? The children of God should with heavy hearts and tears speak out these words, "Why hast thou made us to err from thy ways, and hardened our heart from thy fear?"

There is hope when our hardness of heart is keenly felt. God's strokes upon His children are after all fatherly. There is promise of freedom from our chains when we wrestle with God. He desires to loose us from every yoke and bond. It is a sign that we have not been given up altogether by the Lord when we have a feeling of our hardness. "There is yet hope in Israel concerning this thing."

It is wonderful grace that enables us in our backsliding to say, "Search me, O God, and know my heart: try me, and know my thoughts: And see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting."

"It is the voice of Jesus that I hear;

His are the hands stretched out to draw me near,

And His the blood that can for all atone,
And set me faultless there before the throne."

Sunday School Lessons for December

(International Uniform Series)

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

Lesson for December 2, 1934

THE CHRISTIAN AS WITNESS

(Lesson Text—*I Thess. 1. Golden Text—Acts 1:8*)

HOW differently Christians conceive of the manner in which they may fulfill the command of the Lord which is expressed in the Golden Text: Ye shall be my witnesses! According to a large group of Christian workers at the present time, this obligation may be found to, or consists principally in, showing that a change has taken place for good in one's own life. Others go a step beyond in their insistence that the Christian witness has something to tell, but confine the word of testimony to the recounting of the Christian's individual experience. Examples of these points of view may be found in the current Westminster quarterlies, where the Christian's witness is defined as "the testimony that the changed lives of the Christians give to the power of Christ," and a witness to Christ as "a person who has had personal experience with Christ, and is competent therefore to tell others of this experience."

On the other hand, there are many who still insist that the Christian's witness is not primarily the testimony of his own life and experience, but rather a testimony concerning Christ Himself, as He is set forth in the Word. The latter group of persons, let it be understood, do not overlook the necessity of a true experience and of godly living as qualifications for the Christian witness. However, it is their conviction that such qualifications are not to be confused with the content of the testimony, that is, the Christian message; and they hold, furthermore, that the Christian experience and manner of life are not attainable through communication from one Christian to another, but only from Christ, as His gospel of redemption, as set forth in the Scriptures, is proclaimed.

The latter point of view has been expressed by Dr. Machen in the following words: "We shall, indeed, be but poor witnesses for Christ if we can tell only what Christ has done for the world or for the church and cannot tell what He has done personally for us. But we shall also be poor witnesses if we recount only the experiences of our own lives. Christian evangelism does not consist merely in a man's going about the world saying: 'Look at me, what a wonderful experience I have, how happy I am, what wonderful Christian virtues I

exhibit; you can all be as good and as happy as I am if you will just make a complete surrender of your wills in obedience to what I say.' . . . Men are not saved by the exhibition of our glorious Christian virtues; they are not saved by the contagion of our experiences. We cannot be the instruments of God in saving them if we preach to them thus only ourselves. Nay, we must preach to them the Lord Jesus Christ; for it is only through the gospel which sets Him forth that they can be saved."

The Golden Text serves admirably as a test to determine which of the points of view which have been mentioned is Scriptural. A survey of the Acts of the Apostles makes abundantly clear that those who had been appointed by Christ as His witnesses did not call attention to their own character or experience, but set forth what they had heard and seen in their associations with Christ. Not their own history, but Christ's, and particularly that history as it reached its consummation in His death and resurrection—this according to the pervading testimony of the book was the message they felt called to bring (See 1:22; 2:32; 3:15; 5:30-32; 10:39, 41; 13:31; 22:15; 26:16). Being witnesses of Christ involves first of all, then, giving testimony to His saving acts.

And the description which Paul gives in our Lesson Text of the early witness bearing of the Christians at Thessalonica gives further confirmation of this conclusion. For they merely repeated the apostolic message which had been the means of their conversion. Their conversion, in a time of open hostility to the Gospel, had been marked by their joyful reception of the Word; and that through which they had become an example even beyond their own province was in sounding forth again the same Word (vv. 6-8; Acts 17). Turning from paganism to the service of the only true God, they received Christ as the object of their faith, love and hope. They dared to hope for the return of Christ, the judge of the living and the dead, because, through the preaching of the Gospel, they had come to place their confidence in, and set their affection upon, Christ as their deliverer from the wrath to come (vv. 3, 9 f.). And to these great saving acts, future as well as past, they bore their testimony.

Lesson for December 9, 1934**THE CHRISTIAN AS TEACHER**

(Lesson Text—Matt. 7:24-29; Acts 18:24-28. Golden Text—II Tim. 2:15)

A prominent Liberal teacher said some time ago that he was bound to admit, on the basis of his study of the Acts and other early Christian documents, that it was the religion about Jesus that had conquered the world, although, so far as his own point of view was concerned, he felt called upon to say that he preferred the religion of Jesus. The discussion of the lesson for December 2 has shown that the early Christian message was a testimony to Christ as Saviour and Lord, and has therefore confirmed the truth of the admission of the Liberal professor. But the question naturally arises whether the message of Jesus differed essentially from that of the early church. To give an adequate answer would require a survey of the whole of Jesus' teaching, but even the brief passage selected for the Lesson Text points to the correct solution.

The impression which the Sermon on the Mount has made upon the modern church is essentially different from that which it made upon the original audience. For the modern church thinks of it as a series of statements of ethical principles quite detached from Jesus Himself, whereas those who heard Jesus speak found their attention drawn from the message to the Teacher Himself. They were astonished that He taught not as the Scribes but as having authority. The scribes, of course, did speak with authority. They appealed to the Scriptures and to the traditions of the fathers. But their authority was derived from the authority of their sources whereas Jesus spoke with an authority within Himself, as the Lord of men's lives and of their consciences. So His teaching—including the Sermon on the Mount—directed men's attention to the Teacher, and led men to inquire as to who He was and what manner of claims He was making for Himself.

All of Jesus' teaching is therefore messianic. Attempts have been made to reject as unhistorical all that gives evidence of messianic claims. But such a separation is impossible. His whole life, and so all of the narratives, were so controlled by His conviction of messiahship that to remove the messianic elements would involve scrapping the gospels themselves. But the recognition of these claims is the key to the understanding of everything in the narratives, giving, as it does, unity and purpose to all. And at the same time Jesus' teaching concerning Himself is the preparation for the witness which His disciples were called upon to bear after His departure.

The sayings of Jesus about the wise and foolish builders do not set up a contrast between doctrinal and practical Christianity. Rather they teach that Christianity will be practical only if it is doctrinal first. Why should one act upon what Christ has said?

Simply, because the Anointed of the Lord has spoken. His authority is unique, and to fail to give heed to what one has heard from the Lord must inevitably lead to ruin.

Apollos was a true Christian witness and teacher, and, like the apostles, he took his stand on that which the prophets had witnessed concerning Christ (See Acts 10:43). The prophetic testimony of the coming of Christ, like the apostolic and early Christian testimony of His coming again, points once more to the folly of those who define the Christian's testimony in terms of personal experience. Apollos was so effective because he talked about Christ—not about himself. Christ had said with respect to the Scriptures that "they are they which testify of me," and Apollos was heartily welcomed by the Christians in Achaia because his public, learned refutation of the Jews in his proof of Christ's messiahship had been so helpful. Let those who despise learning and the scholarly defense of the faith ponder the piety of these early Christians which thrived on exactly that fare.

An interesting glimpse of the character of Apollos as a true scholar and a true Christian is afforded by the description of his going aside with Priscilla and Aquila to be taught more accurately the way of God. The impression is not given that Apollos was heard to present a false picture of Christ; indeed, it is stated that he was teaching accurately the things concerning Jesus. What Apollos needed was that his knowledge of the Prophets and of Christ should be supplemented by the fuller knowledge of those who had been in contact with the apostles, and it is a testimony to his breadth of spirit and sound historical judgment as a Christian that Apollos did not despise the word of these less gifted Christians.

Lesson for December 16, 1934**THE CHRISTIAN AND THE LORD'S SUPPER**

(Lesson Text—I Cor. 11:23-34. Golden Text—Verse 26)

The Lesson Text should be studied in connection with the other records of the institution of the Lord's Supper (Matt. 26; Mark 14; Luke 22), for Paul is not concerned to set forth an exhaustive statement as to its significance, but to discuss it only in so far as was necessary to correct abuses which had crept into its observance in the Corinthian church. Consequently, we can treat the lesson to best advantage by centering attention upon the proper observance of the sacrament.

In some circles marked by mystic piety, many professing Christians rarely, if ever, participate in the Communion service. These persons may be credited with a serious regard for Paul's word of caution: Let a man prove himself . . . , for he that eateth and drinketh eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, if he discern not the Lord's body

(28 f.). However, such an attitude often displays a misunderstanding of the real meaning of the sacrament, as if those who observe it thereby profess superior spiritual attainment and progress in sanctification. They forget that the only requirement for participation is saving faith, and that the possession of saving faith requires participation. The Lord commands us to do this in remembrance of Him. Shall His followers fail to observe this precious command? And the apostle adds that at each observance we proclaim the Lord's death until He come. Shall we shrink back from the proclamation of the central fact of the Gospel? Once again our attention is centered upon the fact that the Christian witness is not to moral attainment, nor even to Christian experience first of all, but to Christ Himself and Him crucified.

However, as the crowded services on Communion Sundays show, our times have retained little of this hesitation in the presence of the sacred. Is ours not rather a spirit of self-confidence and superficiality than of deep humility and reflection upon the meaning of it all? Have we taken the apostolic admonition to heart? Do we remember Christ as He would have us remember Him? If we learn how we are to remember Christ, we shall be guarded from both extremes—from excessive timidity towards our holy duty and from thoughtless disregard of the Blood of the Covenant.

The Supper centers our attention upon the cross of Christ. How imperative, then, that we should seek to control our remembrance of His death by His own teaching about it! How concerned we should be that our proclamation of His death until He come should not misrepresent the purpose which led Him to endure the cross, despising the shame! And yet many tell us that it matters little what specifically we think about His death—there are a great many theories, and one is about as good as another. Such latitudinarianism is unchristian. And celebration of the Supper which encourages men to think loosely or unscripturally about the meaning of Christ's death represents an indifference to truth which is indifference to Christ Himself, and can only bring a pronouncement of guilt of the body and blood of the Lord.

And unless by saving faith we receive Christ as He is offered to us in the Gospel, as the Lamb of God who was slain upon Calvary to satisfy the justice of God and to reconcile us to God, we cannot appropriate the benefits of His death, and we remain under the condemnation of God and strangers to His grace.

Lesson for December 23, 1934**THE CHRISTIAN HOME**

(Lesson Text—Luke 2:8-19; Eph. 6:1-4. Golden Text—Luke 2:14.)

The announcement to the shepherds

serves to call attention to the width of the gulf which separates the world from Christ. Indeed, it is often said that, in spite of the commercialization of Christmas, and the din and revelry of its celebration, the world gives signs of having absorbed the spirit of Christmas. Does it not manifest the spirit of Christ in its good will and generosity, its humanitarianism and philanthropy, and in its labors for the promotion of peace among the nations? The answer to this question is that the message to the shepherds is thoroughly unwelcome, as a little reflection on its real character will show.

The announcement would be given no credence today simply because of its thoroughgoing supernaturalism. The shepherds claimed to have received it in supernatural fashion. A light shone around them one night, and there were angelic forms and supernatural voices. And beyond the extraordinary way in which the message had been received, the message itself was represented as the culmination of the prophecies of the Old Testament, and the person whose coming was announced was none other than the divine Messiah, a thoroughly supernatural figure. The promised King of Israel had been born in a city of David, and His coming was the fulfillment of the prophecies of the coming of the Lord. Supernaturally predicted, supernaturally announced, a supernatural person,—how could a self-sufficient world make room for Him?

And as unacceptable as its sheer supernaturalism is the fact that the message is a message of redemption for a chosen people. The world will have none of a message of redemption, partly because redemption itself is supernatural. But also because its note, according to the world, is one of pessimism. The angelic voice proclaims Him as Saviour. His name Jesus means "Jehovah is Salvation," for He has come to save His people from their sins. And the peace which He brings with Him is for "men of good pleasure," that is, for those whom God has chosen as the objects of His love. With this message of supernatural redemption is coupled, then, the particularism of the work of God's grace—all of which is obnoxious to the modern mind. But Simeon had told Mary that the child was "set for the falling and the rising of many in Israel," and it had been told of Him that He should be a "stone of stumbling and rock of offence" but also "the Head of the Corner."

Lesson for December 30, 1934

TESTS OF A CHRISTIAN

(Lesson Text—I John 5:1-12. Golden Text—Verse 1.)

This lesson is designed principally as a review of the discussions of the past three months, and the lesson studies themselves, if taken as a whole for the final quarter, will give suggestive review treatment.

battle seemed over, the first engagement having gone to the conservatives.

A time of relaxation and informality then ensued. The Rev. Edward B. Shaw, Affirmationist, said, "Mr. Moderator, I move we have a recess for five minutes." The Presbytery seemed to be taking such a recess for granted. One member began to distribute programs for a home mission service. Members moved from one part of the room to another. The Moderator left the chair and engaged in conversation with several members in front. No one knew why, hardly any one noticed. A number of members who felt that they had stayed late and done their duty, went home. Then, after about five minutes of cessation of business, it began to be rumored that the Modernist block was asking for a roll-call on the last motion. Obviously the time to ask for such a vote had passed. The matter had been closed. The clerk had transmitted the papers to the Chairman of the Committee on Judicial Business.

The Rev. J. A. MacCallum (Affirmationist), moved that a roll-call vote be granted on the last motion. The motion was defeated, but since more than one-third of those present voted for it a roll-call was granted. It was protested that this roll-call was illegal since the voting was over and the question declared carried. On the roll-call the motion was in form, carried, 52-46. Then, the Modernist-Indifferentist coalition finding itself temporarily in control, it was moved to return the charges to Mr. Griffiths. The Moderator ruled this motion out of order in view of the standing rule and the failure to suspend the rules. On an appeal he was not sustained. The motion was then put and carried. Following this, Presbytery adjourned in haste, leaving a large part of its docket unfinished.

It was immediately made plain that the voting from the roll-call on would be considered illegal by the Conservatives, and brought to a vote at the next meeting of Presbytery.

Before the presentation of the charges to Presbytery, two other persons had associated themselves with the prosecution: the Rev. J. B. Thwing, Th.D., Minister of Beacon Church, Philadelphia, and Mr. Edgar Frutchey, an elder in Tioga Church, Philadelphia.

For other details, see the Eastern Pennsylvania letter.

News of the Church

Affirmation Charges Debated in Philadelphia; Action Indecisive

CHARGES against eleven Philadelphia signers of the heretical "Auburn Affirmation" formed the main subject of heated and prolonged debate at the meeting of the Presbytery of Philadelphia on November 5th. By vote of the Presbytery the charges were first read aloud. Then the Modernist-Indifferentist coalition in Presbytery began a long series of motions designed to quash the charges without entering into them, in direct violation of the standing rules of Presbytery and the Book of Discipline. The standing rules of Presbytery provide that all papers of a judicial nature "shall" be referred to the Committee on Judicial Business. The Moderator, the Rev. Prof. Oswald T. Allis, D.D., ruled that this standing rule made such disposition mandatory on Presbytery. An appeal being taken from his ruling he was sustained by a majority vote. A long effort was then made to suspend the standing rules by a two-thirds vote. This effort failed. All the eleven Affirmationists voted on the disposition of the papers con-

cerning their own cases. This was over the repeated objections and protests of those bringing the charges. Several of the accused also spoke to the various motions. Dr. E. Y. Hill said that he was not speaking in his own defense, but for the sake of peace in the Presbytery. Most active defenders of the Affirmationists among other ministers of Presbytery: the Rev. Howard Moody Morgan, D.D., of Tabernacle Church, and the Rev. J. Renwick Jackson, of the Union Tabernacle Church.

At length after many parliamentary maneuvers, the Presbytery began to vote upon a motion to commit the papers to the Committee on Judicial Business, and two amendments offered thereto. The second amendment was carried by a majority, the first amendment as amended was then adopted by a majority, and the main motion as amended was adopted by a standing vote of 56-50. The count was officially made by the clerks and its accuracy nobody challenged. This motion committed the papers to the Committee on Judicial Business for a report to the Presbytery at an adjourned meeting to be held on November 12th. The Moderator announced the motion carried. The

Olympia Presbytery Seeks Advice

THE Presbytery of Olympia, confronted with an aroused and united membership of the First Church of Tacoma, met on November 13th and decided that discretion was the better part of valor. Hopes of pro-machine advocates that internal dissension would cause the ousting of the Rev. Roy T. Brumbaugh, D.D., militant pastor of

Tacoma's First Church and Independent Board member, were rudely shattered. Dr. Brumbaugh was backed by a united session and people who plainly informed the Presbytery that the Church was one with its pastor, feeling ran high. The Judicial Committee recommended that since Dr. Brumbaugh refused to resign from the Independent Board and refused to recognize the constitutionality of the action of the last Assembly, that he be declared in contempt of Presbytery and not in good and regular standing. (This without the formality of a trial.) This motion was finally tabled and Presbytery passed a motion to refer the question of the constitutionality of the last Assembly's action to the Permanent Judicial Commission of the General Assembly, and then, if its constitutionality were upheld, that the case should be considered by the Synod of Washington.

Dr. Henry M. Woods Elected to Independent Board

IT HAS been announced that the Rev. Henry M. Woods, D.D., of Ventnor, N. J., has been elected as a member of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, and has accepted. Dr. Woods is internationally known as a missionary and author. His election has unusual significance in view of the fact that he is not a minister of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Dr. Woods is a long-time minister and a former missionary of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., sometimes called the "Southern Presbyterian Church."

C. K. Cummings Becomes Secretary for League of Evangelical Students

THE General Secretary of the League of Evangelical Students, Rev. William J. Jones, resigned from office as of September 1st, 1934. For five years Mr. Jones served the League sacrificially and efficiently. It is now his intention to enter the active work of the Baptist ministry.

It soon became evident to the League's Executive Committee that another Secretary had to be appointed as soon as it was financially possible. On October 15, 1934, after careful consideration and prayer they unanimously appointed Rev. Calvin Knox Cummings, A.B., as Field Secretary of the League of Evangelical Students. The Executive Committee rejoices that God has raised up a man so thoroughly acquainted with the work of the League and so eminently qualified in every way for this work. Mr. Cummings is a former President of the League. He was one of the founders of the League chapter at Lafayette College. He is a graduate of Lafayette College and Westminster Theological Seminary. Mr. Cummings began his services with the League on October 15, 1934.

Mr. Cummings is to be known as the

Field Secretary of the League. In addition to carrying on the necessary correspondence, it will be his chief duty to work among the college students and preach in various pulpits in the interest of the League. He will greatly appreciate any contacts which chapter members may give him for speaking engagements and for student contacts.

The work of the League has been reorganized so as to give Mr. Cummings more time to work among the colleges and churches. The President, Mr. Stob, is to be responsible for the Convention program. The Vice-President, Mr. Pleva, will acknowledge receipt of gifts. The Secretary, Mr. Andrews, is to pay bills and keep an account of receipts and expenditures; Mr. Konrad, of the Executive, is to write chapters concerning dues and the One Step Forward Movement. Miss Latta, of Executive Committee, is to write the chapters concerning their sending in their reports and reaffirming their belief in the doctrinal position of the League. Headquarters is now at the Reformed Episcopal Seminary, 25 South 43rd Street, Philadelphia, Pa. The Reformed Episcopal Seminary has kindly extended the use of their endowed guest room for the League's headquarters.

Name of H. W. Coray Erased by Presbytery

THE Presbytery of Lackawanna at its meeting on November 12th, held in the Italian Presbyterian Church of Dunmore, Pa., erased the name of the Rev. Henry W. Coray, missionary of the Independent Board, from its roll. The Rev. Herbert Ure, of Fordy Fort, Pa., was appointed to appear before the congregation and to declare the pulpit vacant. The Rev. Richard A. Rinker, of Pittston, was named Moderator of the session.

The action was opposed by the minority in the Presbytery and complaint will be entered against it.

Shantung Mission Executive Committee Votes Against Hospitality

IT HAS been learned that on July 7th last the Executive Committee of the Shantung Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. passed a resolution virtually barring missionaries under its jurisdiction from entertaining other missionaries in their homes, save in short and temporary cases, unless consent is given by the Mission and the office of the Official Board in New York. Said to be aimed at the new missionaries sent out by the Independent Board, it was rumored that the action was suggested first in America, not China. It is as follows:

"LOYALTY TO THE BOARD AND THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

"We solemnly urge upon our Station

groups in these times of high tension and ecclesiastical strain to take no action, either officially or by common consent, which can by any chance be interpreted by any one as being disloyal to our Board and the General Assembly's recent specific directions.

"Invitation to missionaries of another Board to reside in or work within the bounds of a station should be given by the station or individuals of the station only upon consent of the Mission and the Board, as such would be virtually the consummation of an affiliation agreement with another body."

Reformation Fellowship Holds Annual Members Meeting

THE annual meeting of members of the Reformation Fellowship was held on October 30th, at 8 o'clock in the auditorium of Bethel Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa. Significant actions: re-election of all sitting Trustees whose terms had expired, including the election for the first time by the members of two Trustees formerly elected to fill vacancies by the Board. They are: the Rev. J. U. Selwyn Toms, of Woodstown, N. J., and the Rev. Lawrence B. Gilmore, of Morristown, N. J. Election of the Rev. Prof. Cornelius Van Til, Ph.D., as a Trustee; endorsement of the action of the Trustees in favoring judicial process against Auburn Affirmationists. This process, endorsed by the Trustees, was initiated by five persons not in their capacity as Trustees of the Fellowship, but as Presbyterians. Two of the five co-prosecutors are not Trustees of the Fellowship, one of these not a member. Of the five, only two are members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Two are ministers (one of these a pastor), two are ruling elders, and one a layman.

Northeastern Branch of Christian Assembly to Meet

THE Northeastern Pennsylvania Chapter of the Christian Assembly will meet on Monday evening, December 17th, at 8 o'clock, in the edifice of the Scranton, Pa., Conservatory of Music, Madison Avenue and Mulberry Street. The speaker will be the Rev. Charles J. Woodbridge, General Secretary of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. A large attendance is expected by this fast growing, aggressive branch of the Assembly.

At its last meeting, held on October 26th, in the Y. M. C. A. auditorium at Pottstown, Pa., the branch was addressed by the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths, who outlined the history of the doctrine of final authority from apostolic times until the present. He explained the doctrine of the Reformers concerning the final authority of the Word of God and showed how this doctrine is opposed and denied by those who today are magnifying the machinery and power of the visible Protestant Churches.

Fortieth Year Celebrated By Colportage Association

FORTY years ago, during his great evangelistic campaigns, D. L. Moody discovered the need of wholesome Christian literature, thoroughly evangelical, yet inexpensive, which could be safely placed in the hands of young converts and those inquiring the way of life. Such literature was notably lacking in the average bookstore of his day, and is even more so today.

After much prayer for guidance, and counsel with Christian workers, Mr. Moody was led to establish The Bible Institute Colportage Association in November of 1894, for the purpose of publishing and disseminating dependable, evangelical books and booklets, Scripture portions, and gospel tracts. The anniversary was celebrated on November 15, 1934. The work was begun in a small way in a basement on LaSalle Street, a little north of Chicago Avenue, near the Bible training school which Mr. Moody had previously founded. A few books of sermons by Spurgeon, Moody, Whittle, and others were published at first, and these became the foundation of that well-known series, the Moody Colportage Library, with over one hundred and fifty titles; and of these 10,308,613 copies have been distributed in every state of the Union and in many foreign countries, according to the latest report of the Association. Over 3,000,000 copies of this number, with twenty-five titles, were written in whole or in part by Mr. Moody himself, so that his ministry still continues, and "he being dead yet speaketh." As the work has grown and the demand for such literature has increased, other cloth bound books, together with the Evangel Booklet series, New Testaments, Gospels Scripture portions (including the Pocket Treasury), and gospel tracts have been published from time to time, so that today there are nearly four hundred titles of books and booklets, and over two hundred and fifty titles of tracts issued by the Association; and of these, during the forty years, a grand total of 57,692,350 copies have been distributed.

North China Theological Seminary

President's Report, 1933-1934

AS this term closes the fifteenth school year of this institution, a short review of its inception may not be inappropriate. The Seminary opened in September, 1919, with 18 students, six of whom graduated the next January, leaving only 12 for the Spring term. Each year afterwards lengthened the roll until now the yearly average is a little over 100 students. The affiliated Women's Bible Seminary, which opened in the Autumn of 1922 with six students, now averages about 35. The joint roster for the present year stands at 102

men and 31 women, fully three times the combined number of the three next largest theological schools in China.

Including the class just graduated, the graduates of the NCTS now number 224 and those of the WBS 68. The great majority of these are now serving a large number of missions and churches scattered from North Manchuria to Hainan and from Korea to Szechuen.

At first the Seminary had neither land nor buildings, nothing but a debt and faith, but the Weihsien station kindly loaned the use of classroom, dormitories, and two dwelling houses; friends also soon rallied to our aid financially. Under God's blessing, plus some personal endeavor, it now owns over twelve acres of land, has its own Chapel, Recitation Hall, Library, Women's Memorial Building, Dormitories for both men and women, and six foreign style dwelling houses—in none of which has the Board of Foreign Missions invested a cent; on the contrary, an effort was made by some to prevent funds for building purposes reaching us. Nevertheless, it now makes an effort to claim all the property.

The faculty has gradually increased until now it numbers six full-time professors—three Chinese and three foreign—and two part-time foreign professors. In addition, there are two music teachers, one foreign and one Chinese.

As to financial support, both the NCTS and the WBS depend on faith and economy; confidence in neither has been misplaced, and it is due to the latter that, in spite of the financial difficulties of a number of our supporters and a consequent falling off of receipts, we have been able to continue as before. It is not possible as yet to give a full financial statement for the year, as the books cannot be closed until after June 30th, but the current expenses will be approximately \$5,000 Chinese currency, of which the Chinese professors and teachers' salaries amount to \$2,896. Students pay their own board, books, light, etc. Judging by present conditions in America, we cannot expect any increase in contributions during the coming year, and it will be necessary to stress rather rigid economy, to which, however, we are well accustomed.

While the curriculum has been gradually enlarged, the main stress is laid as before on the plain teachings of the Scriptures and on what "by good and necessary inference" is deduced from the same. There is no substitution of human surmises for the Divine Word, nor any attempt made to correct inspired language. The emphasis laid on the Bible we see is the main reason why students come long distances to take their theological education here. "Them that honor me, I will honor," holds good through all time, and, as we view it, there is nothing more dishonoring to any one than to doubt His word.

Though students come from a large num-

ber of different denominations, varying from Anglicans to Quakers, each one adheres to his own peculiar tenets and no attempt is made to draw any one away from them; this is also a reason why all feel perfectly safe in sending students to us. All that is asked of any one is that the Bible be accepted without reservation. Though coming from fifteen different provinces, no sectionalism is noticeable and all live together in love and harmony. As a body they are exceptionally industrious and many of them do not a little evangelistic work as well. Differences in dialect render this impossible for not a few. For their application to study and their evangelistic zeal they received well merited, though unexpected, commendation in the Findings of the Appraisal Commission.

Great advance has been made in sacred music, both vocal and instrumental, under the careful supervision of Professors Walton and Lee. In the future we expect to pay special attention to the hymns and tunes in common use among the various denominations, so that students from other churches will receive instruction in their own hymnology as well as in that of the Presbyterian Church.

While the controlling power is vested in a board of directors elected by the Presbyterian churches concerned, plus a few co-opted from other bodies, yet no stress is laid by either directors or faculty on denominationalism; students receive the same impartial treatment regardless of their ecclesiastical affiliations.

For all that has been accomplished during the last fifteen years, "All glory to the Lord of Hosts, to whom all glories are," for it is He, who in spite of all opposition, founded this school as a center from which sound teaching might permeate His church in China. That it may continue to do so we earnestly request that prayer be made continually for the blessing of His Spirit to rest upon it, for "except the Lord do build the house," our efforts will all be in vain, but if He does do so, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." We also ask that prayer be made that "no root of bitterness may spring up" which would defile His work; that no strange and harmful influences from abroad may enter in to vitiate it; that we may have all needed wisdom in directing the future of the work entrusted to us, and that all may seek, not their own, but the things of the Lord Christ.

Respectfully submitted in behalf of the faculty,

W. M. HAYES, *President.*

The North China Theological Seminary opened its sixteenth year on September 12th with 118 students enrolled. In addition there are twenty-two in the affiliated Women's Bible Seminary making a total class roll of 140 students. During the preceding three days Rev. Donald G. Barnhouse, D.D., of

Philadelphia, gave a series of ten lectures which were highly appreciated by both faculty and students, not only of the Seminary, but also of the Mateer Memorial Bible Institute.

The Seminary maintains its thoroughly conservative and evangelistic standards, the result being, as the "Fact Finding Commission" state in their report, that it is by far the largest theological institution in China, having according to that report at least fifty per cent. of all the theological students in the country.

The present incoming class being the largest yet enrolled, the dormitories are crowded to the limit, and some students have to room in the attic of the Main Recitation Building, others in the basement of the Cynwyd Library Building.

This large number of students (and some were declined because of lack of accommodations), is evidence that despite much prevalent Modernism, "knowledge which is falsely so called," there is a large body in the Chinese Church as a whole which holds fast by the whole Bible and desires pastors who preach no "other gospel" than that recorded therein.

China Letter

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

WHETHER so intended or not, the recent—we are inclined to think unconstitutional—action of the General Assembly at Cleveland outlawing the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions will be a tremendous encouragement to the "modernist" and "indifferentist" elements in our missions here in China, and will render the efforts of loyal defenders of the "faith once for all delivered" much harder than before. By such arbitrary and divisive action, we fear the Assembly has not taken the best way to restore confidence in its official board. Many out here are convinced that what still is loudly called for is an open and thorough investigation of the specific charges made against the official board but never answered by it. In condemning the new board, it would seem that the General Assembly has taken upon itself a solemn obligation to remove all grounds of suspicion from the old board to which it demands the allegiance of its ministers and members. Bible-believing missionaries and their loyal Chinese colleagues will watch with intense interest to see how that obligation is fulfilled.

That the Christian Literature Society and Cheeloo theological teachers continue to issue books destructive of evangelical faith may be seen from the following recommendation of one of their new books in the June number of the *China Bookman* whose English editor is a member of the Northern Presbyterian Mission:

THE KINGDOM AND THE MESSIAH
—Cheeloo Manual No. V.

Prof. E. F. Scott, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Translated by W. B. Djang, M.A. .30.

This book is intended chiefly for the use of students in Schools of Theology, and also for Christian workers. The theological student will find it invaluable as a book of reference, while those who attempt Christian work among students of college grade will receive much help from it. The book gives a penetrating interpretation of the attitude of Jesus towards the two cardinal apocalyptic ideas of the Kingdom of God and the Messiah. The writer maintains that "the permanent validity of the Christian Gospel is in no way affected by the particular framework in which it was first given."

Those who look with misgivings upon the rapid spread of the Oxford Group movement in the mission field will not be altogether happy to see on the next page of the *China Bookman* the advertisement of a new book by the C. L. S. on Group Evangelism, "a book of method based on the principles of the Oxford Group."

The above two books, not to mention others of questionable authorship, are among less than a score of new religious C. L. S. books advertised in the June number of the *Bookman*. Is it not about time that, instead of providing increasing support for the Christian Literature Society, Presbyterian funds for literature be conserved for distinctively evangelical uses? We appeal to readers of CHRISTIANITY TODAY to help bring this about.

Last spring Rev. Chang Feng Ming, a graduate of the North China Theological Seminary, after several years of greatly blessed ministry among the Chinese in Korea, was called to Tengchowfu, Shantung, to become superintendent of evangelistic work among the six churches of the Church of Christ in China lying within the field of that Presbyterian station. In his new work, he has been a strong advocate of the spirit of self-support which he found in the Korean Church. Already God has blessed his efforts to the arousing of these churches to increase their pledged contributions by 268 per cent over those of last year. His influence upon the Independent Church at Tengchowfu has been almost equally blessed as their subscriptions were increased from \$150 to \$458. Pray for this earnest minister in his new field of labor.

Some years ago, a Southern Presbyterian Committee published an edition of six thousand sound Bible Dictionaries in Chinese based upon the scholarly works of Dr. Orr and Dr. Davis. They met a distinct need among the thousands who were dissatisfied with the destructively "modernistic" Bible Dictionary based on that of Dr. Hastings, and were all sold out in a very short time. Plans for a reprint were frustrated by the burning of the Commercial Press at Shanghai during the Japanese bombardment. Since then, the larger "modernistic" Dictionary and a later smaller

one of more limited scope and for more popular use, also based upon Hastings, have been the only ones available. In March, 1933, the faculty of the North China Theological Seminary and the Executive Committee of the Chinese Presbyterian General Assembly requested the Northern Presbyterian China Council for a grant of ten thousand dollars Chinese from their special literature fund for the revision of the sound and scholarly Bible Dictionary based on Orr and Davis. It is a real pleasure to announce that the recent meeting of the China Council has granted three-fourths of what was asked for the accomplishment of this urgently needed work under a proposed joint committee of representatives of the Southern and Northern Presbyterian Missions, the latter to be selected by the three Northern Presbyterian theological professors at Tenghsien. There will still be a large market for the limited number of dictionaries which can be printed with these funds. The only pity is that so many who would have preferred this dictionary have already supplied themselves with the dangerous dictionaries issued by the Christian Literature Society and will continue to do so until this new edition of the truly evangelical one can be prepared. Pray for this important work.

Since writing the above, my attention has been called to a small sleeve or pocket Chinese Bible Dictionary of 680 pages edited by Dr. H. G. C. Hallock, of which an edition of six thousand has just come from the press. This very attractively bound little dictionary sells for the remarkably low price of seventy cents Chinese. It is doubtless soundly evangelical and will meet a wide need for a popular Bible Dictionary which is true to the faith.

TENGHSIEN, SHANTUNG PROVINCE,
CHINA.

News Letter from Japan

By the Rev. L. W. Moore

The Division in the Holiness Church.

THE 1934 Year Book of the National Christian Council in its statistics for 1933 gives the Holiness Church first place in number of churches with 439 or almost three times as many as its nearest competitor, the Church of Christ in Japan (Presbyterian) which has 150 self-supporting churches. In membership it ranks fifth with 19,500 while the Church of Christ is first with 48,200. Though the Holiness Church has made an especial appeal to the poorer classes it ranks fourth in gifts with 389,000 yen while the Church of Christ is first again with 682,000 yen. However, it reported a gain of 8,000 members during the year while the nearest rival, the Methodist, reported 2,500 and the Church of Christ 1,000.

As the name indicates, Perfect Sanctification is one of the fundamental doctrines of the Holiness Church, together with a special emphasis on the Second Coming of

Christ. They have transliterated the English and they are known in Japanese as the "Horinesu Kyo kai." In government it is strictly Episcopal and has had only one bishop, Rev. J. Nakada. Over-emphasis in regard to events preceding the Second Coming and a bit of autocracy on the part of the bishop gave occasion to a very definite split.

In 1933 the Holiness Church was stirred from end to end with the idea of the very imminent return of our Lord. Some of their ministers still believe that the actual Return took place in 1933. The Bishop called on the Church for special prayer for the speedy conversion of the Jews as the next event in order and threatened with excommunication five prominent ministers who were not wholeheartedly in favor of the trend within the Church. Whereupon the Church Council composed of 60 members met, by a majority of eight excommunicated the Bishop on the charge of "taking too much upon himself," proceeded to reorganize the Church so that the highest authority would be vested in the Council and abolished the office of bishop entirely. Bishop Nakada then ruled the meeting of the Council out of order, together with all its proceedings, since it could not meet except at the call of the Bishop, and excommunicated the ringleaders in the affair. It seems that since there has been so much stir in the Church the Bishop has become more lenient in his views regarding the theological questions which caused the rupture.

The leaders of the opposition were professors in The Bible Seminary which is the only school in the Church for training ministers. It admits both men and women. Of course, an effort was made to seize the Seminary but according to Japanese custom the property is in the name of Bishop Nakada who with eighty pupils proposes to carry on by himself, if necessary, and a law suit is pending.

Definite figures as to membership are not available but the division seems to be about half and half. The Dissenters claim half the workers and, since they are among the older men, have been able to control most of the property of the individual congregations. They call themselves the Holiness Church of the Commissioners (Iingawa Horinesu Kyokai). The followers of Bishop Nakada have rented buildings and are going on with their services. At a recent popular meeting much enthusiasm and sacrificial givings was manifest and seemed to fill them with courage to go on in spite of the loss in numbers. There is a pathetic note in the whole affair when it is realized that most of the Dissenters were converted during the ministry of Bishop Nakada.

A few general remarks might be added. The Holiness Church has staunchly refused to adopt the revised version of the New Testament, which is now in general use in the Churches. The desire of Bishop Nakada to have the new translation published by

Rev. N. Nagai adopted by the Church was a contributing cause of the rupture.

The Holiness Church has the misfortune to have gained the reputation of proselyting from other Churches. It does not belong to the National Christian Council and Bishop Nakada is not listed in the Who's Who of the Year Book of the Council. It is only recently that they have admitted that the Church of Christ holds to the Bible and may be considered a branch of the visible body of Christ.

As can be seen from the statistics it has been going forward with leaps and bounds with three times as many conversions in 1933 as the church next to them. It is this body which was practically ignored by the Laymen's Commission in its investigations in Japan.

Another fundamental practice of this Church has been self government and self support from the start. They have received contributions from abroad but their work has mainly been carried on by Japanese with their own money.

ASAHI MACHI, TOYOHASHI, JAPAN

Korea Letter

By the Rev. Bruce F. Hunt

THE first all-Korea Quadrennial Christian Endeavour Convention was held in Pyongyang, August 28 to September 4, and was attended by some 2,300 delegates from all over Korea. The attendance at the evening meetings for the public was estimated at 5,000. Dr. A. E. Armstrong, one of the Mission Board Secretaries of the United Church of Canada, was guest speaker throughout the convention, the chief burden of his messages being a recommendation of the Oxford Group Movement. Dr. Armstrong came to Korea during the summer and conducted the missionary "Conference" at Wonsan Beach and has spoken at various other gatherings during his stay and on all occasions, as far as your correspondent has been able to discover he has spent a good deal of time speaking about the "group." A temperance oratorical contest which was part of the program was won by Miss Sook Hee Song, the daughter of a wealthy brewer in Choongeburg province, the most backward of Korea's thirteen provinces. Miss Song is now studying in the Women's Higher Bible School in Pyongyang with the expectation of becoming a Bible woman.

In September one of the stormiest sessions known in the 23-year history of the Korean Presbyterian General Assembly was held in Pyongyang. A north and south split in the church loomed up when there was talk that the five southern presbyteries would withdraw due to what they considered an unfair ruling in the Seoul Presbytery tangle, although the Seoul Presbytery tangle in itself

does not seem big enough cause to bring a split. For some years back, the church in the south has felt an irksomeness under what they consider a northern domination in the church due to the greater strength of the church in the north. The people of the south feel that it is the old political north and south parties showing their heads in the church, with the northern party using the church, in which it holds the majority, as a political tool for its advancement. Those in the north, where the church has always been stronger, deny that the political issues have anything to do with it, and are trying to hold the church together contending that the dissatisfaction is being fostered by certain liberal groups of ministers and elders who are trying to break up the orthodox witness of the Korean church.

During the Assembly the 50th anniversary of the coming of the first resident Protestant missionary in Korea was celebrated by a big mass meeting on the Union Christian College athletic field, attended by a crowd variously estimated as between 15,000 and 23,000 Christians. Following the meeting a parade was organized led by all the ex-moderators at the Assembly. After them came all the Pastors, Missionaries and Elders who had served the church 25 years or more. Following these came the General Assembly delegates after which came the pupils of the Christian Schools and Sunday Schools. The procession was over two miles long and went through the city, once known as the most wicked in Korea, singing songs and distributing tracts.

The Foreign Missions Committee brought in an encouraging report of the work in China and showing the Board to be out of debt and ready to undertake a new mission field in Manchuria. The Assembly voted down work in a new field for the time being, counseling caution until the new church offering plan should get more fully established.

The organization of the work of the Assembly under five Boards, which was adopted last year, was reconsidered and rejected.

The Assembly's dissatisfaction with the Korea National Christian Council was expressed in their appointing only five delegates instead of their quota of twenty. These five were instructed to go as spectators rather than regular members. The action seems to have had a good effect for the council was the best spirited in years, according to reports.

Two foreign missionaries working in China, in fields adjacent to that in which the missionaries sent by the Korean church are working brought greetings to the Korean General Assembly and congratulated them on the fine piece of missionary work they are doing in China. A delegate from the Philippine National Church also brought

greetings and was most cordially welcomed by the Korean brethren.
CHUNGJU, KOREA

Letter from Melbourne, Australia

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

THE Judicial Commission to consider the appeal from the decision of the New South Wales Assembly in regard to the teaching of Prof. Angus met in Sydney recently. By a seemingly large vote the Commission declared that the Presbyterian Church adhered to the faith in the Lord Jesus Christ the Eternal Son of the Father, noted Prof. Angus' solemn statement that he holds and teaches the faith without mental reservation, and counseled the parties and Prof. Angus to take every opportunity for frank and brotherly conference on matters of difference. The dissentients are reported as:—Rev. John Gray, representing Victoria; the Revs. D. F. Brandt and C. A. White (N. S. W.); Rev. W. F. Shannon (S. A.) and Revs. A. M. McKillop, R. Miller, A. Watson (Q.). A protest presented by Rev. R. J. H. McGowan for himself and others was recorded.

At first sight this is a great victory for Modernism or rather for compromise. Prof. Angus evidently regards it as giving room for divergent views on the doctrines in question. A leading Presbyterian minister says that there was serious legal doubt as to the powers of the Commission, and that the matter is sure to come up again at the General Assembly in Sydney in 1936. In any case there is the appeal to Caesar. There is too a rising tide of faith and feeling which will have to be reckoned with.

The writer recently spent some weeks in the state of South Australia, chiefly among the beautiful scenery of the hills overlooking the popular seaside resort of Glenelg. Adelaide has been called the city of churches. Time was in the missions of Thomas Cook, Henry Varley, Gipsy Smith, Dr. Chapman and Alexander, when evangelistic messages created a deeper interest than to-day. The writer laboured twenty years ago as one of three ministers in a large mining town. Attached to the circuit were a number of country churches. Occupying key positions in the work of those churches were men who spoke almost with reverence of the missions of Thomas Cook and others. That was the genesis of their service. Evangelism of that sort is depreciated by many. There is a new evangelism or what purports to be such. It has little emphasis on sin and the convicting power of the Holy Spirit. If conversion is referred to, it seems to have a new content. The appeal, in the case of young people especially, seems to be to the religious enthusiasm native to their hearts.

Now and again a revival or a quest for youth is planned. The best work is done by preachers who preserve the old traditions

but it is sometimes with jaunty assurance credited to the new methods and messages. This evangelism is not really new. It has been talked of for some decades but has produced no great revival as yet. It seems to be largely a product of theological colleges in which out of date higher critical theories have for preachers impaired or destroyed the authority of the Word of God.

It is found not in South Australia alone, but in Victoria and probably in the other states.

Dr. Graham Scroggie recently visited Adelaide and delivered some fine Life and Service messages. In one or two apologetic addresses he strongly defended the Deity of Christ and His substitutionary atoning sacrifice. He was followed by W. P. Nicholson, the evangelist. Intense, utterly fearless and uncompromising, though some may depreciate some of his words and phrases yet Mr. Nicholson did good work.

Present at the above meetings at various times, were Rev. J. Wesley Smith, till lately of Norwood Baptist Church but now, for health reasons, doing less strenuous work, Rev. A. C. Hill, Secretary of the Baptist Union, Rev. Daniel P. Reddin, policeman, missionary, Methodist evangelist, Rev. Reg. Burrows, President of the Fundamentalist and Bible League of Southern Australia, Rev. Graham McKie, W. Floyd Shannon, and other prominent evangelicals.

Rev. G. R. Brown, Secretary of the Bible League already referred to, and also of the Evangelization Society of South Australia, has for years been doing very fine work, organizing, speaking, writing articles; and at the same time doing a considerable amount of reading. Adelaide has also a fine band of laymen loyal to the evangelical message, such as A. E. Clarkson, A. E. Gerard, R. Hoepner, R. N. Finlayson and many more. Modernism and especially half way Modernism is very strong, but is not allowed all its own way.

MELBOURNE

Irish Letter

By S. W. Murray

HERALDED by the blowing of ecclesiastical trumpets and an ever-increasing volume of rumour, the Buchmanite attack on Ulster has been launched. Frank Buchman, with several of his trusted lieutenants—Cleve Hicks, Ken Twitchell, London Hamilton, Ray Purdy, and Howie Blake—led the International team which consisted of about 200 Groupers. They were commissioned by the Anglican Bishop (Dr. Griereson) in Belfast Cathedral on Saturday, September 30, when Methodist and Presbyterian Church leaders also took part. The next day about 80 Belfast pulpits were occupied by Groupers. These included about 90 per cent. of Methodist pulpits in Belfast, 70 per cent. Anglican, and 50 per cent. Presbyterian.

The following three days public meetings were held in the Presbyterian Assembly Hall, at each of which about a dozen Group testimonies were given. In the meantime, "teas," "dinners" and informal gatherings were held in the Group Headquarters—the Grand Central Hotel, and elsewhere, and invitations to selected guests freely given out. Prominent business men, and leaders in various walks of life, were marked down for the Group challenge—not always appreciated, however. One caustic critic said that Groupers were interested in people's pedigree first and their soul afterwards.

A few scattered impressions of Group meetings and Groupers may perhaps be recorded—the absence of the preaching of the Cross, the lack of that humility which should characterise servants of Christ, the absence of a spiritual atmosphere, the utter triviality of many Group testimonies, and, of course, the keenness of Groupers to get people "changed." One result of this "march" should be to make Christian people realise their responsibility to pass on the Biblical Gospel to those who are strangers to God's grace. A new emphasis on personal evangelism is surely overdue.

A fortnight later a meeting was held in the Assembly Hall addressed mainly by Ulster Groupers. Among those who spoke were a theological professor, a theological student, a civil servant, a solicitor, an accountant, an ex-moderator's wife, and three Unitarians.

Evangelical Christians had little difficulty in detecting the weakness in the Group message, and were not slow to express it. Others who were at first favourably impressed by the Movement were shocked by the lack of emphasis of foundational truths, and resistance tended to stiffen. Teachers and Christian workers had a busy time explaining to sundry the difference between the Gospel message and the Group message. But the biggest attack on the Movement came from Dr. T. T. Shields, of Toronto, who was in Belfast as the Guest of the local Baptist Council. On the afternoon of Monday, October 15, he delivered his lecture, "The Oxford Group Movement Tested by Scripture," to an audience of 1,800 in the Wellington Hall. This lecture attracted wide attention and has caused many more to reconsider their appraisal of the Movement.

As Dr. Shields was arranging to address two more meetings in Belfast, application was made for the use of the Presbyterian Assembly Hall for him, but was refused. This has caused much indignation locally, and a number of churches were offered for his use—some of them Presbyterian. Dr. Shields thus joins a select company of preachers—those who are under the official ban of the Assembly Hall "letting committee." This company includes the Rev. W. P. Nicholson and Dr. Machen.

On Tuesday, October 16, at the opening meeting of the Presbyterian College, Belfast,

the Rev. Professor H. A. Irvine, M.A., B.D., was installed in the chair of Old Testament Language, Literature and Theology. Professor Irvine delivered the opening lecture of the session on "Who was Jesus? The answer of the early Church." The student enrollment is about 40.

BELFAST.

The Presbyterian Church in Canada

By T. G. M. Bryan

WE ARE indebted to Rev. E. E. Preston, Vankleek Hill, Ont., for the following: "One of the most successful S. S. and Y. P. S. Conventions ever held by the Presbytery of Glengarry has just been concluded at Maxville with Rev. H. Cousens, of Lachute, Que., Moderator of the Presbytery of Montreal, as guest speaker. The Kenyon Church at Dunvegan is vacant, Rev. D. M. Lamont having returned to Scotland. This is a church of the old Presbyterian type where Gaelic is spoken by nearly all the people. Kirk Hill, St. Columba Church, has called Rev. Angus W. R. MacKenzie, of Spencerville.

Rev. Allan S. Reid, D.D., is back in Montreal, having resigned from the position of Budget Secretary of the Church to resume his work as Synodical Missionary in the Montreal and Ottawa synod. In that synod 46 minority groups were organized between June 10, 1925, and January 31, 1932. These contributed in that period to the missionary funds of the Church, Budget and W. M. S., \$123,402. They received in mission grants only \$26,637.

There have recently been organized two new congregations, one at Hardrock in the Presbytery of Superior, Northern Ontario, where Rev. W. M. Mackay found that the gold miners were without any church services. Mr. Mackay and the student appointed for the summer built a church in a week, and thanks to the Thunder Bay Sabbath School Presbyterian Association, it is free of debt. Mr. McLean, the student, gives classes in mineralogy, English and book-keeping as well as Sunday services. The other new case is in the village of Hepworth, nine miles from Warton, Ont., and Rev. J. V. Mills drives to Hepworth after his Sunday evening service. At the June Communion service there were sixty present, and now there is a congregation of eighty, worshipping in a hall, and asking to be admitted at the September meeting of the Bruce Presbytery. The Presbyterian Church in Hepworth became a United Church in 1925.

Rev. W. Lyall Detlor, M.A., alumnus of Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia, and the Presbyterian College, Montreal, minister at Melfort, Sask., has succeeded Rev. R. G. McKay as Clerk of the Presbytery of Prince Albert. Rev. E. A. Wright, Grande Prairie, Alta., is now Clerk of the Peace River Presbytery.

LOUISVILLE PRESBYTERIAN SEMINARY, KY.

The Reformed Church in America

By the Rev. Gerard M. Van Pernis

THE REFORMATION

OCTOBER 31st brought thoughts of the Reformation. For many this day is only a date on the calendar. Have we studied history, particularly Church History, we may think of a Luther and his ninety-five theses. Recalling him and his work, we may even think of a Calvin and a Knox and the Reformation as it spread to the various countries. But even so, the Reformation has become to many more a happening belonging to the middle ages. That the Reformation is a process which must continue as long as errors persist in creeping into the life of the church, or are freely harbored there, is not realized by all. Not even by those who call themselves Reformed.

Reformation will necessarily lead to division and often to separation and not merely to a restoration, or a mending, a correcting. The trend of the present age does not want a separation; much rather an amalgamation.

Restoration seems to savor of retrogression and it is progress which is sought. Mending, would be to admit that errors have crept in, or that our path should lead into a different than the God-intended direction. While it is generally admitted that we are in search of light and truth, progress has been reported and thus to mend would be a deviation from our onward march. So also "to correct" is as much as to confess that we have erred. No, the Reformation is and should remain an historical fact. At least as such, it appears in our histories; particularly our church histories.

Furthermore, we notice again and again attempts at fraternizing the various forces once involved in the Reformation. It is no novelty at all today to see Jews, Catholics and Protestants marshalling their forces for one common cause. That there are instances in which and circumstances under which this is possible and even feasible we do not deny. But when we read of the position and influence of the Church, whether at home or abroad, and we see these three forces: Jewish, Catholic and Protestant, mentioned as in one breath, we pause and try to recall the Reformation.

The desire for amalgamation cannot endure as long as we remember the great fundamental differences which exist. But again, the world of today does not want any differences. It would seem as if the whole world is intent on building another Babel. "Rethinking Missions" suggested that we together are seeking for truth. It proposed a "sharing." Of course, that was abroad; on the foreign field! Here at home we hear of that "universal religion" in which all men can agree.

Strange phenomena, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Lutherans, Reformed, Methodists, Baptists and non-descripts, join hands with Jew and Mohammedan, Confucianists and nominal Christians worship "the Great Architect" of the Universe. No, it seems as if no differences are wanted today and thus the prevailing tendency to forget the Reformation.

This very fact calls for a New Reformation! At least the "process of Reformation" must be revived!

To be sure, beginning at home. If we are to remove splinters out of others' eyes, let us by all means remove the beams out of our own. If we are to undertake any reforming let our eye be single.

We do not advocate any "religious prejudice." We scorn the anti-Semitic movement. We vehemently deny the participation of true Christians in this unjust and unfair enterprise. We deplore with deepest and sincerest regret that the Jews fail to see this. It is equally deplorable that those who do make themselves guilty of persecuting the Jews still call themselves in some way or other, Christian. Here is a challenge to Christianity, a call to Reform. Let us beware, however, lest in our zeal we fail to distinguish between the Jews and Israel. The latter is that spiritual people to which we belong by faith. The first is the national name. Our mission endeavor concerns the Jew; not Israel. Israel needs no mission.

We mention these things as we speak of Reformation. Conrad Henry Moehlman's "The Christian-Jewish Tragedy" is still in our mind.

Then, too, also in the process of Reformation we have a God-given duty to the Jews. Of them—as far as the flesh is concerned—Christ came. They are,—as far as the Covenant and the Election are concerned—the type of the church as also of the Kingdom. Moreover, some of those branches shall yet be engrafted into the natural olive tree, for a remnant shall be saved. When the church shall be completed, gathered out of every tongue and kindred and tribe and nation, there shall also be Jews counted as belonging to the citizens of the heavenly Zion.

Reformation therefore as far as our relation to the Jews is concerned. Reformation also we said, with respect to ourselves. The process of amalgamation has brought us so far at sea that we do well to compare our chart and compass. In our last article: "A Revival of Calvinism?" we have shown our estrangement from the fundamental doctrines. Our life and world view has been perverted. We must return to the Word of God. All present day Modernism, all isms and divisions, in so far as these divisions are not the direct result of the operation of the process of Reformation, are due to a departure from the Word of God.

That Infallible, Inspired Word of God is our only standard for life and conduct. That Word of God—and not the church or its officers, no matter what their name or titles—declares the truth, determines the government and the doctrine and hence the polity of the church. No human opinion and therefore no Congregationalism but "One Holy Catholic (general) Church." Reformation is to return to that Word of God and hence to the God-intended form of the church and the Divinely revealed doctrines. No Humanism! No, the Reformation is not merely an historical fact, though also that. It is a process, to go on until the Lord shall take His church, His Bride unto Himself.

And that the same causes which gave birth to the event which took place October 31, 1517, and which gave the process of Reformation a fair impetus, still exist today, was proven to me again a few days ago. While attending one of our ecclesiastical gatherings in one of the neighboring states we took time to see the city. As we walked about its streets we also visited a Roman Catholic Church where we obtained some literature. Just about at the same time, Catholic neighbors in our home town gave me a book to read. The book is entitled: "The Faith of Our Fathers," and was written by the Rt. Rev. James Gibbons, D.D. It was published in 1878. We have read both the literature and the book and while we find in these many things on which we agree, there are also many things which would call for such a Reformation as we had in 1517.

For instance: the worship of Mary as a sort of Mediator; the Rosary; the Mass; their insistence on the term: "the Infant Jesus"; the various ways to salvation as taught by them. Quoting Rev. Walter Elliott, C.S.P., in his "Eternal Punishment": "Prayer, . . . Mass, Confession and Communion, would have saved the sinner." We were somewhat surprised to read in "Faith of our Fathers," page 45, "It cannot be denied that corruption of morals prevailed in the sixteenth century to such an extent as to call for a sweeping reformation, and that laxity of discipline invaded even the sanctuary." In spite of a reformation within the Roman Church, the same causes which led to the Reformation (1517), still exist today.

In this day of amalgamation, when the Episcopal Church discusses dropping the prefix Protestant from her name, when a return to the "Mother Church" has been mentioned, while a union with the Episcopalian Church and the Protestant churches in South India was advocated at the General Synod of the Reformed Church at least by some of the delegates (commissioners), we cannot afford to lose sight of these essential differences between the Roman Catholic and the Reformed churches.

It is true that the Protestant church is divided. We cannot deny the charge made

by the Roman Catholic Church, that we permit organizations within the church which are in their very nature antagonistic to the Christian Religion. We know and admit our house is divided because we have been tolerant not only with respect to polity but also in doctrine. Hence we advocate a *New Reformation*. What we need today is a *Return to the Word of God*. Here and there voices are raised within the church; let us arise and build. For such a Return to the Word of God, for such a Reformation we pray and labor.

It appears to us that the churches of the Reformation have a particular calling and task today. That task is to lead the other churches *back to the Word of God* and only thus shall the Reformation accomplish its task. Only thus shall the church be purified but also then shall the church be established and extended. Such a Reformation may hasten the day of the coming of the Lord when He shall take His Church unto Himself, as a Bride, chaste and spotless.

FULTON, ILL.

Eastern Pennsylvania Letter

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

HERESY charges brought by a layman, two elders and two ministers of Philadelphia against eleven signers of the Auburn Affirmation have raised the pure doctrinal issue, and a roll-call vote asked by proponents of the accused has revealed the line of cleavage within the presbytery. Those accused of heresy are: the Revs. George E. Barnes,* H. Alford Boggs,* Francis DeSimone, Alvin B. Gurley, Edward Yates Hill,* John A. MacCallum,* Alexander MacColl,* J. B. C. Mackie,* William R. Rearick, Edward B. Shaw,* and Robert B. Whyte,* representing eight churches. On the side of these signers of the Affirmation (who all voted in their own behalf), the following also were recorded: the Revs. Annich, Avery,* Beery,* Boyd, Buchanan, Craig (Gaston Church), Curry (William M.), Dunham, Eubank,* Frame, Freeman (Edward), Jackson (James Renwick), Jordan, Kaufman, Littell, McCormick, McElroy, Morgan (Howard M.), Pence, Rankin, Rosche, Szilagyi, Schall, Triplett, Waide, Wettstone, Zimmerman, Feind and Cannon; together with elders from the churches whose pastors are indicated by asterisks in the preceding two lists, and an elder from the Scots Church.

Speaking with his accustomed fervor, Rev. J. R. Jackson, pastor of Union Tabernacle Church, characterized the defendants as "the finest and noblest men of God in our Presbytery," and spoke of their effect upon members of his own congregation, deploring the effect of these doctrinal charges upon their work. The actual charges, however, dealt with nothing of this sort; they

were specific charges, six in number, and the reading of them before the Presbytery was most impressive and solemn. For many minutes the Presbytery listened with rapt attention as proof after proof was offered, and scripture after scripture cited, along with quotations from the Constitution. Then, the Moderator being unwilling to exercise his right of announcing that the papers were committed to the Committee on Judicial Business (of Philadelphia Presbytery), a motion to this effect was made, and with two amendments as to a special meeting of Presbytery, consistently carried, through viva voce and rising votes on the amendment to the amendment, the amendment as amended, and the main motion as amended. At 5.25 P. M., upon the announcement by the Moderator that the motion had carried, followed by a lull in which the chair conferred, a large number of commissioners left the room. This ended the legal business of the session of Presbytery, but an illegal action was begun and not completed; a roll-call vote, tardily announced after this exodus, and stated by the Moderator to be illegal, in view of the definite failure of a previous motion to suspend the rules, was said by tellers to indicate the loss of the motion by a margin of six. However, this result was never announced by the Moderator, and the duty of the clerk to commit the papers in the case to the Committee on Judicial Business appears to observers to be still mandatory as well as duly authorized by a vote of Presbytery.

Memorial minutes on the death of Dr. Albert Barnes Henry and Dr. J. M. Hubbert, who died October 4th and 6th respectively, were ordered prepared. The name of Licentiate Alexander K. Davidson was erased from the roll because of his ordination by the Presbytery of Moose Jaw Presbyterian Church in Canada. Dismissals include: the Rev. H. Lawrence McCrory; and the Rev. Eugene A. Vecsey, to Lackawanna Presbytery, where he will exchange pastorates with the pastor of the Westmore Magyar Church, Kingston, Pa.

James W. Price, Westminster Seminary graduate, was ordained and installed in the Susquehanna Avenue Church, Philadelphia, November 20th. The Revs. Allan A. MacRae, David Freeman, Oswald T. Allis, Warren R. Ward, Robert Strong, Harvey Klaer and R. B. Kuiper took part.

Trustees of Presbytery announced the election of Elder J. Wilbur Yeats to their board, succeeding Elder Hayes. At a previous meeting the Rev. A. B. Sargis was dismissed to Philadelphia North Presbytery, and Dr. A. B. Dodd received in absentia from Shankiang Presbytery, China. Memorial minutes on the death of the Revs. A. H. Hamilton and J. William Smith were read.

New York and New England Notes

By the Rev. L. Craig Long

THE Synod of New York, comprising 21 Presbyteries and all of the Presbyterian Churches in the Communion of the Presbyterian Church of the U. S. A., held its annual meeting in the Westminster Presbyterian Church of Buffalo, October 15-18. The chief speakers at this supposedly Presbyterian function were: Rev. Albert W. Palmer, the president of Chicago Theological Seminary; Rev. Lynn Harold Hough, Dean of Drew Theological Seminary; Dr. William Chalmers Covert, Moderator of the General Assembly, and Professor Halford E. Luccock, of Yale Divinity School. We fail to be able to understand how Presbyterian laymen can be expected to gain any appreciation for, or education in, the principles of true Presbyterianism when at such times as Synod meetings the laity and the Ministers are invited to hear men who represent Churches and denominations which are as different from Christianity and Presbyterianism as the doctrines of "The privily brought-in false brethren" of Galatians were different than the doctrines which Paul had preached at Galatia and which by God's grace he believed to be God's revelation. Is the answer not tied up with the answer to another question, namely: "Is our denomination really being led today by The Holy Spirit and the standard of the Bible?"

Dr. Henry A. Davenport, pastor emeritus of the Westminster Presbyterian Church of Bridgeport, Conn., and a pastor for more than a quarter of a century in the First Presbyterian Church of that city, died suddenly on October 19th. He was beloved by many people. Dr. Albert VonTobel, who was for several years a pastor in the Benedict Memorial Church of New Haven, and who since then has been pastor of the Rockledge, Florida, Church, died during the past month. He was born in Connecticut and leaves many friends in that state. Dr. Robert L. Barbour, one time pastor of the Westminster Church of Bridgeport and now without a pastorate, was the Guest Preacher in the Benedict Memorial Church of New Haven on a Sunday in November. That Church, which has lost 110 members during the past two years (according to the General Assembly Minutes), is now seeking a Pastor. Dr. Henry M. Woods was the Guest Preacher in the Calvin Presbyterian Church of New Haven on October 21st (Rev. L. Craig Long, Minister). One of his sermons had as its text: "And Lot pitched his tent toward Sodom." It should be printed and a copy sent to every member of the Board of Foreign Missions to show them the dangers of modernism and it should be sent to every Bible-believing Christian to show them the dangers of carnality.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

Denver and Vicinity

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

IT HAS been some time since your correspondent for Denver and vicinity has sent in any items of news. One reason has been that he knew the columns of CHRISTIANITY TODAY would be crowded with reports of and comments upon matters of far greater importance than anything that has transpired in this immediate vicinity during the past few months.

It is safe to say that the proceedings of the General Assembly were followed with great interest by all the ministers and many of the elders of Denver Presbytery. It also is safe to say that the action of the Assembly with reference to the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions was looked upon by many as a proceeding, unconstitutional, unjustifiable and hopelessly inexpedient. One of the shrewdest members of presbytery characterized it as a "major strategical error" on the part of those in control of our ecclesiastical machinery. Surely it was all of this. Denver Presbytery has no member who is connected with the Independent Board, yet that Board is not without its sympathizers in this vicinity. It is greatly to be regretted that there wasn't another Gamaliel to be found among the present officials of the church to counsel, as did the Gamaliel of old, "Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will be overthrown: but if it is of God, ye will not be able to overthrow them; lest haply ye be found even to be fighting against God."

The nearest approach to such eminently wise and timely counsel was the proposal of the Rev. Garrett S. Tamminga, our pastor at Golden and one of the ministerial commissioners from Denver Presbytery, who on Friday afternoon of the Assembly, made the motion to lay the matter on the table till 10.30 Saturday morning on the ground that the commissioners had had no time to consider it. If this wise and eminently fair motion had been allowed to prevail the sad mistake that was made would probably have been avoided and the distressing conditions now prevailing would have been averted.

The fall meeting of Denver Presbytery was held in the Jerome Park Mission (Spanish), Denver. This mission is presided over by the Rev. Jose I. Candelaria, a man of deep spirituality and excellent ability. The Rev. Mr. Candelaria also ministers each Sunday morning and each Wednesday evening to the members of the Spanish Mission in Brighton. A call from the Berkeley Church of Denver for the pastoral services of the Rev. James B. Douthitt, of Lennox, Iowa, was found in order and arrangements were made for Mr. Douthitt's installation. Mr. Douthitt was ordained by Denver Presbytery about a year ago. The Rev. M. H. Wilkinson, of Topeka, Kansas, also received a call from the People's Church (colored), of Denver.

A new Bible school—the Colorado School

of the Bible—has recently been launched in Denver under most favorable auspices. The school is interdenominational in character. The Rev. Perry V. Jenness, D.D., of our Arvada Church, is dean of the faculty. An opening rally was held in the Twenty-third Avenue Church of Denver, the Rev. Robert Karr, D.D., pastor. Justice Benjamin C. Hilliard of the state supreme court presided. The principal address was delivered by the Rev. Martin E. Anderson, D.D., pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church of Denver. Subsequent reports are to the effect that the school is meeting with great success.

The Synod of Colorado met in the First Presbyterian Church of Colorado Springs, the Rev. Wallace H. Carver, D.D., pastor, October 2-4. Out of state speakers were the Rev. Charles S. Polling, D.D., of Phoenix, Ariz.; Mr. George S. Cunningham, M.D., of our Philippine Mission, and the Rev. E. Graham Wilson, D.D., of the Board of National Missions. The Women's Synodical Missionary Society, which met at the same time and place, had for its principal speaker, Clarence G. Salsbury, M.D., of the Ganado, Arizona, Mission.

Mr. Guy W. Green, of Kansas City, Mo., layman evangelist, is conducting special evangelistic meetings in the South Broadway the Rev. Martin E. Anderson, D.D., pastor, October 17-28, and in the Central Church, Church, the Rev. G. Henry Green, pastor, October 31 to November 11.

The Rev. J. F. Riggs, of the General Council, recently addressed several meetings in Denver in the interest of the Youth Budget Plan.

The Brighton Church, of which your correspondent has the privilege and joy of being pastor, recently celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of its organization. Appropriate religious services were held on Sunday, October 7th. The afternoon service was addressed by the Rev. Crayton K. Powell, pastor of the Eighth Avenue (Welsh) Presbyterian Church of Denver, a former pastor of the church. An anniversary dinner was held on the evening of October 10th. At this dinner historical papers were read and greetings were received from former pastors and members either in person or by letter. As an integral part of the anniversary observances, two weeks of special evangelistic meetings were held from October 14th to 28th. These services were conducted by the Rev. Steele D. Goodale, our pastor at Yuma, who formerly gave his entire time to the work of an evangelist. The writer cannot commend too highly the character and spirit of Bro. Goodale's work.

BRIGHTON, COLO.

Minnesota-Wisconsin Letter

By the Rev. H. Warren Allen

WE SHALL list for you, not necessarily in chronological order, a few items of news of the past month or two. Reports

are still coming in of blessing received from the Presbyterian Conference held at Medicine Lake the first week in September for Presbyterians of the State of Minnesota. This Conference was held under the auspices of the Presbyterian League of Faith and under the direction of your correspondent. Pastors and people from all over the State were present and there was an enthusiastic and unanimous vote, by the five hundred people present on the closing evening, to hold a similar Conference next year.

Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Nicol, missionaries on furlough from Syria, are in the vicinity of the Twin cities, speaking to various Churches. Dr. B. B. Sutcliffe has been holding Bible Conferences for Rev. William Cain of Wilmar, Minnesota, Rev. Alexander Patterson of Brainerd and the First Church at Minneapolis. Dr. Joseph Stevenson of the Board of Christian Education was in the State of Minnesota from October 10th to 14th and spoke to Churches and high schools throughout the State. The Presbyterian Union of Minneapolis entertained the Moderator, Dr. William Covert, at a luncheon to which about 75 representative leaders of the Church in the Twin cities were present. He spoke on Spiritual Farm Recovery. How sad it is to miss the old-time ring of the gospel in the message of our Church leaders. They seem to be afraid to use Bible language. With wisdom of words they make of none affect the cross of Christ.

Rev. H. G. Quartly, of Souris, North Dakota, has received a call to the Presbyterian Church at Rush City, Minn. Rev. Ross Cannon, of Chicago, has come to serve as assistant to Dr. Boddy in Westminster Church, Minneapolis.

Rev. Charles F. Greiger is the pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Cummingsville, Minn. It is one of the smallest, but one of the most active Churches in Winona Presbytery. This country Church has supplied three young men for the Christian ministry.

A Forward Movement Conference was held in the Westminster Church, Minneapolis, on Friday, November 9th. Dr. Roy Ewing Vale of Detroit, and Dr. William Hanzche of Trenton, were present, representing the General Council of the Assembly. Without being super-critical it is only fair to say that there is so little honest facing of the facts of the unbelief in our Church today, which lies at the heart of our troubles, and so little time given to real prevailing prayer; in fact none at all. In the words of one of the great champions of the Christian faith, "the first step forward in the Christian Church must be a step backward." There is no substitute for prayer and the preaching of the Word.
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

The address, "Westminster Seminary and the Reformed Faith," delivered at the fifth commencement of the Seminary by the Rev. Samuel G. Craig, D.D., has been reprinted in pamphlet form and is available for distribution. Copies may be secured, postpaid, at fifteen cents for single copies, and ten cents each if ordered in lots of five or more. Orders may be mailed to 501 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

Late News Bulletins:

Chester:

The Presbytery of Chester, on November 20th, by an overwhelming vote of 51 to 16 proceeded to the ordination of Mr. James Blackstone and Mr. Andrew Kauffroth. Since the last Synod of Pennsylvania had not directed revocation of the licenses of the two candidates (while sustaining the complaint against Presbytery), Presbytery held that in accordance with the constitution of the Church it has every right to proceed. The vote against ordination having amounted to less than one-third of the members present, any stay by way of complaint was rendered impossible. This, according to repeated decisions of the General Assembly, means that the validity of the ordinations cannot be called in question. Opposing ordination was the Rev. Wm. B. Pugh, D.D. Sentiment at first seemed almost evenly divided, but as debate continued for hours and it was seen that the opposition insisted that pledges of unqualified future support of the official Board be given by the candidates, sentiment ran strongly in favor of immediate ordination. On the first test vote the Moderator's ruling that the whole matter was out of order was *not* sustained. The vote was 46 to 43 against the Moderator. Then after hours of debate had let in new light, the vote to proceed to ordination was 52 to 24. The final vote, after the candidates had passed splendid examinations before Presbytery, was 51 to 16.

IN THIS ISSUE:

The Independent Board and Its Critics	159
DAVID S. CLARK	
Frank H. Stevenson	161
FRANK R. ELDER	
"In the Lord"	163
WILLIAM PARSONS	
Faulty Orthodoxy and False	164
R. B. KUIPER	
This Changing World	168
"CALVINIST"	
The Comfort of the Scriptures	168
DAVID FREEMAN	
Sunday School Lessons	169
NED B. STONEHOUSE	
NEWS OF THE CHURCH	171

The Committee having in charge the matter of the membership of the Rev. Wilbur M. Smith, D.D., on the Independent Board asked and received more time for deliberation.

West Jersey:

The Presbytery of West Jersey, after strenuous debate, on November 20th, referred to its judicial committee all the papers relating to the membership of the Rev. Carl McIntire of Collingswood, N. J., on the Independent Board. Refusing even to permit discussion of the legality of the last Assembly's action, the Moderator of Presbytery continually, caustically interrupted Mr. McIntire as he spoke. Mr. McIntire offered an overture to the General Assembly asking for radical reform of the official Board of Foreign Missions, which will be considered in January.

More complete reports of these meetings will appear in the next issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

News of Detroit and Vicinity

By the Rev. Ray L. Aldrich

THE Detroit Presbytery met on Monday, November 5th, at the Calvary Presbyterian Church, Rev. Leslie A. Bechtel, pastor. After a short business meeting a conference on evangelism was held under the leadership of Dr. Henry Hepburn, of Chicago. Dr. Hepburn held the attention of everyone as he told how God had blessed a program of simple gospel preaching, Bible study, prayer meetings, and personal work in his church.

Dr. Robert E. Speer was in Detroit, November 14th and 15th. He spoke at the Woodward Avenue Presbyterian Church Thursday afternoon to the Presbyterian women. In the evening, after a fellowship dinner, he addressed a mass meeting of pastors and church leaders of this city. A communion service followed the address.

Dr. George T. Stevens, from High Point, North Carolina, recently finished a series of evangelistic meetings with three churches on the East side. The Eastminster Presbyterian Church, Rev. Carl Kircher, pastor, was one of the co-operating churches. Over three hundred conversions were reported.

The Central Presbyterian Church will celebrate its ninety-second anniversary on Wednesday, November 21st. A short recital will be given by the choir and a few numbers rendered on the newly modernized organ. The message of the evening will be delivered by Dr. Walter McClure, pastor of the Presbyterian Church of the Covenant.

Mr. Daniel G. Finestone, licentiate of Detroit Presbytery, last week gave a series of lantern slide lectures on the Bible at the Boulevard Temple Methodist Church.
DETROIT