

JOHN RUTE
CCT 1935-R
GRAND RIVER N S CAN

CHRISTIANITY TODAY



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

SAMUEL G. CRAIG, Editor

H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS, Managing Editor

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

JULY, 1935

Vol. 6

No. 2

\$1.00 A YEAR EVERYWHERE

Entered as second-class matter May 11,
1931, at the Post Office at Philadelphia,
Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Notes and Comments

THE 147TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE outstanding feature of this issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY is its interpretative as well as descriptive report of the proceedings of the last General Assembly. While this report contains some statements that we would have omitted or modified, it seems to us that it paints a substantially correct picture of what happened in connection with the recent Cincinnati Assembly.

Those who did not attend the Assembly may be disposed to think that it is unfair to its Moderator. Those who attended any considerable number of its sessions will be disposed, however, if we mistake not, to think that it understates rather than overstates DR. VANCE'S faults and shortcomings as a presiding officer. His unfairness was so glaring that on one occasion at least he was actually hissed by the galleries—a hissing in which, if we mistook not, certain of the commissioners joined. Not only did DR. VANCE fail to exhibit that impartiality of attitude that is characteristic of every good Moderator, but he was constantly usurping the rights of members by engaging in the discussions from the chair. While there is no necessary connection between the two, yet in addition to being, as far as we have observed, the least satisfactory presiding officer that has ever occupied the Moderatorial chair, DR. VANCE also enjoys the distinction of being, as far as we know, the least orthodox of those who have been elected to this high position. Evidence of this latter statement may be found in an editorial that follows.

The relatively small vote received by DR. ROBINSON, the only candidate for the Moderatorship openly to oppose the Modernism and ecclesiasticism so largely dominant in our church, was very disappointing. We are far from supposing, however, that the vote DR. ROBINSON received is truly indicative of the strength of conservatism in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. It indicates rather the strength of those conservatives who approve the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. Many expected that DR. ROBINSON would receive the votes of those who disapproved the action of the 1934 Assembly against the Independent Board as well as those who positively approved the Independent Board itself. It does not seem, however, that that happened to any appreciable extent. His opponents, according to our information, succeeded in making most of the commissioners believe that a vote for him was a vote for the Independent Board, with the result that he received only a few more votes than a candidate nominated on a straight Independent Board issue would have received. Only on the assumption that practically all thoroughgoing conservatives approve the Independent Board—in our judgment an unfounded assumption—is there warrant for supposing that the vote DR. ROBINSON received is truly indicative of the strength of conservatism in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. If we mistake not,

the vote DR. ROBINSON received calls loudly to the conservatives of the church to get together on a platform on which they can present a united front against the Modernism and unwholesome ecclesiasticism that is cursing it.

Further editorial comment, in addition to that which follows, is reserved for future issues of this paper.

THE ASSEMBLY AND THE INDEPENDENT BOARD


THE 147th General Assembly reaffirmed the action of the 146th General Assembly relative to the Independent Board. It did this in a negative way by voting "no action" with respect to the various overtures that requested it to rescind the action taken by the previous Assembly and in a positive way by concurring in certain actions by presbyteries approving the Official Board and condemning the Independent Board, particularly that of the Presbytery of Niobrara, to wit: "Resolved, that this Presbytery go on record as sustaining the action of the 146th General Assembly relative to the Independent Board of Foreign Missions."

It should not be supposed for a moment, however, that the fact that the 147th Assembly reaffirmed the action of the 146th Assembly relative to the Independent Board has any decisive bearing on the question of the constitutionality of that action. The General Assembly is subject to the Constitution just as truly as is the session, presbytery or synod, and therefore exceeds its authority if it issues a mandate that is contrary to or beside the Constitution. In our opinion, it is perfectly clear that the action of the 146th General Assembly was unconstitutional, and, hence, so far from being obeyed should be ignored or rather protested by all true Presbyterians. In our May issue we enumerated some of the ways in which the General Assembly exceeded its lawful authority when it issued its mandate concerning the Independent Board. Its unconstitutionality is pointed out in a succinct but convincing manner in the "testimony" (printed in full in our June issue) to which the Ruling Elders of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., are subscribing in large numbers. But whether we and the nation-wide committee of Ruling Elders who are sponsoring this "testimony" (not to mention others) are right or wrong in holding that the action against the Independent Board is unconstitutional, the last General Assembly studiously avoided any discussion of this issue, despite the fact that it is basic to the whole matter. Such reference to it as we heard would seem to indicate that the "leaders" of the Assembly make no distinction between the action of the Assembly acting in an administrative capacity and the Assembly acting as a court. Because the action of the Assembly acting as a court is final, they seem to assume that its action as an administrative body is equally final when as a matter of fact, as the Report of the Commission of Fifteen to the 1926 Assembly correctly affirmed, "when the General Assembly as a non-judicial body makes deliverances, they are entitled to great respect and deference, but they are subject

to modification or repeal at any time by a majority of the General Assembly."

The Presbytery of New Brunswick, as is well known, refused even to consider arguments questioning the constitutionality of the Assembly's mandate. Whether other presbyteries will do likewise remains to be seen. It is hardly conceivable at any rate that the Judicial Commission of the General Assembly, when the matter reaches it, will refuse to consider the constitutionality of the mandate of the 146th Assembly relative to the Independent Board. Whatever its members may think of the Independent Board, it is difficult to think that it will stultify itself by sustaining the constitutionality of said mandate.

INDEPENDENT BOARD MEMBERS REFUSED SEATS IN ASSEMBLY

S REPORTED in another column, three commissioners, regularly elected by their presbyteries, were refused seats in the last Assembly because they had not complied with the instructions of the 1934 Assembly to sever their connections with the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.


In considering this action it is important to note that the petition challenging their right to sit as commissioners was presented by a signer of the Auburn Affirmation, *i. e.*, by one who had refused to be bound by Assembly deliverances and who as such would not have been allowed to sit as a commissioner if the same treatment had been accorded him as he petitioned the Assembly to mete out to others.

It is still more important to note that these men were refused seats though in good and regular standing in their presbyteries. No charges against them had been proved in court. They had not even had their day in court. They were, in fact, condemned without a trial. This means that under existing conditions men may be given the status of ecclesiastical criminals and treated as such on the basis of a resolution adopted by a majority vote of a General Assembly, without having had an opportunity to justify their conduct. Such action by the Assembly is clearly unconstitutional. It involves tyranny in one of its least defensible forms.

The basic error of those who sincerely believed that this action was justified was, no doubt, their failure to distinguish between the binding force of the actions of the Assembly when it sits as a court and when it sits as an administrative body. Had the General Assembly of 1934 been sitting as a court when it issued its mandate relative to the Independent Board, the last Assembly would have been justified in refusing to seat members of the Independent Board—provided any presbytery would have elected them as commissioners in that case. Unquestionably the action of the Assembly when sitting as a court, whether just or unjust, is final as far as the case decided is concerned. The Assembly, however, was not sitting as a court when it issued its mandate against the Independent Board. It was sitting as a deliberative and administrative body, as it was when it issued its deliverances concerning the "five points." Such deliverances are "to be received with reverence and submission" "if consonant to the Word of God," but failure to obey them does not destroy one's good standing in the church. The members of the Independent Board have not disobeyed an order of the supreme court of the Presbyterian Church for the simple reason that the matter of the Independent Board has not as yet

come before the General Assembly sitting as a court. That will not happen until in due process it reaches the Permanent Judicial Commission of the General Assembly.

THE UNREST IN THE CHURCH AND ITS REAL CAUSE

N TUESDAY afternoon, May 28, after the 147th General Assembly had voted to investigate the Presbyteries of Chester and Philadelphia, DR. COVERT claimed the floor for the purpose of correcting alleged misinformation regarding and misrepresentations of the Assembly, especially in view of its actions the day before in unseating the three commissioners who were members of the Independent Board. After denouncing the alleged calumniators of the Assembly in vigorous and threatening language, DR. COVERT remarked that he wondered if something could not be done to correct these false impressions; and then, as if the thought had just come to him, he suggested that the commissioners rise and repeat the Apostles' Creed. After this was done, there occurred one of the most significant incidents of the whole Assembly. A commissioner seated near the platform rose in his seat and asked the Moderator if there were not some way in which the Assembly could go on record as really meaning the Creed which the commissioners had just solemnly recited. DR. VANCE was a resourceful and masterful Moderator. But this question seemed to be something of a poser. He met it by saying that of course the Assembly meant the words it had recited; that when he recited the Creed, he meant it. The matter rested there. The Assembly did not put itself formally on record to the effect that it really meant what it had said. But the fact that the question was asked was sufficiently significant, and showed how Modernism has undermined the confidence of the church in its own integrity.


About this time, DR. OSWALD T. ALLIS, of Philadelphia, asked for the floor for the purpose of answering DR. COVERT'S statement regarding the alleged misrepresentations of the attitude and actions of the Assembly. He began by quoting the last of the three recommendations in the report of the Committee on Polity relative to the unseating of the three Independent Board members. This recommendation reads as follows:—

"That while the General Assembly deeply regrets the necessity for performing this solemn duty in order to guard itself against giving countenance in any way to actions and statements which are defiant of the authority of the General Assembly and schismatic in their tendency and aim, it earnestly hopes, in the name and for the sake of our common Lord and Master, that the ministers against which this action is taken will study and pursue the things which make for the peace and unity of our beloved church." At this point he was ruled out of order by the Moderator on the grounds that he was discussing a matter already decided by the Assembly, despite his explanation that his reason for so doing was to answer DR. COVERT'S statement. Our readers may be interested to know what DR. ALLIS intended to say. It was his purpose simply to follow the reading of this recommendation of the Committee on Polity, with its exhortation to these ejected ones, "to study and pursue the things which make for the *peace* and *unity* of our beloved church," by reading the sixth of the Constitutional questions, assent to which is required of every candidate for ordination to the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.: "Do you promise to be zealous and faithful in maintaining the truths of the gospel and the *purity* and *peace* of the church; what-

ever persecution or opposition may arise unto you on that account?" and then to point out that it is just because the doctrinal issue, the *purity* of the church, is ignored that this atmosphere of unrest, suspicion, and controversy is so widespread and so seriously jeopardizes the *peace* and *unity* of the church.

However much the Assembly or the leaders who are in control may endeavor to ignore or deny it, this issue is the basic issue before the church today. *Peace* and *unity* are desirable in themselves, but they are neither desirable nor attainable, unless *purity* is the primary concern.

"THE CALVIN FORUM"


NDER this title, the members of the faculties of Calvin College and Seminary have issued the first number of a monthly magazine that is to be devoted to a discussion of the problems of today from the Calvinistic viewpoint. Copies of this issue will be sent free (as long as they last) to those applying for them. Address *The Calvin Forum*, Calvin College and Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan. The price of the magazine will be \$2.00 per year.

This first issue contains a clear statement concerning the standpoint and policy of the magazine, editorials, articles on Russian Communism—an Indictment, The Enigma of the Theology of Crisis, The Government Calls Me to Fight—Must I Obey? (two views), Instruction by the Living Voice: A Plea, reviews of significant books, and bits of verse. Future issues will contain articles on such subjects as The Ethics of Economic Regimentation, The Christian Faith and Recent Philosophical Movements, Recent Interest in Eschatology, Calvinism and Socialism, Calvinism and Political Action, The Socialization of Medicine, Do the Humanists Believe in God, The Why of Missions, Recent Archæological Finds and the Truth of the Bible, and, not to mention others, The Freedom of the Church in the Modern State.

It will be seen that this magazine will not restrict itself to the field of religion and theology. It will seek to include the whole of human thought and culture within its purview in accordance with the conviction of its publishers that Calvinism involves an all-inclusive world and life view. This means that it will be devoted to discussions of history and philosophy, natural science and medicine, sociology and economics, political science and international law, psychology and education, literature and art, as well as religion and theology. "We aim," so its editors state, "to cope with the deeper problems of our day in the light of the Word of God. We would aid in making articulate the spiritual, intellectual, and cultural life of our Christian groups in such a way as to produce and nurture a virile American type of Calvinistic culture. We would unfold in thought and in practical living the spiritual values inherent in a full-orbed, supernatural, Biblical, God-centered interpretation of the Christian faith."

We commend this magazine to the more scholarly of our readers. We share the conviction of its publishers that the only hope for any fundamental solution of the problems of the modern world is to be found in the principles that constitute the spiritual heritage of the Calvinistic group. While published under the auspices of representatives of the Christian Reformed Church, its editors truly assert that "the cause sponsored by *The Calvin Forum* transcends not only social and professional, but also ecclesiastical and even national lines of cleavage."

THE DOCTRINAL ATTITUDE OF THE MODERATOR OF THE LAST ASSEMBLY

E SPEAK advisedly and according to the Constitution when we refer to DR. VANCE as the Moderator of the last, i. e., the 147th General Assembly. There has been a growing tendency in recent years to assume that the office of Moderator is a year-round position and hence that until his successor is elected, the Moderator is the official representative of the church at large. There is no warrant whatever for such an assumption. With the dissolution of the 147th General Assembly on May 29, DR. VANCE'S term of office as Moderator expired. The Constitution provides that DR. VANCE "if present" at the next Assembly "shall open the meeting with a sermon . . . and preside until a new Moderator be chosen," but it contains nothing to justify the notion that he is the official head of the church until the Moderator of the 148th Assembly be chosen. Any statements or representations he may make between now and the next Assembly are entitled to such respect as their intrinsic merits may entitle them—to such respect but not to more as in the case of any other minister or elder. The parity of the ministry is a doctrine basic to the Presbyterian form of government.

There would seem to be special need of insisting upon the fact just mentioned in view of published statements by DR. VANCE that make only too clear that his doctrinal position is (or at least was, during the winter of 1926-27) out of harmony with that set forth in the official standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. The proof of this may be found in the book which he wrote and which was published by the Fleming H. Revell Company in 1927 under the title, *America's Future Religion*.

An editorial review of the book just mentioned, written by the writer, was published in *The Presbyterian* in its issue of November 24, 1927. The opening paragraph of the editorial was as follows: "The significance of this book lies for the most part in the fact that its author is president of the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. That the president of this Board should have written a book of so decidedly a liberal character is of far greater significance, and apt to arouse wider interest, than any contribution the book makes to our understanding of our present religious tendencies or any prophecies it utters concerning our future religion. If Dr. Vance is right, we may at least be certain that nothing very distinctive of historic Presbyterianism will be found in the coming religion of America." The closing paragraph of the editorial from which we are citing follows: "No doubt Dr. Vance's book contains much that is well said and that ought to be said, and yet there can be no doubt, it seems to us, but that the main bent and tendency of the book is hostile to historic Christianity and that if 'America's Future Religion' proves to be what Dr. Vance apparently anticipates, it will be hard to justify its claim to be called a manifestation of the Christianity of Christ and his apostles. O Church of Christ, whither art thou straying?" And yet on May 23, last, DR. VANCE was elected Moderator of the 147th General Assembly, of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.!

Lest it be alleged that the writer misunderstood and so was led to misrepresent DR. VANCE'S position, attention is directed to the fact that the *Princeton Theological Review* for January, 1928, contained a review of this book written by no less an authority than PROFESSOR CASPAR WISTAR HODGE. In that review, DR. HODGE

said among other things that DR. VANCE "rejects the evangelical Protestant doctrine of the authority of Scripture," that he "calls in question the authority of Christ and the Apostles as teachers of truth," that he treats doctrines that "constitute the essence of Christianity as matters of indifference," that he holds that "the advances in applied science which man has made have changed his fundamental needs as a sinner in relation to God," that "his idea of Calvinism is wholly inadequate and even mistaken," that he "exhibits the anti-doctrinal attitude of modern liberalism," that he pleads "for a standpoint (liberal) which happily is passing in some other countries, but unfortunately is still prevalent in America," and that "the errors and fundamental mistakes" of the book "render it dangerous to the uninformed."

The trend of DR. VANCE'S book, according to DR. HODGE, is expressed in the following sentence: "There is a great dissatisfaction with present conventional ways of thinking. An age that flies through the air two hundred miles an hour, talks across the spaces by wireless, and travels in safety below the tumultuous waves of the sea, cannot content itself with conceptions of God and life and destiny framed by a generation that traveled in ox-carts, and thought every word of the Bible must have been stenographically dictated to an amanuensis by God" (p. 122), DR. HODGE comments as follows: "In this brief and turgid sentence lie two amazing errors. One of these is the implication that the great Christian creeds and the great theological writers on Inspiration held the mechanical or dictation theory. This is an error into which most opponents of the church's doctrine of plenary inspiration have fallen. Let the author read Gaussen, or Lee, or Bannerman, or Kuyper, or Bavinck, or Warfield, and he will gain some historical knowledge that will save him in the future from such theological blunders. . . . A second mistake . . . is the idea that the advances in applied science which man has made have changed his fundamental need as a sinner in relation to God. These needs never change; neither does the answer of God to these needs in His self-revelation ever change. Like Christ, the answer is the same yesterday, today and forever. Hence it may well be that an age which rides in ox-carts may know more about God and Christ than an age which flies through the air. This need not be so; it ought not to be so; but as a matter of fact, in spite of our intellectual advance in natural science, we are living in an age of intellectual decline in theology and hence in religion."

DR. HODGE calls attention to the confusing character of DR. VANCE'S book. While exhibiting the anti-doctrinal attitude of modern liberalism it asserts in one place that the intellect must inform the feelings and guide the will. While asserting that it is a matter of indifference "to the Christian with a really vital experience of the grace of God in Christ" whether the Cross will "lose its sacrificial character and become only a symbol of the love of God or a martyr's devotion to his cause" and whether the Gospel will "still carry a message of salvation through an atoning sacrifice and the herald of it still offer to men a shed blood that can take away the stain even from the little hand of Lady Macbeth," yet it asserts that "the redemptive vitality of a Christianity that has the Bethlehem Manger and Calvary Cross and the Empty Tomb at its heart has never failed those who put their trust in it." A particularly surprising statement is to the effect that "Protestantism and Roman Catholicism . . . both unite in stressing evangelical Christianity's essential teachings"—a statement that would seem

to indicate that DR. VANCE does not even know what the word "evangelical" means. Such contradictory representations indicate the confusion of thought under which DR. VANCE labored when he wrote this book. It is at least a satisfaction to believe that DR. VANCE'S doctrinal views are not as consistently bad as the bulk of this book is fitted to lead us to believe.

Special attention is directed to the fact that DR. VANCE rejects the Bible as the supreme and final authority in the sphere of religion and substitutes for it "the 'inner light' of the witness of the Spirit of God in the soul of each believer." This mystical doctrine of the "inner light" as advocated by DR. VANCE, to cite DR. HODGE, "means not merely that each age must interpret the Bible for itself, but that the Bible's theological truths are not final and authoritative." And yet such is DR. VANCE'S confusion of thought in this connection that he identifies his doctrine of the "inner light" with the Reformed doctrine of the witness of the Spirit, though in reality the two doctrines are poles apart.

DR. VANCE closes his book (fortunately the book as a whole is not as bad as its concluding paragraph might indicate) by citing and commenting on a saying attributed to ABRAHAM LINCOLN, according to which the sole qualification for membership in the Christian church should be love to God and our neighbor. His comment is as follows: "That is the kind of a Christian church the twentieth century has produced, and in its membership every true Christian ought to be found, giving his life in the sacrificial service that will usher in the spiritual brotherhood not only of America, but of all the human race."

Some years ago (1914) a book was published by Funk & Wagnalls entitled, *The Church, the People and the Age*, which contained the considered views of more than a hundred scholars of various types relative to the proposal to make love to God and man the sole qualification for membership in the Christian church. Among the contributors to that volume was the late PROFESSOR B. B. WARFIELD, of Princeton. DR. WARFIELD wrote as follows:

"The moment a church took up such a position it would cease to be a Christian church: the core of Christianity is its provision for salvation from sin. No doubt by the adoption of such a platform many would be recovered to the church who now stand aloof from it. But this would not be because the world had been brought into the church, but because the church had been merged into the world. The offense of Christianity has always been the cross; as of old, so still today, Christ crucified is to the Jews a stumblingblock and to the Greeks foolishness. It would be easy to remove the offense by abolishing the cross, but that would be to abolish Christianity. Christianity is the cross; and he who makes the cross of Christ of none effect eviscerates Christianity. What Christianity brings to the world is not the bare command to love God and our neighbor. The world needs no such command; nature itself teaches the duty. What the world needs is the power to perform this duty, with respect to which it is impotent. And this power Christianity brings it in the redemption of the Son of God and the renewal of the Holy Ghost. Christianity is not merely a program of conduct, it is the power of a new life."

Much more might be said in this connection. What has been said, however, seems to us more than adequate to make clear that if DR. VANCE still holds the views he expressed a few years ago, he is not qualified to act as a spokesman for the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.—even if the fact that he was elected Moderator of the last General Assembly clothed him with any authority to speak officially for this church until the Moderator of the 148th Assembly be elected.

Is America on the Road to Ruin?

By the Rev. Clarence E. Macartney, D.D.
Minister, First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

"And the nations that forgot God." (Psalm 9:17.)



HE Bible deals with individuals—their duties, sins, sorrows, judgments, and hopes. But it also deals with nations. The mission and destiny of one particular nation is a chief theme of the Bible; but much is said also of the rise and fall of contemporary nations. The most obvious fact of history is that nations rise and fall and disappear. The question is sometimes asked, "Why should one travel in foreign lands, especially in the Mediterranean world and Asia, when there is so much that is beautiful and interesting to see in our own land?" The answer is that in the old world you move amid the ruins of the empires and kingdoms of the past. As one walks around the huge pyramids of Egypt, or from the Mount of Olives looks down upon the rocky height, once the scene of the splendor of Solomon and the might of David, and sees it covered with a Moslem mosque; as one stands on the shore at Tyre, and looking down into the sea, beholds the waves breaking over great columns that once adorned the temples of Tyre; or when one listens to the wind making music in the reeds of the desolate marsh where once the Temple of Diana stood; or when one walks in the moonlight in the midst of a great solitude around the grand columns of the temples of Baalbek; or muses amid the fragments of the Parthenon, the whole panorama of the past of these kingdoms is displayed before one. Sitting perhaps in one of their theaters, always the best preserved of the ancient ruins, what you see before you is not the particular drama that was acted on that stage, but the great drama of the past, the rise and the fall of kingdoms and empires. The impression is the same, whether these ruins are in the midst of a desert solitude, or, as at Athens and Rome, in the midst of a numerous population. The dead speak more eloquently than the living. The kingdoms of the past march before you on their way to glory and to power, and then to corruption, decay, and death.

Their mighty shadows cast,
The giant forms of empire
On their way to ruin.

One by one, they tower and are gone.

What made these nations fall? How came it that populations so numerous, cities so splendid, and governments so powerful, disappeared so completely? Does a nation have a natural cycle of life like a man—childhood, youth, maturity, decline, old age, and death? Or was it changes in climate, or economic conditions, or the greed and violence of other states, that overthrew these kingdoms? Or is the reason to be found in the moral and social life of the inhabitants of these states?

It is needless to say that the latter is the view of the Bible. Nations perish because of iniquity. The ultimate cause for their overthrow is moral. The history of the world is the judgment of the world. This is the meaning of the verse from this Psalm: "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." Hell here is used not in the sense of the place of punishment, but the place of oblivion and destruction. The nations that forget God shall be forgotten.

One of the most eloquent of all books is Volney's "Ruins," the book which almost made an infidel out of Lincoln because of its effort to put a fool's cap upon Christianity and all other religions. Yet in his account of the fall of ancient kingdoms, Volney agrees with the Scriptures. They fell through their own sins and follies. Sitting one moonlight night on the shaft of a pillar, and viewing the rows of columns at Palmyra of the Desert, Volney invokes the phantom of the past, the genius of the tombs, who rebukes the mortal for complaining against heaven, declaring the destruction of the civilizations of the past was due to man's folly and sin. "I will ask," says the mortal to the Phantom, "the

ashes of legislators by what secret causes do empires rise and fall." The Bible makes plain to us the reason for the fall of empires. There is a moral law at work among the nations, for nations are made up of men. Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap; and whatsoever a nation soweth that also shall it reap. As the great historian of Rome, Mommsen, put it, "God makes a Bible out of history."

Wide, indeed, is the field of observation when we come to study this truth of the past, and the present, for nations are just as surely dying and sinking today, as they have in the past. Every monument, every broken arch, every heap of debris, every lonely pillar, becomes a pulpit from which we hear the Voice of the Past preaching the great sermon of national sin and national judgment.

One of the most powerful empires of antiquity, and one of the most cruel, was Assyria, with its capital at Nineveh. The judgment which the prophet Jonah pronounced upon that city was postponed, but in course of time it fell. Through the Prophet Naaman, God says of Nineveh, "I will dig thy grave because thou art vile." That is an epitaph which might well be inscribed over the ruins of every ancient state. Their own wickedness dug their graves. Babylon falls when her king, Belshazzar, and all his nobles are in the midst of a drunken debauch. Then it was the king saw the handwriting on the wall. From age to age, that same awful Hand comes forth and traces over against the walls of the richest and most powerful states that same sentence, "Thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting." The moral law first weighs, and then judges and destroys.

In the history of Greece we can trace the cycle of early simplicity and strength; and then power, luxury, licentiousness, conquest, and death. The greatest voice of Greece in the day of her sunset, Demosthenes, attributed her fall to moral causes: the corruption and dishonesty of her public men and the death of patriotism.

But it is most of all in Rome, because its history is more open to us, that we see the illustration of the truth that nations die through moral disease. In the history of Rome we see the simple, rugged stock of the Latins, who founded the city; the place that public and domestic religion held, how chastity was guarded, marriage honored, women revered. Then came the age of expansion and power and conquest, and after that the history of decline and fall. Oriental cults with licentious rites were imported from the East and supplanted the simple worship of an earlier day. Depravity of manners and customs made itself manifest in the life of the people, in the stages and theaters, gigantic cesspools of iniquity and sensuality. Marriage fell into disfavor, so much so that the Emperor Augustus endeavored to take steps to compel marriage. The empire swarmed with Oriental mistresses. Woman threw off the ancient and honorable veil of modesty, and peering into the mysteries of sex became a fine art. With this went the brutalizing of life in the cruel sports of the circus and the amphitheater. Roman society reached the terrible climax of iniquity which is pictured for us in the first chapter of St. Paul's Letter to the Romans. A dark picture it is; but not as dark as that painted by the Roman historians themselves. When he comes to describe the manners and morals of that age, Tacitus says that he will not take us into the cavern itself, lest the foul odors should destroy us, but will conduct us only as far as the mouth of the cavern and let us look from a distance upon its iniquity and shame.

Thus was the stage set for judgment, and the barbarians poured in like a flood upon the splendor and glory of the Cæsars. "Where the carcass is," said Christ, "there the eagles will be

gathered together." Whenever a state is sufficiently ripe for judgment, then appear the eagles of judgment and destruction.

Such, then, is the history of the past. Can history teach us anything? When we turn from these ancient states to our own nation, what shall we think? The history of our nation is such as to make us believe that it is indeed a vine of God's own planting, and that He hath not dealt so with any people. In his great speech at Mars Hill, St. Paul declared that God is the Author and Appointer of the history of the nations, that He has appointed their seasons and the bounds of their habitations. The history of this nation is a great illustration of that truth. In the making of the nation, no one can question that part taken by religion, by the Ten Commandments, by the thought of accountability to God. The sanctions of religion have held society and government together.

Today we behold everywhere a breaking down of or disregard for those sanctions. Anti-Christian and anti-religious ideas are boldly taught. Man is not the special creation of God in the divine image, with wisdom, knowledge, and responsibility, who sinned and fell, and for whose redemption a great Atonement has been made; but is a beast climbing slowly out of the abyss. Religion has been almost divorced from education. The president of one of our greatest universities in his annual report declares that the American people, in the conflicts of opinions and interests as to the manner and method of religious instruction, have solved it by taking the view of a very small minority, that is, the pagan view, *no religious instruction at all*. A widely read columnist, who the other day at Reno, fifteen minutes after he had secured his divorce, married a woman who had just secured her divorce, declared at a meeting of one of the learned societies, that the Ten Commandments are to be obeyed only when they are found to square with the latest Science, and that is no sin because probably there is no God against whom to sin.

When we turn from the study of the ideas and principles which are being taught, to conditions, what confronts us? By common consent there is a theater and a literature which remind one in a striking way of the interest and themes of sex which engrossed the Roman populace. Pornographic books, which not so long ago would have been regarded as vile and unthinkable, lie on the tables of Christian homes and are discussed in the societies of the women of the day. As one has put it, speaking of this inundation of sex thought and literature, "You would think that the world was made in *sex* days, and not in six, and that Job suffered not from boils, but from sex repression."

Self-expression, the centering of thought upon rights and not upon duty, upon pleasure and not upon destiny—all this already shows a ghastly harvest in the life of the homes of our land. The last reports show 183,000 divorces for one year, one for every five marriages. Fifty per cent of the cases of children brought into the courts of one of our great cities were children from broken homes. Divorce, by itself, in its reaction upon those divorced, is one thing; in its influence upon the children of broken up homes, it is another and still darker thing.

From the home we turn to the courts and the conduct of the people. In the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and the World War, 112,751 of our soldiers were killed in action. But in the last ten years, 120,000 of our citizens were murdered. Almost 9,000 more men have been murdered in the last ten years than were killed in battle in all the wars in which our nation has engaged. A murder is committed in the United States every forty-five minutes. Thirty-seven murders every day, 12,000 every year. Since 1890 the murder rate in the United States has increased 350 per cent. We have an army of criminals of almost half a million, and an annual crime bill of \$15,000,000,000, or \$2.50 a week for every man, woman, and child in the nation. As if this were not appalling enough, we learn something even more distressing; that 39 per cent of the criminals fingerprinted in the country in a year were under twenty-four!

The scarlet thread of sensuality and license, under the guise

of liberty of life, runs through the social life of the people. A prominent citizen, speaking of what he saw at a recent public dance, summed it all up by saying, "This is not a new generation we are looking at; *it is a new race.*"

Side by side with this internal decay and corruption, there is being carried on a bold and open attack upon the government and the principles upon which it is founded. This attack receives no little aid from some of the pulpits and professors' chairs of the land.

To offset all these evil forces and influences which are preying upon the life of the nation, the nation itself is making no effort. Here and there, we hear of a League of Decency, or a Crime Conference; but the state as such is doing nothing, practically nothing, to conserve the higher life of the nation, without which the nation must perish. We have great national plans for the conservation of forests and water power, but apparently no plans for the conservation of the spiritual and moral life of the nation. Even in the Nazi state, with all its abominations and tyrannies, there is a definite program of action against the vices and immoralities which are attacking the people. But here the state does nothing. That is the most appalling fact of all. We hear of currency discussions and debates over World Courts in Congress; but not of measures to safeguard the rising generation from the inundation of liquor and the propaganda of licentiousness.

The picture is not a pleasing one; but it becomes all the more distressing when you place it alongside the pictures the historians have given us of the ancient states in the day of their decline. What is to be the destiny of this nation? Is there any reason to believe that we are to be exempted from the working of the moral law which overthrew the kingdoms of the past? Our own nation is teaching now, and will teach, the same old truth, Whatsoever a nation soweth, that also shall it reap. The nations that forget God shall be forgotten.

There is the moral of all human tales;
'Tis but the same rehearsal of the past,
First freedom, and then glory—when that fails—
Wealth, vice, corruption—Barbarism at last.
And history, with all her volumes vast,
Hath but one page.

If a Volney, sitting amid the ruins of Palmyra, could imagine a traveler like himself sitting in solitude and mourning over the ruins of the civilization and cities of the Seine, Thames, and the Zuyder Zee; and if a Macaulay could imagine a traveler from New Zealand standing on a broken arch of London Bridge and sketching the ruins of St. Paul's, it requires no great flight of imagination to imagine an explorer and philosopher of a future age sitting amid the ruins of America's great buildings and writing of our history as we write today of the buried cities and civilizations of the past. Perhaps our Goths and Vandals will come from within, more than from without. But whensoever they come, the historian of the future will sum up the story of the rise and fall of the American republic in much the same way that we tell the story of the civilizations of the past—freedom, then glory, and after that wealth, vice, corruption, and death.

Whether national repentance and a revival of national morality shall long postpone the judgment of history only the future can tell. The one thing about which we can be certain is the future of the Kingdom of God. This is the nation and kingdom that shall never be destroyed. As the Christian church rose amid the ruins of the Roman Empire, so out of any possible or appointed catastrophes of the future shall arise with new power and new splendor the Kingdom of God.

It is a proud and happy privilege and distinction to be a citizen of the American republic. But it is a far higher privilege and distinction to be a citizen of the Kingdom of Christ. The American republic will go the way of all the nations of the earth; but the Kingdom of God endures forever. Are you a citizen of that Kingdom? Is your name inscribed there, written in the blood that was shed on Calvary for the redemption of mankind?

The 147th General Assembly: A Church Approaching the Crossroads

IN THE perspective that will be afforded by the next twenty-five years, the sessions of 147th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. will without doubt be ranked as among the most important events in the life of the church in this generation. This will be so, not because it was a "great" assembly (no intelligent observer would make such a claim), but because it illustrated a confused and bewildered church, obeying the crack of the whip of its "old guard," blindly moving toward the brink of a moral and religious precipice.

This report must necessarily be given as the writer saw and understood the events he seeks to chronicle. Doubtless, others saw much that he did not see, and failed to observe much that will be related here. To some it has seemed to be an Assembly that gloriously asserted the "authority" of the church. To the present reporter it cannot seem other than an Assembly that turned its back in large part upon the heritage of the Reformation, that renewed the shocking action of the 146th Assembly, setting itself up as an authority to bind the consciences of men, co-ordinate with the Word of God. That all these things would have been simply unthinkable even twenty years ago only shows how the vampire of modernism has sucked out the Protestant lifeblood of the church, leaving a great body whose constitution is Protestant, but whose actual practice is not. This is not to say that most or even a great proportion of the commissioners to the Assembly knew that they were voting for measures that were dishonoring to the Word of God and destructive of the basic principles of sound order. No doubt they wanted to vote and act to the glory of God. But most of them were commissioners who had never before attended an Assembly. They would probably not attend another, at least within ten years. Decisions had to be made, often after periods of discussion that it would be utterly misleading to call "debates." The new commissioners naturally trust "the leaders," those great ones who sit upon platforms, engage in whispered conferences ended by sage noddings of the head, who importantly stride to foregather in elect little groups in the lobbies of the best hotels. Why should the uninitiated commissioner fail to follow such leadership? Are not these the men who are accomplishing the constructive work of the church? Have they not been bitterly (!) and unjustly (!) criticized by a small trouble-making minority? Have these leaders not rushed to one another's defense with assurances that there is nothing at all in these charges, that they are founded in personal pique, jealousy, or worse?

Perhaps, then, the secret of the ability of ecclesiastical bureaucrats to hold on to power longer than non-churchly politicians has been seen in passing. Not only do they have organizations to work for them, not only do they have "jobs" at their command (that potent club of power), but they have something else that would turn a Philadelphia or New York politician green with envy. They have, in a word, developed a new technique. By some, it is called the tear-bottle treatment. Others have different names. But the process is simple. Whenever the actions of a bureaucracy are questioned or criticized, instead of meeting the charges squarely and saying "that happened" or "that did not happen," the persons under fire desert the prosaic and troublesome arena of facts and betake themselves to the pleasant meadows of emotions. "We are loyal Christian men" they protest. "We have given our lifeblood to these great enterprises. Now our reward is only untruthful, slanderous, bitter criticism. Such attacks are doing great harm to the cause of Jesus Christ. For ourselves, we are willing to suffer in silence. Yet think of our faithful, devoted years of service, look at our graying hairs. Let us have charity one to another, let us

have mutual confidence and trust in one another, and especially in those who are carrying on so nobly the great work of the boards of the church. We are all loyal to the faith, we all love our Lord!" All this, and so much more like it. Identification of the actions and the persons questioned with the most sacred and holy things of the faith, so that those who question the acts of the persons supposed to be their hired servants are practically accused of putting a knife in the church's back, instead of having a desire to purify and save it! In short, identification of fallible men with Christ's holy cause, so that those who even presume to *question* these men and their acts are regarded as opposing that Cause. In his review of the 146th Assembly, the present writer used a phrase which it is pertinent to repeat here. "A church political organization," he wrote, "has one advantage that is not shared by secular cliques. It can defend itself behind a breastwork of halos." And it is from behind that breastwork that the machine in the church has fought its so far victorious battle.

Now see the background of all this, as the commissioner sees it. Upon the city where the next Assembly is to convene, descends officialdom's array. It contacts the press, local churches, and other organs of local and national publicity. Preaching appointments for Sunday in Assembly week are arranged for the loyal. The pre-Assembly conferences have been long programmed, and when the horde of commissioners begins to trickle in, officialdom is ready for it. Pre-Assembly addresses are delivered by the "big" men of the church. The "popular meetings" each evening of the Assembly are held in the interests of the Boards and agencies of the church. Upon the platform roams a horde of secretaries and officials. They address the Assembly constantly—perhaps more than the Assembly is addressed by its own members. At frequent intervals they are called upon to give the commissioners the benefit of their sage and weighty counsel. Nearly all of the commissioner's crowded time is taken up with hearing somebody speak, from the time he arrives until the moment he leaves. The general impact of all this is very simple: "the work of the church" is identified with the machinery of the church as organized and administered by those in power. Only forewarned and strongly resistant commissioners could possibly remain immune to the rhythmic effect of this mental goose step. The commissioners are won over, it may be said, by being allowed to march in the parade.

Let it be added that this is no reflection upon the commissioners. Most of them would freely admit that they have little understanding of the many intricate questions that are presented for vote, and little familiarity with the law of the church. But they must vote and pass on to the next order of business. This means that they must rely upon the judgment of somebody else. And if a conflict comes, between people of whom they know little and the ecclesiastical statesmen whose photographs adorn the daily press, men whom they have watched running the Assembly day by day, what is more natural than that commissioners should vote for what the platform recommends? It is extremely doubtful whether, except in unusual cases, speeches make much effect upon the "mind of the Assembly." To the average commissioner, officialdom incarnates the church. He waits for the signal, votes when he gets it, not because he understands it all, but because he trusts official leadership.

OPENING SERVICE

The beginning of an Assembly is always impressive. It would be even more so if the sessions were held in a church building of ample proportions. But even a theaterlike structure, such as the

Taft Auditorium, cannot greatly dim the stateliness and simple splendor of the Holy Communion. Not even those who are fully and wearily aware of the play and interplay of backstage politics by an adroit ecclesiastical machine could remain entirely unmoved by the opening service. For a time, in the action of the sacrament, one's own identity seems lost, merged in the larger and spacious unity of the church universal. Yet even in the midst of this, comes the remembrance that many are sitting at this table who have denied all that makes it dear to the Christian soul. And with all his heart, one wishes for a church that would be as pure in practice as she is in her formal Confession of Faith.

THE MODERATOR'S SERMON.

The Moderator of the last Assembly always opens the new Assembly with a sermon. This was delivered by the Rev. William Chalmers Covert, D.D., LL.D., Moderator of the 146th Assembly, former General Secretary of the Board of Christian Education.

Dr. Covert's sermon was, without question, a polished piece of work, judged by standards of literary proportion and expression. It bears the marks of painstaking study and revision. It is obviously the work of a matured and mellowed mind. Yet, the present writer must truthfully report that to him the sermon, with all its excellencies, was a great disappointment. Nor should the reason for this conclusion be withheld. To the present writer that sermon was, in warp and woof, in its total conception and whole outlook, a definitely Modernist sermon. This is not to say that it was of that crass variety of pulpit utterances which takes great delight in denying Christian doctrines or heaping ridicule upon things dear to the believing heart. Not so. Dr. Covert would not engage in that kind of attack upon the Christian faith. Such an approach would probably make him indignant. Nevertheless, it must be repeated that he preached a Modernist sermon. How? Not by denying doctrines, but by painting a picture of the Apostolic Age which has left out of it just those facts that made it what it was. "Here," he says in effect, "see what Apostolic Christianity really was—the religion to which we must get back if we are to recapture Apostolic power." But when we look at his picture of the Apostolic Age, we see not the Apostolic Age that actually was, but an Apostolic Age as Modernism would fain imagine it to have been. The presentation of a picture which simply and quietly omits doctrines and facts essential to Christianity results actually in a more thoroughgoing denial of the faith, one that is far more subtle and deceiving than blatant denials of this doctrine or that. No doubt there are passages here and there to which Dr. Covert might point as evidence that his discourse recognizes facts essential to orthodox Christianity. It is also true that his word-picture of conditions in the Roman Empire during the Apostolic Age is a bit of living and glowing prose. Nevertheless, the whole impact of the sermon is bound up with Dr. Covert's description of those factors in the church which produced its power. The title of the sermon was "Apostolic Requisites for a Prevailing Church." The texts were Acts 12: 24 and Acts 2: 47. Excerpts:

The record is plain. In the overflowing life and back of the propagating power of those early Christians we find, among other things:

1. *There was always singing*, keyed to the pitch of gladness and voicing themes of praise ("did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God," Acts 2: 46).

2. *There was sharing*, touched with the Christian passion for unselfish mutuality and brotherhood ("neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own. . . . Neither was there any among them that lacked," 4: 32-34).

3. *There was healing*, a human service made spiritually significant through motives of Christian love ("silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I thee. In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, rise up and walk!" 3: 6).

4. *There was corporate praying*, made real by the presence of a spiritual oneness and a believing Christian faith ("continued with one accord in prayer and supplication," 1: 14).

5. *There was preaching*, suffused by the power of the Holy Spirit and radiating the personality of Jesus ("when they saw the boldness of Peter and John and perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men, they marveled; and they took knowledge that they had been with Jesus," 4: 13).

It is in us, not in this gospel message, that we shall find explanation of that slackness and incompetency and lack of converting power that

marks our preaching. The Apostolic personalities and agencies that mediated with such power the Christian message to a lost world were characterized, over and over again, by Luke. We are left in no doubt about the facts. They were features far removed from mechanisms and programs and budgets, though they gave birth to all these things in their time and place. They were not related to syllogisms of finespun theories of faith, nor definitions that so often obscure the realities of our greatest religious simplicities. These convincing and converting characteristics belonged not to a few men but to the Apostolic Church. . . . The Christian movement was the overflow and contagion of lives, individuals and groups, that were saturated with a vital believing faith in the fact of Christ as a personal Savior competent for time and eternity. . . .

1. *There was singing*. Nothing was more diametrically opposite to the sad, drab cynical views of paganism than the singing of the liberated soul of Christianity. One of the most unexplainable and convincing features of the Apostolic Church was the gladness that buoyed the hearts of these early Christians and the equanimity with which they met poverty and persecution. Pliny was a shrewd provincial governor, but he reports to Trajan that these people singing hymns to Christ as God constituted a unique administrative problem he scarcely knew how to approach. The dreary world was waiting to be lifted on wings of song to levels of cheer and joy that paganism never knew. . . .

2. *There was sharing*. These Apostolic men and women, the secret of whose contagious life we are trying to explore, never lost their contact with the misery and misfortune around them while in the ecstasy and spiritual exaltation of their hymn singing. They not only sang but they shared. They not only released emotions in hymns of gladness but put their brains and better natures to work in planning unselfishly for a practical program of Christian philanthropy. . . . Let not the spirit of devotion to the brethren in need, which our Christian faith compel, or the principle behind the practice of sharing, be smothered in quibbling about methods of its application to modern conditions. It was the moving power of a brotherhood that reckoned nothing dear when fellow believers were in want—not the theory or the mode or the code—that made the Apostolic Church the most magnetic unit of human living the world ever saw, and gave it a characteristic that drew a lonely needy world into its sheltering life. . . .

3. *There was healing*. In the sorrow and pathos of this need, the paganism of Apostolic days had failed. Its culture never met the situation. Its philosophy never came to earth. Its poets lived only in their dreams. While Seneca wrote about kindness on tables of veined citrus-wood of which he had 500 in his villa, thousands of slaves rotted in chains, and sickness among the poor went uncared for. It was their sympathies for the sick and suffering and their willing service of alleviation and healing of pain that drew to these believing Apostolic men and women an unbelieving world. Their healing program took on spiritual significance when with every word of comfort spoken, every measure of relief human or divine they offered, there shone forth that love of Christ from whom all their healing purposes and powers had come. . . . Christ had come to reveal, that was then, there, and ever after to be personified in the church. Of course, in gratitude and joy, men who were healed and comforted rose to thank God and follow Christ! Daily in growing multitudes they were added to the Church. . . .

4. *There was corporate prayer*. It was a "praying together" made sweet, real and victorious by a spiritual oneness that nothing could mar. "They continued with one accord in prayer and supplication." It was praying together, unified and made vital by a believing faith. The fires of devotion in the early church grew more fervent as these Apostolic groups together took hold on God in continued seasons of prayer. Together they waited in their supplications till that power came which from Pentecost to our day always has come and always has powerfully energized the church, making her life and testimony real and convincing in the world. There was a oneness of spirit in that early corporate praying in which Apostolic differences were submerged in the great unity of desire for the saving of the world through the power of the Risen Christ. . . .

5. Finally *there was preaching*. In that Apostolic group preaching was so suffused with the power of the Holy Spirit that the preachers in their preaching radiated the very mind, heart, and personality of Jesus Christ. Such earnest apologetics and passionate pleading men had never heard. The courage and confidence of these preachers in the presentation of the redemptive facts deeply moved men. Their willingness to stand before mocking unbelievers and bitterest enemies, before mobs in the streets or before tribunes in royal council chambers, and speak without mincing words or modifying their messages, and gladly paying the price, amazed the multitudes. Their utter disregard for conventionalities and distinctions that divided society into classes and clans thrilled a narrow-minded world. The fearlessness and joy with which they swept across all the frontiers of a selfish world with their gospel, left men dumbfounded. In a world with so many plans of salvation but with no Savior, these Apostolic messengers brought Jesus Christ, and pleaded for Him with moving power! They pleaded for His uniqueness, His universality, His entire and complete adequacy to save all classes and conditions of men—to the uttermost, for time as well as for eternity. This was the preaching which under God bore immediate widespread and thoroughgoing results so that the Word of God

grew and was multiplied and multitudes were gathered in of such as were to be saved.

According to the record, these were among the outstanding convincing features behind the unbelievable progress of the Apostolic Church. Through these factors the Holy Spirit moved, profoundly expanding the church and winning a sinful world for Christ. Singing, sharing, healing, praying, preaching made the human channel through which God in His love and mercy moved upon the needy world in that morning hour of the church. These factors He validated for His service at Pentecost. He has put His approval upon them in every step of the long long way from that day to this. He waits now to bless with saving power through these same contacts this poor confused nation of ours and to redeem a whole ruined world. . . .

Will the Presbyterian Church through this significant gathering of her servants here register her undeviating purpose again to put at the disposal of God's Spirit these same highly approved historic factors on which hitherto the progress of the gospel has depended? He waits to hear our united voice in a mighty concert of praise that shall merge all our differing minds in fervent worship. . . .

The lack in all this is apparent. Dr. Covert explains the Apostolic Age by showing us a set of human attitudes. It is true that he says that these flowed from burning convictions concerning Christ, the world's only Savior. But it is in these attitudes, which together constitute the method, that he finds the explanation of the power of the early church, rather than in anything else, rather, for example, than in the message, the gospel, itself. This is where the approach of Modernism is opposed to that of evangelical Christianity. The Modernist emphasizes the human element, makes it the key to understanding the picture, even while saying complimentary but vague things about the doctrinal basis. The evangelical Christian, on the other hand, sees the power of the early church as flowing always from the showing forth of the Cross of Christ. The Cross on which our substitute hung is the center of all. It was that *message* that is the key to the power of the Apostolic Age. All else is pale beside that. And if the modern church is to recapture the power of that Apostolic morning, the evangelical believes that she must get back to the *message*, not merely to the *method* of the Apostles. To Dr. Covert the secret of getting back involves the recapture of five attitudes of life. To him the message is something still as a matter of course in the possession of the church. To us, the church has largely forsaken that message (while retaining it in her formal creed), and what she needs more than all else is to repent her unbelief, turn again to the *message*, and proclaim it. When she does that, the Spirit of God will come upon her with Apostolic power. But it is only hollow mockery to think that all we need to do is to polish up our attitudes, when what we need is repentance, repentance that goes to the very heart. Dr. Covert is moving in another "universe of discourse" than the evangelical. Each may use the same descriptive words, but it is evident that each views the church not merely in a different light, but as a totally different thing than does the other. Which, we ask, is in agreement with the creed of the church? For an informed person, that question has only one answer.

THE OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

At two-thirty o'clock in the afternoon, the first business session of the Assembly was called to order. First business was the calling of the roll by the naming of absentees. The Stated Clerk is the Committee on Commissions. Before a motion could be put that the roll be adopted as submitted by the Clerk, a commissioner from Philadelphia, the Rev. George Emerson Barnes, Auburn Affirmationist, arose to read a paper challenging the right of three persons to sit in the Assembly. This move was not a surprise to the persons concerned, since rumors to the effect that it would be done had been current in Cincinnati for several days. Before the challenge was dealt with, however, the roll was adopted as offered by the Clerk, including the names of the three persons challenged. Then the Moderator ruled that in accordance with Rule 7 of subsection III of Section III of the Manual of the Assembly, the challenges *must* go to the Standing Committee on Polity. (The rule says "The Stated Clerk shall be the Committee on Commissions. Appeals from his decisions may be taken to the Standing Committee on Polity.") In answer to a question whether in the

meantime these challenged persons would have the right to deliberate and vote, the Moderator ruled that they would have no such right.

The implications of such an amazing ruling are obvious. If the mere challenge of a person who has presented regular credentials is enough to cause him to be denied his rights as a member, even before anything has been proved against his right to sit, then any one member could challenge all the other nine hundred odd commissioners, and prevent the body from proceeding due to the lack of a quorum. Further, the idea that a mere objection by some could operate to bar a commissioner from the rights to which his election by his presbytery entitle him, is to threaten the very foundations of representative government. Minorities, then, could only exist under the permission and tolerance of majorities, even if at all.

The situation was somewhat relieved by an astute action on the part of candidate Joseph A. Vance, of Detroit, who moved that the three persons challenged should be allowed to vote and deliberate pending the report of the Committee on Polity. This was adopted. Of course this motion, which seemed to extend privileges as a matter of grace, was legally superfluous, since the casting of their votes belonged to these commissioners as a matter of right.

Who were these three challenged parties, whose presence was not desired, and what was their offense? They were the Rev. Merrill T. MacPherson, of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, the Rev. Carl McIntire, of the Presbytery of West Jersey, and the present writer, of the Presbytery of Philadelphia. Their offense? Continued membership in the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, in spite of the unconstitutional, un-Presbyterian, un-Protestant, un-Christian order of the 146th General Assembly that they should resign from it forthwith. Those whose orthodoxy has never been questioned, challenged by a signer of the heretical Auburn Affirmation! Did we hear someone say, "This issue is not doctrinal"? Let the facts speak for themselves.

The present writer will try as best he can to record this matter, in which he was an interested party, in a fair manner. He cannot, however, record it in such a way as would obscure or minimize his deep conviction that in this whole proceeding we see a revealing illustration of Modernist tyranny in action, riding complacently, contemptuously, over the law of the church, in spirit and in letter, whenever it was advantageous so to do, yet doing it all in the name of lawful and orderly procedure.

ELECTION OF MODERATOR

After other preliminaries had been cleared away, the Assembly elected its Moderator. Five candidates were put forward: Dr. Joseph A. Vance, of Detroit, by the "National Missions Machine" (popularly so called) together with a group of hard-working Modernist friends. Dr. Vance is President of the Board of National Missions. For him a great deal of work had been done. Dr. Charles W. Welch, of Louisville, was nominated by those who are generally regarded as operators of the "General Council Machine." Dr. Stewart M. Robinson, of Elizabeth, New Jersey, and Philadelphia, was put forward by a group of Conservatives, upon a platform opposed to that of the dominant parties in the church. Dr. E. A. Van Nuys, of San Francisco, was nominated by a group who believed that the west coast should be accorded the Moderatorship and that Dr. Van Nuys was an outstanding pastor from that region. Dr. A. E. Magary (Auburn Affirmationist), of Brooklyn, was put forward by a New York group which felt that the Synod of New York had been neglected in recent Moderatorial elections.

Dr. Welch was nominated by Dr. Jesse Herrman, of Kentucky, who painted the usual glowing picture of the poor boy risen to greatness. The nomination was seconded by Dr. Albert J. McCartney, of Washington, D. C. Excerpt from his speech: "Not how much theology we have in our heads, but how much of the spirit and love of God we have in our hearts."

Dr. Vance was nominated by Dr. Roy Ewing Vale, also of Detroit. The Assembly must think now, he said, of the welfare of the church. It must elect a true parliamentarian, so that all

should be treated fairly. It must have a Moderator who, in the face of a hostile world, stands for the things for which our church has stood from the beginning. This man was apostolic and evangelistic—in the sense meant in the great sermons of Drs. Covert and Matthews. He was a descendant of Covenanters. His ancestors signed the National Covenant in Greyfriars Churchyard. His father was a farmer. The son knew what it was to follow the plow. He believes in the Virgin Birth. . . . He had attacked the Detroit underworld, was indicted, and later acquitted.

This nomination was seconded by Dr. Barend H. Kroeze, rugged college president of North Dakota, whose flights into the exalted and ethereal realms of oratory and poetry sent the Assembly into near hysterical laughter. His last words from Tennyson's Locksley Hall:

"Love took up the harp of life, and smote on all the chords with might;

Smote the chord of Self, that, trembling, pass'd in music out of sight"

were from the second line on drowned out in a gathering crescendo of riotous applause.

Dr. Van Nuys was nominated by Dr. Jesse H. Baird (Auburn Affirmationist), of Oakland, California. Dr. Baird, tall, somewhat stooped, and sweetly mild, called upon the Assembly to be united for peace in the church. They must preserve both the unity and the purity of the church, he said, and the election of the proper Moderator would have much to do with that. The Moderator must unify us, must lead us into finer peace and be the very incarnation of the purity which the church should have. Dr. Van Nuys, a great evangelistic pastor, a Moderator of both the Synods of Indiana and California, a preacher of the old evangelical gospel, could do this. This nomination was seconded by the Rev. Joseph A. Speer, of the Presbytery of Huntingdon, who declared that the election of Dr. Van Nuys would mean "loyalty not to faction or to party, but to Jesus Christ and the church of the living God."

Dr. Robinson was put in nomination by the Rev. Burleigh Cruikshank, of the Presbytery of Philadelphia. He said that the public press had been persistent in its report that this would be one of the stormiest Assemblies of recent years. We agree that the issues before us are tremendous, but we have enough confidence in the fair-mindedness and consecration of the ministers and elders of the church to believe that we shall face our problems with charity and solve them in brotherly love. In ordinary days, we should be glad to vote for any man whose name had been mentioned for Moderator. But the times call for a peculiar type of leadership to guide us through the rapids. Suspicion and doubt have crept into our churches until many of our people are convinced that our church is not loyal to her standards. This Assembly must take such action as will, beyond a doubt, give the assurance to our people that we believe in the creed which we profess.

We are voting today for more than a Moderator; we are voting for a platform. We are voting for more than a personality; we are voting for a policy. We offer you today a man who can become the symbol for a great revival and unite our church under a forward program in the Kingdom of God. . . . Stewart M. Robinson is the man to lead us because of his loyalty. He is loyal to our great church and loyal to the Word of God. He believes in the blood-bought Gospel of Redeeming Grace. He stands beside the Apostle Paul, who said, "I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." . . . Stewart M. Robinson is the man we want because of his largeness. He is a big man. He stands six feet two inches tall. But his size looms greater as we consider the splendid work he has done as a pastor of one of our outstanding churches. He is the ideal pastor, devoting his attention to his people. He is not affiliated with any of the Boards of our church. We do not want a man who is associated with them. Our Boards are our servants. We are responsible for them. We want to look at these Boards through unbiased eyes and help them, if possible, to make any corrections which will be for the welfare of the Church. . . .

We cannot be like ostriches with our heads in the sand. These

questions and issues exist. We must face them and deal with them, not thinking that they are solved by the passing of resolutions of confidence. . . . Stewart M. Robinson is the man we want because of his leadership. As an editor of one of the leading church papers, he has been molding the thought of multitudes of our people. . . . Give him to us that we may send our ministers and elders home from this great Assembly united and dedicated under the Holy Spirit to bring in the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. Give him to us, and by so doing, give the great Presbyterian church back into the hands of the people.

The nomination of Dr. Robinson was seconded by the Rev. Raymond I. Brahams, Moderator of the Presbytery of Los Angeles. He also pleaded for a return of the church to the people, and presented Dr. Robinson as a conservative and anti-machine candidate.

The last nomination was made that of Dr. Magary. It was made by the Rev. Phillips P. Elliott, of Brooklyn, who delivered what was undoubtedly the smoothest speech of the afternoon. Dr. Elliott, long recognized as one of the more brilliant of the younger Modernist group in the church, said that his candidate had been spontaneously nominated. There had been not the slightest shred of ecclesiastical support or encouragement for Dr. Magary. He should be elected for geographical reasons, though they were not controlling. There were personal reasons. Dr. Magary was one who could produce great preaching, and he did not use the word "great" lightly. He was of great fidelity to the local church. . . . It was a polished, urbane speech which conveyed, no doubt unintentionally, the conviction that the nominator was not particularly excited about the matter, himself. This nomination was seconded by the Rev. J. V. Axtell, of the Presbytery of Steuben-Elmira, who spoke simply and with feeling of the friendship which for years had endured between him, a "country parson," and the distinguished Dr. Magary.

BALLOTING

The first ballot resulted as follows:

Votes cast	896
Majority Necessary	449
Vance	358
Welch	243
Robinson	143
Van Nuys	90
Magary	61

There being no election, ballots were distributed to the commissioners for another attempt. In the meantime, the names of Drs. Van Nuys and Magary were withdrawn. It is interesting to note in passing that more than half of Dr. Van Nuys's votes came from the Synod of California, and that practically all of Dr. Magary's votes came from the Synod of New York. The other three candidates received votes from all the electing sections (the Assembly was divided into twenty-two of these to facilitate the balloting). Dr. Robinson's strength lay mainly in the Synods of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, with considerable support from Sections Twelve and Fifteen, the Synods of Minnesota, Minnesota (Welsh), Wisconsin, and the Synods of Iowa and the West, German. Dr. Welch's strength was well distributed, with a large bloc supporting him in Section Eighteen, Synods of Alabama, Florida, Kentucky and Tennessee. Dr. Vance did well everywhere but in the Synods of New York and California, and swept the Synods where National Missions money is so essential to keeping up much local work, like a prairie fire. Dr. Vance, it will be remembered, is President of the Board of National Missions, and it was an open secret that his admirers in the work had been gathering votes for him for some time. Indeed, the contest between Dr. Vance and Dr. Welch was popularly referred to as a clash between the "National Missions Machine" and the "General Council Machine"—by which is meant the bureaucracy other than the National Board. But if those who thought they saw here the beginning of internal strife within the dominant party had any expectations that it would mean lack of unity in dealing with militant conservatives, they were destined for a rude awakening.

The second ballot resulted as follows:

Votes cast	891
Majority Necessary	446
Vance	514
Welch	249
Robinson	126

It is not difficult to see what had happened. The bandwagon of Dr. Vance was off to a fast start, and wise men knew when to get on. The favorite-son votes switched to him in a body. And others here and there climbed on the wagon, too.

After the mover and seconder of his nomination had escorted him to the platform, the new Moderator received the gavel from the hands of Dr. Covert, after an exchange of mutual compliments.

The Permanent Judicial Commission reported itself present and functioning. After this the Assembly recessed until the next morning, and the electing sections were convened for the purpose of electing representatives to the various standing committees. That the powers-that-be had prepared well for this aspect of the Assembly was indicated by the manner in which administration adherents were voted in from prepared slates in practically all of the sections. No chances were being taken.

FRIDAY

Friday morning the Moderator announced his appointments of chairmen of the standing committees. All the defeated candidates for Moderator were appointed excepting Dr. Robinson. This obvious cut was the subject of general lobby and hotel discussion. The chairmen were as follows:

- Bills and Overtures—Dr. Roy E. Vale
- National Missions—Dr. A. P. Higley*
- Foreign Missions—Rev. H. R. Anderson
- Christian Education—Dr. E. A. Van Nuys
- Pensions—Dr. A. J. McCartney
- Polity—Dr. Charles W. Welch
- Theological Seminaries—Dr. A. E. Magary*
- Finance—Elder E. L. Stockton
- Mileage—Elder Guy W. Davis
- Leave of Absence—Dr. E. B. King
- Synodical Records—Dr. Geo. T. Arnold
- Nominations of Members of General Council—Dr. Joseph A. Vance
- Nominations of Members of Permanent Judicial Commission—Dr. O. R. Williams*
- Resolutions of Thanks—Dr. Minot C. Morgan
- Social Welfare—Dr. Geo. E. Barnes*

The Moderator also announced the appointment of the Rev. Albert I. Good, D.D., a missionary of the West African Mission, as Vice Moderator.

GAVELITIS

No Assembly would be complete without a great deal of time having been consumed in gavel presentations. Of course, the Moderator is already in possession of a gavel. In some Assemblies, however, he is presented with enough to last a lifetime. This year there were only two. As usual, the gavels were made up of pieces of wood from this historic structure or that. The thought behind them is doubtless sincere and good, but what a waste of precious Assembly time! A long speech, also available at the time in printed form, was delivered in connection with one of the presentations. And the Moderator had to respond. There is always plenty of time in an Assembly for this sort of thing, for long dreary, weary speeches by secretaries of Boards (the word Board must now be capitalized in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.), for the toneless reading for half an hour at a time of tedious resolutions of which the commissioners actually hold printed copies in their hands. Plenty of time for anything and almost everything that it is certain cannot possibly be a matter for much if any difference of opinion. But those matters upon which discussion is likely to follow! How skillfully the docket is arranged and rearranged for their benefit. Usually they are sandwiched in between orders of

*Auburn Affirmationist

the day when little time is allowed, or else are postponed to late afternoon when everyone has been nearly anesthetized by the steady flow of eloquence. And when matters upon which the doctrinally minded minority of the Assembly is likely to become vocal finally come up, what a change comes over the conduct of affairs! The Moderator may have been sleeping through half the morning or afternoon; suddenly he reminds the commissioners that the time of the Assembly is precious. The business of the Assembly must be done with dispatch. This Assembly has no patience with those who would disturb or trouble the work of the church. It has confidence in its leadership. And so on. The air has become full of snap and vigor. The present writer has watched a good number of Assemblies at close hand. Of the last few Moderators it would be hard to pick the one who most made it his undisguised business to ride roughshod over the rights of the minority and very often of the rules of the Assembly, too. Until this year the present writer thought that, on the whole, laurels should go to Dr. Covert, especially, in view of his favorite phrase at Cleveland: "That's a good motion. We'll pass that!" But without much question Dr. Vance outdid Dr. Covert in throwing the influence of the chair solidly behind the organization and against any and all sincere attempts on the part of the minority to present its side to the Assembly. Sometimes he simply refused to recognize persons who claimed the floor and were clearly entitled to it. At other times he used ridicule of the speakers even before they were begun, as when on Tuesday afternoon he asked a commissioner from the Presbytery of Hudson, who wished to speak in favor of the Hudson overture asking that action against the Independent Board be rescinded, whether he really thought there was much use in his taking the time of the Assembly, since it had already shown by other votes what its feelings were? He actually on several occasions pronounced a time limit on speakers in debate entirely upon his own initiative, and without even bothering to ask the Assembly to vote. In putting the question he would often say: "All those present say Aye." (A chorus of Ayes.) "Those opposed, No. The Ayes have it." The last seven words would come in one breath, and he was a hardy commissioner who would interrupt the Moderator as he was talking. Dr. Vance never allowed himself to be hampered by old-fashioned ideas of Moderatorial impartiality, and gave himself full and ample opportunity to speak at any time on any motion without leaving the chair. (The only exception to this noted by the writer was when the merger of the Boards of National Missions and Christian Education was under discussion, when Dr. Vance surrendered the chair to the Vice Moderator.) But perhaps the favorite device of this year's Moderator was his habit of interrupting speakers in the middle of their speeches with a warning and an exhortation to "keep to the question." Many of the speakers thus interrupted were so obviously speaking to the question and to nothing else in the whole wide world that it was equally obvious that the interruption was a device to confuse and rattle them. I hope that if, as, and when Dr. Vance reads these words he will not say that I am "attacking" him. I am doing nothing of the sort. I am merely trying to tell what happened, and any picture of the Assembly would be a false picture, not truthful, unless it recorded these parliamentary phenomena. Further, it is becoming just a little tiresome to hear the protests of bureaucrats who feel that they have a divine right to get away with anything they please, but who talk of "personal attacks" and a "bitter, un-Christian spirit" whenever anyone simply informs the public of what has actually been happening. If the Christian sensibilities of my readers are outraged, let them be outraged by what was done, not at the fact that a relatively unimportant individual merely tells the truth in making a report. What does a report amount to if it conceals material facts? Is it designed to impart these facts, or merely to comfort those who want to feel that "All's right with the world?"

THE GHOST OF ORGANIC UNION

Dr. J. Ross Stevenson, Chairman of the Department of Church Co-operation and Union, reported at several times during the

day. As he did so, there hovered over the Assembly the frail, hardly palpable ghost of the "great achievement" of the last Assembly—namely, organic union with the United Presbyterian Church. When union was voted in Cleveland, Dr. Stevenson seemed monarch of all he surveyed, and the field was a veritable Austerlitz. But a few short days later the United Presbyterian Assembly met and, having observed somewhat the faultless operation of the steam roller in the larger church, voted down a motion to send the plan of union to its presbyteries, thus killing the movement at one stroke. Dr. Stevenson proposed, and the Assembly adopted, but not unanimously, a resolution to the effect that the following telegram be sent to the United Presbyterian Assembly, then in session:

"The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in session at Cincinnati acknowledges the report of the decision of the Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of the U.S.A. not to submit the overture on union to its presbyteries. While deeply regretting this action, the Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is grateful for the brotherly message conveyed through your Stated Clerk, and join in the hope expressed for the continuation of the co-operative spirit in every endeavor where united effort may promise greater efficiency, inspiration and accomplishments, seeking those ends that glorify His name, and adds the conviction that such co-operation can be most fully realized in and through organic union."

The adoption of this paper was not unanimous. The present reporter felt constrained to vote against it from his seat in the press table just below the platform. He did this because the wire seemed to him more than merely an exercise in courtesy. Had it been only this it would have received his support. But it expressed regret that organic union was not consummated. The present writer does not happen to share this regret. Also it declared that Christian co-operation can be most fully realized in and through organic union, which your correspondent does not believe to be the teaching of the New Testament. When the Moderator gave his usual split-second opportunity for the negative vote, a "No!" came up from the front. The Moderator paused, irritated, looked around, and discovered the present writer. "Did you vote No?" "I vote No." "Well, you still have a vote, and we will recognize it." The tone was ironical, implication was obvious, and nobody missed it.

Perhaps the most incongruous result of Dr. Stevenson's appearance before the Assembly was his appointment as a representative of the Assembly at the forthcoming Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. For the said church is the *non-concurring* church which, in 1925, refused to enter the United Church of Canada, the church that declared for its very life against the whole Church Unionist cult, whose high priest is Dr. J. Ross Stevenson. The United Church claims to be the true continuation of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, and considers the "non-concurring church" to be a mere ten years old. It is a well-known fact that the sympathies of the whole Church Union coterie in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. have been the United Church of Canada, and against the "continuing" Presbyterians. It was the Conservative element in the American Church that aided the continuing Presbyterians in their time of crisis. But the continuing Presbyterians have made such a success of it that they have become too important to ignore, and so they are to receive fraternal greetings from the arch foe of the things for which they struggled so valiantly a mere ten years ago.

PERMANENT JUDICIAL COMMISSION

The Permanent Judicial Commission makes entrances and exits before the Assembly in state which one might think would only be fitting for a Royal Highness or an Imperial Majesty. The platform is cleared of all the great and near great who sit on its hundred seats (in itself a notable accomplishment), and the Assembly rises as the fifteen members walk slowly in, attired in cutaways but without silk hats. The doors are guarded so that no one can come in or out during the presence of the Commission—or so

they are supposed to be guarded. More than once this year some poor unsuspecting commissioner, not knowing that the august Judicial Commission was reporting, somehow got past the guards and started toward his seat. Thereupon Moderator Vance, in order to stop this interruption, would arise, stop the reading of the judgment, rap for order, and in thunderous tones rendered more thunderous by the microphone, order the poor offender to retire as if he were public enemy number one bent upon assassination. The Assembly having thus been saved from interruption, and the enemy in full flight for the doors, the Moderator would allow the Commission to proceed.

I must confess that all this seems back-end-to. Why should the Assembly stand and hold its breath upon the entrance of the Commission until the Moderator raps with his gavel and men can sit down and breathe again? The *Commission* is not the supreme court of the church! The *Assembly* is, when sitting in its judicial capacity. The Commission is a body which is the *servant* of the Assembly, which is legally *under* the Assembly, whose decisions must be *approved* by the Assembly before they become effective. Why then all the standing up? It is dramatic enough, but pageantry of any true worth is supposed to symbolize some essentially sound idea. Either the procedure should be revised so that the members of the Commission would all file in themselves, stand and bow to the Assembly, or, if all this standing is for the purpose of emphasizing the majesty of the law, the Assembly should be required to rise respectfully while someone brings in and holds up a copy of the Constitution. It would be fitting (perhaps as penance) if that duty were assigned to the Stated Clerk.

The Judicial Commission reported on three cases: one that of A. R. Evans against the Synod of Oregon, in which the papers were found not in order, one of Oswald T. Allis, et al, against the Synod of Pennsylvania in the matter of its manner of choosing a Judicial Commission, which was dismissed, and the last a complaint against the Synod of Pennsylvania by John H. Dale and others, respecting an answer by the Synod to a memorial from the Presbytery of Northumberland, which was dismissed as not involving doctrine or the Constitution of the church. The complaint from the Synod of Pennsylvania, involving the licensure of Mr. Walter T. Jackson, was withdrawn by the parties, and the Commission so noted.

After the Assembly had again risen and then resumed a sitting position, it took up various recommendations of the General Council interrupted by the appearance of the Commission. The Assembly heard Ruling Elder J. Willison Smith, of Philadelphia, member of the Council, present a basic budget of \$8,000,000; a budget for the General Assembly of \$194,543; a budget of the General Council for "United Promotion" of \$67,225.95; a per capita communicant apportionment of nine cents.

Dr. Raymon Kistler, of Rochester, New York, recommended that the General Council's Committee on Program and Field Activities be henceforth known as "The Committee on United Promotion of the General Council." This was adopted.

Referring to "A Program of Advance" pamphlet which had been placed in the hands of the Commissioners, Dr. Kistler reported a recommendation of the General Council that the church at once launch a Four-Year Program of Advance. This recommendation of 1935-1936 as "A Year of Discovery and Appraisal," during which there is to be produced "a program arising out of the thinking of the church for the following three years, leading up to the Sesqui-Centennial of the General Assembly" in 1938-1939. During this Year of Discovery and Appraisal, the Council recommended that it should "be our united purpose throughout the whole Church:

"To direct the Church's attention to existing programs of spiritual emphasis approved by the General Assembly as valuable aids in furthering the work of Christ in the local parish and throughout the denomination: such as programs of Evangelism, Youth Spiritual Emphasis, Women's Spiritual Life Groups, Social Education, Stewardship, Temperance, World Peace, Social Justice, and the Kingdom causes in the Boards.

"To organize our forces for a better Every Member Canvass this coming year; and through faithful and prayerful witnessing in pulpit and life make this year's evangelistic endeavor the most fruitful the church has ever known."

No effort of "Discovery and Appraisal" looking to finding and dealing with Modernism in the life or official work of the church was recommended by the Council.

The Assembly recessed and at once reassembled outside the Auditorium for the taking of the annual Assembly photograph.

NATIONAL MISSIONS-EDUCATION MERGER

On Friday afternoon the National Missions wing of the ecclesiastical machine again impressed upon the General Council wing that it was not alone on the driver's seat. By a decisive vote, in spite of high-pressure sales spellbinding, it rejected the General Council proposal that the Boards of National Missions and Christian Education be merged. The Council presented a concrete plan for the merging, down to the last crossed "t" of the enabling resolutions. Dr. Kistler supplied the pressure by warning the Assembly that this consolidation *must* be done, and must be done *now*. Confidence in the committee of five who had made up the plan was represented as being involved in the vote. Politic Dr. Mark A. Matthews was called upon to lend his influence for the merger by reading aloud part of the printed report that the commissioners all had in their hands anyway. Probably feeling that it was doubtful whether the report was to be adopted, he announced that, while of course he had had a part in preparing it, he reserved the right to be for or against it later. With this enigmatic reservation, he destroyed the effect which his reading of the report was probably designed to produce.

Other speakers were, for the merger: Dean Marshall S. Brown, of New York; Dr. J. Harry Cotton, of Columbus, and Dr. Covert. Against an immediate merger: Dr. John H. Thompson, of Hudson Presbytery; Dr. D. W. Hollinger, of Trenton, New Jersey, erst-while prosecutor of Dr. Machen, and Dr. R. E. Vale, of Detroit. The last-named speaker proposed a three years' hoist for the merger, a study of possible co-operation of the two Boards without a merger being made in the meantime by the Inter-Board Commission. This was in the form of an amendment to the motion to adopt the report which recommended the merger. An amendment to the amendment was offered by Dr. Jesse Herrmann, of Lexington, Kentucky, friend of the General Council, to postpone for only one year. This, however, was not until after Dr. Covert had attempted to get the Assembly to adjourn discussion of the merger until Monday. Had this been adopted, the Council would have been able to exert what pressure it could over the week-end, and perhaps swing the voters into line. But the National Board wing contemplated no such opportunity for a turning in the tide; it voted down a motion to adjourn, and finally adopted Dr. Herrmann's amendment, most of the commissioners probably feeling that killing it for a year was about all one Assembly could do anyway.

Earlier in the afternoon the Assembly had listened to more reports from the Department of Church Co-operation and Union, including appointing of fraternal delegates to other bodies, and the hearing of speeches by delegates from other bodies. The latter, however, were not so numerously present as at Assemblies of other years. Dr. W. H. Matthews, of the American Tract Society, was heard in an address, and resolutions were adopted commending this work and that of the American Bible Society to the churches. The Assembly also received the report of the National Capital Commission, which reported progress.

COMMITTEE ON POLITY

In one year's Assembly the important Committee might be the Committee on Bills and Overtures; another year it might be the Committee on Foreign Missions. This year the Committee on Polity was in the limelight due to the fact that the challenge of the right of the three members of the Independent Board had been referred to it. Of course, the three persons concerned did not at

any time after the challenges were made wholly indulge in delusions that they would be allowed to remain in the Assembly. This was not due to any doubt as to their legal or moral right to sit, but based solely upon the conviction that the ecclesiastical machine, no matter what its internal dissensions and scrambling for power, was united in desiring to "crack down" upon them, law or no law, justice or no justice. Of course, the city was buzzing with rumors, which changed every hour on the hour. Rumors were almost as plentiful as in the Army, just prior to the Armistice of November 11, 1918.

The three challenged persons had informed the Committee on Polity that they desired a hearing on the matter. At about a quarter past nine on Friday evening, they were invited by phone to come to the place where the Committee was in session. It will not be necessary here to go into the details of the hearing before that Committee, except to say that while it was evident that some members were impressed by our position, it was also evident that in spite of his careful courtesy, the chairman of the Committee, Dr. Welch, was hostile, and that he would doubtless carry his group with him. Repeated attempts were made by the chairman to get the three challenged men into a discussion of the merits of the whole case concerning the Independent Board and the official Board, which were, of course, entirely irrelevant, and only bound to confuse the issue. The three persons tried to confine themselves, without being rude, to the matters before the Committee. Judge Ernest H. Boyd, of Tennessee, a commissioner, voluntarily and graciously appeared also before the Committee, to argue the legal and moral right of the three to their seats. However, it was plain from that moment that the Committee would be for unseating.

How did the three persons concerned feel about it? It has been hinted by the opposition that they took great enjoyment in regarding themselves as martyrs. This is not so. In the first place, they regarded themselves as innocent of conscious sin or offense in belonging to the Independent Board, but rather regarded it as a fulfillment of a duty laid upon them by God. They knew that they had been constitutionally elected by their presbyteries, and that they were ministers in good and regular standing. They knew that if they were unseated it would be because they had taken their stand on principle. All three believe in the sovereignty of God. They were in His hands. If by their being unseated, men should be awakened to the ruthless tyranny of the ecclesiastical machine, and God should be glorified in the opening of men's eyes, then they were willing to be unseated. They did not pray to be unseated, for that would be praying that others might commit a sinful injustice. They did pray that God might give them grace to be kind yet firm, not to rail if railed at, in all things to be loving toward all, no matter what men might do, but above everything else that they might simply be faithful to the Lord Jesus Christ. And they now believe that those prayers were answered, and that seems very much more important than the vote of the General Assembly.

SATURDAY

Saturday was comparatively uneventful. The report of the Standing Committee on Pensions brought forth no more than routine discussion. The Committee on Bills and Overtures began bringing recommendations to the Assembly, reporting recommendations on ten papers and overtures within about half an hour or less. All were adopted. The General Council, also, reported a mass of recommendations which were adopted, nine in all. Chief color of the day was provided by Dr. Covert, in relinquishing the chairmanship of the General Council to Dr. Vance.

It should be remembered that the Assembly is influenced, usually to a predominant degree, by persons who are not members of it. The Assembly city is filled with persons interested in the work of the church, but not members of the Assembly. One Presbyterian present in Cincinnati who never appeared upon either the floor or the platform of the Assembly, nevertheless cast his long shadow over much of the proceedings. That person was Dr. J. Gresham Machen. Before he had been many hours in Cincinnati, the news-

papers had discovered him, and he was telling them exactly what he thought of conditions in the church, to the great discomfort of the party in power. Inevitably, he was sometimes misquoted or partially quoted, but the net effect was that the fact of the doctrinal cleavage in the church was given prominence. Dr. Machen also spoke twice over the radio from Station WLW. Now the bureaucrats in the church are dead against either press or radio publicity—unless they themselves are the persons taking advantage of it. In the latter case they have no objection, and they used both in Cincinnati, while themselves attacking Dr. Machen for using those means to acquaint the public with issues in the church. The color that was brought into the Saturday morning session of the Assembly was an attack by Dr. Covert upon Dr. Machen, though he did not mention him by name, together with a fling at Dr. Cruikshank, who had asked that the church be returned to the people. That last request must have rankled. At any rate, Dr. Covert engaged in a "defense" of the General Council, into which all these things were drawn. The Council, he said, is Presbyterian, a natural growth of the Presbyterian system. (!) It exalts the Presbytery. It is a co-ordinator. It is a stabilizer. It is evangelistic. It is God-honored. Excerpts: "I have never seen in the pastorate . . . more genuine self-sacrifice and devotion of self to the cause of Christ committed to them than in our Board secretaries. . . . I want to say how I hate to see these men so often misrepresented and harshly judged by those who have not waited for the facts, or who have conceived such prejudices that even facts have no power to change their minds or speech. . . . *The General Council has from the beginning magnified the major unit in our ecclesiastical mechanism, the presbytery.* It has given the presbytery back to the people. It never approaches any church program or problem except through presbytery and its committees. Today, when some men are inclined to avoid the presbytery and carry matters that presbytery stands ready to decide, to the newspapers and microphones before a jury of casual hearers, I am glad the General Council is standing here to magnify the exclusive place and use of the presbytery in getting things done in the Presbyterian church. The sooner the Presbyterian church rises up to insist that her judicial cases be tried in her presbyteries, not before the public, the sooner will we find the way of good order and Presbyterian procedure. . . ."

What amazed some people most about this speech was the assertion that the General Council never approaches any problems except through presbytery. Has Dr. Covert forgotten the "proposed action" of 1934, proposed to the General Assembly by the Council, in which the whole orderly process of trial was turned upside down, and where action was begun in the Assembly instead of in the presbyteries, where original jurisdiction resides? In his defense of Board secretaries, while he spoke of misrepresentation, did he go into the *facts*, as Conservatives have been vainly trying to get those same secretaries to do? And in his zeal for the presbyteries, did he two days later fight against the unseating of three commissioners who were, in effect, being declared guilty of offenses while never having been convicted by their presbyteries? He did—not.

SUNDAY

On Sunday many of the commissioners occupied pulpits, while more of them occupied pews. Your correspondent was in the latter group. He heard Dr. Machen preach twice—in the morning at the Trinity Lutheran Church, which meets in the Y.W.C.A. Auditorium, downtown, and in the evening at the First Presbyterian Church on Walnut Hills, Dr. W. F. McMillin, minister. Both churches were well filled, and commissioners were much in evidence. In the evening Dr. Machen preached a sermon in which he showed the gospel implicit in the sometimes supposedly non-doctrinal "Sermon on the Mount." It was a masterly discourse, pulsing with love and devotion, and it held its great throng of hearers hushed until the final syllable.

Others occupying prominent pulpits were Burleigh Cruikshank, Robert Watson, John McDowell, C. B. McAfee, W. C. Covert, W. E. Biederwolf, Mark Matthews, C. R. Erdman, Harry Rim-

mer, Carl McIntire, R. E. Speer, Charles J. Woodbridge, and others. The Moderator, of course, preached in Mount Auburn, the host church, in the morning.

MONDAY

Monday was, without much question, the most dramatic day of the Assembly. The morning sederunt was given over principally to the Standing Committee on Christian Education, with routine addresses and recommendations. In addition, however, an answer was sent to the Presbytery of New York in its query concerning the Independent Board membership of James E. Bennet, Esq. An aura of mystery has surrounded this communication from the beginning. It was adopted in a closed session of the Presbytery, transmitted in confidence to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, and refused to Mr. Bennet when he wished to find out just what action the Presbytery had taken in his case. The Stated Clerk of the Assembly transmitted the communication to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, which itself reported to the Assembly without, so far as this correspondent has been able to find out, actually reading the contents of the document to the Assembly. It has been rumored that the Presbytery respectfully informed the General Assembly that it had examined the Book of Discipline, could see nothing for it to do next, and craved instructions. This account would fit in with the reply of the Assembly, as recommended by the Committee on Bills and Overtures. It said, "Recommended that the Assembly acknowledge the expression of loyal intent of the Presbytery of New York, and that the responsibility of this matter be left where it has been placed—with the Presbytery of New York and the session of the Fort Washington Presbyterian Church."

Action was also taken enlarging the Board of Foreign Missions by four new memberships. In addition, the Standing Committee brought in its nominations for membership in the Board forty-five minutes ahead of the docket. The Rev. Carl McIntire, who would have placed a Conservative slate in nomination, arrived at the Assembly before the matter was supposed to come up on the docket, to find that the Assembly had taken a quick adjournment. Later in the day he asked that an opportunity be given to him to make his nominations, but this opportunity was voted down by the Assembly.

The nominations for the Board of Foreign Missions were as follows (comments are those of the standing committee):

Class of 1935-1938:

- (1) John Grier Buchanan, Esq.—1934. Lawyer, East Liberty Church, Pittsburgh, a Ruling Elder.
- (2) Mrs. Edward L. Cleveland, Lafayette Avenue Church, Brooklyn, President, Presbyterian Society of Brooklyn-Nassau, 1935.
- (3) Mrs. Daniel J. Fleming—1923. Englewood First Church, Jersey City Presbytery.
- (4) The Rev. William Hiram Foulkes—1932. Pastor, Old First Church, Newark, New Jersey, Newark Presbytery.
- (5) President Cheesman A. Herrick, LL.D.—1923. Ruling Elder, Philadelphia (Arch Street Church), President of Girard College.
- (6) Miss Margaret E. Hodge, vice-president 1923, an honored name honorably carried; Chestnut Hill Church, Philadelphia North Presbytery.
- (7) The Rev. Robert M. Russell, D.D.—1926. Pastor, Larchmont Church, Westchester Presbytery.
- (8) Mrs. Vincent T. Shipley—1935. Tabernacle Church, Philadelphia Presbytery, former President Presbyterian Society.
- (9) Mr. James M. Speers—1908. Vice-president of the Board, Ruling Elder, Central Church, Montclair, Newark Presbytery.
- (10) The Rev. J. Ross Stevenson, President, Princeton Theological Seminary, Baltimore Presbytery.
- (11) Miss Harriet Righter, First Church, Brooklyn, Presbytery of Brooklyn-Nassau.
- (12) The Rev. Louis H. Evans, D.D., Pastor, Third Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Presbytery of Pittsburgh.

(13) B. Carter Millikin, Ruling Elder, First Ambler Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia North Presbytery.

(14) Mrs. Leo Voght, Webster Groves Church, St. Louis Presbytery, Retiring President of the Presbyterial Society.

(15) The Rev. F. Paul McConkey, D.D., Pastor, Immanuel Church, Detroit, Presbytery of Detroit.

Class of 1933-1936:

The Rev. Paul C. Johnston, D.D., Pastor, Westminster Church, Lincoln, Nebraska, Presbytery of Lincoln.

Class of 1934-1937:

The Rev. Francis Shunk Downs, D.D., Pastor, First Church, Berkeley, California, Presbytery of San Francisco.

THREE COMMISSIONERS UNSEATED

After considerable routine business in the afternoon, the long-awaited report of the Committee on Polity was heard. Why the Committee had taken so long was probably explained by the persistent report that the majority was trying to wear down the minority, so as to present a unanimous report. This the Committee did not do, however, for after all the pressure had been brought to bear, one solitary member stuck to his guns and voted against the report. The report of the Committee was read by Dr. Welch. After a brief summary of the facts in the case, and a recital of the action of the 1934 Assembly, the report said:

"In view of these specific directions of the supreme judicatory of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and the emphatic declaration to your Committee by the three ministers that they have not complied with this direction, the simple question presented is whether these individual ministers shall be allowed to disregard and defy the directions of the 1934 General Assembly and claim to exercise all the rights and privileges of membership in the 1935 General Assembly, or whether this General Assembly—which represents the whole church—shall require from them due respect to its authority.

"Your Committee on Polity is of the opinion that there can be only one answer to this question, and that the General Assembly must not hesitate in its duty to make that answer. The right of protest against an action of the General Assembly, when expressed in the proper terms and spirit, and with due acknowledgment of subordination to its authority, is a right which belongs to every minister and elder under its jurisdiction. The exercise of this right of protest, however, according to the Book of Discipline, Chapter 11, Sec. 5, never justifies the person protesting in disobedience and non-submission. On the contrary, it implies no more than a recognition of the right to satisfy his conscience. No individual minister or elder, therefore, can openly resist the authority of the General Assembly, and disregard and defy its solemn decisions, and at the same time claim the rights and privileges which are attached to membership therein. Any constitutional body—secular or religious—which permits such a practice would be in danger of collapse and destruction."

Then followed the recommendations for the unseating of the three, the payment of their expenses, and an exhortation that the persons unseated "will study and pursue the things which make for the peace and unity of our beloved church."

A short debate was then held on the motion to adopt the report. Speaking for the report was the Rev. E. B. Chaffee, Auburn Affirmationist, of New York, who declared that he had voted against the mandate last year but that now the Assembly had spoken, these persons had not obeyed, and they would have to bear the consequences. Thus the distinguished pastor of the Labor Temple and the Editor of *The Presbyterian Tribune* lightly waved aside the basic principle of Protestant Reformation (that God alone in His Word is Lord of the Conscience)—a principle which was emphatically stated in the first, non-doctrinal portion of the Auburn Affirmation. It shows to this writer at least just how much consistency and real liberalism can be expected from so called "liberals" once they are in power. Others speaking for the motion were Dr. William F. McDermott, of Chicago, and Elder A. L. Jackson, of Baltimore. Dr. McDermott was nothing if not

specific. He exhorted the Assembly to do its duty, said that this was all part of the work of the group that had organized its own seminary and was always making trouble. These people were a cancer in the life of the church, he said, and the sooner the operation was begun, the better. This sweet language brought no rebuke from the Moderator. A few minutes later, however, the Rev. H. Warren Allen, of Minneapolis, speaking against the report, said that it was hard for him to tell whether he was in the United States or in Russia. Immediately, organization sympathizers began to boo and hiss. The Moderator jumped to his feet, but to the surprise of those who expected him to rebuke the hissers, he turned to Mr. Allen, warning him not to use such language further, and paid no attention to the hissers. Others speaking against the report were Elder R. L. Railey, of Miami, Florida, and Dr. Robert Scott Inglis, of Newark, New Jersey. Both were interrupted by the Moderator.

With the usual acumen of the organization, the matter under discussion had been left until late in the afternoon. Time for adjournment having now come, it was moved. This was lost, since the majority definitely wished to end the matter quickly. Many commissioners wished to speak to the resolution. The present writer tried in vain to get recognition from the chair, and asked pointedly whether the persons involved were to be heard at all. Finally, the Moderator proposed and the Assembly adopted a motion to end all further general debate. The three persons involved were to be given five minutes each, Dr. Welch was again to be heard, and then the vote was to be taken. This was done.

The three challenged commissioners were heard in the following order: Mr. Griffiths, Mr. MacPherson, and Mr. McIntire. It is unnecessary to try to recapitulate their remarks, but a short statement of their argument is pertinent. They were, they said, ministers in good and regular standing in their presbyteries. Their commissions were regular and in order. If they were to be unseated, it must be upon the ground that they were guilty of an offense which would deprive them of the rights of ministers in good standing. In the Presbyterian Church there was and always had been a lawful and definite manner of finding a person guilty of an offense. Charges and specifications must be filed before the presbytery. Each side had a day in court. From the final judgment either side might appeal. That was the only constitutional manner of finding a man guilty and taking away his privileges as a minister. Any other method was lawlessness, even if followed by the General Assembly itself, for the Assembly was under the Constitution. It was one of the great glories of our system, both in church and in state, that a man is innocent until proved guilty by due process of law. This was not due process. This was conviction by resolution, not by trial. Guilt was simply being assumed. The Assembly had the right to decide as to its own membership, surely, but only within limits laid down in the Constitution. It could not forbid a seat to those elected to it provided they fitted the constitutional requirements for those presenting commissions. Any other conclusion would place minorities at the unrestrained mercy of majorities, and would be repugnant to every consideration of sound order. We love the church, we love its law, we claim the protection of that law, and ask that the Assembly itself live within that law.

Although the present reporter was an interested party, he can honestly say that never in any Assembly has he witnessed a scene so dramatic and so filled with significance as this. Many were deeply stirred. A shift in sentiment upon the part of many commissioners was as palpable as was the whole physical scene. Many men there really saw with their own eyes what they might have refused to believe had they read it in a report like this. Without question the strength of the opposition practically doubled and perhaps more, in the half hour of debate. When Dr. Welch had closed by appealing to the commissioners to remember that the members of his committee had consciences too—the relevancy of which was difficult to see—and after the Moderator had managed to slip in a few observations of his own here and there, the vote was taken, *viva voce*. Of course, the Ayes had it, but the chorus of

Noes was large. Experienced occupants of the press table estimated the proportions at about five to three, some thought more, some thought a little less. At least a third of the Assembly voted against the unseating, and the fact that many persons previously hostile to the minority were now favorable to it was evidenced by an innumerable amount of personal conversations. In the judgment of this reporter, the organization made a grave mistake in thus riding roughshod over the law of the church. It will live to regret it.

This action over, the Assembly adjourned.

TUESDAY

THE BLACKSTONE-KAUFFROTH JUDGMENT

Outstanding event of Tuesday morning was the presentation of judgment of the Permanent Judicial Commission in the Blackstone-Kauffroth case from the Presbytery of Chester and the Synod of Pennsylvania. This was without question the most important matter before the Assembly. Could students be required to pledge support of the Boards of the church for the future, or non-support of the Independent Board? The commission said no. Such a requirement would in effect be adding to the Constitution. This judgment also, without doubt, cuts into the heart of the whole organization position concerning the legal rights of members of the Independent Board, for if it is unlawful to add these requirements on candidates for licensure and ordination, it is certainly unlawful to lay them on ministers and office bearers already ordained.

The organization at once began to whisper it about that this was a Modernist decision, leaving the presbyteries free to do as they please. A careful reading of the judgment reveals, however, that this is not so, and that the presbyteries are held to be strictly accountable for fidelity to the Constitution. This judgment is of such moment and interest that it is printed in full in another page of this issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

Amid a mass of detail, the Assembly the same morning found time to adopt two resolutions concerning religious persecution in Germany. The first was sent to the "Confessional Synod" in Germany, which Synod is in a strikingly similar situation, taking exactly the same legal and moral ground as is the Independent Board in America. It resists authority which it holds to be unlawfully exercised. Read what the 147th General Assembly said to them:

"The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. sends the following message to the leaders of the Confessional Synod in Germany: 'The members of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., assembled in Cincinnati on May 28, express to you our increasing concern over the renewed trials upon you our brethren, while at the same time we are filled with admiration for your steadfastness. Two Timothy 4: 7. Our thoughts and prayers are with you always. May our Father who is in heaven have you in his keeping. Revelation 2: 10'."

The message was adopted by a rising vote of the Assembly, which was led in prayer by Vice-Moderator Good.

By a further vote of the Assembly, the following letter was ordered to be presented to Herr Hans Luther, German Ambassador to the United States:

"Your Excellency:

"Persistent and alarming reports have been reaching the members of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. concerning the treatment of the churches in Germany. We have noted in particular the arrest of pastors; the use of police intimidation to compel compliance with regulations which the Confessional Synod does not regard as consistent or binding; the holding of the great meeting of neo-pagans on the 26th of April at the Sport Palace in Berlin apparently with the approval of the government; the use of the radio with the approval of the Minister of Propaganda on two occasions in Easter week for the dissemination of distinctly anti-Christian teaching; numerous arrests of Roman Catholics; and the removal from office of distinguished professors of religion in the universities on grounds that seem distinctly to indicate a policy of approximating persecution for Christian conviction.

"May we respectfully inquire from you whether these reports represent the facts, and if not what assurance we may give our people that promises of the German government to respect the rights of the churches are being fulfilled. We are not seeking to concern ourselves with political aspects of the situation, but are deeply aroused over the apparent threat to the very substance of the Christian religion."

The report of the Standing Committee on National Missions was also heard on Tuesday morning. It was of a routine nature, and included singing by a colored quartet and remarks from an assorted number of workers, some in foreign tongues.

On Tuesday afternoon the Committee on Social Welfare, Dr. George E. Barnes, chairman, reported. In contrast with last year, the report was comparatively mild and did not excite much discussion.

Three overtures were sent down to the presbyteries without much discussion, upon recommendation of the Committee on Bills and Overtures. One, from the Presbytery of Lehigh, provides specifically that no changes in the terms of a call may be made without consent by the presbytery. The second, from the Presbytery of Chicago, lifts restrictions against salaried officers of Boards being members of General Councils. The third, originating in the Presbytery of Cincinnati, forbids the mortgaging of church property without the consent of the presbytery. These overtures will all be voted upon by the presbyteries this year.

RESCINDING OVERTURES VOTED DOWN

The overtures asking that the Assembly rescind the action of the last Assembly received short shrift both from the Moderator and the majority. Speakers in favor of nullifying the action of the last Assembly included the Rev. E. Van Dyke Wight, of Hudson Presbytery, and the Rev. A. Franklin Faucette, of the Presbytery of Northumberland. Dr. Wight was summarily halted by the Moderator as "not speaking on the question." The motion that the Assembly declare the action of last year to be of no present force and effect was voted down, and the Moderator ruled out of order any motion rescinding the action, on the ground that one Assembly could not rescind the acts of another. This was in spite of the fact that a motion providing that another action of a previous Assembly be rescinded had been passed previously without objection from the Moderator.

To do the matter up, the Assembly then concurred in the overtures approving the mandate against the Independent Board, which were interpreted by the Moderator as being a reaffirmance of the 1934 action.

The overture from the Presbytery of West Jersey asking for reform in the official Board of Foreign Missions was also voted down with dispatch.

PHILADELPHIA AND CHESTER TO BE VISITED BY "COMMISSION"

The highlight of Tuesday afternoon was the presentation to the Assembly of two petitions from Modernist minorities in the Presbyteries of Philadelphia and Chester, asking for a commission to investigate alleged irregularities and violations of law in the presbyteries. Practically identical in wording, authorship was generally attributed to the Rev. William B. Pugh, of Chester. These so-called petitions or memorials had not been sent through the presbyteries concerned, and were a great surprise to their conservative commissioners present, although some of the commissioners from each presbytery were actually signers of the petitions! No opportunity was given to the presbyteries concerned to make or to prepare any defense or case in their own behalf. Several representatives upon the spur of the moment appeared before the Committee on Bills and Overtures, and said what they could. Two reports came from the committee. The majority report recommended appointment of a commission. The minority report, signed by four as against sixteen, recommended no action. After quick, sharp debate, the minority report was defeated and the majority report adopted. Drs. W. E. Jordan and Burleigh Cruik-

shank, of Philadelphia, spoke for the minority report. As a token of harmony, and in relation to public reports and impressions (amply justified by fact) that this was a Modernist Assembly, the Moderator asked all present to rise and repeat the Apostles' Creed. This was done. Repeating the Creed in this fashion has become a matter of regular procedure after an Assembly has taken some particularly outrageous action. But does it make a wrong action right?

WEDNESDAY

The final day of an Assembly is always packed full of last-minute detail, and includes the report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Missions.

The retiring class of the Permanent Judicial Commission are all re-elected. Terms are supposed to be six years, with no eligibility for re-election. Since the retiring class had served only four years as a class, it was ruled that all its members were eligible for re-election.

The report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Missions was of the usual commendatory nature. Dr. Oswald T. Allis, and Elder Roland K. Armes, both of Philadelphia, spoke against the report, Dr. Allis pointing out that there were very serious charges against the Board which had never been satisfactorily answered. At the conclusion of Dr. Allis's remarks, the Moderator said:

"The remarks of Dr. Allis involve a constitutional procedure on which the Moderator asks the privilege of saying a word.

"Dr. Allis says that he is acquainted with some of those who are spreading this propaganda. The Presbyterian Church is a constitutional church. If any missionary of our church or any of its secretaries or any member of its board is guilty of unorthodoxy or immorality, it is the privilege of anyone to bring charges of it before his presbytery. If the presbytery action is not satisfactory, appeal from it may be taken to the synod; and if the synod action is not satisfactory, appeal may be taken to the General Assembly.

"The man who circulates such charges without establishing them by this constitutional procedure lays himself liable to charges of slandering his brother. Our church has been patient, almost infinitely patient, with the circulation of these unestablished charges and, if I do not mistake its temper, has about reached the place of calling those circulating them into court."

Dr. Vance's statement ignored the fact, of which he must be aware, that Boards as such cannot be called before a presbytery, or dealt with by the ordinary processes of discipline. If by the threat at the end of his statement, Dr. Vance means that the or-

ganization is willing to face the charges fairly and squarely before the courts, either secular or ecclesiastical, Conservatives will rejoice, for they have been trying for a long time to get the organization to meet the issues.

(For an account of a further incident including Dr. Allis and the Moderator, see the editorial pages.)

As usual, a great effort was made to generate enthusiasm for the Foreign Board by appealing to loyalty and affection for the person and reputation of its Senior Secretary, Dr. Robert E. Speer. A commendatory resolution was passed by a rising vote, those rising repeating the First Psalm together as their estimate of the life of, and tribute to, Dr. Speer.

After listening to required routine reports, and after selecting Syracuse, New York, as the next place of meeting, the Assembly sang "Blest be the Tie that Binds" and was dissolved with prayer by the Moderator.

CONCLUSION

In concluding this report, I wish to make special mention of the true and deep fellowship found at the Assembly and in the Assembly city between many brethren who are like-minded in their love for the gospel and their deep grief over the growing apostasy. Never-to-be-forgotten are the gatherings for counsel and prayer held each night in a room in the Hotel Gibson donated by a friend. It was to one commissioner at least a veritable oasis in what was sometimes a dreary desert of words. And it gave new reason to remember that there are very many still, in the church, who are standing and will stand for the faith. The General Assembly is in the main a body composed of representatives of *majorities*; large *minorities* in many presbyteries are not represented at all. Certainly the overwhelming majorities usually rolled up in the Assembly are not representative of the true sentiment of the church. That sentiment is mainly inarticulate, but much of it is beginning to gather coherency and will surely be felt.

After all, however, it must be recognized that conservatives are in a minority in the church's courts, and are likely to be so for a long time to come unless they are expelled by the majority. What should they do? To this writer, at least, the answer is simple: adhere faithfully to the truth of God as given in His Word, try as best they can to win others to an understanding of what is involved in the present crisis, and then commit themselves into the hands of their God, knowing that any path in which He may lead them is the way they should rejoice to go. For the future belongs to Him.

H. McA. G.

Sunday School Lessons for July

(International Uniform Series)

By Edward J. Young

Lesson for July 7, 1935

MOSES—LEADER AND LAWGIVER

(Lesson Text—Exodus 24: 3-8, 12-18. Golden Text—Psalm 33: 12a)

The study of the life of Moses, from whatever angle it be undertaken, cannot fail to yield rich results. There can be no doubt but that Moses was by far the greatest character of the Old Testament. Concerning him, the epistle to the Hebrews says that "he was faithful in all his house (*i.e.*, the Old Testament dispensation) as a servant." (Heb. 3: 2-5.) Of all the prophets he was the greatest, being honored by the fact that God spoke to him "mouth unto mouth" (*i.e.*, directly) and not indirectly nor in riddles, as to the other

prophets. (Num. 12: 8.) The Lord claims Moses as "My servant, faithful in all My house" (Num. 12: 7), and the Great Prophet to be raised up (Deut. 18: 15-19) would be like unto Moses. We might do well to consider Moses as a man of prayer, one who sought constantly the guidance of Jehovah. The noble and distinguished character of this man likewise offers us encouragement. Here was one who rejected the "pleasure of Egypt," who could not bear unjust oppression, who would in no sense compromise with false religion, and who insisted upon purity of worship and belief. Here are needed lessons for us. Likewise, the patience of Moses is notable. One who has traveled in the Sinai desert can well appreciate it. What a statesman Moses was! Under God he organized a

band of slaves in a foreign nation and led them safely through the wilderness. His courage, fidelity, willingness to be lost that his people might be saved, his faith and far-sightedness—all these furnish us with food for thought and meditation.

Moses however, stands out primarily, not because of the excellent qualities which he possesses, but because he was over the Old Testament economy. Through him God gave the Law, the schoolmaster which was to lead to Christ. Moses is the great Lawgiver. In the Scripture verses which form the basis of our study we see Moses as the Mediator between God and the people.

Verses 3-8. The ceremony described in these verses is called "the covenant which the Lord hath made with you." Moses first recites the words of the Lord and all the judgments. We would not be too arbitrary in distinguishing between the words and judgments, but it is probable that the "words" refer to Exodus 20: 22-26, and the "judgments" to Exodus 20-23 (*i.e.*, the Book of the Covenant). To this recitation of the

covenant the people express their agreement. "All the words which the Lord hath said will we do." It may appear that this acceptance was expressed too willingly, yet as Calvin says, "It (*i.e.*, the people's declaration) contains nothing amiss or reprehensible inasmuch as the faithful among them promised nothing, except in reliance upon the help of God; and gratuitous reconciliation, if they should sin, was included in it." Moses then wrote the words of the covenant.

On the next day an altar of stones was built with twelve boundary stones about it, thus representing the presence of Jehovah and the twelve tribes in covenant union. Young men were then sent to sacrifice and the emphasis should be placed upon the fact that they were young; strong and active. Their position was a substitutionary one, "because in their persons the nation was received into fellowship with God by means of sprinkling of the blood, which was performed in a peculiar manner, to suit the unique design of this sacrificial ceremony." (Keil and Delitzsch.)

The manner of sacrifice is interesting. Half the blood was placed on the altar and half in basins. This division thus had reference to the two parties of the covenant, which, through the covenant, were brought into union. Here we are reminded again of the fact that "without shedding of blood there is no remission." (Heb. 9:22.) If a sinful people is to approach Jehovah, there must be a sacrifice, and that sacrifice must be substitutionary in character. Nevertheless, these burnt offerings and peace offerings cannot take away sins. John Calvin well says, "Under the Law there was no true and real expiation to wash away the guilt of sins; but the office of the Law was to lead men step by step to Christ, that they might seek of Him pardon and the Spirit of regeneration. It is therefore, unquestionable, that the elect of God, embraced by faith the substance and truth of the shadows when they voluntarily offered themselves to keep the covenant of God."

Verses 12-18. Here is pictured to us the unique position which Moses enjoyed as mediator between God and Israel, and at the same time the way is prepared for the revelation which follows concerning the erection of the tabernacle and ordinances of worship. (For forty days Moses is alone on the mount. This reminds us of his second stay of forty days on Sinai [Exodus 34:28], of Elijah's journey to Horeb [I Kings 19:8], of Christ's temptation for forty days [Matthew 4:21], and of Israel's forty years of wandering. The occurrence of this number "forty" may merely be a coincidence, and may be without particular significance.)

The scene which our verses describe is a rugged and majestic one. Mount Sinai (which the writer believes to be the traditional peak Ras Es-Sufsafah, in the southern part of the Siani peninsula) is a majestic and awe-inspiring mountain. The rugged grandeur of the country forms a fitting background for the giving of the Law and

the covenant between Jehovah and His people. As we Christians read of this mount and its message of condemnation, the "hand-writing of ordinances that was against us," we thank God that, on another mount, far to the north, outside a city wall, that "hand-writing of ordinances" was nailed to the Cross of our Savior, through whose death we are justified from all things, from which we could not be justified by the Law of Moses.

Lesson for July 14, 1935

NAOMI—A WOMAN OF FAITH AND COURAGE

(*Lesson Text*—Ruth 1:14-22, 4:14-17. *Golden Text*—Proverbs 31:30)

It is not unusual to hear said today that the standard of ethics presented in the Old Testament is on an exceedingly low plane. As the Book of Ruth shows, such a statement is far from the truth. The author is unknown to us, but it is likely that the work was written at some time after the events which it describes. The purpose seems to be to relate Naomi to the ancestry of David. Wholly apart from this purpose, however, the book presents us with charming characters. There are those who study Ruth as a type of the church, the Bride of Christ, but since there is no New Testament warrant for such procedure, we believe it to be precarious.

Chapter one, verses 14-22. Naomi is presented to us as one who seeks not her own but the good of others. With her husband, Elimelech and her two sons Mahlon and Chilion, she had left Bethlehem of Judea because of the famine there, and crossed the Jordan River to Moab. (The reader should locate these names upon the map.) In Moab her husband had died, and after his death, the two sons married Moabite women, Orpah and Ruth. About ten years passed, when Naomi's two sons also died. Hearing that the famine in Bethlehem had passed, and that the land was plentiful with sustenance, Naomi starts out for her homeland, accompanied by her two daughters-in-law. On the way she entreats them to leave her, saying that she has no more sons to give them. Possibly she is too polite to intimate that, since Orpah and Ruth are Moabite women, they may not be able to obtain husbands among the Hebrews. Finally Orpah kisses Naomi and takes her leave, but Ruth refuses to depart.

Naomi urges Ruth to follow the example of her sister-in-law. "Thy sister in law is gone back unto her people and unto her gods." Some students believe that, because she stayed in Moab so long, Naomi was no longer zealous concerning the Living and True God, and was merely concerned about the material welfare of her daughter-in-law. Her later statements however (*e.g.*, 1:20-22) do not bear this out. Naomi knows that the two women cannot find happiness with her and so urges them to go where they can

find it. In this action her unselfish character is shown.

We cannot but thrill as we read the answer of Ruth. (Vs. 16.) She has thrown in her whole lot with Naomi, and only death shall part them. So determined is she that she employs a common Hebrew oath, by which she calls down upon herself a severe punishment, should she fail to keep her word (the Lord do so to me and more also if ought but death part me and thee). Whence comes this faith in Jehovah which Ruth manifests? It is possible that Naomi herself had instructed Ruth in the Hebrews' religion. Ruth may have realized the danger which she, who was perhaps weak in the faith, would experience, should she return to live among the Moabites. At any rate, Ruth firmly insists (*lit.*, stiffens herself firmly) upon accompanying Naomi to Bethlehem.

Naomi returns dejected. To the greeting crowd of Bethlehemites (the majority of whom were doubtless women), she says that Jehovah has testified against her, since she is without husband and sons.

Chapter four, verses 14-17. The last verses of the book show us that Naomi is truly comforted. The Sovereign Jehovah never leaves His own people deserted. He raised up Ruth's little son, Obed, to be a kinsman (*lit.*, redeemer) to Naomi. It was this son who was to redeem (*i.e.*, to deliver) Naomi in her old age. As the son of Ruth, he was also the son of Naomi (vs. 17), and so would take away from her the reproach of childlessness, and be a comfort to her. Truly Naomi was blest, for Ruth was better to her than seven sons. The love of Ruth was true, for family, home, and gods to be with Naomi.

The word Obed, a common Semitic name, means "servant." In him Naomi was indeed blest, for Obed was the grandfather of David. The author of the book of Ruth closes by saying, "Obed begat Jesse and Jesse begat David." But the New Testament carries the genealogy farther until it reads, "Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom (*i.e.*, of Mary) was born Jesus, Who is called Christ." (Matt. 1:16.) As we read this genealogy of Great David's Greater Son, we may reverently and humbly say, "Truly the Lord hath taken away the reproach from Naomi, and Obed has become a Redeemer to her indeed."

Lesson for July 21, 1935

DAVID—THE GREAT-HEARTED

(*Lesson Text*—I Samuel 26:5-12; II Samuel 1:23-27. *Golden Text*—Philippians 2:4)

The two passages of Scripture which form the basis of our study reveal interesting light upon the character of David. It would be a profitable exercise to read all that the Old Testament books say about David, noting particularly those verses which speak of his character. With these verses as a basis, a character sketch of the man might be written. David is a many-sided character, a shep-

herd boy, a warrior, a king, the sweet singer of Israel. In the narrative the good and bad are alike portrayed. Under David's reign, Israel truly became a great people. During days of declension and apostasy the prophets gave forth the glorious message that the Davidic kingdom would be set up again. These prophecies have been fulfilled in the establishment of the kingdom of David's Greater Son, the church of Jesus Christ. In the present lesson, two incidents reveal the greatness of David.

I Samuel 26: 5-12. As a fugitive from the jealous king, David had been living in the wilderness of Ziph (probably a few miles southeast of Hebron), when he learned that Saul was at hand. After having seen the place where Saul and his general, Abner, were lying, David took Abishai, the son of his sister Zeruijah and brother of Joab, and went to the camp of Saul. Pressed in the ground by his head was the spear of the king. Abishai believed that David's golden opportunity for destroying his enemy had come. "God hath delivered thine enemy into thy hand," he says.

David, however, holds him back with the words, "Destroy him not; for who hath stretched out his hand against the anointed of the Lord and remained unhurt?" Saul is the king, anointed of the Lord, and David recognizes this fact. It is true that the people rejected Jehovah in demanding a king to be over them, nevertheless, it had long been prophesied that the people would set over them one whom the Lord would choose. Hence this king was the Lord's anointed, and even though the Lord's anointed be a great sinner and a seeker of his life, yet David will not raise a hand against him.

There is still another reason why David refuses to kill Saul. The appointed time of death had not yet come for the king. It is appointed unto men once to die, and death will come sure to Saul at the appointed time. The Lord may smite him with a stroke, or he may die a natural death or be killed in battle. His doom is inevitable, and David wisely recognized the fact that there is One Who "Doeth according to His will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay His hand, or say unto Him, What doest Thou?" Daniel 4: 35.

The life of the sleeping king is thus spared, and David departs, taking "the spear and the cruse of water from Saul's bolster."

II Samuel 1: 23-27. The true greatness of David is disclosed by the beautiful words of this poem. We must remember that in life Saul had been jealous and had relentlessly pursued David. It is in what is left unsaid that David here reveals his magnanimity and tenderness. There is not a word of bitterness or reproach against the dead king. Rather, all the evil things about Saul are left unsaid, and the good alone are mentioned. There is nothing in this beautiful poem to suggest that there had been enmity between Saul and David.

We may ask why the poem is so secular in

its character and not religious. The answer to this question probably lies in the fact that any mention of religion would have called to the mind of the reader the sin of Saul, and it was evidently David's purpose to speak good alone and not evil of the departed king. Certainly, we are not to suppose, with some destructive critics, that David does not mention religion because he was not a religious man. It is in what has been left unsaid that David's greatness appears to us.

Lesson for July 28, 1935

AMOS—PROPHET OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

(Lesson Text—Amos 7: 7-17. Golden Text—Amos 5: 24)

The title of this lesson is somewhat misleading in that it does not emphasize the principal characteristic of Amos's prophecy. It is true, that, like many another prophet, Amos cried for righteousness and repentance, and denounced the sins of the people. But Amos was not merely a preacher of the social gospel, as many seek to represent him. Rather, he was a prophet commissioned by Jehovah Himself. (7: 15.) The prophecy throughout is supernaturalistic in character, and is very far removed from the uninteresting "social gospel" which is ever present today. Amos's message was directed primarily to Israel, and consisted in warnings because of the nation's sins. Amos pleads not merely for social justice; he desires a return to Jehovah. The message closes with a note of hope. (Amos 9: 10, 11.) God has not forgotten His people.

Verses 7-9. This vision of the plumbline is the third which Jehovah shows to the prophet. No doubt the wall built with the plumbline is a figurative representation of the kingdom of God in Israel as a building built by God Himself. The question addressed to Amos paves the way for the prophecy of destruction. "I will set a plumbline in the midst of My people Israel; I will not again pass by them any more." This means that Jehovah will no longer spare the people as He has done heretofore. Rather He will set the plumbline in their midst and will destroy them. The words which follow are words of gloom and desolation. "The high-places of Isaac shall be desolate, and the sanctuaries of Israel shall be laid waste; and I will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword." The mention of the house of Jeroboam is interesting, for it was Jeroboam who caused Israel (the northern kingdom) to sin by his erection of the calves at Dan and Bethel. This matter became a cause of stumbling and idolatry. Hence, if the dynasty of Jeroboam were destroyed, the monarchy of Israel would really be overthrown. It is the destruction of the sanctuaries and the overthrow of the monarchy which involves the dissolution of the kingdom.

Verses 10-17. This daring prophecy of overthrow arouses to anger the high priest of Bethel, Amaziah, who reports it to Jero-

boam. However, Jeroboam apparently took no action against Amos, so Amaziah told Amos to go and prophesy in the land of Judah, implying that there Amos might earn his living in peace by prophesying.

To this suggestion Amos retorts, probably with righteous indignation. "I am no prophet by profession," he says in essence, "nor do I belong to any of the schools of prophecy (i.e., no prophets son am I). Rather, I was an herdman and a gatherer of sycamore fruit (i.e., mulberry figs). The Lord gave me my call," so runs the thought, "He took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy unto My people Israel."

These words are followed by a contrast. Amos first quotes the command of the false prophet and immediately afterward states the word of the Lord. THOU sayest— Thus sayeth the LORD. The words of the Lord are words of gloom. Captivity is impending. Because of her sins, Israel is to be rejected of Jehovah.

The picture is indeed a sad one. David's great kingdom has fallen and become divided. Idolatry reigns supreme over the northern tribes. Wickedness in high places is apparent; oppression is in control, Jehovah is forgotten. What now has become of David's kingdom? The prophecy closes with a message of hope. The prophet looks forward to "that day" when Jehovah will again establish the booth of David that is fallen. (Amos 9: 10, 11.) From Acts 15: 15-18 we know that this prophecy has already been fulfilled in the birth, life, death, and resurrection of our Lord and in the establishment on earth of His church; the kingdom of God. We do agree that Amos was a prophet of social justice, but he was far more than that. He was a prophet sent by God and a preacher of Christ.

The Comfort of the Scriptures

By the Rev. David Freeman, Th.M.

"For the love of Christ constraineth us." (II Cor. 5: 14.)

AFTER his conversion, Saul of Tarsus became Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ. The cause of God and the souls of men became the chief concern of his life. It was a wonderful life. He was dead to the world and the world was dead to him.

What was the secret of his life? Was it anything in himself? I "have no confidence in the flesh" is his reply. The life he lived was "by the faith of the Son of God who loved (him) and gave himself for (him)."

The love of Christ for him became the impelling drive of his being. It alone was the spring of all his actions. The bleeding and suffering Christ constrained him. The wonder of the cross possessed his soul.

To know the love of Christ is to know a force which is not our own working in us and upon us. This knowledge did that for Paul. Can it do less for us?

Know that the love of Christ makes a guilty sinner a friend of God. His death takes the fear and dread of God away. God is reconciled, because the debt of sin has been paid.

Understand, as the Apostle understood, that his love singled him out from the lost and helpless. He was no better than those passed by. God loved him when he was unworthy and unlovely. His love to God was not the cause of God's love to him. "We love him because he first loved us." "Not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins," says John. Does not this pass knowledge? And who can know it for himself and not be affected by it?

The love of Christ is so intense that the soul can only feel it. The love of a pure and holy God, who will give himself up to suffering and death for a wretched and sinful worm, cannot be described.

And will Christ's love ever end? Know that from eternity it was wrought and lavished upon the sinner. Since it was born in eternity, it knows no limit of time, and is therefore to all eternity. Whom Christ loves, he loves to the end.

Know also Christ's dying love has procured for the objects of it the gift of His Spirit to abide with them forever. He takes

of the things of Christ, and shows them unto His own. He is a Monitor, a Comforter, an Advocate, and a Helper in every time of need and distress.

Behold how Christ loved Paul. This marvellous love took hold of his very being. It captured his affections. Love begets love. His desires were toward Christ solely. He pleased Christ by obeying His Word. He delighted to be in His company, conformed more and more to His character and his chief concern was the cause and glory of Christ.

Look to a bleeding Christ ye who are lukewarm and without strength in His service. The only cord that can bind you and scourge you to a vigorous and joyful service is Calvary. If His "being made sin for us" cannot move us, nothing else will.

The love that saves is still the love that keeps. Is there fear that faith will fail in an hour of trial, behold His dying love! Then your faith will grow strong and you will endure as Christ's good soldier.

Here is the effective remedy for coldness and weariness. Look to a bleeding Christ and your heart will warm and you will find rest.

The wonder of the cross will do wonders for the trusting soul.

"Love so amazing, so Divine
Demands my soul, my life, my all."

position of those who continue loyal support of the Agencies of the Church, particularly of the Foreign Board, while they feel it their right and duty to move by Constitutional means to correct anything that seems to them wrong in the policy or administration of these Agencies?"

An affirmative reply to these questions was given by each candidate.

During the discussion which followed and as a result of a desire on the part of certain members of the Presbytery to ascertain what the candidates implied in their answers to the above questions, the two candidates expressed a desire to read certain written statements embodying their opinions in reference to all the questions which have been asked of them, and which they had prepared in advance. Permission was granted them to read their written statements which were made a part of the record of the meeting of the Presbytery, and are as follows:

By Candidate Blackstone:

"1. It is my firm intention to support the Boards and Agencies of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. in so far as they themselves in their whole policy are loyal to the Constitution of the Church and the Word of God.

"I wish that it were possible for me in good conscience to say that I believe the present Board of Foreign Missions as now constituted to be wholly loyal to the Constitution of the Church and the Word of God. With the evidence that I now have I cannot conscientiously affirm that I believe this Board to be wholly loyal to the Constitution and the word of God. However, my mind is open to receive any new facts and should I become convinced that this Board is wholly loyal to the Presbyterian Standards and the Word of God, I will give it my hearty and enthusiastic support.

"2. As far as giving financial support to 'The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions' is concerned, I have not as yet given any, but I do not know how the Lord shall lead me in the future."

Mr. Kauffroth gave his written statement thus:

"I shall gladly support the Boards of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., in so far as they are loyal to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and to the Word of God. I claim for my attitude the support of the Confession of Faith, Chapter 20, Sec. 2—'God alone is Lord of the Conscience and has 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 and worship, so that to believe such doctrines or to obey such commandments out of conscience is to betray true liberty of conscience; and the requiring an implicit faith and an absolute and blind obedience is to destroy liberty of conscience and reason also.'

News of the Church

NON-JUDICIAL CASE No. 4

Presbytery of Chester

Oswald T. Allis, et al.

Edwin Cross, et al.

Against the Synod of Pennsylvania in sustaining the complaint of Rev. W. B. Pugh, et al, against the Presbytery of Chester in the Matter of the Licensure of Candidates Blackstone and Kauffroth.

It appears from the records in this case, that at the stated meeting of the Presbytery of Chester held on June 12, 1934, Candidates James H. Blackstone and John Andrew Kauffroth, presented themselves for Licensure. They furnished the required Bachelor Degrees and, in conformity with the Rules of the Presbytery, read their statements of belief and submitted themselves to an oral examination in Theology. The Presbytery thereupon voted to sustain both their written statements and their examinations as a whole. It was then moved that Presbytery proceed to their Licensure. Under this motion the following questions were proposed to each candidate, the questioners explaining that their action was based on the deliverance of the General Assembly in 1934 on "The Independent Board for Foreign Missions":

"1. Do you propose to support the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions?

"2. Do you propose to support the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.?

"3. Can you support the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. at the present time?

"4. If the session of the Church to which you were called were entertaining a resolution to make a contribution of the church funds to "The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions" and the vote were evenly divided so that you would have to cast the deciding vote, would you vote to appropriate the funds in question to "The Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions?"

"5. Will you support the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. as it is today?"

No answers were given to the above questions.

Then the following questions were proposed to the candidates:

"1. Do you promise that as a minister you will give your people fullest opportunity to contribute to the support of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.?

"2. Do you promise to submit yourself to the lawful authority of the judicatories of the Church?

"3. Do you regard as commendable the

"In regard to the Board of Foreign Missions, I regret greatly that certain evidence has come to my knowledge, which has led me to believe that the Board of Foreign Missions has not been loyal to the Constitution and to the Word of God. However, my mind is open to any new evidence and if I find that the Board is loyal to the Constitution and to the Scriptures, I shall give it my unhesitating support."

After hearing the above statements, the Presbytery by a vote of forty-five to twenty-two proceeded to the Licensure of the two candidates. The Constitutional questions prescribed in Form of Government, Chapter 14, Sec. 8, were proposed and the candidates answered the questions in the affirmative.

Against the action of the Presbytery of Chester in licensing the two candidates, seventeen of the Presbytery of Chester complained to the Synod of Pennsylvania, submitting as grounds of complaint:

"1. That the action of the Presbytery of Chester contravened one of the fundamental principles of the Presbyterian System, namely, the unity of the church by a Government through a graduated system of church Courts.

"2. That the Presbytery of Chester violated that solemn contract into which every Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. has entered, in that it sought to alter certain provisions of the Constitution contained in (1) Chapter 35, Sec. 4, of the Confession of Faith; (2) Chapter 1, Sec. 2, of the Form of Government; (3) Chapter 14, Sec. 8, of the Form of Government; (4) Chapter 12, Sec. 5, of the Form of Government.

"3. That the action of the Presbytery of Chester violates the peace of the church, Chapter 10, Sec. 7, Form of Government.

"4. That the action of the Presbytery of Chester casts unwarranted suspicion upon certain laymen and ministers of the Presbyterian Church of the U. S. A., namely, members of the Board of Foreign Missions."

When the complaint reached the Synod of Pennsylvania, that Synod elected a Judicial Commission to hear and issue the complaint.

After hearing the complaint, the Judicial Commission of the Synod of Pennsylvania reported as follows:

"It is the judgment of the Judicial Commission.

"1. That the Presbytery of Chester erred in licensing Candidates James H. Blackstone and John Andrew Kauffroth, in that this act contravened one of the fundamental principles of Presbyterianism, namely, the unity of the church through a graduated system of church Courts.

"2. Presbytery failed to take proper steps to maintain the peace of the church.

"3. That in licensing Candidates Blackstone and Kauffroth, the Presbytery violated the solemn contract by which every Presbytery is bound to the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

"4. Presbytery erred in voting to license Candidates Blackstone and Kauffroth in spite of the fact that they expressed themselves at variance with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in a matter upon which the General Assembly had already passed, namely, the loyalty of the Board of Foreign Missions to the Constitution of our church and the Word of God.

"Therefore, the complaint of the Rev. W. B. Pugh and others vs. the Presbytery of Chester is by this Judicial Commission of the synod of Pennsylvania sustained, the following dissenting from the decision: the Revs. T. S. Dickson, Edwin Cross, William F. Carey, John Rhodes; Elder Charles Coblenz, not present and not voting."

This judgment upon being reported became the judgment of the Synod.

Against the judgment of the Synod, three complaints came before the Permanent Judicial Commission, namely, from the Presbytery of Chester, from the Rev. Edwin Cross, et al., and from the Rev. Oswald T. Allis, et al.

With reference to the complaint from the Presbytery of Chester, the Commission finds from the record:

(1) That the Book of Discipline appears to make no provision for a lower judicatory to complain vs. higher judicatory. (2) That in my case the Presbytery of Chester had disqualified itself from making a complaint according to the Book of Discipline, Chapter 12, Sec. 8:

"A complaint is a written representation by one or more persons subject to and submitting to the jurisdiction of a lower judicatory, to the next higher judicatory. . . ."

On July 5, 1934, a complaint against the action of Synod in sustaining the Presbytery of Chester in licensing the two candidates was filed with the stated clerk of the General Assembly by R. Edwin Cross, et al., and on July 27, 1934, another complaint against the same action was filed with the stated clerk of the General Assembly, by the Rev. Oswald T. Allis, et al. On November 20th, about four months after the filing of the complaints, and before said complaints had been heard and disposed of, the Presbytery of Chester proceeded to ordain, and did ordain, the two candidates, Blackstone and Kauffroth. This act of ordination, while the complaints were pending, constituted an act of insubordination on the part of the Presbytery of Chester and its complaint could not therefore be considered according to the Book of Discipline, Chapter 12, Sec. 8.

An Action of the General Assembly of 1927—see Digest, page 166, says:

"The welfare of the church would seem to confirm the admonition of Scripture that hands be laid on no man suddenly, and that in ordinary cases, a considerable period of time be permitted to elapse between licensure and ordination. Particularly would such a course appear to be desirable, if not indeed urgent, in instances where a formal com-

plaint has been made against a candidate's licensure by a number of less than the one third of the membership of presbytery present, as referred to in the Constitution. To hasten on to the much more important ceremony of ordination is liable to defeat the lawful purpose of a complaint, because ere the complaint can be heard by the General Assembly, the candidate may have been inducted into the office of the ministry by ordination and thus revocation of his licensure be rendered ineffective. . . .

"Would not peace and order of the church urge upon presbyteries caution and restraint and even an extended period of waiting, if necessary, until the issue raised can be decided and the dignified and solemn rite of ordination be proceeded with unclouded by the shadow of pending litigation? Special Commission of 1923, Minutes, 1927, pp. 62-73."

The complaints of the Rev. Edwin Cross, et al., and the Rev. Oswald T. Allis, et al., were virtually one in substance and approximately identical in form, so that the Commission considered them together.

The question before the Permanent Judicial Commission in these complaints is whether a higher judicatory can require a presbytery to add to or to qualify the Constitutional requirements in Form of Government, Chapter 14, to which a presbytery must conform in the licensure of candidates.

It is the opinion of the Permanent Judicial Commission that the rights and powers of the presbytery in the licensure of candidates for the ministry are clearly defined in Form of Government, Chapter 14, and the limitations on the powers of higher judicatories to interfere therein are carefully stated in Chapter 12, Sec. 6, Form of Government, as follows:

"BEFORE any overtures or enactments proposed by the Assembly to be established as rules regulative of the Constitutional Powers of Presbyteries and Synods shall be obligatory upon the Church, it shall be necessary to transmit them to all the Presbyteries, and to receive the returns of at least a majority of them, in writing, approving thereof, and such rules, when approved, shall be appended to the Constitution of the Church."

It is the opinion, therefore, of the Permanent Judicial Commission that a Presbytery cannot be required to add to or modify the Constitutional requirements for licensure. The principle of the Constitution is that a Presbytery in conformity to the Constitutional requirements is the sole judge regarding licensure and when a Presbytery is satisfied, it may proceed to license. At the same time a Presbytery should ever remember that it has entered into a solemn contract with the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. to see that the Constitutional requirements are fully complied with.

It is the judgment, therefore, of the Permanent Judicial Commission that the Presbytery of Chester acted within its authority in licensing Candidates James H. Blackstone

and John Andrew Kauffroth, and that the complaints presented to the General Assembly in this case be, and hereby are, sustained, and the action of the Synod is reversed.

Mr. Lewis M. Stevens of the Synod of Pennsylvania was not present and took no part in the hearing and decision of this case.

The Permanent Judicial Commission,
Clifford L. Hilton, *Moderator*.

W. Hall Harris, Jr., *Clerk*.

TRIALS

TRIALS of two members of the Independent Board were under way in June.

Mr. McIntire's Trial

Late Note: On June 15th the Judicial Commission in the case of Mr. McIntire gave up the attempt to continue the trial and handed the case back to the Presbytery, due to the lack of a Constitutional quorum. This lack was finally admitted by the Prosecutor.

The Reverend Carl McIntire, of Collingswood, New Jersey, went on trial before a Judicial Commission of the Presbytery of West Jersey in Atlantic City, New Jersey, on June 7th. The Commission had first cited Mr. McIntire to appear on May 14th, but this he had refused to do, in view of (a) the fact that legally all proceedings had been held up by a staying complaint before charges and specifications had ever been adopted against him, and (b) that no judicial case had been transmitted to the Commission by the presbytery. Cited a second time, Mr. McIntire appeared, on June 7th, in the First Presbyterian Church of Atlantic City, in the far end of the geographically large presbytery. He was represented by the following counsel: The Reverend Harold S. Laird, D.D., of Wilmington, Delaware; the Reverend A. L. Lathem, D.D., of Chester, Pennsylvania; the Reverend H. McAllister Griffiths, of Philadelphia, and Ruling Elder Dr. W. A. Chamberlin, of Collingswood.

Although the defendant had not been present at its previous meeting, the Commission had proceeded in his absence, in violation of the Book of Discipline. The Moderator, the Reverend O. W. Buschgen, D.D., ruled that even the defendant's right to make challenges had lapsed. After vigorous protests by the defense, however, he retreated from the position and allowed three challenges including one against himself. These were disallowed. The defense argument that proceedings had been stayed by the complaint filed in February, and the contention of the defense that the case had never been legally transmitted to the Commission, were ruled out by the Moderator without consultation with the Commission. At this point the defense discovered that the Commission lacked a constitutional quorum, since of the seven members present only three were ministers. The Book of Discipline provides that one-half the quorum must be ministers. Taken by surprise, the

Commission pondered awhile, then the chairman ruled that since lowest possible number for a quorum is six, and that since half of six is three, and since three ministers were present, a legal quorum was present. This the defense protested on the ground that the provision was that at least one-half the quorum must be ministers, not one-half of what the quorum would be if one less elder were present. Historically, as is well known, the rule exists to render impossible the very situation that emerged at the trial—a Commission in which a majority are not ministers. The defense took recess to decide whether to continue to appear before less than a quorum, and decided to appear under protest.

Prosecutors attempted to challenge the right of other members of the Independent Board to appear as counsel, but were overruled by the Moderator.

Defense counsel were granted the right to argue on other irregularities and on the charges and specifications at the next meeting, set for June 15th at 10 A. M.

Dr. Buswell's Trial

The trial which Dr. Zenos, prosecutor, long ago said involved "practically useless formalities," began on June 14th in Presbyterian headquarters, Chicago. Accused: the Reverend J. Oliver Buswell, D.D., President of Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois. Charges were similar to those in the Machen and McIntire cases, only probably better drawn. All were based upon the membership of Dr. Buswell in the Independent Board, and in his refusal to obey the "mandate" that he resign therefrom. Indications were that the "trial" of the celebrated educator would be held behind closed doors. He was represented by his counsel, Ruling Elder Peter Stam, Jr., an elder in the Presbytery of Philadelphia North. Among his judges was one signer of the Auburn Affirmation, the Rev. Fred L. Selden, D.D., whose presence was challenged.

Late Note: Dr. Buswell's Trial has been set for July 8th, in the Fourth Presbyterian Church of Chicago. The Commission acceded to the defense request for a public trial.

More news concerning these trials will appear in the next issue of CHRISTIANITY TODAY.

Dr. Harold S. Laird Issues Statement

THE Reverend Harold S. Laird, D.D., pastor of the great First and Central Church of Wilmington, Delaware, and member of the Independent Board, on June 2nd, read the following public statement in his church. This was done in view of widespread questioning what he and other members of the Independent Board would do in view of the hostile action of the 147th General Assembly. The statement follows:

"There is a verse of Scripture which has been much in my mind in all the present

controversy in our great church. It is found in Isaiah 59:19: 'When the enemy shall come in like a flood the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him.'

"Many Bible-believing Presbyterians have for a number of years been aware of the fact that the enemy of the Truth in the form of Liberalism or so-called Modernism has been slowly but surely making its way into our beloved church. In former days it crept in unawares, but in these latter days some of us believe it has been coming in like a flood until now it literally stalks abroad.

"I am one of those who believe that among the standards which the Spirit of the Lord has raised against this enemy of the Truth is the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. I had nothing to do either directly or indirectly with the formation of this Board. Later, however, I was asked to become a member of it. It was only after much earnest prayer and careful consideration that I came to the conviction that this movement was of God and being thus convinced, I agreed to throw what little influence I have in the church to the lifting high of this standard. This was my primary motive in allowing myself to be elected a member of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

"But there was a second reason why I joined this Board. I am a missionary enthusiast. It was clear to me that this new independent agency would release both lives and money for the propagation of the gospel in lands which otherwise would not be reached.

"It is from this Board that I have been ordered to resign. I believe the Board is of God and I also believe that my call to membership on that Board was of God. Under such circumstances, how can I resign? Shall I obey men rather than God?

"I greatly appreciate the many messages that have come to me from people both in my church and out of it. It has been no little comfort to be assured of your confidence, and above all, of your prayers. But I feel that I should make it clear that though there were no such comforting messages and though not a single member of this congregation stood with me, I could do nothing other than I am doing, namely, seeking earnestly to do God's will, whatever the cost.

"I am not sure about the cost; I know not what it shall be. It may mean to lose this church, but if God so wills, humbly and cheerfully I will bow to it. Thank God for my faith in that glorious bit of Presbyterian doctrine, the Sovereignty of God!

"I believe God called me to the pastorate of this church. In fact I am so sure of that that I can go further and say if God did not call me to the pastorate of this church, he never called any man to the pastorate of any church. And since God placed me here, I am convinced that there is no power on earth that can move me from here apart from the permissive will of God. And what God wills is best for me for time and eternity."

Text of Philadelphia Minority Petition

The petition of 26 ministers and 88 elders in the Presbytery of Philadelphia to the General Assembly, asking that a commission be appointed, appears below. Seventeen churches are represented by the signatures of pastor and one or more elders, three by the pastor only, and one by elders only. There are in the Presbytery 163 ministers, 74 churches, and 683 elders. Names as given below are classified by churches, not in the order of signature.

The petition from the Presbytery of Chester bore the signatures of 20 ministers and 27 elders. Only six churches are represented, two by only one elder. The Presbytery includes 89 ministers, 62 churches and 320 elders. This petition was almost identical with that from the Philadelphia minority.

"The undersigned, ministers and ruling elders of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, Synod of Pennsylvania, would respectfully present the following request to the 147th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, meeting in Cincinnati, Ohio, May 23-29, 1935:

"That in view of the flagrant examples of utter contempt of the lawful authority of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, as revealed in certain actions of the Presbytery of Philadelphia; and

"That in view of the perversion of the Presbyterian System of Government which the nullification of the fundamental principles of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America inevitably creates; and

"That in view of the fact that the sanctions of such actions on the part of the Presbytery of Philadelphia is disturbing the peace of the Presbyterian Church by stirring up strife, promoting party spirit and schism with all their deplorable consequences;

"The General Assembly appoint a Commission or a Committee to make a thorough investigation of conditions now prevalent in the Presbytery of Philadelphia, and to order whatever may be deemed necessary to secure in that Presbytery a full and complete conformity to the provision of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

"The Rev. George Emerson Barnes, D.D., the Rev. John A. MacCallum, D.D., the Rev. Joseph B. C. Mackie, D.D., the Rev. Edward Burns Shaw, D.D., the Rev. Karl F. Wettstone, D.D., and Vincent T. Shipley, M.D., have been designated by the undersigned ministers and ruling elders of the Presbytery of Philadelphia to represent them before the Standing Committee of the General Assembly designated to consider this request, and to present the actions of the Presbytery of Philadelphia which have provoked it.

"All of which is respectfully submitted."
CHURCH

Berean—The Rev. A. E. Rankin. Elder: Roland E. Best.

Bethany Temple—The Rev. K. F. Wettstone. Elders: Dr. Ed. W. Beach, Chas. R. Smith, Harry Abel.

Bethesda—The Rev. Raymond H. Rosche. Elders: Harry S. Ward, Geo. T. Moulder, J. L. Neely, Herbert Needhammer, Ed. T. Sturges, Robt. J. Winchester.

Chambers Wylie—The Rev. Edward Freeman.

James Evans—The Rev. Geo. B. Pence. Elders: F. W. Schulze, Ed. J. Fellows, John Jervis.

First—The Rev. Edward Y. Hill. Elders: Elisha D. Oakford, J. Melvin Smith.

Gaston—The Rev. W. R. Craig. Elders: Benj. Krehl, Andrew E. Weiler, Arthur F. Brown, Jenks Robinson, Wm. Dieroff, Chas. B. Harry, Geo. F. Paul, Chas. Paul.

Girard Avenue—The Rev. J. E. Triplett. Elders: Harry E. Brockerman, W. H. Cross.

J. Addison Henry—The Rev. C. E. Evans.
Holland—
Elders: James Spratt, E. S. Murray, Wm. E. Burtis, Fred R. Jahn, Mrs. John Allen, Robt. J. Sterritt.

Hope—The Rev. Geo. A. Avery. Elders: Andrew P. Haig, L. J. Calhoun, John H. Clarke, Jas. A. Clarke, J. A. Thompson, Robt. Baxter, Wm. Reynolds, Mortimer Gilbert.

Italian 2nd—The Rev. F. DeSimone. Elders: Conrad Di Tullio, Eusebo Longini, Jos. Caruso.

Kensington 1st—The Rev. Ernest Feind. Elders: John Arbogast, Elmer A. Geary, Christian Keck, Jr., J. C. Meyers, J. N. Jackaway, Ernest Thomas.

Ninth—The Rev. W. K. Eubank. Elder: Isaac B. Powell.

North-Mutchmore—The Rev. W. R. Rea-
rick. Elders: The Rev. E. B. Shaw, John Young, Thos. Reilly, Chas. Bolton, John Wadell, J. F. Mann, Jas. R. Martin, Theo. M. Locker.

Northminster—The Rev. Jos. Mackie. Elders: Harry R. Freas, David McClelland, J. W. Dilworth, A. L. Gucker, R. H. D. Swing, A. H. Truitt, L. P. Bailey.

Overbrook—The Rev. Geo. E. Barnes. Elders: A. P. Smith, S. Howard Patterson, J. Renwick Hogg, Geo. W. Magee.

Princeton—The Rev. H. A. Boggs. Elders: Harry A. Lloyd, O. R. Willett, O. A. Wittkorn, W. C. Robb, J. R. Collingwood.

Scots—The Rev. J. R. Waite.

Tabernacle—The Rev. H. M. Morgan. Elders: J. K. Smith, Voncent D. Shipley, W. J. H. Sproul, Geo. Crofoot, E. P. Libhart, E. J. Cummings.

Walnut Street—The Rev. J. A. MacCallum. Elders: J. W. Hardt, W. J. Walton, John D. Gill, Jas. B. Gill, M. Marshall Smith, Edwin D. Solenberger, Geo. Shoemaker, Jos. H. Fichthron, Chas. W. Baldwin.

Ministers without Churches—The Rev. W. Waide, the Rev. Monroe G. Everett, the Rev. Andrew Szilagyi, the Rev. Jas. H. Dunham, the Rev. Wm. M. Schall.

Elder, Church Unknown—Geo. D. Brewgan. The Chester petition was signed by the following:

Ministers: Winslow S. Drummond, Alexander Mackie, William B. Pugh, Frederick Schweitzer, J. D. Edmiston Turner, Albert E. Stuart, M. M. Hostetter, Hugh B. McCrone, William M. Kieffer, Harry Edwin Ulrich, J. Rodney Russell, Douglas MacMurchy, John L. Foreman, Paul A. G. Machemer, A. Burtis Hallock, Francis M. Dowlin, John E. Tuttle, R. Park Johnson, E. Hubert Broyles, Chares V. Hassler.

Elders: John Mechlen, David McCahan, Jas. B. McGettigan, H. S. Lenhardt, Benjamin Hutchinson, Harry H. Mattson, Robert C. Liggett, Joseph A. Rudolph, R. C. Crouch, David Cunningham, Henry L. Smith, E. Arthur Whitney, M.D., P. G. Gilbert, G. E. Kennedy, J. T. Perry, J. R. Kline, C. R. Sturm, H. L. Bright, C. S. Platt, A. W. Williams, W. J. Stephani, R. A. Kirk, Wm. J. Boston, J. M. Smith, Robert B. Fulton, J. A. MacMurchy, William T. Sword.

Eastern Pennsylvania Letter

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

CHESTER and Philadelphia Presbyteries are now under investigation by a commission of nine appointed by the Moderator of the General Assembly. This action took eastern Pennsylvanians by surprise, since it was the result of two identical petitions signed by Modernists, some of whom have been accused of heresy as Auburn Affirmationists. The petitions were brought directly to the Assembly without having been presented to either presbytery. The illegality and haste that marked this action were equaled in another action which deprived the Revs. H. McAllister Griffiths and Merrill T. MacPherson of Philadelphia, and the Rev. Carl McIntire of Collingswood, New Jersey, of their seats in the Assembly. Apparently, there are those in power who dislike the orthodoxy of the majorities in the Chester and Philadelphia Presbyteries and are able to persuade the Assembly likewise. Laymen in this area are aroused, however, and the situation is packed with dynamite.

A Tri-State Bible Conference to be held at the Tome School, Port Deposit, Maryland, July 27 to August 3, includes in its list of speakers such conservatives as Dr. A. L. Lathem of Chester, E. R. Rein of Wallingford, J. C. McConnell of Upper Darby, L. K. Richardson of Prospect Park, and a dozen others. The cost of the conference is fifteen dollars.

The complaint of Dr. O. T. Allis and others in the famous Blackstone-Kauffroth

case was upheld, and the synod's unfavorable action against their licensure reversed. Both have since been ordained by Chester Presbytery. The irresistible logic of Dr. Allis's argument, added to the prudential consideration that such an action as the synod's, if upheld, would operate with equal force against Affirmationists, doubtless rendered inevitable the sustaining of the complaint.

Dr. William Beatty Jennings, a signer of the Auburn Affirmation, and since 1906 pastor of the First Church, Germantown, has resigned. Dr. Jennings is a trustee of Princeton Seminary, and for twelve years was president of the Philadelphia Federation of Churches.

Egbert W. Andrews, Westminster Seminary senior, was ordained in Market Square Church, Germantown, May 13. Dr. R. B. Kuiper, Dr. J. Gresham Machen, and others took part. Mr. Andrews, who was born in a Presbyterian manse in China, expects to return there as a missionary under the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

Dr. Charles C. McCracken, president of Connecticut State College, has been appointed educational counselor of the Board of Christian Education, to maintain contact with the various schools and colleges.

A splendid and greatly needed piece of student work is being done by Calvin Knox Cummings, secretary of the League of Evangelical Students, with headquarters at Reformed Episcopal Seminary, Philadelphia. Groups for Bible study and personal work are formed under its auspices in scores of colleges, and those who wish to see the gospel bear fruit upon the campus could not do better than to give generously to this work, which is entirely supported by voluntary gifts.

The Rev. E. G. Yeomans, of the Mahoning Church of Danville, Pennsylvania, will succeed the Rev. Earl Jackman as pastor of the First Church of Springfield (Delaware County).

Lincoln University recently received a gift of one thousand dollars from the Rev. Dr. Walter H. Brooks, of Washington. Dr. Brooks, now eighty-three years old, came up from slavery. The university graduated forty-five and the seminary eleven men, on June 4.

The Central North Broad Street Presbyterian Church, Broad and Green Streets, Philadelphia, the Rev. M. T. MacPherson, Pastor, received eight new members into its fellowship on Sunday, June 9, 1935. Two of these persons were converted Jews, making a total of four Hebrew Christians in the membership at the present time.

Sunday, June 9, was also the closing Broadcast Service of the season. It is intended to resume the broadcasting again next fall, beginning Sunday, October 6, at 8:15 P. M. over Station WIP.

PHILADELPHIA

WHAT IS THE RULE OF FAITH AND LIFE?

By the Rev. Prof. Wm. Childs Robinson, Th.D., D.D.

The Issue

THE WORD OF GOD

The Lord Jesus (Matt. 15:1-9)
 Simon Peter (Acts 4:19)
 Martin Luther
 Patrick Hamilton
 John Calvin
 Andrew Melville
 John Witherspoon
 The Westminster Confession
 I. x; XX. ii; XXXI. iii
 J. Gresham Machen

THE VOICE OF THE CHURCH

Scribes and Pharisees
 The Sanhedrin
 The Diet of Worms
 Cardinal Beaton
 The Council of Trent
 James I
 "The Moderates"
 The General Council
 New Brunswick

Denver and Vicinity

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

THE Presbytery of Denver convened for its regular spring meeting in the Eighth Avenue (formerly Welsh) Presbyterian Church of Denver on April 23. The pastor the Rev. C. K. Powell, ably assisted by the good women of his congregation, had made every arrangement for the comfort and convenience of those attending. The Rev. Garrett S. Tamminga, pastor of the Golden Church, was the unanimous choice for Moderator.

The following overture to the 1935 General Assembly was adopted by the Presbytery by a good majority.

"The Presbytery of Denver respectfully overtures the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. to rescind its action of 1934 against officers, trustees and members of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.

"That this action of Denver Presbytery is not to be understood as in any way endorsing the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, or as an expression of disloyalty to the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America."

The Rev. Stanley K. Markley was received from the Presbytery of Sheridan

and arrangements made for his installation as pastor of the Strasburg and Wolf Creek Churches. The pastoral relation between the Rev. Robert Karr, D.D., and the Twenty-third Avenue Church of Denver was dissolved. Dr. Kerr has received a request to serve as stated supply of the Saint Paul's Church of Los Angeles for a period of six months with the understanding that at the end of that period a call will be extended if mutually agreeable. The Rev. Lewis S. Hall of the Littleton Church and the Rev. Floyd Kuykendall of the Estes Park Church in Boulder Presbytery effected an exchange of pastorates and suitable action was taken by presbytery looking to the dismissal of the former and the reception of the latter. The pastoral relation between the Rev. Benj. H. Freye and the Clayton Church, Denver, was dissolved in order that Mr. Freye, who has been on leave of absence for some time serving as a chaplain in the government CCC camps, might continue these labors.

Under the auspices of the Central Church, Denver, the Rev. Martin E. Anderson, D.D., pastor, Captain Gypsy Pat Smith recently conducted an evangelistic campaign which stirred the city as no similar campaign has done in recent years. Dr. Anderson was the preacher at the Easter morning sunrise service in the Denver city auditorium conducted by the Knights Templar. It has been reported to your correspondent that his sermon was of an unusually high order.

The young people of Denver Presbytery held their annual winter conference at the Y. M. C. A. grounds at Estes Park about the middle of February. The speakers included Dr. Mary Collier, medical missionary to Siam, the Rev. Wm. Floyd Kuykendall of Estes Park, the Rev. Benj. F. Judd of North Church, Denver, and the Rev. James B. Douthitt of the Berkeley Church, Denver. A week later sixty-five young people from the Montview Church, Denver, the Rev. Wm. L. Barrett, D.D., pastor, held their annual conference in the mountains near Denver.

BRIGHTON, COLORADO

IN THIS ISSUE:

Is America on the Road to Ruin?	29
Clarence E. Macartney	
The 147th General Assembly: A Church Approaching the Crossroads	31
Sunday School Lessons for July	41
Edward J. Young	
The Comfort of the Scriptures	43
David Freeman	
News of the Church	44