

# 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.

JANUARY, 1935

Vol. 5

No. 8

\$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

### WHY JESUS CAME

**I**T is basic to Christian faith that Jesus came. He was alive prior to His birth in Bethlehem of Judea and it was for the accomplishment of a specific purpose that He entered into the conditions of earth. It is only because He is the one who came that it is possible to see in Him the God-man. Moreover it is only as we think of Him as the one who came that we can have any adequate appreciation of the service He has rendered us or any proper understanding of the mind that was in Christ Jesus. "We shall never understand the Servant-Christ," to cite ALEXANDER MACLAREN, "until we understand that He was and is the eternal Son of the Father. His service began long before He rendered help to any of the miserable here on earth. His service began when He laid aside not the garments of the earth but the vesture of the heavens, and girded himself not with the cincture woven in man's loom but with the flesh of our humanity. This was the first and the chiefest of all His acts of self-sacrifice, and the sanctity and awfulness of it runs through the list of all His deeds and makes them unspeakably great. It was much that His hands should heal, that His lips should comfort, that His heart should bleed with sympathy for sorrow. But oh, it was more that He had hands to touch, that He had lips to speak to human hearts, that He had the heart of a man and of a brother to feel with as well as for us." Christmas Day cannot possibly mean for us what it ought to mean unless we see in Jesus the One who deliberately left that glory that He had with the Father before the world was and bowed Himself to enter the conditions of earth that He might devote Himself to the service of others. It is equally important, however, if the significance of Christmas is to be at all fully grasped, that we keep in mind the specific purpose that the Son of God had in view in coming into this world. Everywhere in Scripture we are taught that it was the sinful condition of men that led Him to forsake, for a season, His throne of glory. "The Son of Man came to seek and save that which was lost." "Faithful is the saying and worthy of all acceptance that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." To say that it was specifically to save sinners that Jesus came into this world is not necessarily to say that this was the only end He had in view, and yet, if we are to preserve the emphasis of Scripture we must maintain, without hesitation, that it was the central end He had in view.

If we are to be saved from a superficial conception of Christmas we must remember not only that Jesus came but why He came. Only as we see in Him the one who became incarnate for us men and our salvation—not merely for men generally but for us individually—can Christmas speak to us not merely of transient joys, given and received, but of eternal joy and an unfailing hope.

### "FIRST PRINCIPLES OF AMERICAN PRESBYTERIANISM"

**I**N its issue for November 29th *The Presbyterian Tribune* tells us, editorially, that American Presbyterianism stands for four fundamental principles, to wit: (1) "freedom of conscience and the right of private judgment"; (2) "life as the final test of doctrine"; (3) "tolerance and forbearance when Christians differ"; (4) "freedom from ecclesiastical authority when not based on clear and unquestionable scriptural teaching." It finds its warrant for this representation in the statement of "Preliminary Principles" which preface the Form of Government of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. These "Preliminary Principles," we are told, "state authoritatively and explicitly the fundamental convictions for which our church stands."

If this editorial had been entitled, "First Principles of American Presbyterian Church Government," it would for the most part have our hearty approval. American Presbyterianism, however, stands for something much more important than a form of church government (though it does stand for that) and that something more is the Bible as the Word of God and that understanding of the Bible set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms. If American Presbyterianism stood for only a form of church government, there would be no good reason why it should be especially interested in the difference, for instance, between Calvinism and Unitarianism inasmuch as Unitarians have functioned under a Presbyterian form of government. Our contemporary to the contrary notwithstanding, we must direct our attention to its Confession of Faith and Catechism rather than its Form of Government if we are to have any adequate conception of the fundamental things for which the Presbyterian Church in America together with Presbyterian churches throughout the world stands.

But while this editorial, in our judgment, is sadly defective as an attempt to set forth the fundamental principles of American Presbyterianism, it has much to commend it as an exposition of the fundamental principles of our Presbyterian Church government. We say "much" advisedly as we think that from this point of view the editorial is about three-fourths sound. Items (1), (3), and (4) of those listed above are essential elements of the form of government under which our Church is supposed to operate. Here too we use the word "supposed" advisedly since just at present they are more honored in the breach than the observance. Certainly the action of the last Assembly relative to the Independent Board was taken in defiance of all three of these principles. Item (2), however, so far from being a fundamental of Presbyterianism as it is confessed by our Church is rather foreign to it. Life is indeed a test of the genuineness of our adherence to truth but not necessarily a test of the truth that we confess. It would seem as though this item had been included to justify that doctrinal indifferentism or at least that minimizing attitude



toward doctrine that seems to be characteristic of *The Tribune*. Be that as it may there is nothing in the Westminster Standards to justify anything like doctrinal indifference. Teaching as they do that the Christian life is founded on Christian doctrine it would be a gross inconsistency for them to teach that the life reared on this foundation is the final test of the soundness of the foundation itself. The words cited from the Standards, viz., "that truth is in order to goodness and the great touchstone of truth its tendency to promote holiness &c," while it justifies the conclusion that American Presbyterianism does not stand for a merely theoretical orthodoxy, does not justify the further conclusion that our contemporary draws from them. We are told that the devil believes and trembles: are we to suppose that the life the devil lives is the final test of the truth of what he believes?

It should perhaps be added that while freedom of conscience, the right of private judgment, a certain measure of tolerance and forbearance, and freedom from ecclesiastical authority that is not based on clear scriptural teaching, are all elements essential to real American Presbyterianism as a form of government yet it can hardly be said that they are distinctive of that form of government. Congregationalism, for instance, puts equal if not greater stress on these matters.

### A PERTINENT OPEN LETTER

**C**ON another page of this issue readers will find an open letter to the members of the Presbytery of Lackawanna, written by the REV. WALTER VAIL WATSON, of Syracuse, N. Y. MR. WATSON protests vigorously to "the presbytery of [his] youth" against the summary and illegal action of that Presbytery in erasing the name of the REV. HENRY W. CORAY from its roll.

And well may many others join in his protest,—all who love the gospel and the noble Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. HENRY CORAY'S name was erased from the roll of his Presbytery simply because he refused to lay down the call of God at the command of men. Because he insisted upon crossing the ocean to preach the Gospel to the heathen, he is blotted from the roll! No charges lay against him; his doctrinal soundness was unquestioned, his achievements as a pastor were distinguished. Had he gone out under the official Board the same Presbytery would doubtless have banqueted in his honor. But he goes out under the Independent Board. "You must preach the gospel to the heathen under *our* auspices," says the Presbytery in effect, "or you must stay at home." HENRY CORAY *went* and thereby deserves lasting honor.

The technical means which the Presbytery used to justify its action is interesting in passing. It was done in professed conformity to the Book of Discipline (1934) Chapter VII, Section 2 (b). This section reads in part as follows: "When a minister, not otherwise chargeable with an offense, renounces the jurisdiction of this Church, by abandoning the ministry, or becoming independent, or joining another body not deemed heretical, without a regular dismissal, the presbytery shall take no other action than to record the fact and to erase his name from the roll. . . ." This section provides a way by which a minister renounces the Church, not a way by which the Church renounces a minister. Very clearly the intention must be present in the mind of the minister to renounce the jurisdiction of the Church. Three ways are open to him. No one pretends that HENRY CORAY has either abandoned the ministry or joined another body not deemed heretical. But it is claimed by the Presbytery (reputedly on the advice of the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly) that since the last Assembly said that the *members* of the Independent Board had repudiated the jurisdiction of the Church (which they deny) that therefore a *missionary* of that Board has voluntarily renounced the jurisdiction of the Church as well. This ecclesiastical legerdemain may be paraphrased: *The Presbytery*: "MR. CORAY, we see you have declared yourself independent. Since you have

yourself done this we will have to erase your name from the roll." MR. CORAY: "Oh no, I have not declared myself independent and do not denounce the jurisdiction of the Church. I want to stay in the Church." *The Presbytery*: "Dear MR. CORAY, you are mistaken, whether you admit it or not you have declared your independency. You may *say* you want to remain in the Church, but we know better what you mean than you do. You really mean that you are becoming Independent, quite voluntarily." MR. CORAY: "But I protest I do not want to be Independent. I do *not* renounce the Church. You are trying to make me say the opposite of what I clearly mean. If I have done wrong, try me. But I am *not* declaring myself Independent. I am a Presbyterian!" *The Presbytery* (sorrowfully): "Young man, we insist that you say you are becoming Independent, whether you like it or not." (To the Clerk): "Mr. Clerk, this man has voluntarily declared his independency. Off with his head."

### THE CHESTER ORDINATIONS



HE recent action of the Presbytery of Chester in ordaining two licentiates who could not in good conscience pledge future blind support to the Boards of the Church, should be approved by loyal Presbyterians. The Presbytery acted with determination, courage and good sense.

Readers of CHRISTIANITY TODAY are aware that in the spring of 1934, the Presbytery of Chester first licensed the two candidates, MESSRS. BLACKSTONE and KAUFFROTH. A complaint was entered against this action by the REV. WM. B. PUGH, of Chester, leader of the pro-machine forces in the Presbytery. He insisted that the candidates should have been required by the Presbytery to pledge future support to the Boards, and that in not so insisting the Presbytery had violated "that solemn compact" which holds the church together, namely, the Constitution. By a close vote the Judicial Commission of the Synod of Pennsylvania sustained the complaint. A large minority of the Commission dissented and complained to the Assembly. But in sustaining the complaint the Commission issued no instructions to the Presbytery. Nor did it declare the licenses revoked. Now, the Book of Discipline is very clear in providing that the effect of sustaining a complaint is not necessarily reversal of the act complained against. It says, in Chapter XII, Section 13, "the effect of a complaint if sustained, *may be* the reversal, in whole or in part, of the action or decision complained of. When a complaint is sustained, the lower judiciary shall be directed as to further proceedings in the case." (Italics ours.) Since the effect of the sustaining of a complaint *may be* (not "shall be") the reversal of the action in whole or in part, and since the Synod gave no directions whatsoever to the Presbytery, it is clear as day that for the Presbytery to have assumed that the licensures had been voided would have been itself a violation of the law. If language means anything, the effect of sustaining the complaint does not reverse the action complained of unless the appellate court distinctly says so. In this case it said nothing. The Presbytery of Chester, therefore, could in view of these facts only conclude that while its action had been disapproved by the Synod, the young men were still licentiates and eligible for ordination. Any other assumption would be purely gratuitous.

It is reported that DR. PUGH suggested that the ordinations would not be considered valid. DR. PUGH ought to be sufficiently well informed on the history of such cases to know that the Assembly has repeatedly ruled that it will not invalidate ordinations even while sustaining complaints. This rule has been applied in the past to the benefit of the liberal Presbytery of New York. It will be interesting to see whether the bureaucracy will move to have a different principle applied to the conservative Presbytery of Chester.



## THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE SPIRIT

**T**HE movement known as The Fellowship of the Spirit was launched on June 29, 1934, under the leadership of the REV. WILLIAM CARTER until recently pastor of the Throop Avenue Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn. It is interdenominational in character and seeks to interest the ministers and laymen of the evangelical churches of America. It has as its objective the deepening of the spiritual life of the churches and holds that this can be done only as greater dependence is placed on the Holy Spirit. An official statement affirms that it stands for: (1) a recognition of the Lordship of the Holy Spirit in the lives and hearts of men; (2) a whole Bible as the Word of God; (3) a place for prayer in daily life; (4) a witness for God to others who need Him, and; (5) individual sacrificial service to save the individual, the nation and the world, from itself, to God. Stress is placed on the fact that it consists of "an unofficial body of laymen and ministers of evangelical denominations, banded together by a mutual anxiety for the generally recognized low spiritual estate of our churches, and an earnest desire to find some solution for this sadly menacing problem." In the conviction that the things for which it stands are the things needed to "revitalize the Church, stabilize society and save the world" it appeals to men everywhere to join them in this work. It is under the control of a Committee of Fifteen which includes ministers and laymen from the Baptist, Dutch Reformed, Episcopal, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches with DR. CARTER as chairman. Its headquarters are at 1421 Madison Avenue, New York City. The Fellowship welcomes correspondence as it is desirous in every way possible to promote a spiritual revival in the Church of God. With this end in view it commends its Chairman "to the Christian consideration and attention of the churches and various Christian conferences that he may present this need of the Holy Spirit, for infilling and soul winning, that the churches may be revived and strengthened, and souls born into the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." This is a movement that has great possibilities. Its greatest danger, if we mistake not, is that through a failure to stress the importance of sound doctrine it will promote a sickly rather than a vigorous spirituality.

## PAGAN MORALITY?

**T**HE "Catalogue of Promotional Literature of the Board of Foreign Missions, Board of National Missions, Spring-Summer 1934" was issued in the spring of this year. On its outside back cover page is listed a set of readings for "Spiritual Life Groups." Seven books or booklets were named, in addition to the monthly "Today." Among them were: "Private Prayer," "Great Souls at Prayer," "The Ministry of Silence and Meditation," and "The Way of Discovery" by WINIFRED KIRKLAND. Copies of the catalogue released late this summer are unusual in that "Private Prayer" and "The Way of Discovery" are crossed out with a heavy blue pencil. Why?

No explanations are given in the catalogue, and so far as we know, no statement in explanation has ever been given to the Church.

Now it is quite true that the two booklets in question are, not only in isolated parts, but as a whole thoroughly modernistic. Indeed, MISS KIRKLAND'S booklet was originally written for use in DR. FOSDICK'S Riverside Church. It contained the amazing sentence: "There has been only one human being brave enough to release within himself the full creative power of believing that God was his Father. But unless Jesus' method of making himself divine can be imitated, his achievement is a mockery rather than a challenge." (Page 19.) At the Assembly the Senior Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions defended the book before the Standing Committee on two grounds. First, MISS KIRKLAND was writing only of Jesus' *humanity*. Second, MISS KIRKLAND is a rare Christian spirit, an invalid. If one only knew her one would not be

so harshly critical of what she writes. It is not necessary to criticize this so-called defense other than to remark that no one dreams of aiming personal shafts at MISS KIRKLAND. She has written in accordance with her convictions. But her convictions are not those of the Presbyterian Church, according to its Confession of Faith.

But still the question: "Why was the catalogue blue-pencilled?" Not because of the Modernism of the pamphlets. The pamphlets *not* crossed off were just as objectionable to conservatives as the ones eliminated. "The Ministry of Silence and Meditation" had the following to say (page 34): "We need to wrestle with spiritual principles, to come to grips with the 'hard sayings' of the Gospels and the tremendous Pauline paradoxes. Whether our ultimate intellectual conclusions be orthodox or heterodox matters comparatively little. . . ." Had modernism been the cause of elimination then this book should have been crossed out, and others. Further, in at least five issues of "Women and Missions" (Published by the Woman's Committees of the Boards of Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.) articles by MISS KIRKLAND had appeared prior to the sudden blue-pencilling. In one of these articles (April, 1934, issue, page 6) MISS KIRKLAND had written: "What does the agony on Gethsemane reveal except that Jesus saw human existence so beautiful that he could not bear to leave it?" When that shocking question was asked, the censor remained silent. His blue-pencil lay idly beside him. Indeed as early as April, 1933, these devotional literature pamphlets were recommended in "Women and Missions." Why the sudden change of heart late in the summer of 1934?

They tell us that in certain African countries virtue consists, not in conformity to moral law, but in ability to escape detection. The offensiveness of MISS KIRKLAND'S booklet was detected by conservatives only a few months ago. The Catalogue was then blue-pencilled. Must we draw the inevitable conclusion?

## "A CHRISTIAN MANIFESTO"

**T**HE publication of *A Christian Manifesto* by DR. EDWIN LEWIS is something of an event. DR. LEWIS, who is Professor of Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion in Drew Theological Seminary, is a well-known figure in the theological world whose previous books contained attractive presentations of what passes under the name of Christian liberalism. Yet in this book he boldly condemns what he once praised and issues a call to the Church to return to the faith once for all delivered. Small wonder that many of his former admirers accuse him of having "sold out to the Fundamentalists." This book which is published by the Abingdon Press (\$2.00) is dedicated "to all who are concerned that the Christian Faith shall not perish from the earth."

It is true that in our opinion this "Christian Manifesto" leaves much to be desired; but it is so much better than DR. LEWIS' former books led us to expect and so far superior to most recent professedly Christian publications that we welcome its appearance—despite the fact that it will be judged gravely defective by those who accept the Bible as God's infallible Word and the Westminster Standards as containing the system of doctrine taught in this authoritative Word. Its appearance is fitted to hearten and encourage all of God's people and is to be commended to those who are more or less under modernistic influences.

DR. LEWIS writes with something like an adequate understanding of the existing situation. He perceives that apostasy is widespread. "A whole generation," he writes, "has been subjected to a type of preaching and a type of teaching which was presumably Christian, and yet from which have been eliminated those very truths in which the church began and by which it has been nourished and perpetuated—and, I will add, by which alone it can long continue into the future" (p. 80). "I think it would not be difficult to show," he says further, "that what is ordinarily



supposed to be the Unitarian view of our Lord is being taken for granted by vast numbers of Christian people, ministers and laymen alike, who yet in the hymns they sing, and the prayers they repeat, and the sacraments they observe, and the forms of worship they engage in, profess assent to a view that is incalculably different. 'This people honor me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.' I have no intention of laying a charge of insincerity. What an apostate church needs today is not someone to accuse it so much as someone to lead it seriously to face the realities of the case. Apostasy may be largely unconscious; its results will be none the less deadly on that account" (p. 173). A number of other passages might be cited but these will suffice to make clear that in DR. LEWIS' judgment the existing church is largely an apostate church.

DR. LEWIS also writes in the consciousness that Christian practice is dependent on Christian beliefs. Witness such statements as the following: "The Christian way of life cannot be permanently maintained without the Christian belief" (p. 13); "When the Christian ethic is divorced from the Christian faith, it becomes the world's supreme example of the fatal antithesis of a splendid idealism and the necessary power of attainment" (p. 19); "We have supposed, have we not, that we could keep the 'practical' aspects of Christianity and surrender the 'theoretical'?" Perhaps we are waking up to realize how impossible such a division of Christian truth is. It will be a great day for the Church of Christ when it shall again realize that for every demand its faith makes on the *mind* a corresponding demand is made on its *life* and that there is no demand on its life, for action, for service, for self-forgetting toil among needy men, which does not rest back upon a truth which the church is committed to accept" (p. 195). It is encouraging to note that DR. LEWIS repudiates the widely current notion that Christianity is life not doctrine.

It is even more important as well as more encouraging to note that DR. LEWIS writes with something like an adequate understanding of the true nature of the Christian religion. He defines it as belief, as experience, and as a way of life. "It is the belief that God, of whom and through whom are all things, at infinite cost did in Jesus Christ manifest and satisfy his holy love for the purpose of making atonement for the sins of the world and opening a way for men from death unto life." "It is the realization of sin forgiven; the knowledge of God reconciled; the sense of peace within; an inner glow which to the believer himself is the indubitable evidence to the presence and favor of his Lord; a satisfaction and an inspiration in the fellowship of those who are of like mind; and the possession of an expansive love which takes the form of an increasing 'passion for souls.'" "It is such forms of behaviour as are everywhere compatible with the purpose to glorify Christ and exhibit him before the world. It is Christlikeness, when that is properly understood. It is love triumphant; it is selfless living; it is sacrificial but joyous endeavor to make every individual life, every human relationship, every social institution, so expressive of the will of God, 'that in all things Jesus Christ, who is the image of the invisible God, might have the preeminence'" (pp. 14-15).

DR. LEWIS recognizes that Christianity is through and through a supernatural religion. He flatly states: "Christianity means supernaturalism" (p. 97). "No statement of Christian belief," he says, "which does not include a supernatural reference—I mean, a reference to God as the living God and to Christ as his human embodiment by a process which involves God himself in sacrifice—is a true statement and I use the word 'true' advisedly" (p. 15). How anti-modernistic he is is indicated by the fact that while affirming that modernism is "an attempt to establish an alliance between a philosophical naturalism and Christianity" (p. 104) he yet

says that "naturalism in philosophy spells the doom of Christianity because Christianity is the religion of the supernatural: that is to say, it is *really* a religion, and not merely a code of ethics, not even a system of moral idealism" (p. 98). What is more, the supernaturalism that our author recognizes and boldly proclaims includes the supernatural in the form of the miraculous. He not only believes in a supernatural God but in a supernatural Christ and a supernatural salvation. Such concepts as revelation, incarnation, atonement, regeneration play a large part in his thinking. He delights to call his faith an affirmative faith and eloquently urges his readers to affirm the reality of God, the divinity of Christ, the fact of sin, the authority of the Word of God, the cross as the supreme event in history, and the gospel as God's provision for the salvation of the whole world.

DR. LEWIS' book contains so much to approve—much more might be said in this connection—that we greatly regret that it also contains not a little of which we disapprove. For instance he denies that God is omniscient (pp. 56-58) and affirms His changeableness (pp. 169 and 178). Moreover, if we mistake not, he holds a modalistic rather than the orthodox theory of the Trinity. Again his conception of sin is seriously defective for while he recognizes that sin is both status and deed yet he seems to hold that we are sinners by virtue of the fact that we are human (pp. 146-151). But while the creature is necessarily a limited being that does not necessarily mean that his status is that of a sinner. If so the original creation was hardly good. Most basic of all is his defective view of the Bible. He indeed recognizes that there is no way of learning what Christianity is than from its own records and its own history (p. 31) but at the same time he says that the Bible is not the historical basis of Christianity but rather the witness to that faith which as he adds "is a quite different thing" (p. 52). DR. LEWIS holds that the Bible contains the Word of God. Apart from revelation there would have been no Bible. At the same time he holds that the Bible contains much that is not the Word of God. Perhaps the following passage indicates as clearly as any his view of the Bible: "The least we can say is that the Bible is the Word of God because unless God had spoken and men had heard, it would never have been written. It has its basis in a divine initiative, and is itself the evidence to a human response to that initiative. Indeed, if you like to have it so, it is a human production, but the production is because of the inspiration of God. God spoke and men heard: this is what you cannot escape, explain it how you will and express it in what terms you will. Sometimes men heard rightly and sometimes they heard wrongly, but God kept on speaking and men kept on listening, and the longer they listened the better they heard, the more clearly they understood, the more clearly the divine meaning got into human minds . . ." (p. 129). This means of course that the Bible in DR. LEWIS' opinion is an errant book. Hence criticism must be called in to enable us to distinguish between what is divine and what is human. He even says that the most radical criticism applied to the Gospels may leave the real faith undisturbed (p. 94).

More might be said both by way of commendation and of condemnation if the limits of our space permitted. The informed reader will not need to be told that DR. LEWIS has been powerfully influenced by the Barthians. But Barthianism (DR. LEWIS has given us an Arminian rather than a Calvinistic edition) while immensely to be preferred to the dominant type of Modernism can hardly qualify as an adequate statement of the gospel of the grace of God. But while this book does not seem to us to set forth the Gospel in its purity and integrity it does set it forth to such a degree that we not only congratulate DR. LEWIS on its production but wish for it a wide reading. Despite its serious shortcomings it seems to us a really *Christian Manifesto*.



# The Miracle of the Manger

## A Christmas Sermon

By the Rev. William Edward Biederwolf, D.D.

(This sermon is reprinted by permission from the latest volume of Dr. Biederwolf's discourses, entitled "The New Paganism and Other Sermons," published by the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 234 Pearl St., N. W., Grand Rapids, Mich. Price \$1.)

*"Fear not to take unto thee Mary, thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS; for he shall save his people from their sins."*—MATTHEW 1:20, 21.

**T**HE man who does not believe in the story of the incarnation has no Christmas to celebrate. Upon that story for 2,000 years the wisest and noblest characters of the world have found "the unmistakable marks of eternal truth," but for the Atheist, the Rationalist, the Infidel, who are bent on keeping all the stupendous facts of the Christian religion between the four walls of natural law, the miracle of the manger was only a human invention fabricated, as Elbert Hubbard declared, in the interest of a Jewish maiden's good name, and the Babe of Bethlehem a natural child born out of wedlock as the illegitimate offspring of a lecherous Jewish peasant.

### A BEAUTIFUL STORY

The story is as beautiful as it is familiar. Joseph and Mary were normal lovers. Luke says Mary was "espoused" to Joseph. That means they were engaged. During the customary year which must elapse before marriage according to Judean law Joseph discovered that Mary, the girl he was to marry, was about to give birth to a child. Joseph was crushed. He felt he had been deceived and his honor injured, and he was much perplexed about what he ought to do. But he was a "just man," we are told, and he made up his mind to protect Mary and so far as possible not to let the public know anything about it. He would put her away quietly but he was "not willing to make a public example out of her." And while he thought on these things, deeply troubled in mind, an angel of the Lord came to him in a dream and said, "Joseph, fear not to take unto thee Mary, thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS; for he shall save his people from their sins."

The rest of the story runs quickly to its end: How Joseph made Mary his wife and how together they went down to Bethlehem to be taxed and while there the miracle of the manger took place.

And this is the story that some men refuse to believe. But denying the miracle of the manger only brings the unbelieving man up against a still harder proposition, namely, to account for Jesus Christ in some other way. The very person, the very character and career of Christ is the strongest argument for His miraculous birth.

No man ever lived such a wonderful life. His enemies watched Him like a hawk and the worst thing they could say about Him was that He did good on the Sabbath and that He let a sinful woman come close enough to Him to touch the hem of His garment.

No man ever uttered such wonderful teaching. It was so simple the common people heard Him gladly and yet so profound that no philosopher has ever been able to sound its depths. He never wrote a sermon. He never published a book. He never founded a college to perpetuate His doctrines. And yet His teaching has endured for 2,000 years. It has been translated into every language under the sky and it has so transformed human life that whole nations have been lifted out of darkness and degradation by its power, and before this humble Galilean peasant the scholarship of the world uncovers its head today, and says, "Never man spake like this man."

And so I would like to ask the unbelieving man how he is going to account for Jesus Christ apart from the miracle of the manger. Isaiah said, "His name shall be called Wonderful." And there is no better name to describe Him.

He is the world's one great wonder.

He walked like a giant among the pigmies of the earth.

No one else ever approached Him.

He is in a class all by Himself.

He has no second.

If He was only a man, then by every law of progress and by every norm of reason this twentieth century ought to produce a better one.

Jesus Christ is the world's one great mystery, and the only clue you will find to His origin you will have to find in Luke 1:35 where it says, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, and therefore that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

### WHAT THE INCARNATION IS

And now I am ready to tell you what the Miracle of the Manger really means. It means that when Jesus Christ came into this world He came into it with two natures—a human nature and a divine nature, and that this most extraordinary occurrence was brought about by the miraculous manner of His birth; that He was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of a virgin mother.

And this is what some people refuse to believe.

They tell us the whole thing is an idea borrowed from pagan mythology. But this is only a "scarecrow," as another has said, "to frighten timid believers away from



Christian truth just as gardeners try to frighten away the birds."

We know that the Greeks had a fable that Perseus was born of a virgin, Jupiter having come down to her in a shower of gold. And there is the Hindu myth of Krishna, born of the virgin Davaki through the direct power of their god. And there are doubtless others. But the similarity is only on the surface, and a mere cursory examination shows an impassable gulf between these heathen stories and the New Testament narrative.

Now, let us look at the record for a moment. It says that "When Mary was espoused to Joseph (that is, betrothed, engaged to him) she was found with child *before they came together.*"

If Jesus was not conceived by the Holy Ghost, then Mary was not a good woman, for Jesus was born out of wedlock. That is why the Jews called Him "the son of fornication." And this insult to His mother He resented as with flushed cheek and flashing eye He turned upon them and said, "Ye are of your father, the Devil."

Listen. If Joseph was the father of Jesus, why did Mary say to the angel, "how shall this thing be, seeing I know not a man?"

If Joseph was the father of Jesus, why was he minded to put her away?

If Joseph was the father of Jesus, why did God have to explain to him how it all came about before he would take her back?

Listen. Did Mary act anything like a girl who has given birth to an illegitimate child? What a beautiful mystery the birth of a baby really is! Young womanhood's proudest moment is when that precious little life, *which is a very part of her own self, carried so long under her heart, is laid for the first time upon her breast as heaven's sweetest and purest gift to virtue.*

But the girl who is the mother of a child born out of wedlock can never be happy about it. She is ashamed and hangs her head in silent grief, and it is babies of this kind that are found so often on the doorstep of the orphanage or some rich woman's home.

But how did Mary act?

Was she embarrassed and did she hang her head in shame?

Did she sob?

*No, she sang.* She said, "My soul doth magnify the Lord!" She said, "Henceforth all generations shall call me blessed!"

Does that sound like a woman who is about to give birth to an illegitimate child? Does such a woman sing a Magnificat unto the Lord? Is it reasonable to believe that a young woman who is to become the mother of a child born out of wedlock would ever think of saying, "Henceforth all generations shall call me blessed"?

Once more. Mary went at once to her relatives. That's about the last place a girl in a trouble of the sort suggested would ever want to go. She would rather tell a stranger, for as a rule she would get less of criticism and more of sympathy.

But did Elizabeth criticise?

No. She called Mary "the mother of my Lord," and said, "Blessed art thou among women; and blessed is the fruit of thy womb!"

How is the unbelieving critic going to explain all this? Would Elizabeth, think you, have said such things to a young woman about to give birth to an illegitimate child? Let the destructive critics explain the actions of Joseph and Mary and Elizabeth psychologically, if they think they can; and if they can't, then let them hold their peace theologically.

*And yet, some men refuse to believe. And why?*

1. *You say you can't understand it.* You can't understand how the human and the divine could combine to make a person out of Christ.

Well, can you understand how oxygen and hydrogen combine to make the water that you drink? Can you understand how oxygen and nitrogen combine to make the air that you breathe? Can you understand how body and soul combine to make a person out of you? You are a person, and if you can't understand the simpler union of matter and spirit that makes a person out of you, why do you stumble over the union of the divine and the human in the person of Christ? And please remember that transcending human reason is quite a different thing from contradicting it.

2. *But you say the thing is so utterly impossible. It is contrary to all the laws of nature.*

Well, let us not be too sure about these laws of nature. What about the female pheasants in the medical museum of the Royal College of Surgeons in London that were completely transformed into males. Had a woman certified that 2,000 years ago this unbelieving world would be saying today, "Preposterous, Violation of natural law, Impossible!"

The scientific name for virgin birth is Parthenogenesis, and it is a recognized fact today in some of the lower forms of life, such as the silkworm, the honey bee, sawflies and beetles, where occasional cases of birth without a male parent have been noted. And if science, by a simple operation, can render this thing possible in the lower realm of life, I wonder just how foolish a man would be to believe that God could not do it in the higher.

But why argue the matter? Nothing is impossible with God. Some people are awfully afraid of the supernatural. If you admit one miracle you might as well admit them all. What kind of a God do you want us to worship? A God who can't do this and can't do that and can't do the other? I believe in a God who can do anything. Why not?

3. *Well, you say, if the story is true, why are there not more witnesses to it in the Bible?* But how many witnesses does God require to prove His Word? It was recorded by the prophets at least 800 years before the son of Mary was born. It was recorded by two of the evangelists after He was born. It is supported by the question of Mary, and by her conduct as well as that of Joseph and Elizabeth. And all this in language so plain that a child can read and not misunderstand.

I know that some of the New Testament writers say



nothing about it, and the unbelieving critic claims that their silence implies denial. But one can just as well say that their silence implies their acceptance of it, for if they knew about it, as they must have known, and knew it was not true they most assuredly would have been under obligation to Almighty God and to man to say so.

If silence implies denial, then by that rule of logic the authenticity and the truthfulness of almost every statement found in the New Testament concerning Jesus can be destroyed.

John says nothing about the Transfiguration. Therefore there was no Transfiguration! Yet Matthew, Mark, and Luke say John was one of the three disciples who was there.

Matthew, Mark and Luke say nothing about the resurrection of Lazarus. Therefore Lazarus was never raised from the dead!

Mark and John say nothing about the birth of Jesus. Therefore He was never even born! These two Gospels, for reasons quite pertinent, begin with His public ministry, and so had no occasion to mention His birth. But both of them specifically call Him the Son of God, and John repeatedly calls Him the Only Begotten Son of God.

What does "begotten" mean? It means to generate, to bring into existence. Did John mean that Jesus was begotten of Joseph, or did he mean what he said, namely, that He was the Only Begotten Son of God?

Was Jesus the son of Joseph?

The prophets say, "No."

Matthew says, "No."

Mark says, "No."

Luke says, "No."

John says, "No."

Joseph says, "No."

Mary says, "No."

Elizabeth says, "No."

The Angel says, "No."

Christ says, "No."

God says, "No."

The Modernist says, "Yes."

And all I can say is—I cannot understand how in the face of such overwhelming testimony any man could be willing to prostitute his brain and his soul either by mutilating the Word of God or insulting the mother of Jesus in this Satan-inspired but futile endeavor to snatch from the brow of Jesus Christ this piece of the incontrovertible evidence of His glorious Godhood.

"The Word was made flesh and dwelt among men." How we thank God that Jesus came! He might have come some other way, but what it could have been is beyond the knowledge of man to conceive, but the human mind can think of no more beautiful way, no more reasonable way, no more fitting way He could have come than by the way He did come—the way of His supernatural Virgin Birth.

I hear some one say, "But after all it makes no difference *how* He came."

*But it does make a difference.* Let the attack upon the Cradle go unchallenged and they will train their attack upon His Cross. Let them deny the miracle of His Birth

and they will next deny the miracle of His Resurrection, of His Ascension, and of His Return and we will be without any Christ at all.

*It does make a difference.*

*If Jesus had a human father,* then the Bible is not true.

*If Jesus had a human father,* then He was not pre-existent from all eternity and was only a human being.

*If Jesus had a human father,* then He had a sinful nature, as all men have, and instead of being the Saviour of others He would have needed a Saviour for Himself.

*If Jesus had a human father,* then there was no redemptive value to His death on the Cross.

*If Jesus had a human father,* then when they took His life He would have had no power to "take it up again" in the Resurrection; no power to ascend to His Father; no power to come again in the clouds with the angels and the great glory.

Hear me, oh men and women, as I say to you that it was none other than the Spirit of the Almighty God Himself, the Eternal Father, functioning through His own direct and immediate generative power that constituted the Son of Mary the sinless, Sovereign Saviour of the world.

If you have ever said it before, don't, I plead with you, ever say it again, in thoughtless indifference, that it makes no difference whether Jesus had or did not have a human father. If Jesus was not born as the record says He was, then He was not the Son of God, and there was no Emmanuel, "God with Us"; no "Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," and we are yet in our sins, without God; without any assurance of immortality or without any hope of heaven.

#### THE PURPOSE OF THE INCARNATION

But I am not so much concerned, and I am sure you are not, about HOW the Miracle of the Manger took place, as I am about WHY it ever took place at all; why God ever made that Christmas night bright with the Star that shone above the little city of His birth.

He did it for three reasons.

1. *In First John 3:5 we are told that He came to take away sin.*

*That means pardon for the past.*

Isn't that a bit of the most glorious news you ever heard!

I tell you, to the man whose soul is lashed with the whips of a guilty conscience, to the man who knows his sin and hates the memory of it, the sweetest story ever told, the sweetest song ever sung, the sweetest message ever delivered is the glad news that in some mysterious way that he can never fully understand the Man of the Manger puts Himself down underneath the sin and the shame and all the unholy past of his life, and, lifting it up and off from his soul, bears it forever away. And yet that is what He came to do.

2. *Then, in First John 3:8 we are told that He came to destroy the works of the Devil.*

*That means help for the present.*

The only thing that I'm afraid of in all the universe of



God is sin. That is the work of the Devil. My brother, if you must play with something dangerous, go out into the field and play with a rattler; go down to the electric road and play with the third rail; reach up into the skies and play with the forked lightning, but for God's sake, as you value your soul, do not play with sin.

But thank God, sin never took any man so far down but that Christ Jesus, the God-Man, could reach that far down, and farther, and snap the fetters and set him free.

3. *And once more, in John 10:10 we are told that He came that you and I might have life, and have it more abundantly—eternal life, here and now and forever.*

*That means hope for the future.*

What a value that places on your soul and mine in the sight of God! "How much then is a man better than a

sheep!" said Jesus one day in exclamation. Yes, how much better!

God would never have sent His Son into this world; He would never have made this dark earth bright with the shining Star of Bethlehem for all the gold and diamonds its mines could ever yield; no, not for all the sheep on ten thousand hills, but He did it for you and for me. And if your soul and mine are of such infinite value in His sight ought they not to be the thing of supreme value in our own? What an act, therefore, of the greatest folly to neglect its salvation! "For what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

And here is the invitation: "The Spirit and the bride say, 'Come.' And let him that is athirst come; and whosoever will let him take of the water of life freely."

## Our Search for Truth: To What is it Leading?

By President Joseph Dupuy Eggleston, LL.D.

(The Editors are happy to be able to publish the address delivered at the opening of Westminster Theological Seminary on Sept. 26, 1934, by the distinguished President of Hampden-Sydney College, Virginia.)

**O**VER the portals of one of the great universities of this country one reads the words, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

We are assured in innumerable public addresses; in newspaper and magazine articles; and in scores of books which constantly pour from the press, that one of the great purposes of our seats of learning is to "search for the truth"; and that these truth-seekers must have unlimited freedom, or liberty, to conduct their researches and to state their conclusions.

Liberty, or freedom, is very dear to the heart of the American people. More and more is there an insistent note that each one must have unlimited freedom, not only in thinking, but in speech and in action.

Someone has said that a half-truth is sometimes worse than a whole lie; and I think that the quotation ascribed to Jesus, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," is much worse than a whole lie, if it has been wrested from its context, and made to mean exactly the opposite of what Jesus Christ actually said and meant. One might in the same way assert that the Bible says, "There is no God." What the Bible says is, "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God." One might assert that the Bible says, "All that a man hath will he give for his life." But what the Bible says is, "Satan said . . . all that a man hath will he give for his life."

And so, in the utterance of Jesus Christ as outlined in the 8th Chapter of John.

Read that chapter, and you will see that the Pharisees were trying to entrap Jesus; they told Him that His statement about Himself was not true. This statement of His was, "If ye believe not that I am *He* (that is, Jesus the Messiah), ye shall die in your sins"; and when He said

to them, "Before Abraham was, *I AM*," the Jews knew exactly what He meant; they knew that God had said to Moses, when the latter asked God whom he should say had sent him, "Say unto the children of Israel, *I AM* hath sent me unto you." This was an explicit declaration by Jesus Christ that He was the same *I AM* who had spoken to Moses and was now speaking to the Pharisees and the other Jews assembled before Him. And so the Pharisees attempted to stone Him for blasphemy, because if Jesus Christ was not speaking the truth, He *was* speaking blasphemy.

And we read that "As He spake these words, many believed on Him. Then said Jesus to those Jews *which believed on Him*, If ye continue in my word, ye are my disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make *you* free." He certainly would not have said to those scoffers, "If ye continue in my word, ye are my disciples indeed"; and when, in answer to the positive statement, the leaders asserted that *they* were already free, Jesus told them that *they* were in bondage to sin, and added, "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

It seems perfectly obvious to me that, broadly speaking, there were two groups assembled before Him—the Pharisees, who were trying to entrap Jesus, and who were scoffing at Him, and a larger group, who were there to see what it was all about and to ascertain whether the Pharisees were right, or whether Jesus was right. And while He was speaking to the Pharisees, many in the crowd came to believe on Him; and then Jesus said to these who had now come to believe on Him, the memorable words which have been so completely wrested from their context and meaning.

What sin were the Pharisees in bondage to? The whole



context shows that it was the sin of unbelief in rejecting Him as God: "If ye believe not that I AM (He), ye shall die in your sins."

Is it not obvious, therefore, that there were two conditions on which men could know the truth and could become free? One condition was belief in, and acceptance of, Him as Lord and Saviour; and the second condition was continuance in His word.

It can therefore be said on the authority of the Bible—to me the transcendent and only authority—that no one can find spiritual truth without starting as a believer in Jesus as the Christ. The passage to which I have referred has no meaning—at least to me—unless it means just this. And yet there are vast numbers of people who have been led to depart from this standard—this way—laid down by Jesus Christ, and who do believe that spiritual truth can be found in other sources than in Him.

It may be said that this declaration of Jesus is very narrow; or that this interpretation of it is. But the narrowness or breadth of a proposition does not determine its truth or its falsity. And so there can be no successful contradiction—if the Bible is accepted as the supreme authority in the spiritual realm—that the man who declines to believe on Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour, and declines to continue in His word, will never know that truth which alone will make him free.

Why is this necessarily so? Because Jesus Christ is the source of all spiritual truth, according to His own declaration: "I am the way, the truth, the light, the life." And if He is not the source of all spiritual truth, if He is not "the truth and the way," He is not God. If His word is not the revelation of all essential spiritual truth, it is an inadequate revelation. Spiritual truth is a revelation from God to man; not a discovery to be made by brain-toil. And if this is not true, there was no need for a revelation, and no need for any God-Man.

"There is no large religion, man, in the chemistry of the sod;

He who delves for God in nature, will never unearth God."

It is impossible for any man to mention any spiritual truth of any value whatsoever that is not found in the Bible, as a revelation from God to man. In his perplexity, doubting Thomas said to Jesus, "Lord, how can we know the way?" Jesus saith unto him, "I am *the way, the truth, and the light*; no man cometh unto the Father *but by me*." This is a supreme declaration, and a supreme claim, and there can be only a willful misunderstanding of its full meaning.

"Narrow?" "Dogmatic?" Yes, to the last degree; and either utterly true or utterly false. He was either the great God-Man, or He was a great deceiver.

"But," says someone, "if one has doubts, what then? How is one to *know* that Jesus is the *only way*?" The answer to this question was anticipated by Jesus, when some of the pundits—the university and college group—wondered how Jesus could know anything worth while, since He had not attended university classes, or lectures.

Jesus answered them and said, "My doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me. If any man will do His will, he *shall know* of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." "If any man is willing—wills—he shall know." It all goes back to the human will. And not here only, but everywhere, the Bible gives the scientific approach, offers the scientific test. "O, taste and see that the Lord is good; blessed is the man that putteth his trust in Him." Isn't that the scientific way to learn whether this doctrine be true or false?

Howard Agnew Johnston rightfully says that "The scientific method is inductive, pragmatic, empirical, resulting from actual experiment. It is equally applicable to every subject, including religion." Of course the Bible recognizes this fact. The Holy Spirit did not need the help of the "modern mind" when He wrote the Bible through human agents; and it should go without saying that the book He wrote makes the scientific approach to man. It is brazen assumption to deny or doubt it.

It will be recalled that the brilliant scientist, George J. Romanes, wrote to the Christian missionary, Dr. John P. Gulick, asking him how he, Dr. Gulick, could believe in Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world. This was at the time when Romanes was under the impression that "scientific thinking" required a rejection of even God Himself. He had been led into this position by following Darwin's evolutionary theories. Dr. Gulick asked Romanes to approach the subject with him "from the viewpoint of biology," and then proceeded to reason with him in a really scientific way. Romanes was tremendously impressed, and said, in reference to this correspondence, that he himself "had never taken seriously that saying of Jesus, 'If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching whether it be of God,'" and he then said, "I find that Jesus was scientific, in that He gave us a working hypothesis in that saying, challenging us to test and prove that it works"; and he then made this statement: "No man ever tried it who did not prove it true."

Romanes had now come to real scientific thinking; formerly he had gone only part of the way, and his position, as he admitted, had been unscientific. In one of his discussions on the meaning of faith, he stated that Prof. Thomas Huxley fell "into the common error of identifying *faith* with *opinion*." It may be said just here that Lord Kelvin, recognized as one of the greatest scientists in the history of the world, and of whom Lord Fisher said that he had the greatest brain he had ever known, made the statement that scientific thinking compelled belief in a creative power; and yet the "modern mind," as exemplified by Julian Huxley, states that "With the advance of science God inevitably becomes more remote from human affairs. This process has continued," he says, "until the hypothesis of God has lost most of its old intellectual and practical value. It is man who provides the element of sacredness in religion." You can see that there are scientists—and scientists; and each one, of course, is at liberty to choose his own group.

When Jesus Christ laid down the two necessary con-



ditions of finding spiritual truth, He gave the strictly scientific approach. I was much interested recently, to find this statement from Romanes, after he had become a Christian: "No one is entitled to deny the possibility of what may be termed an organ of spiritual discernment." Mind you, that statement comes from a scientist of brilliant attainments and of an unsurpassed experience.

Prof. Thomas J. Smith of the University of Melbourne quotes Ritschl as saying, "We are able to know and understand God, sin, conversion, eternal life in the Christian sense, only so far as we consciously and intentionally reckon ourselves members of the community which Christ founded." Prof. Smith adds, "That means that we can understand and appreciate Christianity only by coming inside it." And surely if the evidence for the truth, as it is in Jesus Christ, is asked for, we can reply in the words of Romanes, "It is a matter of fact that if Christianity is

truthful in representing this world as a school of moral probation, we cannot conceive a system better adapted to this end than is the world, or a better schoolmaster than Christianity." Lecky, not a Christian, speaks in a similar vein; and Prof. Huxley himself urged the importance—indeed, the necessity—of teaching the Bible in the schools of England.

"The truth shall make you free." Freedom is not inconsistent with real belief in Jesus Christ. The "open mind" may be open to error and closed to truth, and inevitably will be, unless the individual proceeds in the scientific way. The idea that to disbelieve is scientific, and to believe is unscientific, is very prevalent, but none the less a false assumption. The really open mind will test, in the laboratory of daily life, the claims of Jesus Christ.

(To be concluded in the next issue)

## Dr. Pugh v. Dr. Macartney

By Murray Forst Thompson, Esq.  
A Member of the Pennsylvania Bar

(This article is the first of two in which Mr. Thompson will examine the arguments for and against the action of the last Assembly concerning the Independent Board as set forth by Dr. William B. Pugh and Dr. Clarence E. Macartney, together with observations of his own.)

**T**ODAY a life and death struggle is taking place in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.—a struggle which involves anew the great issue of the Protestant Reformation, namely, the final authority of the Holy Scriptures. Let no mistake be made about the subject of controversy. It transcends technical principles of church government, important as those principles are. The issue is plain and we must face it. In matters of faith and practice are we to look for final authority to the infallible Word of God or to fallible men? The very life of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. depends upon the answer to that question.

The importance of the crisis causes us to read with unusual interest the opinion of DR. CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY. In a trenchant article entitled, "Presbyterian Awake!"<sup>1</sup> DR. MACARTNEY has taken his stand for infallible Scripture. DR. WILLIAM BARROW PUGH, in a reply called "Presbyterians Are Awake!,"<sup>2</sup> has taken his stand for fallible men. We regret that DR. PUGH's denunciatory language is more vigorous than his reasoning. His profound misunderstanding of basic principles of Presbyterianism compels us, in the interest of truth, to review some of these principles and to explain the particulars in which DR. PUGH misconceives them.

DR. MACARTNEY'S article is directed primarily against "the extraordinary and unconstitutional action of the last General Assembly." That action related to The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, but, as DR. MACARTNEY points out, it affects "every officer and communicant of the Presbyterian Church, because it involves questions of conscience and liberty in the Presbyterian Church under its Constitution."

### I.

#### THE ALLEGED EMERGENCY CREATED BY THE INDEPENDENT BOARD AND THE GENERAL COUNCIL'S AUTHORITY TO ACT AS IT DID

DR. MACARTNEY properly objects that this action, although passed by the General Assembly, originated in the General

Council, which had no authority either to present an interpretation of the Constitution or to initiate action against the members of the Independent Board. DR. PUGH seeks to defend the General Council on the theory that, under Chapter XXVI, Section II of the Form of Government, the General Council has the duty "to consider between annual meetings of the General Assembly cases of serious embarrassment or emergency concerning the benevolent and missionary work of the Church, and to provide direct methods of relief." The serious emergency, we are told, was brought about by the formation and activity of the Independent Board.

We must first say a word about this "emergency," and then determine whether the General Council had authority to meet it as it did. The 1933 Assembly had before it Overtures from three Presbyteries asking for certain changes in the personnel of the Board of Foreign Missions and requesting the Assembly to give the Board definite instructions regarding its policies.<sup>3</sup> There was ample evidence to sustain charges that the policies of the Board had become so vitiated by Modernism as to require reform. This evidence has been ably presented in other places and we cannot review it here.<sup>4</sup> Neither DR. PUGH nor any of the Modernist-Indifferentist group has made any real effort to answer the charges on their merits. It is difficult to understand how DR. PUGH can hope to brush aside *facts* by calling them "false charges."

The action of the 1933 Assembly is now a tragic fact of history. The Standing Committee on Foreign Missions (one of whom was a member of the Appraisal Commission which pro-

<sup>3</sup> CHRISTIANITY TODAY, May, 1933, pp. 31 and 36. The third overture was from the Presbytery of Northumberland.

<sup>4</sup> Modernism and the Board of Foreign Missions in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., a 110 page pamphlet by the REV. DR. J. GRESHAM MACHEN, reviewed in CHRISTIANITY TODAY, May, 1933, page 20; Why Does Our Board of Foreign Missions Approve and Commend Modernist "Mission Study Books"? by the REV. JOSEPH A. SCHOFIELD, JR., CHRISTIANITY TODAY, May, 1933. For other evidence see "The Never Failing Light": A Study in Mission-Book Modernism, by the REV. DR. WILBUR M. SMITH, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, October, 1933; The Prescribed Mission Study Course for Children, 1934-1935, by ETHEL WALLACE, and Mission Work in China: Its Trends, by the REV. ALEXANDER N. MACLEOD, both in CHRISTIANITY TODAY, September, 1934.

<sup>1</sup> The Presbyterian, July 19, 1934.

<sup>2</sup> The Presbyterian, September 6 and 13, 1934.



duced the anti-doctrinal "Re-Thinking Missions"), recommended that no action be taken on the Overtures. The majority report of the Committee was adopted by the Assembly without any real consideration of the issue on its merits, and without anything like adequate debate on the questions presented by the minority report.<sup>5</sup>

It has been well said that the Assembly's expression of confidence in its Board "placed squarely before the Conservatives in the Church an inevitable choice. Could they continue to support, and to recommend for support a Board against which the evidence had piled so high? The action of a General Assembly that was never in possession of the facts in the case could not quiet the consciences of those who knew what the facts were."<sup>6</sup>

The Independent Board was subsequently formed by conservatives who were eager to support truly Biblical and truly Presbyterian Foreign Missions, but who had learned that they could not do so through the Board which had been formed within the Church and which was therefore subject to the control of the General Assembly.

In the face of this "emergency" the General Council made no open move until three weeks before the 1934 General Assembly, when certain members of the Council sought to induce representatives of the Independent Board to dissolve the Board by threatening to present the matter to the Assembly.<sup>7</sup> "Studies of the Constitution," a forty-three page attack on the Independent Board, was then being printed, and was sent to all Assembly commissioners. The persons attacked were given no opportunity to make an adequate reply. All fair-minded people will resent such tactics. The General Council completed its work by presenting to the Assembly a "Proposed Action" against the members of the Independent Board. The Assembly then turned its back upon its Protestant heritage of gospel truth and liberty and adopted both "Studies of the Constitution" and the "Proposed Action."

The "Proposed Action" included the following directions: (a) that the Independent Board cease exercising "administrative or ecclesiastical functions," including the solicitation of funds within the judicatories and mission stations of the Church; (b) that members and officers of the Board be notified to sever their connection with the Board or be considered "disorderly and disloyal" and "subject . . . to the discipline of the Church"; and (c) that Presbyteries institute disciplinary action against members of the Independent Board if they should refuse to comply.<sup>8</sup> Did the General Council have the authority to initiate this unprecedented action?

The powers of General Councils are set forth in Chapter XXVI of the Form of Government. The first nine sections of that chapter refer expressly to the General Council of the General Assembly. The other sections (except XII, XIII, and XVI), plainly apply only to General Councils of synods and presbyteries.

Section XII, with which we are particularly concerned, provides that "General Councils" shall consider "only such administrative business as may be referred to them by the electing judicatories as indicated in the succeeding sections, and shall have no power of initiating action *except as hereinafter provided*. No judicial business shall be referred to a General Council." (Italics ours.) There is grave doubt that this section applies to the Assembly's General Council since Sections XIV and XV describe the business which may be referred to General Councils of synods and presbyteries, although the last sentence apparently refers to all General Councils.

Quite apart from Section XII, however, we believe that the General Council of the Assembly exceeded its powers. The functions of the General Council are administrative. It has enumerated duties which are to be exercised "subject to the authority

of the General Assembly." Sections II and III indicate that the General Council is formed to aid in the coordination of the work of Presbyteries, synods, and the Boards of the Church, and to assist in arranging a budget for the "benevolent and missionary" work of the Church. The duty to consider "cases of serious embarrassment or emergency" affecting this work evidently contemplates the preparation of plans to relieve financial stringency. Certainly there is nothing in this chapter which empowers the General Council, itself a servant of the Assembly, to present interpretations of the Constitution or to initiate disciplinary action against members of the Church.

The action adopted by the Assembly was judicial in character, and therefore should not have been originated by the General Council. We do not mean of course that it was "judicial" in the sense that it purported to provide a hearing to those whom it condemned. It was judicial in the sense that it was the first step in the initiation of disciplinary proceedings. A "judicial case" is defined in Chapter I, Section 9 of the Book of Discipline as one "in which there is a charge of an offense against a church member or officer." Language has no meaning if the General Council's indictment of the Independent Board members does not charge them with an offense. They are branded as "disorderly and disloyal" unless they dissolve their Board. Obviously they can lawfully be disciplined *only if their membership on the Independent Board and/or their refusal to resign constitutes an offense*.

Chapter XII, Section IV of the Form of Government empowers the General Assembly to appoint a General Council but provides that "judicial cases shall be referred only to Judicial Commissions." This provision furnishes ground for a strong presumption that the General Council may not *initiate* a judicial case. If it be objected that formal charges and specifications were not filed and therefore there was no "judicial case," we reply that the essential difference between the General Council's action and the filing of formal charges is that the latter affords the accused an opportunity to make a defense, whereas the General Council prejudged the guilt of those it condemned. Surely the General Council has no power to do indirectly that which it may not do directly, especially when the indirect action deprives the accused of rights which he would ordinarily possess.

In his eagerness to demonstrate the ignorance of DR. MACARTNEY, DR. PUGH cites the resolution of the General Assembly of 1930 which states, *inter alia*, that Section XII applies only to General Councils of synods and Presbyteries. This resolution, of course, is not a binding interpretation, but since DR. PUGH has appealed to it, we must correct the impression given by its citation. DR. PUGH has cited the first paragraph but has neglected to refer to the second which states, "That business of a doctrinal or *judicial character* . . . shall not be *originated by* or referred to the General Council of the General Assembly . . ."<sup>9</sup> (Italics ours.) In other words DR. PUGH cites the first part of an Assembly resolution to prove a contention which is expressly denied by the second part of the same resolution! DR. PUGH either knowingly kept silent about the second paragraph or was ignorant of its existence. In either case he is hardly in a position to criticize DR. MACARTNEY.

In view of the conduct of the General Council it is not surprising that DR. MACARTNEY describes it as "un-Presbyterian" and "a menace to the liberty and freedom of Presbyterians under the Constitution of the Church."

## II.

### THE AUTHORITY OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND THE RIGHT OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT

The authority of the General Assembly to adopt the action recommended by the General Council is said to be found in Chapter XII, Section V of the Form of Government, which gives to the Assembly "the power . . . of superintending the concerns

<sup>5</sup> For further details, see CHRISTIANITY TODAY, June, 1933, pp. 10-13.

<sup>6</sup> CHRISTIANITY TODAY, June, 1933, Editorial, "An Independent Mission Board."

<sup>7</sup> See CHRISTIANITY TODAY, May, 1934, page 22.

<sup>8</sup> Minutes, General Assembly, 1934, page 115-116.

<sup>9</sup> The Presbyterian Digest, 1930, Vol. I, page 490.



of the whole Church." This general clause, as we expect to show, cannot be made to confer upon the Assembly the sovereign attribute of infallibility or empower it to act without regard for the Constitution or the Word of God.

Many things could be said about the unconstitutionality, as well as the ethical implications, of the General Assembly's action. We shall confine ourselves to the objections which are most serious.

In the first place the Assembly sought to deal with an organization over which it had no control. The Independent Board is not an "organization of the Church" within the meaning of Chapter XXIII of the Form of Government. This chapter refers to organizations claiming standing because of their relation to the Church. Manifestly it would be improper for an organization to hold itself out as an agency of the Church and at the same time deny responsibility to the Church. The Independent Board has sought in every way possible (including the use of the adjective "Independent" in its name), to make it clear that it "neither has, nor desires to have any official relationship to the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A."<sup>10</sup> In "Studies of the Constitution" the Assembly contents itself with the bland statement that the Independent Board is "within the denomination" and "operates in precisely the same sphere which the General Assembly has assigned to its own Board of Foreign Missions."<sup>11</sup> No reasons are given for these conclusions, nor is there any attempt to show that Chapter XXIII applies to the Independent Board. While this chapter is mentioned by the Assembly, it is assumed rather than shown that the Independent Board is an organization of the Church.

Much is made of the statement in the Articles of Incorporation of the Independent Board that one of its purposes is "to encourage *Presbyterian Churches and individuals* to support this Board . . ." (Italics ours.) It should be noted that there is no reference here to any particular Presbyterian denomination. Neither the Articles nor the By-laws of the Independent Board require members or missionaries to be affiliated with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. The only requirement is that they be able and willing to subscribe to the Confession of the Faith and Catechisms of that Church (in the form they possessed in 1933). It should be obvious that members of the denomination as individuals have as much right to form an agency to propagate foreign missions which will teach Presbyterian doctrine as they have to establish a home for indigent widows or unfortunate orphans.

In the second place the General Assembly condemned members in good and regular standing without affording them any hearing. We shall have more to say about this under another head, but here we record our agreement with DR. MACARTNEY that this action "strikes at the very foundation, not only of Christian or Presbyterian liberty, but of all civil liberty. . ."

The most serious objection to the Assembly's action is that it attempted to bind men's consciences in virtue of its own authority. The Assembly directed Presbyteries to discipline persons whose only "offense" is the formation and support of an organization designed to conduct truly Biblical, and therefore truly Presbyterian, foreign missions. These persons are declared to be "disorderly and disloyal" unless they give up a work which they conscientiously felt compelled to undertake for the Lord. What a monstrous demand! The really tragic fact, however, is that it is made in the name of Presbyterianism.

It is no coincidence that the opening chapter of the Confession of Faith testifies to the final authority of Holy Scripture and that the first chapter of the Form of Government explains the limited power of the Church and her courts. The men who prepared the Confession of Faith and formulated the principles of Presbyterian Church government had learned the lesson of the

Reformation. They knew that the life of the Church depended upon the recognition of the sovereignty of God as He speaks in the Scriptures. This necessarily involved the proper limitation of the authority of the Church, which was not to add to the Word of God. Accordingly, the writers reinforced the principles enunciated early in the Confession by including a clear statement of the principles of Christian liberty (Chapter XX), and definite restrictions upon the powers of "Synods and Councils" (Chapter XXXI).

In the first place, we are reminded that "All synods or councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred." (Section III of Chapter XXXI.) We begin with the frank admission that church councils are fallible. This must be so, as the Form of Government states, because of "the frailty inseparable from humanity" (Chapter I, Section VII). Who then is to judge whether a particular decree is consonant to the Word of God? Section X of the first Chapter of the Confession states that,

"The Supreme Judge, by whom all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture."

As DR. A. A. HODGE has said, ". . . the Scriptures are the only authoritative voice in the Church, which is to be interpreted and applied by every individual for himself, with the assistance, though not by the authority, of his fellow-Christians."<sup>12</sup> The believer must determine, in view of the teaching of the Word of God, whether the "decrees of councils" and "the doctrines of men" are consonant to that Word. This becomes even plainer when we read in Chapter XX of the Confession, Section II,

"God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in any thing contrary to his Word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commandments out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience; and the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also."

If these majestic words mean anything at all, they mean that the individual has not merely the *right* but the *duty* to disobey the commandments of men which he conscientiously believes are in any respect contrary to Scripture.

DR. PUGH relies upon Section VII of the first chapter of the Form of Government, which he says teaches that "there must be legislative power somewhere in the Church." That section reads as follows:

"That all church power, whether exercised by the body in general, or in the way of representation by delegated authority, is only ministerial and declarative; *that is to say*, that the Holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith and manners; that no church judicatory ought to pretend to make laws, to bind the conscience in virtue of their own authority; and that all their decisions should be founded upon the revealed will of God. Now, though it will easily be admitted, that all synods and councils may err, through the frailty inseparable from humanity; yet there is much greater danger from the usurped claim of making laws, than from the right of judging upon laws already made, and common to all who profess the gospel; although this right, as necessity requires in the present state, be lodged with fallible men."

We are glad DR. PUGH refers to this section for it contains a definite limitation upon the power of church courts. The important words are "ministerial and declarative." The same emphasis appears in Chapter XXXI, Section II of the Confession, which declares that,

"It belongeth to synods and councils, *ministerially*, to deter-

<sup>10</sup> See statement adopted by Executive Committee of the Independent Board, CHRISTIANITY TODAY, May, 1934, page 27.

<sup>11</sup> Minutes, General Assembly, 1934, page 70.

<sup>12</sup> "Commentary on the Confession of Faith," page 67.



mine controversies of faith, and cases of conscience; to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and government of his Church; to receive complaints in cases of mal-administration, and authoritatively to determine the same: *which decrees and determinations, if consonant to the Word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission, not only for their agreement with the Word, but also for the power whereby they are made, as being an ordinance of God, appointed thereunto in his Word.*"

(Italics ours.)

DR. PUGH contends that this section authorizes "the Church to make laws to bind the conscience." *That is precisely the power which is disclaimed.* Determinations in cases of conscience are made "ministerially," that is, they are made by men, as servants of Christ, to execute *His* will and *not their own*. Furthermore, if the determinations of Church Councils were absolutely binding upon the consciences of believers, the italicized words in the above section would be meaningless.

In commenting upon this part of the Confession DR. A. A. HODGE wrote,

"The powers of synods and councils . . . relate simply to the declaration and execution of the will of Christ. They are therefore wholly judicial and executive, and in no instance legislative."<sup>13</sup>

We can admit that Church Councils have power "to set down rules and directions" without admitting that their power is legislative in the sense that they can bind the consciences of believers. If such rules and directions are contrary to the Bible, the believer may and should disregard them. To obey in such case would be "to betray true liberty of conscience."

It is clear therefore that the Constitution plainly guards the right of private judgment. This right is expressly referred to in the Form of Government (Chapter I, Section I), where it is said to be "universal and unalienable." What is meant by "unalienable"? DR. PUGH seems to argue that it means "alienable." His position is that one exercises his first, last and only private judgment when he becomes an office-bearer in the Church because at that time he approves of the "government and discipline" of the Church. It is a part of that government, we are reminded, "that a larger part of the Church, or a representation of it, should govern a smaller, or determine matters of controversy which arise therein,"<sup>14</sup> and that "to the General Assembly also belongs the power of superintending the concerns of the whole Church." We agree that both principles are proper, but they must be interpreted in the light of the limitations which the Constitution places upon "synods and councils."

At this juncture it is important to point out that the General Assembly is a creature of the Constitution. Its powers are specifically set forth in Chapter XII of the Form of Government. We admit that it has important powers, which are described particularly in Section V of that chapter. For those powers we are willing to contend with all our might, and to the Assembly we are willing to submit when those powers are *lawfully* exercised. Even the Special Commission of 1925<sup>15</sup> admitted that the Assembly's powers are limited. That Commission, whose report was adopted by the General Assembly of 1926, said,

"The General Assembly has limited, defined and delegated powers. It has another authority, above it, namely, the Constitution of the Church. The General Assembly did not make

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, pages 510-511.

<sup>14</sup> Note on Chapter XII of the Form of Government.

<sup>15</sup> The personnel of the Commission is most interesting in view of developments in the last two years. Some of the members were: The REV. DRS. HUGH T. KERR and MARK A. MATTHEWS; DRS. CHEESMAN A. HERRICK, and ROBERT E. SPEER. The REV. DR. LEWIS S. MUDGE served as Secretary of the Committee.

the Constitution, . . . but the Constitution made the General Assembly . . . It would be intolerable if the General Assembly, whose powers are limited by the Constitution, could, even when sitting as a judicial court, amend by indirection, the organic law of the Church, which contains within itself provisions for effecting orderly change."<sup>16</sup>

We do not deny that generally the Church is governed by majorities, or that the General Assembly is the body established to integrate the work of the Church and to unify its government. We do deny, however, that individuals are required to obey Assembly deliverances which are in violation of the Constitution or contrary to Scripture. The Standards of the Church are necessary restraints upon majorities. We do not see how any one can seriously contend that *whatever* a temporary majority decrees is constitutional or binding upon the conscience of the believer.

DR. PUGH argues, in effect, that the members of the Independent Board are required either to submit to the "rules and regulations" of the General Assembly or withdraw from the Church. Observe the alternatives. If the individual obeys a mandate he believes unconstitutional and unscriptural, he "betrays true liberty of conscience." If he withdraws, he has forfeited the right to work for a reversal of that which he believes to be wrong. The first alternative compels the believer to sin against the truth; the second makes him avoid a solemn obligation. The right of private judgment means that a Christian *cannot* be placed in that dilemma by any body of fallible men. We cannot state our position nearly as well as DR. CHARLES HODGE stated it in his article on the General Assembly of 1866,

"Another great principle of our common Protestant Presbyterianism is the right of private judgment. It was said on the floor of the Assembly, in the warmth of debate, that the deliverances, acts, or injunctions, of that body, are to be assumed to be within the sphere of Church power, to be constitutional, and consistent with the word of God, and obeyed as such, until by competent authority the contrary is officially declared. This is the denial of the first principles of Christian liberty, whether civil or religious. Every man has not only the right to judge for himself on all these points, but is bound by his allegiance to God to claim and exercise it. . . . The deliverances of the Assembly, therefore, by common consent, bind the people and lower courts only when they are consistent with the Constitution and the Scriptures and of that consistency every man may and must judge, as he has to render an account to God."<sup>17</sup>

DR. PUGH'S whole argument, which he insists upon identifying with Presbyterianism, is one long negation of the whole essential Protestant position. He says, "But that each individual may assume to himself the right to pronounce on the validity of laws, and refuse compliance with such as his whim or caprice may decide unconstitutional, is simply intolerable." This is the age-long Roman Catholic argument against Protestantism. In effect Rome has said through the years, "You Protestants need a living voice to speak infallibly, to tell you exactly what the Scriptures mean, and to enforce your obedience. If you do not have such a voice, you will have religious anarchy. Without it there can be no law and no government in the Church." To this DR. PUGH adds his "amen." But historic Protestantism says, "No, we will have no such authority." The great Reformation creeds testify against such authority. The cries of Protestant martyrs borne down the winds of time from gibbet, stake and rack ring out, "No such authority! We will be bound only by God's word." Has Protestantism become so ignorant that it is

<sup>16</sup> Minutes, General Assembly, 1926, pages 81-83.

(Amendments to the Constitution may be proposed by the Assembly but are obligatory only if passed by the requisite number of Presbyteries. Form of Government, Chapter XXIV. See also Chapter XII, Section VI.)

<sup>17</sup> Discussions in Church Polity, pages 406-407.



willing to join in denouncing its own distinctive reason for being Protestant? DR. PUGH may think so. We do not.

We think of Peter and John standing before the council of the rulers in Jerusalem as they say, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." (Acts IV, 19-20.) They were appealing to the truth of God as opposed to the opinion of men. Today we have the Holy Scriptures as the complete and final revelation of God's will for us. To that truth alone the believer must appeal, and its commands are above all other commands. Against even the commandments of men which in themselves seem innocent the Christian will contend with all his strength *if they are given to bind his conscience*, for that binding is the high prerogative of God alone, speaking in His Word. Our Lord said of the scribes and Pharisees, "But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." (Matt. XV, 9.) No believer wants those words said of him. No, it is always better "to obey God rather than men" (Acts V, 29), and the one who seeks to induce us to obey men is, no matter how worthy his motives, in

rebellion against the Bible and is threatening the moral life of the Church.

What then are the obligations and rights of those who were condemned by the Assembly of 1934? As God is their judge, they have the obligation to examine the Deliverance of the Assembly and to determine whether it is in accordance with the Constitution and with the Word of God, which is the primary standard of the Church. Tested by those standards the action of the Assembly is unconstitutional and unscriptural. The Independent Board is set for the defense of the gospel. We believe that its members should disobey the directions of the Assembly because the authority of the Assembly is opposed to that of the Lord of the conscience. They have the right, as those who appeal to the Standards of the Church, to remain in the Church and to work for the correction of that which they believe to be wrong. Their duty is not an easy one, but they can perform it in the confidence that, although they may not please men, they remain the servants of Christ, who is their only Lord and King.

*(To be concluded in the next issue)*

## Sunday School Lessons for January

(International Uniform Series)

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

### Lesson for January 6, 1935

#### PETER'S CONVERSION AND CALL

*(Lesson Text—John 1:35-42; Mark 1:14-18. Golden Text—Mark 1:17.)*

THE narratives of the birth of Jesus, which form the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke, disclose the fact that the joyous prophetic anticipation of that blessed event, as well as the glad thanksgiving afterward, was bound up with the conviction that in His coming into the world the ancient and prolonged messianic hope of Israel found its fulfillment. The prophets of the Old Testament had kept alive the expectation of the coming of the Anointed of the Lord from generation to generation, and now the day of His advent had arrived. Much of the joy of those days was due, as was pointed out in the discussion of the Christmas lesson, to the belief that the new-born King was also the Saviour of His people.

It is evident, then, that the message of John the Baptist, the message that led Peter to Christ, was not essentially new, for it was these same elements that he repeated as an echo of the prophets of old time and of the voices of the Spirit at the time of his own birth. His uniqueness consisted merely in the nearness with which he stood to these events which had been the central theme of prophecy. The kingdom is at hand. The King whose way he had come to prepare was in their midst. And the day comes, when, as he is preaching, he points to Jesus as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. Here John shows that he is on the same ground as the early Christian disciples, anticipating, as he does, the conviction that the

great King of Israel was also the Servant of the Lord whose suffering as a Lamb in the stead of His people had been described by Isaiah. To John, then, was given an understanding of the messianic prophecies which failing to grasp, Israel stumbled and fell. The Messiah of John's preaching was not a king who would deliver the nation Israel from all who oppressed her, nor one who would guarantee to every descendant of Abraham a future of happiness and glory. On the contrary, he tried to shake their confidence in their physical relation to Abraham (Matt. 3:9), and pointed them to a King and Saviour who demanded repentance from sin and Himself would provide full redemption and glory.

Andrew, as a true son of Abraham who longed for the consolation of Israel, was drawn to Jesus through the message of the Baptist. The narrative does not state that Andrew had been a disciple of John, but in turning from John's preaching to follow Jesus he did do exactly what John was trying to bring about. Like every true preacher since, John did not seek to attach men to his own person but to win them as followers of Christ. And the natural desire of Andrew, after he had met Jesus, was to remain in contact with Him as long as possible; and, as the result of his prolonged conversation with Jesus at His lodging, the testimony of the Baptist that the Messiah had indeed come was confirmed. No wonder that he sought out his brother Simon to acquaint him with the happy discovery: We have found the Messiah! We are not told what Simon's reactions were at that first meeting, but Jesus, who knew what was in man (John 2:25), foresaw immediately the

future significance of Peter, and by His words no doubt bound Peter to Him.

The passage in Mark discloses Jesus at the beginning of His ministry, reaffirming the message of the Baptist that the kingdom was at hand, a message which He was to illumine constantly in His ministry by His kingly claims and His kingly activity. The realization of His purposes as messianic King demanded that Jesus should gather around Him a group of intimate disciples who should be prepared for the work of establishing His church after His departure. And the selection of the Twelve shows that from the beginning He realized that the Jewish religious organization would not suffice for the fulfillment of His messianic program simply because the leaders of the Jews would fail to acknowledge His royal claims. Accordingly, it was necessary to begin from the ground up by calling into being a new fellowship whose organizing principle would be the acknowledgment of Him as King and Saviour. Peter was one of the first to be chosen by Jesus for a part in this great plan. At the command of Jesus to leave his nets in order to become a fisher of men, Peter once again is silent in the presence of Him to whom his brother Andrew had led him, but he responds by leaving his gainful occupation without hesitation and throwing in his lot with Jesus—soon to repeat the message of Andrew in a manner so effectual as to astound the Jews who had rejected Christ.

### Lesson for January 13, 1935

#### PETER'S GREAT CONFESSION

*(Lesson Text—Luke 9:18-26; I Peter 2:5 f. Golden Text—Matt. 16:16.)*

It was Andrew's words: we have found the Messiah that first attracted Peter to Jesus; and the association with Jesus from the day that he had obeyed the command at the Sea of Galilee must have done much



to confirm this belief. The incident at Caesarea Philippi can hardly be regarded, therefore, in the nature of a sudden discovery of Peter's. On the other hand, there is nothing to suggest that the confession represents a conclusion that had matured only after prolonged deliberation. The point of view from which the confession must be approached is that of Jesus' own question as to who He was. The form in which the question is put by Jesus indicates that it was His purpose to call forth a *confession* of their faith. Its significance lies in the fact that He wished to hear from their own lips an acknowledgment of His claims which shall indicate that those who have been chosen to carry out His messianic program possess the prime qualification for their task. Accordingly, too, he sets before them in sharp antithesis questions which will show how utterly different the testimony of the average man, not to speak of the attitude of the Jewish leaders, is from the confession of a true disciple. And to the same effect, the words recorded by Matthew that Peter's confession of Christ as Divine Messiah was a revelation from the Father are in keeping with the teaching of Jesus that true knowledge of God and of the Son can come only through revelation and illumination from above, and hence is possible only for those who are true children of God (Matt. 11:27; cf. I Cor. 2).

And the question of Jesus had a peculiar timeliness now that the hour of His last journey to Jerusalem was approaching, and it had become necessary for Him to instruct His disciples with reference to the necessity and meaning of His death. Jesus was crucified because He claimed to be the Messiah—this is the only conclusion that the records allow; and the same records show that Jesus Himself insisted that He was going to Jerusalem to suffer and die only because it had been appointed unto Him as Messiah so to do. For Jesus the Messiahship and the cross were inseparable. And in His instruction to His disciples He insisted that these two should be inseparable in their minds too. The necessity of enlarging upon the subject of His approaching death explains, therefore, why just at this time He should have desired to call forth this acknowledgment of Himself. And, on the other hand, once Peter had made his confession, it became imperative that Jesus should interpret the Messiahship in terms of the cross. How necessary it was for Him to do so is seen in the attitude of Peter towards Jesus' pronouncement concerning His death. For Peter who had been blessed for his confession is now linked with the Tempter who in the wilderness had sought to prevent Jesus from entering upon the pathway of self-humiliation and suffering

that lay before Him as the Messiah (Matt. 16:22 f.).

Is Peter's confession the rock upon which Jesus promises to build His church? The prevailing Protestant answer has been in the affirmative. The Roman Church has transcribed the verse high in the dome of St. Peter's in Rome as grounding its claim to possess the power of Peter. The Roman Church, no doubt, has put a burden upon the verse which it will not bear, but have not Protestant exegetes generally gone astray through their concern to overthrow the Roman contention with one blow? To the present writer it seems impossible not to admit a personal reference to Peter, not, of course, as authoritative head of the church, but as a *true confessor of Christ*. Of such true confessors of Christ the church consists. Peter himself speaks of them as "living stones" who are established upon the chief corner stone through faith (I Peter 2:5 f.). Peter had the honor of being the first of those who qualified as living stones for the new spiritual house established by Christ. Peter was called a rock because of the confession he made, and later on he was to prove his rocklike character as a Christian and as an Apostle in the witness which he bore to Christ. "Thou art the Christ," says Peter, and it is Christ who builds the church; "thou art Peter," says Christ, and it is Peter, and those who join with him in the confession of Christ, who make up His church.

### Lesson for January 20, 1935

#### PETER'S LESSON IN HUMBLE SERVICE

(Lesson Text—John 13:1-17. Golden Text—I Peter 5:5.)

Jesus frequently made the instruction of His disciples as to the meaning of His death the occasion for enforcing the lesson of humble service. At the time of Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, He not only insisted that as Messiah it was necessary for Him to go to the cross, but He also made Peter's protest serve to introduce the warning that those who were attached to the Messiah would have to bear a cross too (Matt. 16:24). Again later on the journey to Jerusalem, while His mind was on the suffering that awaited Him when theirs was concerned with the glory of the Messianic kingdom, he reminds them that if they would be called great or chief, they must serve and perform even the most menial tasks; and He enforces the validity of this principle by telling them that even the Son of Man, who is far greater than they can hope to be, came not to be served, but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for many (Matt. 20:17-28). And now again as

they are at the Supper, which He instituted to call to remembrance and show forth His death till He come again, He joins the force of His example to words like those spoken on the earlier occasion to drive home the lesson once for all.

The occasion of the lesson, like that in Matthew 20, is the contention that had arisen among the disciples. The earlier incident concerned the ambitions of the sons of Zebedee particularly, but the other disciples had shown that they too were not ready to take the positions of humble service. And to Jesus' great sorrow, this spirit of selfish ambition entered even into the upper room. For Luke records that while they were at supper there was a contention as to who would be accounted the greatest. And Jesus points to His own example among them as serving rather than as being served (Luke 22:24 ff.). And thereupon He must have undertaken the humiliating task of washing their feet.

Peter is not slow to react to Jesus' humiliating act. Dost *Thou* wash *my* feet? In the "Thou" is an acknowledgment of Jesus' own high Self-consciousness. But Jesus had not forgotten Himself. Indeed, it was as their Lord and Teacher that He had washed their feet, knowing, as the Evangelist says, that "the Father had given all things into His hands, and that He came forth from God and goeth to God" (13:3, 14). And the "my" of Peter's question reflects a consciousness of guilt. Likewise Peter's emphatic refusal to allow Jesus to proceed in his own case expresses the shame which he felt in the presence of the Self-humiliation of Jesus. But once more Peter is ready to submit when his Lord intimates that otherwise his relation to Him must be broken off. Only Jesus still has to make plain that the lesson is not of the necessity of cleansing but rather of humble service—the washing of their feet only was sufficient to show that.

Modern literature dealing with the death of Christ frequently tends to depreciate every attempt to set forth the doctrine of the atonement, and it is often suggested that what Jesus says about His death may be reduced to the necessity of self-sacrifice as a principle of conduct. Everything else, it is said, is incidental to His concern to rebuke the pride and ambition of His disciples and to substitute for these a spirit of love and humility. It is, of course, most unfortunate if one overlooks the radical ethical demands which Jesus makes in these connections, but, on the other hand, it is an even greater tragedy if one fails to see that the ethical imperatives of Jesus are directed to those who are the objects of His unique redemptive love. Those who are expected to follow His example are the many for whom He has given up His life as



a ransom, His disciples whom He has loved to the uttermost (13:1). And it is this unique service of Christ for His own that is pre-eminently set forth in the Gospels.

### Lesson for January 27, 1935

#### PETER'S DENIAL

(Lesson Text—Mark 14:27-31, 54, 66-72.  
Golden Text—I Cor. 10:12.)

At the very end of Jesus' ministry, as He leaves the intimate fellowship of the upper room for the Garden of Gethsemane, He goes out to apparent defeat, conscious that He will have to face death, and alone. For the very disciples who have been chosen, instructed and disciplined by Him—who have been the objects of His special love as the sheep of His fold—are to forsake Him when the blow is struck. They will be offended in Him, that is, they will be led to sin because of Him in a manner that reminds of the attitude of the wicked husbandmen who stumbled at the "rock of offence" and of the Jews to whom Paul's gospel was a stumblingblock.

But the confidence of Jesus is not shaken in spite of the apparent crumbling of all that He had planned and built during His ministry. And the reasons are not far to seek. His own death did not come as a surprise, for had it not been foretold by the prophets that the Messiah should be smitten of God? What is more, the quotation from Zechariah 13:7 shows that He is conscious that the death of the Messiah is not ultimately the work of Jews or Romans, but of God Himself, and since He is God's Anointed Servant He cannot but submit to it. And Jesus is confident in the face of death, and remained serene although the disciples were to find Him a stumblingblock, because He looks beyond His death and the scattering of the sheep to a reunion after His resurrection through which God's purpose in His death will yet be accomplished. The Jewish nation rejected Him in utter unbelief, but the disciples wavered in the hour of crisis as those of little faith, and those months and years of association with Him would not be lost because they were to be brought together by the Risen Lord for the great work for which they had been chosen from the beginning.

Peter's denial of Christ is a sad story to recall after all that had been done for him, but it is not altogether an enigma. For we have seen that he was a character in whom extremes were always meeting, and no man is so near temptation as he who thinks that he is immune. "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." Peter believed in Christ, he loved Christ, he could not stand the thought of separation from Christ. But the man who had often grieved Christ by his rash judgments and acts now is led by self-trust and overconfidence in his own loyalty to oppose

Christ's sober word. He, Peter, is ready to die with Christ although all others should leave Him. Jesus knew Peter better than he knew himself, had not foreseen his great significance for the future for naught, and

in the sad experience that followed He does not allow Peter to forget Him, for the crowing of the cock is made to recall to Peter the prophecy of Jesus. His repentance followed. So he was saved for the future.

## Two Open Letters

### AN OPEN LETTER

*To the members of Lackawanna Presbytery.*

FATHERS AND BRETHREN:

This is an open letter to the presbytery of my youth, to the presbytery which sent me into the ministry, to the presbytery I have loved above all others.

Why did you do it? What could you or the cause gain by erasing Henry Coray's name with no semblance of tolerance or fair play? Was he insincere? inefficient? disloyal to the Presbyterian Church? untrue to the Lord of the conscience? If so, on what exact grounds, please? It is only fair that we at a distance know the reason for so summary an action. I have known Henry Coray as one who coveted the peace and purity of the church. I have never seen him approach the role of insubordinate. I have ever known him as one who took his ordination vows most seriously.

Do you sense what you have done? You have discredited a man who held his Lord's call above all other values, and who felt constrained to heed that call, even at great cost to himself. Lackawanna Presbytery needs more men of that caliber; we all need more men of that caliber. You have discredited the Presbyterian reputation for fine tolerance and the spirit of fair play. "Et tu . . . !" You above all; who have enjoyed the reputation among us for rock-ribbed conservatism! Here is a new thing in Israel! Like the politician, who looks to see which way the crowd goes, then jumps over fences and goes across lots to lead them, would you thus lead Israel out of the ecclesiastical wilderness? Are you so sure which way the crowd is going? Is Lackawanna at last to take the lead among the prophets—of intolerance? What is the idea? Do you seek the doubtful praise of ecclesiastical bureaucrats? Would you be the bell-wether leading the Presbyterian Church to further catastrophe?

"Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things." Put Henry Coray's name back on the roll of Presbytery where it still belongs in spite of everything that can be said. He deserves a break; he has had a raw deal. Let the counsel of Gamaliel prevail, lest haply you be found

to be fighting against God. And may heaven be merciful to Lackawanna Presbytery if the counsel of intolerance and spiritual short-sightedness continues in the ascendancy! What you have done affects the whole church.

Most sincerely,

WALTER VAIL WATSON.

### An Ex-Affirmationist Protests

INDEPENDENCE, PENNA.

December 3, 1934.

*To the Editor of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.*

SIR: About four years ago the Lord wonderfully delivered me from the toils of Modernism in which I had been instructed at the Seminary in Auburn, N. Y. At that time I renounced all sympathy with Modernism and repudiated my subscription to the infamous "Auburn Affirmation." I understand that copies of this heretical document are still being sent out from Auburn with my subscription attached to it, in spite of the fact that I notified the Conference Committee that I was no longer in sympathy with it. Again I have earnestly requested them to remove my name from all future copies sent out.

It might be of interest to some of your readers that the writer is the author of the article entitled, "My Experience in a Modernist Seminary" which appeared under the pen-name of "John Gullible" in the Jan. 23, 1932, issue of the "Sunday School Times."

There may be other signers of the nefarious "Auburn Affirmation" who regret that action, or who have changed their minds as to its doctrine since affixing their signatures to it. I hope that they will immediately repudiate their action and urge the Conference Committee at Auburn to cross their names from all future copies that are mailed out. Anyone leaving his name on it, still lends sympathy and support to this heretical movement in the church.

With kindest fraternal greetings, I am

ROBERT J. TOPPING.



## The Comfort of the Scriptures

By the Rev. David Freeman, Th.M.

"For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." (Romans 8:14.)

**O**FTEN God's word frightens. God expects so much of us. From whom does He expect more than from the children of God!

His demands for holiness and righteousness are ever the same. Never has He toned down His perfect law. The Christian's God is a holy God. Are not Christians called unto holiness and to good works and to glorify their Father which is in heaven?

We are told that the sons of God are only those who are led by the Spirit of God. If men have not the Spirit of God they are none of His. To be a Christian is to have the third person of the Holy Trinity. What a high mark designates the Christian man.

Knowing ourselves and our past sinfulness as we do we are able to look forward to the coming year with hope. Can it be that we shall show forth marks of the Spirit's leading? Has there ever been a time when we could say that this life of ours is a product of the Spirit's leading? In despair because of your sins. The Word of God?"

Yet, DESPAIR NOT, ye who are given to despair because of your sins. The Word of God tells us we are sinners. Our sins will not bar us from the privilege of being God's children. The Word of God assures us that by believing in the name of the Son of God the Holy Ghost is given to us to lead us. We cannot but be the children of God because the Spirit is given to every believer.

If this glorious truth does not arouse us to hope and does not enable us to face the future with confidence it is because we understand not what the Spirit does in us when He leads us.

We are not to think the Spirit will carry us. He is not given to take the place of our own struggles and warfare. We are still to fight the good fight of faith and work out our own salvation with fear and trembling. Never are we encouraged to relax our own endeavor. Truly we are led but the walk is ours every bit.

Even though we tread every step He keeps us in the pathway. The road will not be the less rough when He sets us in it but He is ever in us and by us. He is given to the least in the faith to powerfully control every step of the way.

Certainly there will be a conflict in the believer with sin. Only where the Holy Spirit is not there is no conflict. Sin always rules over the life where the Holy Spirit is not. The Spirit of God is leading unto holiness the one who does not rest complacently in his sins.

Here is hope, not despair. The Apostle tells us the Spirit of the most high God is

in us making for righteousness. God is for us, if we trust in the Redeemer. "Who can be against us."

Shall we cease to press on to the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus when we are assured that victory will ulti-

mately be ours. The Holy Spirit within us cannot fail us.

The Spirit-led man can rejoice in prospect of what is to be, for

"The eternal God is thy dwelling-place, And underneath are the everlasting arms."

## News of the Church

### Presbytery of New Brunswick in "Surprise" Move

**J**UST before this paper goes to press news has come that the Presbytery of New Brunswick, in what appears to be a surprise move, has authorized a special meeting for December 20th to hear a report from the Special Committee appointed at the September meeting of Presbytery to confer with Dr. Machen regarding his membership in the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. After the last regular meeting of the Presbytery in September the understanding was widespread that no report of the Committee would be made prior to the regular January meeting. The Presbytery at its September meeting did, it is true, vote down an amendment to the effect that the Committee should be directed to report at that regular January meeting. But that, it was thought, might well be interpreted to mean that the Committee would be permitted to postpone its report even longer if it desired to do so, and that the Presbytery merely desired to refrain from setting a time limit upon the Committee. However, an adjourned meeting of the Presbytery was held at Atlantic City on October 15th, during the sessions of the Synod of New Jersey. This meeting was attended by only 23 members including but five elders. At this small adjourned meeting the Committee asked for and received authority to have a special meeting of Presbytery called at a date to be set by the Committee. No report of this action came to Dr. Machen until he was finally informed of it through a letter of the Chairman of the Committee which was written to him on December 1st. It is a notorious fact that comparatively few members of a presbytery will attend special meetings. The case of Dr. Machen is thus to be discussed at a special meeting (less than a week before Christmas) which has been in turn called by a small adjourned meeting. Observers were inclined to regard this procedure as exceedingly unfortunate.

### Foreign Mission Overture Proposed in West Jersey

**A**T THE stated meeting of the Presbytery of West Jersey, held November 20th, in Glassboro, the Rev. Carl McIntire of

Collingswood, N. J., gave notice of a proposed overture to the General Assembly. The overture is concerned with effecting such reforms in the official work of Foreign Missions as would cause it to have the support of Bible-believing Christians. The overture will be voted upon at the January meeting of the Presbytery. Its last section is considered unusually significant. The text of the overture is as follows:

The Presbytery of West Jersey respectfully overtures the General Assembly of 1935,

1. To instruct the Board of Foreign Missions that all literature published by or in the name of the Board be thoroughly evangelical and loyal to the doctrinal standards of our Church.
2. To instruct the Board of Foreign Missions to refuse to sanction policies or cooperate in union enterprises in which the essential doctrinal teachings of the Christian Faith, and of our Standards, such as, the full truthfulness of Scripture, the Virgin Birth of our Lord, His substitutionary death as a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice, His bodily resurrection and His miracles, are not maintained.
3. To instruct the Board of Foreign Missions to take care to send out as missionaries only those individuals who believe the doctrinal teaching of our Church without mental reservation, and to remove from the mission field those missionaries under its control who have given up their belief in the doctrinal teaching of our Church.
4. To take care to elect to positions on the Board of Foreign Missions only persons who are fully aware of the danger in which the Church stands and who are determined to insist upon such verities as the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth of our Lord, His substitutionary death as a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice, His bodily resurrection and His miracles, as being essential to the Word of God and our Standards and as being necessary to the message which every missionary under our Church shall proclaim.
5. To give to the laymen of our Church to whom our Church appeals for funds answers to the evidence of modernism in our Board of Foreign Missions which has been brought forth.



## Further Details of Meeting of Presbytery of Olympia

IN THE last issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY it was reported that the Presbytery of Olympia had, on November 13th, attempted to get rid of the matter of the Rev. Roy T. Brumbaugh, D.D., and his membership on the Independent Board. This was done by a double "reference" to the Judicial Commission of the Assembly for a ruling as to the legality of the deliverance of the last Assembly and to the synod of Washington in case its legality were upheld. Such "reference," in the opinion of those familiar with church law, is illegal. Reference can be only of "a judicial case not yet decided." A judicial case comes into being only when charges and specifications are filed. No such papers have been filed against Dr. Brumbaugh, and the "reference" is therefore actually non-existent.

The meeting began with a "sermon" or address by the moderator, Dr. Wm. J. Sharp, attacking Dr. Brumbaugh, the Independent Board and critics of the official Board. Full of almost unbelievably amazing misstatements, the address illustrates the type of attack on the Independent Board and its members that is now being carried on. Excerpts of this speech, taken from a stenographic transcript, presumably accurate, are as follows (some misstatements of fact, too numerous to be discussed, are printed in *italic type*. Parts not italicized are not necessarily correct either as to fact or to inference):

"My friends, we are here today as friends, not as enemies. We are here to build up, not to tear down. This Presbytery has nothing to hide or to conceal. It has been hinted to me that if he went into executive session at this meeting that it would be because we had something secret, something sinister, something corrupt, to put across. I want to say that such a charge is a baseless slander on the members of the Presbytery. Such a statement as that is not made in the interests of justice. It is made to cast reflection on those who differ from them. If anyone has ever made such a suggestion to you, I beg of you to cast it aside as coming from one who is not worthy to be called a Christian gentleman. . . .

"We have heard considerable about Presbytery and about the General Assembly convicting men without a trial. I want to say to you that such a statement is absolutely false. Never has this Presbytery convicted any man without a trial. *Never has the General Assembly ever convicted a single soul without a trial.* If they have, I defy anyone to stand in the presence of this congregation and tell us when, and who was convicted, and what the judgment was.

"We ask the same consideration of you. There are generally two sides to every question. There are two sides to the questions that are before us and if anyone here

A Series of Weekly Radio Broadcasts  
Will Be Held Under the Auspices of  
**WESTMINSTER THEOLOGICAL  
SEMINARY**

Over Station  
WIP, Philadelphia, 610 Kilocycles  
Beginning Sunday, January 6  
4 to 4.30 P. M.

Speaker:  
The Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D.  
Listen in                      Tell Your Friends

has not heard both sides, I beg of you that you will hear the side of the Presbytery before you convict them. . . .

"I think I have never seen in the heat of a political campaign more exaggeration, more falsehood, more untruth than has been directed at men and organizations high in position and responsibility in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. *I say to you it is a shame and disgrace when men who do not find the truth sufficient to convict must resort to falsehood and misrepresentation.* To clear up this situation, let me say two or three things to you this afternoon.

"I want to say positively in the first place, that there is no doctrinal issue between the First Presbyterian Church and the Presbytery of Olympia and the General Assembly. I understand that you of the First Presbyterian Church are Bible-lovers, Bible-believing, Bible-teaching, Bible-defending Christians. So are we. . . .

"We believe those doctrines, and how unfair, how unjust, how un-Christian for anyone who has never heard these men preach to broadcast to the world that they are modernists. How dare anyone be so unjust, so false, as to say when they were not present at the last meeting of the General Assembly that it was dominated by modernists. How dare they say that? *No one present could say that honestly.*

"There was not before that Assembly, and I was present there, from its opening invocation to its final benediction, a single doctrinal issue. That being true, how dare anyone proclaim to the world that the Assembly was modernistic? How do they know how they stood? *The mandate of the Assembly, relative to the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions was not a doctrinal issue.* I can prove that when you remember that some of the outstanding militant, out-spoken leaders of fundamentalism in the Presbyterian Church spoke for and voted for that mandate. How can you say it had in it a doctrinal issue when such outstanding fundamentalists as Dr. Matthews of this Synod of Washington, will speak for and vote for that mandate? To say it was a question of doctrine and the fight is between modernists and fundamentalists now makes one absolutely ridiculous and absurd.

"When anyone proclaims to you that they are the only original and unadulterated fundamentalists in the Presbyterian church they are simply trying to throw dust in the eyes of uninformed men and women. . . .

"Let me say to you in the second place that we are not defending the mistakes of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. They have made mistakes. No one questions that. It might be well for him that never has made a mistake to cast the first stone. That there are some modernists on that Board may be true, but it is also true, although very rarely stated that some of the outstanding fundamentalists of the Presbyterian Church are also on that Board. And these men, fundamentalist men, outstanding leaders, are able to control and dominate that Board.

"Again, we do not deny at all that there are modernists on the foreign field among our missionaries. How could it be otherwise when hundreds of young men and women in the past years have been coming before this Board, unknown practically to the members of the Board, except as they came recommended and endorsed by their different Presbyteries? . . . It may be that a few modernists are sent out. It may be that some modernists become so after they land upon the field. But after all this is admitted, this fact remains, that all denominations concede, that there is no finer group of Bible-loving, Bible-believing, Bible-teaching, honest, loyal, sacrificial, Christ-propagating, Christ-defending missionaries than those in the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

"*The Board stands so high that even its worst enemies are not able to discredit that Board by telling the truth.* They must resort to misrepresentation, they must resort to falsehood. . . .

"The Foreign Missions standing committee at the last General Assembly was composed of 23 ministers and 22 elders, 45 in all . . . elected by their Presbyteries and Assembly on this committee. Before that committee came a small group of men with complaints against the Foreign Board. The same group, the same complaints, that had been made at successive General Assemblies. A member of that committee told me that they had shown that committee every courtesy possible. They had shown them every courtesy possible so that they would not be allowed to go out and say they had not been treated fairly.

"*They listened to them far into the night, almost exceeding the limits of patience, but after thorough investigation they found no sufficient evidence for action against the Board.* And in spite of that, men who were not there, men who were hundreds of miles away, thought that fundamentalists were not allowed to speak but a brief time in comparison with others. *Mr. Griffiths, who was a leader against the mandate for the fundamentalists at this last General Assembly, said he had been treated courte-*



ously and with every consideration by that standing committee.

"In the 1933 Assembly, the leader of this Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions appeared before the standing committee of that year. He was not a member of the Assembly, *he was not a member of any Presbytery*. But out of consideration for him, the standing committee allowed him to come before them and before that committee he made this declaration. *I quote, "I will not accept the judgment nor the decision of the Assembly if it does not conform to my views."* In the face of all that, they allowed him to appear. They listened at great length. *They investigated carefully every charge*. They heard the men against whom the charges were made. *And after it was all heard, the whole 45 voted unanimously to dismiss the charges*. Then he went out and organized the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

"If that is not lawlessness, if that is not anarchy, I would like to know what it is. If the great Presbyterian Church, almost two million strong, with fifty thousand elders, wants a pope, there is your chance to get him. A man who is the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

"I want to say a word about that mandate before the Assembly. 'The General Council presented two different papers. I want you to get that. One was called 'Studies in the Constitution in the Presbyterian Church.' *That paper was presented as studies and studies only. They did not ask for its adoption. It was never adopted. No action was taken on that 'Studies in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church.'*

"The second paper contained the mandate now before us. It was presented for adoption and adopted as I stated, by about ninety per cent of the delegates present. They meant that order should be obeyed.

*Now, some of these men, with no regard for the truth, take the two papers and put them together as one and declare to you with false propaganda that the two measures were put together as part of a mandate of the General Assembly. . . ."*

Most amazement was centered upon the moderator's declaration that the "Studies in the Constitution" had not been adopted by the 146th General Assembly, and branding conservatives as untruthful for saying that it had. The fact is that the studies in the Constitution was adopted by the Assembly and is found in the 1934 minutes beginning on Page 69, and concluding on Page 111.

After the moderator's address Dr. Brumbaugh took the floor on a point of personal privilege. The moderator denied Dr. Brumbaugh the right to reply since Presbytery had not yet been constituted. After prayer, the roll-call and reading of the minutes, Dr. Brumbaugh was recognized. He said that if given an opportunity he could refute practically everything the moderator had said. Thereupon several hundred of the

people of Tacoma's First Church who were present, applauded vigorously. The building (Sprague Memorial Church, South Tacoma) was packed to the doors. After the applause, the moderator said "Let us throw this mob out." A motion was passed that if the people applauded again they would be put out. Dr. Brumbaugh protested his people being called a "mob," and said everything should be done in the open. The moderator suggested that Presbytery might retire to his home.

The report of the Judicial Committee was received and read as follows (Of the signers of this report, one, Dr. John Kennedy, is also a signer of the "Auburn Affirmation"):

"To the Presbytery of Olympia, Synod of Washington, Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. We, the Judicial committee, of the Olympia Presbytery, seeking the best interest of the minister and his church have been much in prayer and have sought diligently to complete the task you gave us to do. We wish to report as follows:

"1—That whereas the Rev. Roy T. Brumbaugh, D.D., declared in his ordination vows as a Presbyterian minister his approval of the government and doctrines of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. And, in addition, promised submission therewith — to his brethren in the Lord, (Form of Govt. Chap. 15, sec. 12)

"2—And whereas the Rev. Roy T. Brumbaugh, D.D., has been directed by the 146th General Assembly and also by the Presbytery of Olympia to resign as a member of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions and has refused to obey the mandate of the General Assembly and the direction of the Presbytery of Olympia of which he is a member,

"3—And whereas the 146th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., has directed that membership in said Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions be considered a repudiation of the jurisdiction of the General Assembly and of those terms of fellowship and communion contained in the constitution of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., which he solemnly and certainly promised to obey when he assumed office in the church,

"Therefore, this committee rules that the Rev. Roy T. Brumbaugh, having refused to submit himself according to his vows, to his brethren in the Lord, in not having complied with the mandate of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., and not having heeded the direction of the Presbytery of Olympia, that the Rev. Roy T. Brumbaugh, D.D., be declared in contempt of Presbytery of Olympia and not in good and regular standing and that until such time as he shall declare in writing that he has obeyed the mandate of the General Assembly and followed the direction of the General Assembly and will, therefore, keep his vows to be in subjection to his brethren

in the Lord. Respectfully submitted, signed by the Committee, B. F. Mitchell, Dr. John Kennedy, Mr. George Harlow, Mr. Wendell Taylor, and Mr. Hopkins. Dated, Nov. 13, 1934."

An attempt was then made to entice Dr. Brumbaugh into committing an offense (probably contumacy) before the Presbytery, so that the provisions of the Book of Discipline, Chapter VII, Section 1, could be applied to him. This section says that "If a person commits an offense in the presence of the judicatory, or comes forward as his own accuser and makes known his offense, the judicatory may proceed to judgment without full judicial process. . . ." The moderator then read a prepared statement and asked Dr. Brumbaugh to answer to it. He refused because he saw that the intention was to trap him into an offense before the judicatory. Then a member of the Judicial Committee brought forth Dr. Brumbaugh's written statement to the committee. The latter, however, still protested they were wrong. He had not accused himself nor had he committed any offense in the presence of the judicatory. At this point the moderator and the chairman of the committee seemed not to know what to do next. Then other members of Presbytery moved that the report of the committee be tabled — a rebuke to the committee. This motion was carried. Then, after considerable spirited debate the Presbytery adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved by the Presbytery of Olympia in session at Sprague Memorial Church, Nov. 13th, 1934, that in view of the grave and widespread doubt existing within the denomination as to the Constitutionality of the Deliverance of the General Assembly of 1934 relating to the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions, The Presbytery of Olympia, therefore, appeals to the Permanent Judicial Commission meeting at the next General Assembly to render a decision as to the Constitutionality of said deliverance and the mandate to the Judicatories of the church which it embodies and if such mandate be found constitutional the whole case relative to Dr. Roy T. Brumbaugh's relationship to the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Missions shall be referred to the Synod of Washington at their next annual meeting for trial and decision."

## Founder's Week at Moody Institute

THE traditional Founder's Week Conference is slated to be held at the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago from Tuesday to Friday, inclusive, February 5 to 8, 1935. For years the occasion of the birthday of its founder, D. L. Moody, the 5th of February, has been included in such a massing of religious, missionary, and evangelistic messages and Bible expositions



as to insure rich blessing and inspiration for the many hundreds of Christian workers from most of the states of the Union and many foreign countries who attend.

The new president of the Institute, Rev. Will H. Houghton, D.D., will make substantial contributions to the program, as will the president emeritus, Dr. James M. Gray. A full program will be announced later, but friends who plan to be present are assured of hearing the Rev. Herbert Lockyer, of the British Isles, and the eminent medical missionary of China, Dr. George W. Leavell, whose messages at the Conference in 1927 were surcharged with unusual power. Reservations may be made by addressing the Business Manager, 153 Institute Place, Chicago.

## Parade

**D**R. HARRY RIMMER, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Duluth, Minn., has accepted an invitation to be the evangelist during special meetings to be held in Flemington, N. J., from January 20th until February 5th. The meetings will be held in the First Methodist Church. These are to be county-wide in scope and the whole countryside is being prepared for them by a barrage of pre-services to be held at every important place in the county. These will be headed by Walter MacDonald, singer and preacher and Victor Jacobson of the Trenton Church of the Air. This will be a real opportunity to reach the many who will attend the trial of Bruno Hauptmann. This venture has the backing of many prominent men and women in the county as well as the hearty endorsement of Governor A. Harry Moore. Practically every church organization in the county is in full cooperation.

The centennial celebration of the First Presbyterian Church of Peoria, Ill., was begun on December 2nd to continue through the month. Speakers: Dr. A. C. Zenos, of Chicago; Dr. Henry Seymour Brown, of Chicago; Dr. Hugh Jack, of Detroit. A pageant depicting a hundred years growth in the Congregation was given December 10th. In one hundred years the church has had only seven ministers. Among them were Newell Dwight Hillis, Jonathan Edwards, III, and Daniel Williamson. Present minister: William Atkinson Young.

The twenty-fifth volume of the "Moslem World," edited by Dr. Samuel M. Zwemer, was marked by the January issue. Articles appear written by: the Archbishop of York, Prof. Arthur Jeffery, Prof. E. A. Suthers, the Rev. Frank C. Laubach and Prof. G. H. Bousquet.

Many are enjoying the weekly half-hour program of music broadcast by Wheaton College (Ill.) every Thursday afternoon over Station W-M-B-I by the courtesy of the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago. Each

June, 1932

copies of "Christianity Today" are needed for binding. For each copy of that issue sent in and in good condition we will extend subscriptions two months. Thank you!

week a group of Christian young people are thus giving their testimony over the air in song or on their instruments. The broadcast is given at three o'clock on a frequency of 1080 Kilocycles, 277.6 Meters. Programs are in charge of Mr. Peter Stam, Jr., Executive Director of the Conservatory of Music, but represent the whole College rather than the Conservatory alone. Those who have not before tuned in, are invited to do so. Dr. J. Oliver Buswell is President of this distinctively Christian College.

A day of real waiting upon God was spent in the Central North Broad Street Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, on the National Day of Prayer, November 25. The usual Morning Service was held at 10.30 A. M., at which time the Rev. Merrill T. MacPherson, pastor of the Church, gave a heart-searching message on "The Kind of Prayer That Changes Things." At 2.30 o'clock the special season of prayer began. After a brief song service, Philip E. Howard, Sr., President and Publisher of the Sunday School Times, brought, from a life of rich experience in the Lord, a very inspiring and helpful message on "Prayer." The remainder of the time was spent in prayer and praise, and laying hold upon God for the needs of our nation and individual lives; interspersed with singing and another brief message by Mr. MacPherson. Nearly three hundred people were present during most of the afternoon, continuing in prayer until about six o'clock. After a short recess, the Young People of the Church gathered together, devoting their whole service to a time of prayer. At the regular Evening Service, beginning at 7.30 P. M. and broadcast over WIP from 8-9 o'clock Mr. MacPherson spoke on "Get Right With God! It's an Individual Matter." This was followed by another hour of prayer. When the meeting was dismissed, everyone left with the deep consciousness that things would be different because of the prayers of the thousands of Christian people which were ascending to the Throne of Grace during that day.

The Church was very happy to receive into its Membership ten new members on Sunday, December 2. Nine were received on Confession of Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and one by letter from another Church. The Church is rejoicing in God's continued blessing upon its ministry. Many souls are being saved, continually, in the great evangelistic type of service which is

broadcast over WIP every Sunday evening from 8 to 9 o'clock.

The world is falling to pieces internationally, racially and industrially, the Rev. Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, president of Union Theological Seminary, declared December 5th, at a mass meeting in Carnegie Hall held under the auspices of the Presbytery of New York, according to Miss Rachel McDowell, writing in the *New York Times*.

Many people today are following the NRA for "the loaves and the fishes," said the Rev. Dr. A. Edwin Keigwin, pastor of the West End Presbyterian Church and national-known radio preacher.

Before us there yawns the mouth of a hell which does not wait for an after life but may open for us even in a few months, the Rev. Dr. Edmund B. Chaffee, author and pastor of the Presbyterian Labor Temple, said. He declared that Christ today would weep over our civilization as He wept over Jerusalem.

The rally, the first of its kind ever held there, was the climax of a campaign in all the sixty-three Presbyterian churches in Manhattan, the Bronx and Staten Island for "a deepening of the spiritual life." Each church sent a delegation of its members.

All the pastors sat on the platform wearing their black pulpit gowns. Back of them was a choir of 300 young men and women led by Professor Seth Bingham, organist of the Madison Avenue Church.

The presiding officer was the Rev. Dr. Daniel Russell, pastor of the Rutgers Church, who is Moderator of the Presbytery. The scripture lesson was read by the Rev. Dr. Wesley Megaw, pastor of Fort Washington Church, who has served as chairman of the campaign committee. Prayer was offered by the Rev. William Lloyd Imes, pastor of St. James Negro Church.

An overflow mass meeting took place in the Broadway Congregational Tabernacle at Fifty-sixth Street, only a block away, which was lent to the Presbytery for the occasion. Dr. Coffin, Dr. Keigwin and Dr. Chaffee spoke at both meetings.

"As one approaches an American city one is likely to see a large building above which in huge letters one reads, "Light, Heat and Power Company," Dr. Coffin said. "Such should be and is the Christian Church. Like a revealing shaft from some searchlight Christ illumines every social situation and every man's own heart. There is our world, here ourselves. He discontents us and makes us uncomfortable. Of the social injustices around us Christ makes us see they can't go on.

"We live in a cold world which is falling to pieces internationally, racially and industrially, and all about us are men and women gone to pieces. Only the warmth of Christ's love can fuse these disintegrating masses of humanity into a comradeship of faith and purpose.



"The most serious feature in our churches today is discouragement, but the church needs power from its faith. It is supplied with a force of energy and with a force of endurance. How dare any Christian feel weak or inadequate? There is power in Heaven and in earth behind those who seek to carry out God's will."

Dr. Keigwin asserted that if we are to have national recovery we must have national repentance.

"And repentance is something that no nation can do collectively," he continued. "Repentance must be personal and individual."

"If we are to have national recovery we must put behind the New Deal a new heart. We must improve character in business and in industry, in politics and in personal dealing."

"I sometimes wonder whether we want national recovery or whether we just want recovery of work in order to get the wages, and the recovery of markets in order to have profits, and the recovery of power in order to have party spoils. If that kind of recovery were granted it would pass as quickly almost as it came because it would have no rootings in a changed spirit on the part of the citizens of this country."

Dr. Chaffee, speaking on the topic, "A Lost World," quoted a critic of the church as having recently said that "the conduct of church members differs in no wise from their non-professing neighbors."

"This stinging criticism has caused great searching of heart among leaders in the Presbytery of New York," said Dr. Chaffee. "A great sense of failure has come to all of us. God himself has convicted us of sin."

"We have been glibly saying for years that this was a lost world, but the terrible truth of this statement had never been driven home to us. No we see our civilization for what it is—spiritually hollow, cruel, blind, literally sliding toward hell. Unless Christ's gospel is preached quickly, fearlessly, passionately, ours is a lost world. Even now it may be too late."

Dr. Chaffee said that among the evidences that this was "a lost world" was "the fact that 11,000,000 Americans vainly seek work."

"And there is more than economic danger," he continued. "There is also the threat of war, war so hellish that words can scarcely describe it. All the nations are madly arming. Men, women and children are being trained to slaughter and to be slaughtered. All this 2,000 years after the coming of the Prince of Peace."

The great modernist Presbytery evidently did not think that apostasy from God's Word was responsible for many of the conditions it deplored.

## West Jersey Refers Papers To Judicial Committee

PROTEST has been filed against the summary action of the Presbytery of West Jersey in receiving on November 20th, a bundle of papers from its Stated Clerk Dr. A. B. Collins and referring them to a judicial committee without even finding out the contents of several items. The papers related to the membership of the Rev. Carl McIntire on the Independent Board. At its September meeting the Presbytery had adopted a report which contained "no recommendations." Many considered the matter disposed of. Upon his own authority, however, and not as instructed by the Presbytery the clerk wrote Mr. McIntire demanding to know if he were still a member of the Independent Board and his intentions with regard to it. (This letter and Mr. McIntire's reply were published in CHRISTIANITY TODAY for page .)

Just prior to the last meeting of the Presbytery on November 20, the clerk informed Mr. McIntire that since the latter had made the correspondence public, the clerk could make a public reply to Mr. McIntire before the Presbytery. At the meeting, the clerk tabled his reply, which was not read, but which was on motion included with a number of other papers referred to the Judicial Committee. To date Mr. McIntire has not seen this reply "to him," nor has the Presbytery seen it. The vigorous protest filed by Mr. McIntire summarizes the facts of the meeting and its actions, although it does not reproduce the atmosphere of tense determination to repress discussion and suppress information created by the promachine majority. The protest is as follows:

PROTEST OF THE REV. CARL MCINTIRE  
AGAINST AN ACTION OF THE  
PRESBYTERY OF WEST JERSEY  
NOVEMBER 20, 1934  
MEETING IN THE HIGH SCHOOL AT  
GLASSBORO, NEW JERSEY

I wish respectfully to protest the action of the Presbytery of West Jersey on November 20, 1934, in receiving as Communication No. 4 in the report of the stated clerk under Item 8 of the adopted docket, Reception of Reference of Communications, a communication of the Rev. A. B. Collins, stated clerk of the Presbytery of West Jersey, consisting of 12 items gathered together by him concerning the Rev. Carl McIntire; and proceeding upon motion in purported accordance with the Book of Discipline, Chapter 15, 1, Section C, Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, Page 429 of the 1934 edition of the Constitution, to place these papers in the hands of the Judicial Committee, for the following reasons.

1. The Presbytery acted irregularly in receiving under Item 8, Reception of Reference of Communications, of its adopted docket the matter which was not a communication to the Presbytery

through the stated clerk but a matter which the stated clerk himself desired to bring to the attention of the Presbytery. Such a matter should have been presented and received under Item 19, Unfinished Business, or Item 20, New Business, of the adopted docket. For the stated clerk as an individual to bring to the attention of the Presbytery 12 items, letters and other things which he had gathered, under Item of the docket, Communications, with the impression that they are matters which have been brought to him as stated clerk to bring to the attention of Presbytery, is misleading and irregular.

2. The Presbytery acted irregularly in receiving as a communication these 12 items from the Rev. A. B. Collins and placing them in the hands of the Judicial Committee without having the matter involved in the 12 papers brought to the full attention of the Presbytery and especially of the individual who is thereby "accused." None of the 12 items were read and the content of some of them are unknown. For Presbytery to proceed to initiate judicial process upon the receipt of a communication from one member of the Presbytery without a full knowledge of the nature of this communication is indeed irregular.

3. The Presbytery acted irregularly in proceeding to initiate judicial process on motion in purported accordance with Book of Discipline, Chapter 15, Section 1, upon the mere reception of certain papers brought by one member of the Presbytery in which the Presbytery, upon receiving the same and placing the same in the hands of the Judicial Committee, according to Chapter 15, 1, Section C, Subdivision 2, considers the person involved "the alleged offender," when no formal charges of an offence have been filed by the Rev. A. B. Collins in any of his 12 items or by any one else, and when, according to the Book of Discipline, Chapter 1, Section 8, "An offense is anything in the doctrine, principles, or practice or a church member, officer, or judicatory, which is contrary to the Word of God or to those expositions of its teachings as to faith and practice which are contained in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A." For the Presbytery to consider one of its members "the alleged offender" when not even formal charges of an offence have been filed against the individual is indeed unjust and unconstitutional.

4. The Presbytery acted irregularly in refusing to permit any discussion of the 12 items of the communication of the Rev. A. B. Collins or a discussion as to why this communication with its 12 items should not be placed in the hands of a Judicial Committee. The 12 items involved, including the action of the General Assembly against the Independent



Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions as one of the 12 items, assumed that the Rev. Carl McIntire was guilty of an offense, and the constitutionality of the item concerning the action of the General Assembly was assumed and no discussion permitted concerning its unconstitutionality.

5. Presbytery acted irregularly in making the basis for the initiation of judicial process against the Rev. Carl McIntire 12 items which do not warrant any such action.

(1) The "official" communication of the stated clerk of Presbytery under date of September 26, 1934 was an unauthorized action of the stated clerk which can have no bearing upon whether the Presbytery wishes or does not wish to obey the mandate of the General Assembly to proceed to discipline one of its members.

(2) The answer of the Rev. Carl McIntire to the "official" communication of the stated clerk under date of September 29, 1934, in which Mr. McIntire refused to recognize the letter of the stated clerk as official. This letter can have no bearing in the initiation of judicial process against the Rev. Carl McIntire even under Section 3 of the Independent Board action. Mr. McIntire has not been asked by this Presbytery nor has he had an opportunity to tell the Presbytery what is his attitude toward the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

(3) A letter from two elders of the Collingswood Church addressed to the elders of Presbytery merely informed the men of the unauthorized "official" action of the stated clerk since the last meeting of the Presbytery, and as such concerns the two elders and not a case of judicial process against the Rev. Carl McIntire.

(4) The copy of the November issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY in which is printed the "official" communication of the stated clerk and Mr. McIntire's reply can have no more bearing upon the initiation of a case of judicial process than items 1 and 2 mentioned above.

(5) The statement of the stated clerk of Presbytery under date of November 20, 1934 addressed to the moderator of West Jersey Presbytery calling attention to the so-called "erroneous statement and deductions" in the Rev. Carl McIntire's communication of September 29, 1934; also so-called "erroneous statements and deductions" in the communications of the two elders. Copies of this answer to Mr. McIntire's communication and to the elders' letter have never been sent to Mr. McIntire or the elders, and though its content is unknown, it cannot be entered in a case of judicial process against the Rev. Carl McIntire, but concerns the action

### If You Wish

to send "Christianity Today" to friends as a Christmas Gift, we will be glad to send an appropriate card. Do it now!

Please remember that two new subscriptions sent in will give you your own for a year, without other cost.

If your renewal is due, please help us by remitting now, saving the expense of sending out notices.

of the stated clerk to which Mr. McIntire replied and which the elders made known.

(6) The letter of June 6, 1934 from the stated clerk of the General Assembly communicating the action of the General Assembly in adopting the "Studies in the Constitution" prepared by the General Council and the deliverance against the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. This communication was presented to the Presbytery by the clerk at its meeting June 19, 1934 and was duly placed in the hands of a committee for consideration, which consideration was given and a report made September 11. The stated clerk cannot gratuitously report a letter the second time simply because the disposition made of that letter was not satisfactory to him, the disposition of that matter resting in the hands of the Presbytery. Besides, this communication can have no bearing in a case of judicial process against Mr. McIntire because the action of the General Assembly is unconstitutional and contrary to the Bible.

(7) The communication by registered mail from the stated clerk of the General Assembly dated June 13, 1934, which the stated clerk said had not been placed in the hands of the Committee on Church Government by the Presbytery, reveals, if this is so, since two stated meetings of Presbytery have passed, that the stated clerk has no right to incorporate in a communication of 12 items a communication to the Presbytery, the disposition of which was not satisfactory to him. If this communication of June 13 has never been brought to the attention of the Presbytery it should have been made a separate and individual communication to the Presbytery and not incorporated gratuitously by the stated clerk in his communication of 12 items.

(8) The portion of the original minutes dated June 19, 1934 is a gratuitous effort to bring to the attention of the Presbytery the Presbytery's own minutes to which it is free to refer at any time.

(9) A copy of the synopsis of the

minutes of June 19, 1934 does not authorize the stated clerk to address the Rev. Carl McIntire or to proceed in the name of Presbytery to carry out the orders of the 146th General Assembly. The action of the Presbytery merely received the communication from the stated clerk of the General Assembly and ordered that it be made a part of the minutes of Presbytery. Many items are included in the minutes of the Presbytery for future information which do not become the action of the Presbytery. The Presbytery did not adopt the action of the 146th General Assembly, and even if the stated clerk felt that the Presbytery had adopted the action of the 146th General Assembly, this would not have authorized him to proceed, for the matter printed in the synopsis of the minutes of June 19 says that *Presbytery is to ascertain.*

(10) A portion of the minutes of September 11, 1934 is again a gratuitous effort to bring the Presbytery its own minutes in which at no place did Presbytery instruct the stated clerk to proceed with the Rev. Carl McIntire or adopt the action of the 146th General Assembly.

(11) A communication from the Rev. H. E. Bodder, D.D., presenting the report of the Committee on Church Government of September 11, 1934 under a letter dated October 5, 1934 is irrelevant in the initiation of a case of judicial process against the Rev. Carl McIntire. The Committee's report was made orally and this letter addressed to the stated clerk was written after the stated clerk's official communication to the Rev. Mr. McIntire and the letter of the elders sending information to the laymen of the church, and, of course, long after the minutes embodying the oral report were completed. The matter which concerns Presbytery in this is the report which was made on the floor of Presbytery September 11.

(12) The copy of the communication of the stated clerk to the Rev. Carl McIntire under date of November 15. This can have no bearing in a case of judicial process against the Rev. Carl McIntire as it merely tells him that the stated clerk intends to bring to the attention of Presbytery these matters and intends to answer his letter before Presbytery. No copies of the answer were sent to Mr. McIntire or to the elders, and neither was the purported answer read to the Presbytery.

This protest is made respectfully and sincerely and is not intended to reflect upon any member of Presbytery, but to bring before the Presbytery the facts in this present matter.

Signed:

CARL MCINTIRE.



## Korea Letter

By the Rev. Bruce F. Hunt

THE 2nd Quadrennial Conference of the Korean Methodist Church convened in Seoul on October 3rd. Bishop Yang was re-elected Bishop for another four year term. Several actions were taken which affect other denominations as well: (1) A committee of five was appointed to work towards union with the Presbyterian church. This may be traced back to a discussion on the possibility of such a union, which took place at the Fall meeting of the Federal Council of Protestant Missions following a paper on the history of union work. In this paper it was pointed out that at one time practically the whole missionary body in Korea, Presbyterian and Methodist, had favored One Korean Christian Church. As one thinks back to the days of the revival, which effected both denominations, and to the days when this union was so close to being within the range of possibility, one cannot but regret the theological chasm which has become so great between the two denominations as to make it impossible for a true evangelical to desire union, unless indeed there first be a reviving which will affect the faith of both the missionaries and pastors. (2) The constitution of the new Korean Christian Church in Japan (made up of Methodists and Presbyterians) was approved by the Conference. The Presbyterian General Assembly having already passed on it, it will now become effective. (3) They voted to establish a Bible Institute in Manchuria and raised Y5000 to carry on missionary work in Manchuria. A donation of Y500 was received to begin work among the Chinese.

On October 12th, Dr. H. H. Underwood and Dr. Uk Keum Yoo were installed as President and Vice-President respectively of the Chosen Christian College (Union Institution with the Methodists in Seoul). Dr. Underwood is son of the first President, Dr. H. G. Underwood, who was also one of the pioneer evangelistic missionaries in Korea.

In our last letter, mention was made of the threatened split in the Presbyterian Church in Korea. It has been laid on the heart of several of the missionaries to call a retreat of missionaries from the three Presbyterian Missions and the United Church of Canada, and of Korean pastors from the different sections of Korea, to study God's word together and pray over the situation in the hopes of bringing about a reconciliation. The invitation has been sent out to eight missionaries and 40 Korean pastors. The retreat is to meet in Chungju from November 8-12. The invitation was issued under the following names: S. A. Moffett, D. M. McRae, W. F. Bull, F. J. L. Macrae.

December 12th has been set aside as Jubilee day in the Korean Presbyterian Church and Jubilee celebrations will be held in all the churches throughout the country, using

a special printed program prepared by the committee of General Assembly, on the back of which is a brief history of the Korean Church. A Jubilee Hymn has also been prepared which will be sung in connection with the celebrations and in the afternoon the church members will go about the surrounding villages distributing a tract specially prepared for use on this occasion.

CHUNGJU, KOREA

## The Presbyterian Church in Canada

By T. G. M. Bryan

AMONG the few ministers of the Presbyterian Church in Canada now living who have published books are the following: Dr. Frank Baird, Dr. W. W. Bryden, Rev. C. L. Cowan, Dr. Jonathan Goforth, Dr. W. Harvey-Jellie, Rev. John McNab, Dr. E. L. Morrow, Dr. Stuart Parker and Dr. A. R. Osborn. Rev. Andrew R. Osborn, D.D., author of "Schleiermacher and Religious Education" (Oxford University Press, New York), is a gifted Australian preacher formerly professor at the Biblical Seminary in New York and visiting professor of Apologetics at Princeton, and now minister of First Church, Edmonton, where the late Dr. D. G. McQueen served for so many years. Dr. Osborn ministers to a large radio audience by means of a week-night service, some of whom live in the North-West Territories.

The September meeting of the Presbytery of Saskatoon was held in St. Andrew's Church, Saskatoon, with Rev. W. G. Brown, moderator, and Rev. J. A. Munro, clerk. Rev. L. Webster, of Wilkie, was welcomed to the Presbytery, and was appointed moderator of Luseland session, Luseland had Presbyterian services this past summer for the first time in seven years, Mr. John Brent, an elder, having been appointed to serve Kindersley, Ealingford, Coleville, Dewar Lake and Luseland. Mr. Brent reported that he had held three services a Sunday, driving over one hundred miles one Sunday and eighty-five the next. In the winter he will supply only two churches. Dewar Lake was given up as hopeless the summer before, but Mr. Brent sometimes preached to forty there. Presbytery heard a report of the General Assembly from Rev. J. A. Munro, who spoke especially of Knox College and the Formosa Mission.

From Rev. J. Y. Fraser, of Streetsville, news has come of the following calls: Runnymede Church, Toronto, to Rev. A. B. Ransom, B.D. (Queen's), of Wenham, Mass.; St. Andrew's, Sarnia, to Rev. J. M. Macgillivray (Queen's, 1917), of Central Church, Vancouver; Drummond Hill Church, Niagara Falls, to Dr. J. D. Smart (Knox, 1929), of Ailsa Craig; and Rosedale Church, Toronto, to Dr. J. B. Paulin (Knox, 1907), late of St. John's, Newfoundland, a former

pastor of Rosedale. Rev. J. MacBeath Miller, B.D. (Queen's, 1926), of Palmerston, has been appointed missionary in British Guiana, and Rev. W. A. Cameron (Knox, 1910), of Weyburn, Sask., has been called to Seaforth, Ontario.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

## Eastern Pennsylvania Letter

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

E VANGELISTIC services were conducted in the Grace Church, the Rev. David Freeman, Ph.D., pastor, from November 25th to December 7th, with Edward J. Young, Westminster student, as the evangelist. Tenth Church, Philadelphia, heard Dr. Edward A. Marshall deliver three lectures on Palestine, on December 2nd, 3rd and 4th.

The Rev. Henry H. Heerschap, received by the presbytery of Philadelphia North from Flint (Mich.) Presbytery on November 12th, was installed as pastor of the Hermon Church of Frankford, November 23rd. Drs. J. B. C. Mackie, John B. Laird and William M. Yeomans participated. Dr. Edwin A. O'Dell addressed the November meeting of the Philadelphia North presbytery, reported to have been the most peaceful in many months. Licentiate Howard Haynes was dismissed to the presbytery of West Chester.

The 25th anniversary of the installation of the Rev. James G. Raymond in the Palethorp Church, Philadelphia, was celebrated December 2nd. The day was marked by a homecoming, music by the Puritan Choir, and an address by Dr. Harold McAfee Robinson, general secretary of the Board of Christian Education, who recently succeeded Dr. Covert, now retired.

Dr. Charles Vuilleumier, Pastor Emeritus of the Peace (German) Church of Philadelphia, died on November 20th, at the age of 69. His recent residence has been in Norwood, a suburb of Philadelphia. Born in Basle, Switzerland, he served for a time as Swiss Consul at Philadelphia.

The Senior Christian Endeavor of Beacon Church, E. Cumberland and Cedar Sts., will hear an address by Dr. Charles J. Woodbridge on January 20th, at 6.45 P. M., on the subject of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. The general public is invited to this meeting, which will include the answering of questions. Mr. Woodbridge, having served for years under the official board, is able to speak with authority concerning present-day conditions on the field in Africa; and having been born and reared in China, of missionary parents, he is also familiar with that field, in which he also labored for a time as a teacher. He is a thrilling and convincing speaker. Those who wish to hear both sides of the foreign board question with an open mind are especially invited; take car No. 39 from elevated or subway, to Cedar Street.



Richmond Church, located in a largely Polish community, held a demonstration of its work among the foreign-born on November 15th. Miss May Hope is in charge of this work, which is carried on under the auspices of the City Missions Committee of Philadelphia Presbytery. Tioga Church celebrated its 75th anniversary November 23rd.

PHILADELPHIA

## New England and New York

By the Rev. Luther Craig Long

**A**FTER Rev. Wm. Harlee Bordeaux resigned from the Community Presbyterian Church of Old Greenwich, Conn., because of the refusal of that Church to hear the doctrines of the Reformed Faith, he went to his home in North Carolina. After an illness which confined him for a while to a Sanitarium, he accepted the position as Chairman of the Bible College and Student Pastor at John Brown University in Siloam Springs, Arkansas. His many friends are rejoicing in God's faithfulness in raising him to a place of such great responsibility and knowing that his whole nature cries out to serve Christ, we can only expect great things from his ministry. The Church in New England of which Mr. Bordeaux was the pastor has thus far not called another Minister. Rev. George Stewart of Stamford is the Moderator. Mr. John T. Manson, one of the Elders of the Benedict Memorial Church of New Haven and likewise a Director of Princeton Seminary and the President of the American Bible Society, spoke in his home Church on Sunday evening, December ninth, on the occasion of "Bible Sunday." Many New England Churches which in their preaching and practices deny the inspiration and authority of the Bible, celebrated "Bible Sunday." We observed that one of the New England Churches celebrated the Lord's Supper after explaining that it was not through the death of Jesus that His followers receive the Holy Spirit but that it is by "Whatever our growing wisdom learns that is marvelous about the past of this planet and the vast universe of which it is a part, or about the strange and splendid deeds of heroic men upon its surface, that a divine voice spake through the heart, mind and deeds of an incomparable Son of Man, as Phillips Brooks used to say—must stand out forever high above all else in human history. Such are the splendor and importance of the advent of Jesus Christ." When we see Christmas, Easter, The Lord's Supper, and Baptism, as well as Bible Sunday, and Reformation Sunday celebrated by some Churches, we can only wish that they who can so readily celebrate those great occasions might find equal joy in contending for "The Faith once for all delivered to the Saints." . . . Transferring

### The Editors Wish

To the great international family of "Christianity Today," a very blessed Christmas-Tide and a new year full of good things. Let us not forget that He who guided the star until at last it rested above the little village of Bethlehem also as gently and surely guides the courses of the lives of His own in the perfect path of His choosing. Let us receive and endure all that He sends, the sweet or the bitter, with thanksgiving because His love accompanies His every gift.

all the way to Boston, we learn that it is rumored that although all of the pulpit supplies in the Park Street Congregational Church last Summer were to be considered as Candidates, Dr. A. Z. Conrad, now feels so strong that he intends to carry on his great Ministry in that city as long as God permits. This is good news because it means that what the Presbyterians lack in Boston will still be provided by one who has thus far not been "ashamed of the Gospel." The Moody Bible Institute conducted two Conferences in Connecticut during November; the one was held in the First Presbyterian Church of Bridgeport with Dr. Alexander Alison as host; the other was held jointly in the Methodist and Baptist Churches of Danbury. The speakers were: Dr. Will Houghton of Moody, Dr. Henry Ostrom and Dr. Isaac Page. Large attendances were reported in Bridgeport; The Danbury Conference was not so well attended but was nevertheless a good spiritual Conference because of the interest which would naturally be shown by a Church which in itself is true to the Faith and whose Pastor is a graduate of Moody. Dr. Houghton reported that approximately twenty Conferences would be conducted in New England throughout this winter. . . . Transferring to New York City and State, we observe that the *Broadway Presbyterian Church* is still making the rounds of the

evangelical and otherwise Ministers. A great many eyes are on the Broadway Church at this time because of the will of the late Pastor, who left a large sum of money, the interest of which goes to that Church, provided a man of Dr. Buchanan's conservative stamp is chosen. By the provision of the will, the same amount is available in the event a Modernist is chosen and the conservative minority steps out to form a new Church; it is also available for "Any other Church which does preach the Gospel" in the event a conservative minority does not show itself and in the event the Church does not call a Conservative. Dr. Buchanan supported both Westminster Seminary and the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

. . . In Gouverneur, New York, Rev. Joseph A. Schofield, is preaching an interesting series of Sermons on the theme: *Remarks you hear every day*. Some of the remarks include: "Christianity is living the Christian life" and "Why does God punish me by the death of my loved ones?" Great interest is manifest.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

## Synod of Kansas News

By the Rev. Jay C. Everett

**T**HE Synod of Kansas met in annual assembly on invitation of the Presbyterian Church at Clay Center, October 9-11, 1934, Rev. Howard E. Hansen as Pastor-host. A pre-Synod conference held on the afternoon before the opening session, devoted largely to a forum on church methods, followed an address on foreign missions by the Rev. John A. Mackay, Ph.D., of the Official Board. In the evening, Rev. David Townley, D.D., retiring moderator, preached from the theme, "Serving the Present Age." Whereupon, by vote of acclamation, Dr. Harry T. Scherer, of the Presbytery of Larned, was chosen moderator. This annual meeting marked the rounding out of seventy full years of organized Presbyterianism in the sunflower state. An outstanding "Historical Address" was delivered by the Rev. Drury H. Fisher, of Manhattan, Kansas. Synod's devotional periods were in charge of the recently installed pastor at the First Church of Wichita, Rev. Asa J. Ferry, D.D., formerly of Chicago. An address, "The State of the Church," was delivered by the Rev. John A. McAfee, D.D., of Westminster Church, Topeka. An address on the subject, "The Presbyterian Church in Relation to Keeping Kansas Dry," was delivered by Attorney Carl S. Byers, of Salina, Kansas, a ruling elder in the First Church there. Foreign Missions was represented by Dr. John A. Mackay. An unforeseen automobile accident overtook Dr. John McDowell near Emporia while he was enroute to the Synod.

MINNEAPOLIS, KANSAS

### IN THIS ISSUE:

The Miracle of the Manger . . . . .	185
William Edward Biederwolf	
Our Search for Truth—Part I . . . . .	188
Joseph Dupuy Eggleston	
Dr. Pugh v. Dr. Macartney—Part I . . . . .	190
Murray Forst Thompson	
Sunday School Lessons . . . . .	194
Ned Bernard Stonehouse	
Two Open Letters . . . . .	196
The Comfort of the Scriptures . . . . .	197
David Freeman	
News of the Church . . . . .	197